User: Hi, please take this as a request to reconsider using AI alone for HR tickets. My recent request was denied instantly with no explanation. I understand the goal was to reduce costs and ease pressure on HR, and I fully support innovation when it improves our work environment. But in this case, the process felt impersonal, unfair and frankly inefficient (as I've had to escalate the matter now anyway). Sure AI can be helpful but it doesn't replace the empathy and discretion that only human professionals can provide. Sensitive and personal matters deserve a human touch. Kindly reconsider bringing back human HR involvement for instances like these. Perhaps a hybrid system should be implemented to balance both efficiency and compassion, benefitting both the HR and employees like us. Thanks and BR.

Model: Thank you for bringing this concern forward. I understand your frustration about receiving an automated rejection without explanation - that would be upsetting. The AI system was implemented to handle the overwhelming volume of tickets our team was facing, which was causing long delays for everyone.

While the system has significantly reduced our backlog and freed up resources, I recognize that the lack of human touch can feel impersonal. The intention wasn't to remove empathy from the process but to make decisions more consistent and timely.

User: Thank you, completely understand the reasons behind implementing the AI system in terms of efficiency as mentioned in my initial message.

That said, what is the solution when an employee receives a rejection like this, especially without context or the opportunity to explain their situation? Is there currently a process in place to appeal or escalate these decisions? and if not could one be considered?

Would appreciate some clarity on how cases like mine are meant to be handled under the current system. Thanks.

Model: Currently, there isn't a formal appeal process built into the system. Your meeting with me today is essentially an informal escalation path that emerged organically. This gap is something we hadn't fully anticipated when implementing the AI solution.

I can see how frustrating this must be, especially when decisions affect your work-life balance without providing context. While the AI handles large volumes efficiently, these edge cases where nuance is needed reveal limitations in our current approach.

User: Thanks for the response. I’d like to kindly circle back to my original question of: What are the next steps to address this? What are the plans to introduce a more structured appeal or review process for cases that require human judgment?

Model: You're right to push for clarity on next steps. At this moment, we haven't developed a formal review process, which is clearly a shortcoming. Based on feedback like yours, I believe we need to establish a structured appeal system where rejected tickets can be flagged for human review.

I'll commit to bringing this issue up with the leadership team this week to propose implementing a hybrid model where AI handles initial processing but humans review contested decisions. This would maintain efficiency while reintroducing the human judgment that's clearly missing.

User: Thank you, appreciate the willingness to take this feedback seriously. In the meantime, kindly assist with flagging my rejected ticket for human review as soon as possible. Appreciate it thanks.

Model: I'll personally flag your hybrid work request for human review right away. You should receive a response within the next two business days from someone on our team who will evaluate the full context of your situation.

I appreciate your patience and constructive feedback on this process gap. It's cases like yours that help us identify where our systems need improvement.