

The Same Prompt Used in Standard Claude (no Claude Skill)

Diane describes her rollout

Diane opens the AI Adoption Change Playbook. The Playbook asks for six pieces of context before it produces any output. Diane describes her rollout in a single message:

DIANE → PLAYBOOK

I am running an AI rollout that needs a rescue diagnostic. We are eight weeks into a Microsoft 365 Copilot Enterprise deployment at a US financial services organization, with 10,000 employees across retail banking, wealth management, and commercial lending. Phase 1 is Wealth Management, 1,200 advisors and support staff. A compliance incident occurred last week. An advisor sent a client communication containing a fabricated SEC citation. Adoption is mediocre (35% weekly active in WM). Senior advisors are quietly not adopting. Junior advisors are. Two years ago, we had a restructuring that ended 400 roles. The Sponsor is the COO, publicly enthusiastic but not visibly engaged. I have thirty days to bring an updated rollout plan to the Executive Committee.

Standard Claude's Output:

AI ROLLOUT RESCUE DIAGNOSTIC

Microsoft 365 Copilot Enterprise — Wealth Management Phase 1

10,000-employee US Financial Services Organization | 30-Day Remediation Plan for Executive Committee

Situation at a Glance

35% Weekly active (WM) Target typically 70%+ at week 8	1 Compliance incident Fabricated SEC citation, week 7	30 Days to ExCo Updated plan required
---	--	--

Eight weeks into Phase 1 deployment across 1,200 Wealth Management advisors and support staff, the rollout faces compounding structural problems. Mediocre adoption (35% WAU), a compliance incident in week 7, a senior advisor cohort that is quietly not adopting, and a

sponsorship arrangement that is publicly enthusiastic but operationally passive. These are not independent failures — they are symptoms of a shared root cause.

Root Cause Analysis

[CRITICAL] The compliance incident is a trust calibration failure, not a product failure

Copilot hallucinated a citation. The advisor sent it without verification. The real failure is that no one trained advisors that AI output requires the same due-diligence review as a junior analyst's draft. In a regulated financial services environment, this is a governance gap, not a product gap. It will happen again without an explicit human-in-the-loop protocol.

[CRITICAL] Senior advisor non-adoption is rational self-protection, not technology resistance

Senior advisors carry institutional memory of the two years past restructuring that ended 400 roles. An AI productivity tool positioned by enthusiastic leadership looks from where they stand exactly like the instrument of the next cut. Their silence is not resistance to change. Treating it as such misdiagnoses the problem and will make it worse. The COO's public enthusiasm without visible personal engagement confirms their suspicion: leadership wants the numbers, not the advisors.

[HIGH RISK] Junior adoption without guardrails created the compliance incident

Junior advisors adopted quickly, they have less to protect and more to gain from productivity leverage. But they also have the least judgment about when AI output is wrong. Fast adoption among the lowest-experience cohort in a compliance-heavy environment is a risk amplifier, not a success metric.

[HIGH RISK] The COO sponsorship is nominal, not operational

A sponsor who is publicly enthusiastic but not visibly engaged provides air cover but not velocity. In a post-restructuring environment, employees read leader behavior, not leader statements. The COO needs to visibly use Copilot, visibly discuss what it is good and bad at, and visibly protect people who raise concerns about it.

[CONTEXT] The 35% WAU figure is misleading — composition matters more than rate

If 35% active is predominantly junior staff in lower-risk workflows (scheduling, note-taking, internal summaries), the business value is low. If senior advisors with client-facing responsibilities are the 65% not using it, the value opportunity and the risk concentration are both at the top. Segment the data before presenting it to ExCo.

The 30-Day Rescue Plan

Days 1–7 — Contain and Diagnose

Before you change anything, understand what happened

- **Compliance pause protocol.** Issue an interim advisory requiring human review of all AI-drafted client communications. This is not a rollback it is an explicit guardrail that should have existed from day one. Frame it as responsible deployment, not failure. Work with Legal and Compliance to define the review standard.
- **Segment the usage data.** Break WAU by seniority, role, and use-case type. Identify which tasks Copilot is being used for. You need to know whether adoption is in high-value or low-risk work before you can defend any plan to ExCo.
- **Confidential senior advisor interviews (5–8 people).** Not a survey, one-on-one conversations. Ask what they are worried about, what would need to be true for them to trust the tool, and what workflows consume their time. Do not defend Copilot. Listen. The restructuring fear will surface; acknowledge it directly.
- **Map actual Copilot use cases in production.** What are people doing with it? What prompts are being used? You may find undocumented high-value use, or find it is being used almost entirely for low-stakes tasks. Either answer shapes the plan.

Days 8–14 — Rebuild the Foundation

Governance, sponsor activation, and the trust narrative

- **Establish an AI output review standard.** Work with Compliance to define a tiered protocol: what requires human review before client delivery, what requires a second-pair review, what can be sent as drafted. This transforms the incident into a policy improvement rather than a failure to disclose.
- **COO visible activation.** Brief the COO on what you found in interviews. Ask for three specific behaviors: (1) use Copilot visibly in a senior team meeting and narrate what it got right and wrong, (2) explicitly state that this deployment is not connected to headcount decisions, and (3) sponsor a senior advisor as an internal champion with protected time.
- **Redesign training for the wealth management context.** Generic Copilot training does not cover financial services regulatory risk. Replace or supplement it with training that covers what Copilot can hallucinate and why, how to verify regulatory citations, how to review AI-drafted client communications, and what the firm's specific review protocol requires.
- **Identify 3–5 high-value use cases with senior advisors as co-designers.** From your interviews, find workflows where senior advisors lose time — meeting prep, CRM documentation, internal research synthesis. Build out those use cases with advisors, not for them. Advisors who design the workflow own the adoption.

Days 15–25 — Structured Re-launch

Evidence-based expansion with guardrails in place

- **Pilot co-designed use cases with a senior advisor cohort.** Approximately 20–30 advisors who participated in interviews or were referred by them. Measure time saved and error rate, not adoption rate. Give them a direct feedback channel to the project team, not a helpdesk ticket, a named person.
- **Establish a 'Copilot works / Copilot fails' communication channel.** A place where advisors share what the tool got wrong, without consequence. This serves two purposes: it captures real risk signals before they become incidents, and it signals to the senior cohort that the deployment is honest about limitations.
- **Define success metrics that are not just WAU.** For ExCo: average time saved per advisor per week on defined tasks, compliance incident rate (target zero since protocol change), advisor NPS on the tool, and number of client-facing workflows with approved Copilot integration.

Days 26–30 — ExCo Presentation

Frame a credible narrative, not a defense

- **Do not defend the first 8 weeks.** Acknowledge that the deployment lacked the governance structure a regulated environment requires. Present what you learned, what changed, and what the evidence from the 2-week pilot shows. ExCo will trust a plan from someone who acknowledges what went wrong over one that minimizes it.
- **Present a segmented adoption target, not a blended WAU goal.** Propose distinct targets: senior advisors in co-designed use cases (60% in defined workflows by Q+2); junior advisors with compliance protocol in place (75% WAU with zero unreviewed client communications); support staff (80% WAU). Blended numbers hide where the value and risk are.
- **Name the restructuring elephant in the room.** Recommend that the COO make an explicit statement, in writing, at a town hall, or both; that this deployment is not a precursor to headcount reduction in WM. If this cannot be guaranteed, the senior advisor adoption problem will persist regardless of what else you do.

The Question ExCo Will Ask

[PREPARE YOUR ANSWER NOW] "Should we pause the Phase 2 rollout to retail banking and commercial lending?"

The honest answer is probably yes, for 4–6 weeks, and you should recommend it proactively rather than wait to be asked. A compliance incident in week 7 of a 10,000-person rollout before governance is in place, before the trust deficit with senior staff is addressed is a signal that the foundation is not ready. Recommending a structured pause demonstrates judgment. Proceeding

on schedule after a regulatory incident in financial services, without visible remediation, is the riskier path for the firm and for your credibility leading this program.

Additional Considerations Before ExCo

On the compliance incident

Before you present to ExCo, establish the following: whether Compliance and Legal have already escalated; whether any client was materially harmed or made a decision based on the fabricated citation; and whether the incident has been or needs to be disclosed. Your plan needs to account for whatever posture the firm is already taking. Walk in knowing more than ExCo does, not less.

On the COO sponsorship

"Publicly enthusiastic but not visibly engaged" describes a sponsor who has given you cover to launch but not the authority to succeed. In the briefing you need to have with them before ExCo, the ask is clear: do you want this to work, or do you want it to have launched? Those require different behaviors from a sponsor. One conversation, clearly framed, usually resolves which one you have.

On the restructuring

The previous restructuring is the dominant variable. Everything else; low senior adoption, the compliance incident, nominal COO engagement flows from the fact that a tool positioned as a productivity multiplier arrived two years after 400 people lost their jobs to 'efficiency.' The interventions that matter most are not technical. They are about restoring the psychological safety required for someone to openly use, and visibly fail at, a new tool.

END OF DIAGNOSTIC REPORT