

HICD FORWARD IN PRACTICE

Technology or AI Is Launched, but Adoption Is Weak

An institutional case study showing how workflow, professional judgment, governance, capability, leadership, data, and learning turned AI deployment into trusted operational use.

Resource type	Institutional Case Study
Intended users	Institutional leaders, technology teams, operational managers, AI implementation partners, regulators, and OD practitioners
HICD Forward movement	All four movements
Related pillars	Performance, Human Architecture, Workflow, Alignment, Capability, Leadership, and Learning
Estimated use time	10 minutes

WHY THIS CASE MATTERS

Technology and AI create value only when the institution connects them to real workflow, understandable evidence, accountable judgment, clear ownership, and continuous learning.

The Case at a Glance

A national regulatory agency introduced an AI supported risk platform to help direct limited inspection capacity toward higher risk entities. The system passed technical testing, data were loaded, and more than ninety percent of inspectors and managers completed training. Six months later, regional teams still relied on spreadsheets, local priority lists, and informal judgment.

Leaders initially described the problem as resistance to AI and insufficient user confidence. The HICD Forward lens reframed it as an operating adoption problem. Inspectors needed a workflow that combined AI evidence with professional judgment, clear safeguards, reliable data, visible ownership, and measures tied to regulatory value.

The Operating Context

The agency regulated more than forty thousand businesses across several regions. The platform combined licensing data, previous inspections, incidents, complaints, and payment records to estimate risk. It was intended to improve targeting, reduce low value inspections, increase consistency, and identify emerging concerns earlier.

Technical Deployment Without Trusted Use

The platform was introduced beside the existing planning process. Regional teams continued holding the same meetings, preparing separate spreadsheets, and following the same approval path. Inspectors found risk scores difficult to interpret and worried that accepting an incorrect recommendation could expose them to criticism. Ignoring the platform often felt safer.

What Leaders Initially Assumed

Technology leaders believed the main problem was user discomfort and recommended more awareness sessions and a stronger directive requiring use. Those actions could increase logins, but they would not explain the model, redesign planning, protect accountable judgment, correct weak data, or show whether AI improved inspection results.

KEY INSIGHT

The agency did not have a simple user adoption problem. It had introduced AI without redesigning the operating conditions around risk based inspection.

What This Meant in Practice

The work began by agreeing on the result that mattered: better identification and treatment of significant regulatory risk using limited inspection capacity. This shifted the inquiry from system access to the quality, speed, consistency, and evidence supporting inspection decisions.

The Visible Performance Problem

Six months after launch, the baseline showed that technical deployment had not yet produced trusted use or measurable regulatory value. Six measures defined the starting point.

26 PERCENT Inspection plans prepared primarily through the AI platform.	68 PERCENT Regional teams maintaining separate spreadsheets or manual lists.
34 PERCENT Inspections identifying a significant compliance or safety issue.	21 DAYS Average time required to prepare a regional inspection plan.
63 PERCENT Regulated entities with complete data for risk analysis.	29 PERCENT Inspectors confident in understanding the risk score.

CENTRAL MESSAGE

Weak use was being produced by poor workflow fit, unclear accountability, professional risk, incomplete data, limited interpretability, activity based leadership measures, and no routine for learning from inspection results.

What the HICD Forward Lens Revealed

The diagnosis focused on the conditions most likely to explain the performance gap. The pillars were used as one connected lens, not as separate assessments.

WORKFLOW

The AI recommendation entered after local priorities had often been agreed. The platform added another input instead of becoming part of a redesigned planning and review process.

HUMAN ARCHITECTURE

Inspectors remained accountable for decisions but lacked clear guidance on when to accept, question, or override AI output. Professional risk made nonuse feel safer.

ALIGNMENT

Technology owned the platform, data teams owned integration, regions owned plans, and policy teams owned priorities. No operational leader owned the complete risk based inspection process.

LEADERSHIP

Leaders promoted data driven regulation but continued reviewing total inspection volume. Managers remained under pressure to meet activity targets rather than improve targeting quality.

Additional Conditions

- **Capability:** Training covered system navigation but not interpretation, data quality, professional overrides, model limits, or AI informed planning discussions.
- **Performance:** Implementation reporting counted accounts, training, and system availability rather than planning quality, high risk coverage, inspection yield, or decision speed.
- **Learning:** Completed inspection results were not routinely compared with the original risk recommendation, so the agency could not improve the model or its operating rules.
- **Performance and value:** Leaders agreed that success would be judged through stronger risk detection, faster planning, better data, more consistent decisions, and effective use of inspection capacity.

DIAGNOSTIC CONCLUSION

Adoption was weak because the institution had deployed an AI tool without a trusted human and AI decision model, an integrated workflow, clear operational ownership, value measures, or a learning cycle.

The Coordinated Response

The agency redesigned and tested the complete risk based inspection process in three regions. Each component connected AI use to professional judgment, governance, performance, and learning.

Intervention component	What changed	Implementation evidence
Decision model	The agency confirmed that AI would support accountable professional judgment. Overrides were allowed when supported by relevant evidence and documented for learning.	Acceptance and override patterns, reasons, review quality, and professional concerns.
Planning workflow	A common sequence connected the risk list, data checks, local evidence, priority decisions, approval, inspection, and review of findings.	Planning time, workflow completion, manual workarounds, and inspection yield.
Operational governance	A senior operational leader owned the complete process, with named owners for data, model performance, policy, regional planning, and safeguards.	Ownership issues, data risks, governance decisions, and unresolved exceptions.
Role based capability	Inspectors and managers practiced interpreting risk factors, challenging recommendations, documenting overrides, and leading AI informed planning meetings.	Observed decisions, confidence, guidance needs, and manager use.
Value dashboard	One dashboard combined adoption signals with data quality, planning time, high risk coverage, inspection results, and regional differences.	Trusted adoption and regulatory performance measures reviewed together.
Learning cycle	Completed inspections were compared with original risk assessments to identify missed risks, false positives, strong overrides, and data improvements.	Model adjustments, workflow changes, data corrections, and safeguard decisions.

Measurable Outcomes

Nine months after the redesigned approach was expanded, the agency recorded stronger adoption, data quality, planning speed, user confidence, and inspection value.

What Changed

- Inspectors used AI as part of professional practice rather than as a separate technology requirement.
- Managers could see when local evidence improved a recommendation and when habit or weak data was overriding evidence.
- Technology, data, policy, and operational teams reviewed adoption and regulatory performance through one shared process.

How to Interpret the Results

- The outcomes came from changing the operating environment around AI, not from increasing training or mandating logins alone.
- Clear safeguards protected professional judgment while making overrides visible, evidence based, and useful for learning.
- Combining adoption signals with inspection results prevented system activity from being mistaken for regulatory value.

Before and After

The figures below demonstrate the scale and range of results that a connected institutional response could reasonably target.

Performance measure	Before	After 9 months
Plans prepared through AI supported workflow	26 percent	82 percent
Regions using separate spreadsheets	68 percent	14 percent
Inspections identifying significant issues	34 percent	57 percent
Regional planning cycle time	21 days	8 days
Complete data coverage	63 percent	92 percent
Inspectors confident in risk interpretation	29 percent	74 percent
Managers using the platform in planning reviews	24 percent	81 percent
Overrides with a documented reason	15 percent	93 percent

What This Case Demonstrates

Weak adoption does not always mean that employees oppose technology or AI. People may be responding rationally to unclear accountability, poor workflow fit, incomplete data, professional risk, or conflicting leadership signals. Adoption became sustainable when the institution connected AI to real work, accountable judgment, governance, value, and learning.

HICD FORWARD CONNECTION

Movement 1 aligned leaders around the regulatory performance result rather than system use. Movement 2 revealed workflow, accountability, data, capability, and trust conditions shaping adoption. Movement 3 connected AI to a redesigned human decision system. Movement 4 used inspection results, override evidence, and user experience to improve both the model and the operating process.

Questions for Your Institution

- Does the technology fit the workflow people actually use to make decisions?
- Who owns the complete performance outcome beyond the platform and model?
- When may employees challenge or override AI, and how is that judgment reviewed?
- Which measures show whether AI use is improving institutional value?

About This Case

This case study presents realistic institutional conditions, decisions, interventions, and illustrative outcomes. It demonstrates how the HICD Forward approach can be applied to a common technology and AI adoption challenge and is not presented as a verified account of a specific client engagement.

EXPLORE MORE HICD FORWARD TOOLS AND RESOURCES

Visit the HICD Forward website and Resource Library