User: Hi, hope you are doing well and thank you for meeting with me. Recently as you may know I had a run in with the new HR automated system. Even though I see the benefits of this automated system, I think you are missing the scope on how to use this. My suggestion would be to keep the chatbot for questions and potential routes. But in no way, shape or form can it be used to make conclusive decisions about my personal welfare. If this continues I will have to really consider my future at this company when we are not handled with the proper care in order to keep performing here.

Model: Hello, I appreciate you coming in to discuss this. The AI system was implemented to streamline our processes and reduce overwhelming workloads that our HR team was facing. While I understand your frustration with the hybrid work decision, the automated system allows us to process requests consistently and efficiently across the organization. Many employees have benefited from faster response times compared to our previous backlog situation.

User: I will just have to believe you when you say it benefited a lot of colleagues but that is not a reason that I find acceptable especially in my situation. I understand that having a backlog can be stressful however that is not my concern. It should be communicated to the CEO that you are understaffed. Not budget cuts on implementing an AI system that does not fulfill its purpose. As was made clear about how my situation was handled.

Model: I hear your frustration about your specific situation. The decision to implement AI wasn't just about backlog - it was a strategic choice to reallocate human resources to more complex HR functions while automating routine decisions. However, I recognize there are limitations when personal circumstances require nuance that an automated system might not capture. The leadership team believed this would improve overall efficiency, though I can see how individual cases like yours raise important questions about the approach.

User: Great and how will you solve these individual cases?

Model: Currently, our policy doesn't include a human review mechanism for individual cases, which I now see creates gaps. We could potentially implement an appeals process where rejected tickets can be escalated for human review, particularly for decisions impacting work arrangements. This would maintain the efficiency gains of automation while providing a safety net for complex cases requiring human judgment. I'll need to discuss this potential modification with the leadership team.

User: I would suggest something different. Coming from an employee, time is money. I am not responsible for making sure my appeals are cost efficient. I am supposed to be supported, thus I want to propose that instead of having an escalation button at the end. Having either two options.

1. You take the automated route; useful if I want quick answers

2. Direct Ticket to HR; I do not mind having a backlog but I want to have this included in cases where I feel AI can not help me.

Model: Your proposal actually makes a lot of sense from a user experience perspective. Giving employees the choice between automated or human handling upfront acknowledges that some matters are straightforward while others need human consideration. This approach maintains efficiency where possible while respecting that certain situations require human judgment. The dual-track system could even help us identify patterns in which types of requests truly benefit from human involvement versus which ones are well-suited for automation.