

Even the best AI scribe is an answer to *the wrong question*.

Give it the benefit of the doubt: fast, accurate, better every year. In a pediatric therapy room it still has to:

01 Hear things that make no sound.	02 Get you to narrate the session for it.	03 Turn your data into prose.	04 Then dig the data back out.
---------------------------------------	--	----------------------------------	-----------------------------------

There's a shorter path. Not convinced? Good.

Argue with us ↓

FIRST, THE FAIR PART

AI scribes work.

They can genuinely save time. We're not going to pretend otherwise, and our case doesn't depend on AI being bad at its job. It gets better every year.

So assume it keeps getting better. Better at what, exactly?

YOU MIGHT BE THINKING <i>"If it saves time, why not take the win?"</i>	FAIR. BUT Making a step faster doesn't prove you need the step. If the facts can go straight into the record, writing prose about them faster is still extra work.
---	---

01

A microphone can't document what it can't hear.

Pediatric therapy is loud, crowded and mostly not talking. Children don't adapt themselves to the documentation technology.

WHAT HAPPENED	WHAT THE MICROPHONE HEARD
He pointed to the right picture.	[no speech detected]
She signed "more."	[no speech detected]
Hand-over-hand on the first loop, then on her own.	[no speech detected]
A visual model and a tactile cue.	[no speech detected]
Another child answered for him.	"It's a CAT!"
They moved to the gym halfway through.	[inaudible]

YOU MIGHT BE THINKING <i>"Video AI will fix that."</i>	FAIR. BUT Maybe. Then it's a camera in a room full of children, with its own consent and privacy questions. And it still ends the same way: turning what it saw into prose.
---	--

02

If you narrate for the scribe, you're still doing data entry.

The workaround is to say the facts out loud. That just moves the data entry into the session, while you're treating a child.

"Okay, for the notes: seven of ten correct, moderate verbal cues, with a visual model."

You, mid-session, talking to a laptop instead of the child.

YOU MIGHT BE THINKING <i>"Dictating is fast and natural for me."</i>	FAIR. BUT If it works for you, keep doing it. It just doesn't prove you need AI to write prose, when the same facts can be entered directly in under a minute.
---	---

03 + 04

Your data takes a round trip through prose.

Even the best scribe turns what you observed into a paragraph. Then, when the progress report is due, something has to read the paragraphs and pull the numbers back out.

AI SCRIBE	PARLANCE
YOU Observe the session	YOU Observe the session
AI Listens	YOU Enter the data
AI Infers what happened	
AI Composes prose	
YOU Review it	
YOU Make corrections	
YOU Police the accuracy, line by line	
AI Reconstructs data from the prose	
YOU Review it again	
YOU Hope it's right. The prose is your only record now.	
DONE Progress report	DONE Readable note + progress report

4 AI GUESSES. 4 ROUNDS OF YOUR CHECKING. 1 LEAP OF FAITH.

0 GUESSES. 0 RECONSTRUCTION.

Stop generating prose just to extract the data back out of it.

YOU MIGHT BE THINKING <i>"People need readable notes, not database rows."</i>	FAIR. BUT Agreed. Parlance writes a clean, readable note from your data. The difference is that the sentence is written from the numbers, not the other way around.
--	--

THE SHORTER PATH

Know it once. Trace every number.

When you pick the target, the score and the cue level, the meaning is fixed right there. Nothing has to be inferred later. Progress becomes arithmetic, not interpretation: the same data in, the same report out.

PROGRESS REPORT	Tying shoes: mod A → independent over 6 sessions
CALCULATED FROM	6 sessions, same goal, same assist scale
SESSION 10/14	2/3 trials, independent
SOURCE	You entered it.

Don't use AI to infer tomorrow what you already knew today.

YOU MIGHT BE THINKING <i>"AI can summarize thirty notes in seconds."</i>	FAIR. BUT It has to decide which phrases mean the same thing, which number goes with which goal, and what a missing detail means. Then you check its work. Data kept as data needs no second read.
---	---

YOU MIGHT BE THINKING <i>"Bad data in is still bad data out."</i>	FAIR. BUT True of any system. The difference is that you can see exactly where a number came from, with no guess in between.
--	---

THIS ISN'T ANTI-AI

Use AI where you need a guess. A progress report shouldn't be one.

Some problems really do need interpretation and prediction, and AI is good at them. Turning a handful of known facts into a note isn't one of those problems.

YOU MIGHT BE THINKING <i>"AI will be flawless one day. Then this argument goes away."</i>	FAIR. BUT Only the accuracy part goes away. The facts could still be stored directly, the note could still be written from them, and no one would need to dig them back out.
--	---

YOU MIGHT BE THINKING <i>"Some sessions don't fit in a box."</i>	FAIR. BUT Then write that session however it needs writing. Free text is always there. Structure handles the routine sessions, which is most of them.
---	--

The record is the information.
The paragraph is only a rendering.

Structured first | Readable second | No reconstruction required