



New Dynamics

AI at work

AI in HR: a practical opportunity map

Identify useful AI applications in HR and choose a bounded pilot with measurable value and accountable review.

Practical guidance · Worked examples · Printable worksheet

New Dynamics Editorial Team
Published 15 September 2026

www.new-dynamics.com
contact@new-dynamics.com

Inside this guide

Map tasks instead of buying a broad promise	3
Compare value with review effort	3
Define the boundary and owner	3
Worked example: drafting a policy announcement	3
Opportunity assessment worksheet	4
Pilot and make an explicit decision	4
Put the guide into practice	4
Frequently asked questions	5
Review the first cycle	6
About New Dynamics	6
Your working worksheet	7

Read in order for the full approach, or use the linked contents to find a section. The final worksheet gives you space to record decisions and next steps.

Identify useful AI applications in HR and choose a bounded pilot with measurable value and accountable review. This practical guide to AI in HR brings together a step-by-step approach, illustrative examples, a reusable worksheet and answers to common questions. Start with the section closest to your current challenge, then use the working session to turn the guidance into a clear next action.

Map tasks instead of buying a broad promise

AI can support several different kinds of HR work: drafting, summarising, finding information, classifying requests or assisting analysis. These tasks have different consequences and need different controls. Begin with a task inventory rather than a plan to “automate HR.”

For each task, record the user, information required, output and action someone may take from it. A draft internal announcement has a different risk profile from a recommendation about a candidate or employee. Do not treat them as the same use case because they share a model.

Compare value with review effort

Estimate the current time, delays and rework involved. Then include the time needed to check an AI output, correct mistakes and handle exceptions. A faster first draft does not establish a faster or better end-to-end process.

Look for bounded tasks where a knowledgeable person can verify the result. Examples include drafting a communication from approved facts or locating a policy passage for an HR adviser. Avoid starting with consequential employee decisions or information whose correctness cannot be checked reliably.

Define the boundary and owner

Write down approved inputs, excluded information, permitted outputs and the responsible reviewer. Confirm the tool and data arrangements with the relevant owners before using employee information. Explain what happens when the output is incomplete or wrong.

The [NIST AI Risk Management Framework](#) is a useful general reference for organising AI risk work. The practical opportunity worksheet below is an editorial planning tool, not a claim of certification or conformance.

Worked example: drafting a policy announcement

Illustrative scenario: HR needs an announcement about an already approved leave-process change. The AI receives the approved facts and drafts a short message with an action and a support contact.

An HR reviewer checks eligibility wording, dates, links and whether the draft invents a new entitlement. The message is released only through the ordinary approval process. The pilot measures total preparation time and corrections compared with the previous method, using no unnecessary employee data.

Opportunity assessment worksheet

- **Task:** What specific work would the assistant help with?
- **Current problem:** What delay, repetition or quality issue exists?
- **Inputs:** Which information is necessary and approved for use?
- **Output:** What would a useful result contain?
- **Consequence:** What happens if it is wrong, incomplete or disclosed?
- **Review:** Who can check it and against which source?
- **Value:** What improvement would justify continuing after review costs?

Rank opportunities using the organisation's priorities. Do not reduce serious access or decision risks to a low numerical score that can be offset by a large time-saving estimate.

Pilot and make an explicit decision

Test ordinary cases and cases with missing, conflicting or outdated information. Log failures and review whether users notice them. Agree stop conditions before the pilot starts.

At the end, decide whether to continue, narrow, revise or stop. Record the evidence and remaining limitations. Use the [AI rollout guide](#) to structure adoption and the [AI procurement guide](#) when evaluating a supplier.

Put the guide into practice

Set aside a working session with the people who own this process and one or two people who experience it. Use a fictional or appropriately authorised case, so the discussion can be specific without sharing unnecessary personal information. The purpose is to leave with a usable decision or document, not just agreement that the topic matters.

Prepare the case

List five recurring HR tasks and describe the input, output and decision that follows each one. Separate drafting from assessment and routine information retrieval from sensitive case handling. Choose a task whose result a knowledgeable person can verify without needing to reconstruct an entire employee history.

Write the starting assumptions down before discussing solutions. If the group disagrees on what happened, identify the information needed to resolve that difference rather than building a plan on an untested story.

Work through the decision

Estimate the current effort and define a useful result before testing a tool. Include review, corrections and exception handling in the comparison. Ask what happens if the output is wrong. A task with a modest time saving may be a better pilot than a dramatic promise whose errors are difficult to detect.

Ask each participant to explain the proposed decision in their own words. Differences in interpretation often reveal an unclear criterion, a missing responsibility or an instruction that will be difficult to follow.

Test an exception

Introduce incomplete source material or an output that sounds plausible but adds a policy rule. Ask the proposed reviewer to find the problem. If they cannot verify the result with reasonable effort, narrow the task or improve source access rather than relying on a stronger instruction to the model.

Record what changes in this situation and what remains the same. An exception should lead to a clear next step, with an owner, rather than an informal workaround that nobody can explain later.

Agree the handoff

Give the use-case owner a pilot brief containing the information boundary, success measures, review process and stop conditions. Confirm the approved tool and the people who can answer questions. Keep broader adoption separate from the decision to run a small, controlled experiment.

Finish by confirming the owner, the next action and the date when the result will be reviewed. Give the person receiving the work enough context to continue without repeating the whole discussion.

Frequently asked questions

Which AI use case should HR try first?

Choose a bounded task with a clear problem, approved information and a result that a capable person can check. Drafting from approved facts or finding a relevant source may be suitable starting points in some organisations. Avoid choosing solely by publicity or apparent time savings. The right first use depends on your processes, controls, expertise and ability to handle mistakes.

Will AI remove the need for HR judgement?

AI assistance does not remove the organisation's responsibility for decisions affecting people. Context, fairness, relationships and applicable requirements still need accountable human consideration. Some administrative work may change, but the effect depends on the actual task and implementation. Evaluate what people must review and explain rather than assuming automation makes a process independent of professional judgement.

How should we calculate value from a pilot?

Compare the complete task, including preparation, review, correction, administration and exceptions. Examine quality and the consequences of errors alongside time. Use a relevant baseline and document the limits of a small test. A faster draft that requires extensive checking may not save effort, while a modest time saving with better source access may still be useful.

Review the first cycle

Decide whether the tested use improves the original task enough to justify operating it. Record failures as well as successes and keep the scope explicit. If the pilot changes the task, information or affected population materially, reassess it instead of treating the original approval as permission for every adjacent use.

Keep a brief record of what was tried, what participants found useful and what needs to change. Compare the result with the original problem rather than judging success only by completion. If the process created extra work without improving clarity, quality or support, simplify it and test again. Share the agreed change with the people who will use it, and name the person responsible for keeping the guidance current.

About New Dynamics

[New Dynamics](#) connects goals, feedback, recognition and reviews around the way organisations work. This guide is published by the New Dynamics Editorial Team as part of our practical library for HR leaders, managers and People teams.

Use the examples and worksheets to structure your own discussions and adapt them to your organisation. Illustrative scenarios are not customer case studies. Policy and employment guidance needs appropriate local review before adoption.

For questions about this guide, corrections or a conversation about your performance management process, email contact@new-dynamics.com. Explore the complete [guide library](#) for related resources.

Your working worksheet

Use the prompts from this guide to prepare one real conversation or decision. Keep personal or sensitive information in your organisation's approved records. This page is for your own working notes.

Task: What specific work would the assistant help with?

Current problem: What delay, repetition or quality issue exists?

Inputs: Which information is necessary and approved for use?

Output: What would a useful result contain?

Consequence: What happens if it is wrong, incomplete or disclosed?

Review: Who can check it and against which source?

Value: What improvement would justify continuing after review costs?

Discuss your next step with New Dynamics: contact@new-dynamics.com