

AI-Powered Content Curation with SharePoint + Syntax

A Knowledge Manager's practical guide to automating content discovery, classification, tagging, governance and routing

1. The problem we are trying to solve

Organisations accumulate large amounts of content in SharePoint and other collaboration spaces. The content may be valuable, but it is not necessarily curated, classified or easy to reuse. The traditional approach depends heavily on KM professionals opening and processing individual content items.

- Content is scattered across folders and sites.
- Metadata is inconsistent or missing.
- Similar content may exist in multiple locations.
- Sensitive or restricted content may be mixed with reusable content.
- KM teams spend time on repetitive processing instead of higher-value knowledge work.

2. The AI-assisted curation model

A practical target workflow is:

SharePoint source → Syntax/AI processing → Content type → Category → Metadata → Governance flags → KM review → Approved repository

3. What to prepare before automation

AI automation should not start with the tool. Start with the KM rules.

Area	Questions to define
Content types	What types of knowledge do we recognise?
Taxonomy	Which categories, practices, industries, technologies or functions matter?
Metadata	Which fields are mandatory, optional or controlled?
Reuse	What makes content reusable? What is client-specific?
Confidentiality	What information requires restricted handling?
Copyright	What third-party or licensed material needs review?
IP	What proprietary material requires special handling?
Lifecycle	When should content be reviewed, refreshed, archived or retired?
Ownership	Who is accountable for final approval?

4. Example content classification

Source content	Possible classification	Human check
Customer success story	Case Study	Client approval/reuse status
Proposal response	Proposal Content	Client-specific information
Solution presentation	Solution	Currency and ownership
Project lessons learned	Lessons Learned	Confidentiality
Meeting notes	Meeting Knowledge	Sensitive information
Framework/methodology	IP/Offering	Ownership and reuse rights
Third-party article/deck	External/Copyright Review	Licence/permission

5. Training and configuration principles

The better the examples and rules, the better the initial output is likely to be. Give the automation clear definitions and representative examples of what good classification looks like.

- Define each content type in plain language.
- Provide positive and negative examples where possible.
- Use controlled values for important metadata.
- Explain what should trigger a confidentiality or IP flag.
- Separate 'flag for review' from 'automatically reject'.
- Test against a sample set before processing a large repository.
- Measure accuracy and refine the rules iteratively.

6. Human-in-the-loop quality gate

Check	KM question	Decision
Classification	Is the content type correct?	Approve / Correct
Metadata	Are tags accurate and useful?	Approve / Edit
Currency	Is the content still valid?	Publish / Refresh / Archive
Reuse	Can others reuse it?	Reusable / Restricted
Confidentiality	Does it contain sensitive information?	Clear / Restrict
Copyright	Are there external rights concerns?	Clear / Review
IP	Does it contain proprietary material?	Clear / Review
Destination	Is this the right repository/location?	Route / Re-route

7. Forms + Power Automate use cases

Use a form as the capture layer and automation as the knowledge pipeline.

- Meeting notes and key decisions.
- Project closure and lessons learned.
- Reusable solution or asset submissions.
- SME knowledge capture.

- Win/loss insights from bids.
- Content review requests.
- Content retirement or refresh requests.

Example workflow:

Form submission → Power Automate → AI structure/classify → governance flags → KM review → SharePoint storage → notification/reuse

8. Bid and proposal use cases

- Automatically classify previous proposal responses.
- Tag case studies by industry, capability, geography and outcome.
- Surface reusable solution descriptions.
- Identify previous answers to similar requirements.
- Build a cleaner pool of approved credentials and proof points.
- Flag client-specific content before reuse.
- Reduce time spent searching multiple folders during bid deadlines.

The goal is not simply faster search. The goal is faster access to trusted, reusable knowledge.

9. Manual vs AI-assisted effort model

Step	Manual effort	AI-assisted effort	KM role
Discovery	High	Low/Medium	Set source and validate
Initial reading	High	Low/Medium	Review exceptions
Classification	Medium/High	Low/Medium	Validate
Metadata	Medium/High	Low/Medium	Validate/edit
Governance flagging	Medium/High	Low/Medium	Make decision
Routing	Medium	Low	Approve workflow
Final quality	High	High	Accountable

10. How to measure success

- Average time spent processing one content item before vs after automation.
- Percentage of content correctly classified on first pass.
- Metadata accuracy rate.
- Percentage of content requiring human correction.
- Number/percentage of governance flags validated correctly.
- Percentage of curated content reused by business teams.
- Reduction in time spent by bid teams searching for reusable content.
- Reduction in duplicate or obsolete content.
- User satisfaction with search and discovery.

11. A realistic expectation: automation, not autopilot

In my own exploration, the initial output was not 100% accurate. I would use approximately 70% as an observed working level rather than a universal product benchmark. Accuracy will depend on the content, taxonomy, examples, instructions and governance design.

The practical objective is therefore not 'zero human involvement'. It is to reduce repetitive human effort while improving consistency and creating more capacity for higher-value KM work.

12. KM governance checklist

- ☐ Taxonomy has an accountable owner.
- ☐ Metadata values are defined and controlled.
- ☐ Content types have clear definitions.
- ☐ Confidentiality rules are documented.
- ☐ Copyright/IP review criteria are documented.
- ☐ AI outputs are sampled and quality-checked.
- ☐ Final publishing accountability is assigned to a human.
- ☐ Exceptions and errors are captured for continuous improvement.
- ☐ Content lifecycle and review dates are defined.
- ☐ Business reuse is measured, not just repository activity.

13. The future state

The longer-term opportunity is to create an intelligent knowledge pipeline in which knowledge is captured during work, processed automatically, validated by humans and made available at the point of need.

Capture → Understand → Curate → Govern → Activate → Learn → Improve

For KM professionals, this represents a shift from managing documents to designing intelligent knowledge ecosystems.

Important note

This guide reflects a practical KM perspective based on exploration of an AI-assisted SharePoint content-curation workflow. Specific Syntax, SharePoint, Microsoft 365 or Power Automate capabilities, connectors, permissions and configuration options can vary by product version, tenant setup and licensing. AI-generated classifications or governance flags should be validated before publishing or making reuse decisions, particularly for confidential, client, copyright or IP-sensitive material.

Prepared for Content Arena

A practical Knowledge Management perspective on AI, automation and the future of KM.