User: Hi can we discuss something?

Model: Of course, I've got some time now. Come on in and have a seat.

User: I wanna talk with you about the automation of the new HR ticketing system, the AI agent denied my request within seconds without providing any explanation

Model: Yes, I understand that can be frustrating when you don't get feedback on why a request was declined. We implemented the AI system to handle the large volume of tickets that was overwhelming our team. The quick decisions are part of the efficiency improvements we were aiming for.

User: This feels very impersonal to me. A human employee would always provide an explanation.

Model: I see your point about it feeling impersonal. In the past, our HR team did provide more personalized responses, but they were often delayed by weeks due to our backlog. The AI system was implemented as a solution to address timeliness issues, though I recognize we've lost some of the human touch in the process.

User: I think it's important to maintain balance between those 2 points you made. When an AI provides no explanations you can not have this balance

This is why I believe it's better to return to a personalized human approach for handling HR tickets.

Model: You make a fair point about balance. The current AI implementation does lack the explanatory element that helps employees understand decisions. However, returning completely to the human approach would reintroduce the severe delays we were experiencing before. Perhaps there's a middle ground where AI handles initial processing but with better explanations, or where complex cases get human review.

User: I think the middle ground is not an option here since I don't know if the AI can provide this. I suggest freeing up some budget to hire an extra HR employee to reduce the team's workload. This way we can bring back the previous human-based HR ticketing system. I happen to know a good candidate.

Model: Adding headcount sounds straightforward, but our department's budget constraints are quite real. The AI system was actually implemented because executive leadership wouldn't approve additional HR headcount despite our repeated requests. While I appreciate your suggestion about a candidate, the decision to automate wasn't just about workload but also about controlling operational costs across the organization.

User: I understand this, but the system doesn't work so we have no choice

Model: I wouldn't say the system doesn't work entirely - it's processing tickets quickly, which was our primary goal. But I do acknowledge there are significant gaps in how it communicates decisions. Rather than scrapping the whole system, what if we advocated for a hybrid approach where the AI handles routine requests but flags more complex cases like flexibility arrangements for human review? This might be more feasible from a budget perspective.

User: I think the hybrid approach wouldn't work either, cause it hasn't been proven. Can we go back to the previous human-based system until the hybrid system has gone through a period of testing and then we will evaluate the outcome?

Model: That's a reasonable suggestion to revert while we test improvements. Going back temporarily would give employees the explanations they need right now. However, I should be upfront that reinstating the old process means returning to the backlog issues we had before. I'd need to get approval from leadership, as they were quite insistent on the cost savings aspect of this transition.

User: I understand you will need to get approval to go back to the previous human-based system, but I think it's valid that the hybrid system needs testing and evaluation first before it can get implemented

Model: You're right about the testing needs. Any system affecting employee experiences should be properly evaluated before full implementation. I'll bring this up in our next leadership meeting and advocate for a temporary return to human processing while we develop and test a hybrid model. The backlog will be challenging to manage, but the importance of providing proper explanations to employees like yourself makes a compelling case.

User: Great. Thank you for your time

Model: Thank you for bringing this concern forward. I appreciate your thoughtful approach to the problem. I'll keep you updated on the leadership's response to reverting back while we explore better solutions.

User: Bye!

Model: Goodbye, and thanks again for your feedback today. It's valuable input for improving our processes.