



# The AI Ready Workforce: Reskilling, Redeployment, and Redesign



**Talent Stratify**

# The AI Ready Workforce: Reskilling, Redeployment, and Redesign

Ross Sparkman, February 2026

Elevating the Workforce Through Strategic AI Transformation

## Introduction

Artificial Intelligence (AI) has moved from the periphery of business operations to the core of strategic workforce planning. Leaders now face a dual imperative: harness AI to drive productivity, while proactively supporting employees through the transition. At Talent Stratify, we view this transformation as an opportunity to elevate the workforce by redefining roles, developing new skills, and redesigning organizations for an AI-augmented future. An authoritative body of research indicates that AI's impact will be pervasive but nuanced: nearly 40% of jobs worldwide are exposed to AI-driven change, yet outright replacement of roles is expected to be limited (Georgieva, 2026[1][2]). Instead, the nature of work will be reshaped through task-level transformation. In this white paper, we provide a strategic roadmap for building an "AI ready" workforce, structured around five key areas: (1) performing AI job impact assessments, (2) identifying roles for augmentation vs. automation, (3) developing reskilling pathways and learning architecture, (4) considering organizational design implications, and (5) planning realignment scenarios and change management. Throughout, we integrate insights from leading sources to ensure an evidence-based approach – from Autor, Levy & Murnane's task-based perspective on technological change, to recent studies on generative AI by institutions like OECD, ILO, IMF, PwC, WEF, NIST, and Prosci. The tone is intentionally strategic and optimistic: with the right planning, AI can make workers more valuable, roles more enriching, and organizations more agile. By anticipating the workforce impacts of AI and acting deliberately, business leaders can turn disruption into opportunity. The sections that follow provide a comprehensive guide to doing so, aligning with Talent Stratify's core principle that people development and technology deployment must go hand-in-hand for



sustainable success.

# 1. Performing AI Job Impact Assessments

To effectively prepare for AI's workforce implications, organizations must first understand how jobs and tasks are likely to be affected. This begins with rigorous AI job impact assessments at the task level. Pioneering research by Autor, Levy, and Murnane (2003) introduced a task-based framework for analyzing technological change, arguing that computers substitute for workers in routine cognitive and manual tasks that follow explicit rules, while complementing workers in nonroutine problem-solving and complex communication tasks[3]. In practice, this means that rather than eliminating whole occupations, automation targets specific tasks. This is especially for those that are repetitive and well-defined within jobs. Thus, the unit of analysis for AI impact should be discrete work activities. By cataloguing the tasks that comprise each role and evaluating their amenability to current AI capabilities, organizations can map where automation or augmentation is feasible.

Recent studies provide quantitative measures to guide these assessments. For example, Eloundou et al. (2023) used a new rubric to evaluate the "exposure" of occupations to large language models like GPT-4[4]. Their analysis found that approximately 80% of the U.S. workforce could have at least 10% of their work tasks affected by LLMs, while around 19% of workers may see at least 50% of their tasks impacted (Eloundou et al., 2023[4]). Notably, this potential impact spans all wage levels and industries, suggesting that advanced AI is a general-purpose technology with far-reaching effects[5]. Importantly, exposure does not equal displacement, rather it flags where the nature of work will shift. In a global context, the International Labour Organization's Generative AI Occupational Exposure Index (2025) provides a refined, task-level assessment across countries and sectors. The ILO's latest analysis concluded that one in four jobs worldwide is potentially exposed to

generative AI, with higher exposure (up to 34% of jobs) in high-income countries (ILO, 2025[6]). Critically, the ILO emphasizes that transformation, not replacement, is the most likely outcome of this exposure[2]. Because most occupations consist of a mix of automatable and non-automatable tasks, full job automation remains relatively rare. As the ILO report notes, even when generative AI can perform certain tasks more efficiently, many processes still require human input and oversight, meaning roles will evolve rather than vanish[7]. These findings underscore why impact assessments should focus on how jobs can be redesigned, which tasks might be offloaded to AI and which new tasks (e.g. oversight, interpretation, complex problem-solving) will emerge for humans.

In conducting AI job impact assessments, companies should combine data-driven analysis with human expertise. One approach is to leverage the kind of rubric used by Eloundou et al. – scoring tasks by their compatibility with current AI capabilities (e.g. natural language understanding, image recognition, predictive analytics). The OECD Employment Outlook 2023 provides a useful statistic: considering all forms of automation (including AI), about 27% of jobs are in occupations at high risk of automation based on task composition (OECD, 2023[8]). These tend to be roles heavy in routine tasks (whether physical or cognitive) that technology can readily take over. However, that also implies 73% of jobs are not at high risk – often because they involve nonroutine duties, interpersonal interaction, creative thinking, or complex manual work that machines still struggle with. An assessment should therefore segment tasks into categories: highly automatable (routine, rule-based), augmentable (can be partially assisted by AI), and resilient (require uniquely human strengths). For instance, a job like “data entry clerk” has a large share of routine tasks ripe for automation, whereas a job like “marketing strategist” has many creative and judgment-intensive tasks that AI can support but not fully replace.

It is equally vital to assess qualitative factors such as the context in which tasks are performed and the level of decision-making involved. Engaging subject matter experts or frontline employees in reviewing AI’s current capabilities can help validate which tasks truly could be entrusted to AI with acceptable quality and risk. In some cases, tasks might be technically automatable but unwise to automate due to risk management, customer expectations, or regulatory compliance. For example, making final hiring decisions or medical diagnoses solely via AI. Here frameworks like the NIST AI Risk Management Framework (2023) come into play. The NIST AI RMF provides guidance for evaluating risks to



individuals and society from deploying AI, and it emphasizes incorporating trustworthiness considerations into the design, development, use, and evaluation of AI systems[9]. Applying such a framework during impact assessments helps ensure that just because a task can be automated doesn't mean it should be without proper controls. An AI job impact assessment, then, is not only a technical feasibility study but also a risk and ethics appraisal.

In summary, performing AI job impact assessments allows organizations to take a granular, evidence-based look at how each role might change. Pioneers of task analysis (Autor, Levy & Murnane, 2003) showed that technology reconfigures the task composition of jobs rather than eliminating them wholesale[10]. Building on that insight with modern AI exposure metrics (Eloundou et al., 2023; ILO, 2025) and risk frameworks (NIST, 2023), leaders can forecast the specific impacts and also which tasks will be done by AI, which by humans, and where new value can be created. This diagnostic is the foundation for all subsequent steps: deciding where to deploy AI, how to redesign jobs, and what skills and training will be required.

## 2. Identifying Roles for Augmentation vs. Automation

Armed with task-level impact insights, organizations can make strategic decisions about which roles will be augmented by AI and which tasks (or, in rare cases, entire roles) will be automated. A central theme emerging from research is that augmentation (AI and humans working together) will be far more common than pure automation. Even in highly digitized fields, full automation of jobs is limited by the need for human judgment, creativity, and interpersonal skills (ILO, 2025[7]). The goal, therefore, is to identify how to optimally allocate tasks between AI tools and human workers to amplify productivity and effectiveness.

One useful framework is to categorize jobs (or segments of

jobs) along two dimensions: the degree to which AI can perform the tasks independently, and the degree to which human involvement adds value or is necessary. Augmentation roles are those where AI can handle certain sub-tasks or provide decision support, but human workers are still essential for oversight, final decisions, or tasks requiring emotional intelligence and complex problem-solving. Automation candidates, by contrast, are tasks that could be fully handled by AI with minimal human intervention. These can be characterized as typically routine, repetitive processes or data-heavy tasks where algorithms excel. According to a global analysis by PwC (2025), even roles traditionally deemed “highly automatable” can often be reimagined as augmented roles. PwC’s Global AI Jobs Barometer examined nearly a billion job ads and distinguished “augmentable jobs” (those with many tasks where AI can assist humans) from “automatable jobs” (those with many tasks AI can do autonomously)[11]. The findings were illuminating: AI is making workers more productive and valuable even in roles with high automation potential. In industries most exposed to AI, productivity (revenue per employee) has grown 3× faster since 2022, after the breakthrough of generative AI, compared to less-exposed industries[12]. Furthermore, wages are rising twice as quickly in AI-intensive industries, and critically, workers with AI skills are commanding a 56% wage premium over their peers (PwC, 2025[13]). These trends suggest that when companies choose augmentation, e.g. giving employees AI tools, it often leads to higher output and higher compensation, rather than making those workers redundant.

Concrete examples are emerging from the field. Brynjolfsson, Li, and Raymond (2023) studied the deployment of a generative AI assistant in a Fortune 500 customer support center[14][15]. The AI system provided suggested responses and guidance to support agents during live customer chats. Rather than replacing agents, the tool augmented their capabilities. The result: a 14% increase in issues resolved per hour on average, with newer, less-experienced agents seeing the greatest productivity gains (up to 34% more issues resolved) as the AI helped them perform closer to expert levels[15][16]. Seasoned agents saw little change in output which indicates that AI augmentation closed skill gaps by bringing lower performers up toward the top performers’ level. Not only did productivity improve, but there were ancillary benefits as well: customer satisfaction improved (customers of AI-assisted agents used less profanity and were less likely to escalate to managers), and employee turnover dropped as the job became less stressful (Brynjolfsson et al., 2023[17]). This case exemplifies augmentation: the AI handled routine lookups and offered best-practice suggestions, while the human



agent maintained control of the conversation and handled the nuanced customer interactions. The human-AI collaboration yielded better results than either alone.

Similarly, an experimental study by Noy and Zhang (2023) provides evidence of augmentation boosting knowledge work. In a controlled trial, 453 professionals were given writing tasks – half with access to ChatGPT and half without. The group with AI assistance completed their tasks 40% faster, and their output quality (as rated by blind evaluators) was 18% higher on average (Noy & Zhang, 2023[18]).

Interestingly, the variance in performance between workers shrank, as the AI helped lower-skill writers improve more dramatically, thereby reducing inequality in output[19]. This suggests that AI augmentation can act as a force multiplier for talent, bringing everyone closer to a high baseline of performance for certain tasks. In the workplace, this could translate to more consistent service levels and the ability for staff to take on more work or more complex projects once mundane parts are handled by AI.

Of course, not every task should be augmented as some truly can be fully automated, and doing so frees up human capacity for higher-value activities. The challenge is distinguishing those cases. Process analysis might reveal, for instance, that data extraction and report generation can be entirely automated with an AI system, requiring humans only to handle exceptions. In such cases, the “role” of performing that task can be reassigned from people to machines. But even when automating, organizations should plan for redeployment of the affected employees. As research and experience show, AI often does not eliminate the need for humans but changes what humans do. The ILO’s exposure gradients explicitly separate occupations at high risk of full automation from those likely to evolve through task transformation[6]. Very few common jobs fall in the first category. The ones that do might be roles like switchboard operators or typists, which are already largely automated by software. More frequently, jobs fall in the latter category of transformation. For example, clerical and administrative roles face high exposure to AI (because AI can draft text, handle documentation, etc.), yet even here the expectation is a shift in duties rather than wholesale job loss (ILO, 2025[20]). A clerk

may spend less time writing routine emails or inputting data (with AI handling those tasks) and more time on coordinating between departments or handling complex cases that require a human touch.

To systematically identify augmentation vs. automation opportunities, companies can create a task matrix for each role: one column for tasks to fully automate (now or eventually), one for tasks to retain with humans, and one for tasks to be done collaboratively. This exercise benefits from employee input who are often the people doing the job and who can best identify where AI could help or where it would be risky. Additionally, economic analysis should inform these decisions: tasks that are tedious and time-consuming for people but easy for AI represent quick wins for automation. Tasks that are high-impact for business outcomes but where AI can enhance human decision-making (e.g. analyzing large data sets to give recommendations to a strategist) are prime augmentation targets. By contrast, tasks where human expertise or empathy is central (e.g. resolving a sensitive customer complaint or leading a creative brainstorming session) are not candidates for automation with current AI, though AI might still provide support (such as generating data insights or draft ideas for the human to review).

In making these choices, it is encouraging to note the macro-level evidence that augmentation can yield positive-sum outcomes. The PwC AI Jobs Barometer (2025) reports that industries with higher AI adoption have seen about a fourfold increase in productivity growth and are experiencing rising employment, not shrinking[21]. In fact, job postings requiring AI skills have grown, and even “automatable” roles are evolving rather than disappearing (often with enriched job content and better pay) (PwC, 2025[13]). What this tells us is that identifying roles for augmentation versus automation is not purely a cost-cutting exercise; it is a strategic workforce optimization. Augmentation can enable employees to focus on what humans do best, which is exercising judgment, nurturing relationships, and innovating. These skill sets should then be supported by AI in the form of handling repetitive or analytical burdens of the work. Meanwhile, careful automation of select processes can improve efficiency and accuracy. When balanced correctly, the organization can achieve higher output with a workforce that feels more engaged (because work is more interesting and less menial) and customers who receive higher-quality service.

In conclusion, the key is to proactively design the human-AI division of labor. Rather than succumbing to an exaggerated narrative of AI replacing everyone,



leading organizations are taking a nuanced approach. They examine each role and ask: How can AI make this role more effective? Which tasks should be offloaded entirely, and which should be done in partnership with smart machines? By answering these questions, companies can define future role profiles (often retaining the same number of employees or more), but with different task portfolios. This sets the stage for targeted reskilling, as employees learn to work with AI tools and take on the higher-value responsibilities that remain after automation.

### 3. Reskilling Pathways and Learning Architecture

Realigning roles in the age of AI is only feasible if accompanied by robust reskilling pathways and a supportive learning architecture. As AI takes over certain tasks and augments others, the skill profile required of the workforce changes significantly. The World Economic Forum's Future of Jobs Report 2023 estimates that 23% of jobs will change by 2027 through growth or decline, with 69 million new jobs created and 83 million eliminated. This works out to a net displacement of 14 million jobs globally[22]. Whether this transition results in opportunity or hardship depends largely on how well workers can acquire the new skills needed for these emerging roles. At Talent Stratify, we advocate for treating reskilling and upskilling as a strategic investment, not a reactive cost. The objective is to build an adaptable workforce fluent in collaborating with AI and capable of moving into new value-adding roles as old ones evolve.

The first step is to identify skills adjacencies and pathways for workers whose current tasks are highly automatable. Rather than viewing these employees as redundant, organizations should map out where their human skills could be redeployed with additional training. For example, a bank that automates routine loan processing might retrain loan officers in consultative financial advising or AI oversight roles. To do this effectively, companies can leverage insights from labor market

data and their own internal talent assessments. The IMF's research indicates that demand for new skills is already surging. In advanced economies, one in ten job postings now requires at least one new skill that was not previously common in the role, and even in emerging markets this figure is one in twenty (Georgieva, 2026[23]). These new skills range from technical abilities (like prompt engineering, data analysis, AI tool use) to advanced soft skills (like digital communication, adaptability, and systems thinking). Notably, the largest skill shifts are happening in professional and technical fields (IT, finance, engineering) where technology adoption is fastest[24]. This highlights a need for ongoing learning even among highly educated workers, not just those in clerical or manufacturing jobs historically targeted by automation.

A successful reskilling program begins with a skills gap analysis: what skills do we have, what will we need, and where are the gaps? The OECD Employment Outlook 2023 stresses that rapid AI development means new skills will be needed while others become obsolete, and it urges governments and employers to ensure training for both low-skilled and high-skilled workers alike[25]. For organizations, this translates to offering learning opportunities across the hierarchy. Which should include basic digital literacy for frontline roles all the way to advanced analytics or AI ethics training for professionals and leaders. An "AI ready" learning architecture often includes multiple layers:

- **Foundational AI Literacy:** Every employee should understand at a high level what AI is, how it works, and its capabilities and limitations. This builds awareness (the first stage of change readiness, as we'll discuss with ADKAR) and helps demystify the technology. Many companies now run internal AI academies or e-learning modules to teach concepts like machine learning basics, data privacy, and how AI is used in the business.
- **Role-Specific Upskilling:** Tailored programs to help employees acquire the specific skills to use AI tools in their job or to transition to new roles. For instance, marketers might be trained in using generative AI for content creation and analytics, while customer service representatives learn to work alongside AI chatbots. The World Economic Forum notes that education and workforce technologies are among the top adopted technologies, with 81% of companies planning to adopt new training tech by 2027[26]. This includes AI-driven learning platforms that personalize training to each employee's needs (a good example of AI augmenting the learning function itself).



- **Soft Skills and Meta-Skills:** Ironically, as technical automation grows, human-centric skills become more, not less, important. Creativity, critical thinking, emotional intelligence, and adaptability are consistently cited as top skills for the future. These enable employees to do what AI cannot, and to continually pivot as technology changes. The IMF's managing director, Kristalina Georgieva, emphasized that education systems must cultivate cognitive, creative, and technical skills that complement AI, rather than compete with it[27]. For today's workers, that means training programs should include problem-solving with AI, ethical reasoning, and collaboration to ensure employees know how to apply their uniquely human faculties in concert with intelligent machines.
- **Leadership and Strategy Skills:** Managers and executives need training too. They should understand how to drive AI adoption, interpret AI outputs, and lead teams through change. Many organizations are investing in leadership development that covers data-driven decision making and AI risk management. The NIST AI Risk Management Framework can be part of leadership training, so that decision-makers understand how to evaluate AI systems for fairness, security, and reliability before deploying them. Leaders also need to hone their change management capabilities (e.g., using models like Prosci's ADKAR) to effectively champion workforce transformation.

To support these layers, a learning architecture must be put in place. This refers to the systems, platforms, and processes that deliver training at scale. Traditional one-off workshops are insufficient against the pace of AI advancement. Companies are shifting towards agile learning ecosystems: online learning platforms with vast libraries of content (often leveraging AI to recommend courses), on-the-job learning through stretch assignments or hackathons, mentorship programs pairing less experienced staff with experts, and partnerships with universities or online providers for certifications. Additionally, micro-credentialing is on the rise which allows employees to earn certificates in specific skills (like data visualization or AI ethics) that are recognized internally or even industry-wide.

Crucially, time and encouragement to learn must be embedded into the work culture. One best practice is allocating a certain percentage of work hours for self-directed learning or class attendance. Some leading firms have even created AI trainee programs or “fusion teams” where tech experts and domain experts learn from each other by solving real business problems with AI. All these efforts signal to employees that the company is investing in them, which boosts morale and reduces fear of automation. It also addresses what the OECD found as a clear need: ensuring no one is left behind as AI transforms work[28]. Lower-educated or older workers, in particular, might need extra support (more intensive training, coaching, or apprenticeship-style programs) to successfully reskill, since they may not have engaged in formal learning for some time.

The benefits of a strong reskilling strategy are measurable. IMF research shows that job postings requiring new skills tend to offer higher pay (about 3% more on average), and up to 15% more for postings that list multiple new skills (IMF, 2026[29]). This wage premium reflects the higher value that skilled workers can command. Moreover, regions that have more aggressively adopted new skills have seen employment increase, not decrease, as new economic opportunities emerge around those skills[30]. In the United States, regions with greater uptake of new skills experienced a 1.3% employment boost for each percentage point increase in new-skill job postings[30]. In contrast, the IMF notes that areas with high demand for AI skills have seen lower employment in some “AI-vulnerable” occupations, especially entry-level roles[31]. This implies that while AI may reduce certain junior positions, those effects can be countered by creating higher-skill jobs and training people to fill them. In practical terms, a bank might hire fewer entry-level analysts if AI software does data crunching, but it might need more AI supervisors, data scientists, or relationship managers which are positions that the displaced analysts can potentially fill after retraining. The net outcome can be positive if reskilling enables upward mobility.

Government and industry collaboration can also support corporate reskilling efforts. Public initiatives like apprenticeships, training subsidies, or portable credentials make it easier for companies to invest in their workforce. According to the OECD, policies that encourage employers to provide training and integrate AI skills into education are urgently needed to keep pace with the labor market’s evolution[32]. Many forward-looking organizations aren’t waiting, they are acting on their own to build the workforce they need. The World Economic Forum reports that about 50% of employers plan to invest in reskilling and upskilling as a key



workforce strategy through 2027, making it the top strategy alongside workforce expansion in new high-tech roles (WEF, 2023). This reflects a recognition that talent is the limiting factor in AI transformation; those companies that cultivate needed skills internally will have a competitive advantage.

In summary, reskilling is the driving force behind an AI-ready workforce. Without it, even the best AI impact assessment or role redesign plan will falter because employees won't be equipped to succeed in new workflows. With a well-designed learning architecture, however, organizations can turn potential disruption into an upskilling opportunity, creating a culture of continuous development. Employees, in turn, are more likely to embrace AI tools if they feel confident in their ability to use them and secure in their future career prospects. Through clear pathways (from old roles to new roles) and comprehensive training support, the workforce becomes not just AI-ready, but AI-empowered.

## 4. Organizational Design Implications

Adopting AI at scale and reskilling the workforce will inevitably spur changes in organizational design. As roles are redefined and new capabilities emerge, companies must reconsider how work is organized, how teams are structured, and how technology governance is integrated into corporate frameworks. The introduction of AI is an opportunity (even a necessity) to redesign organizations to be more agile, collaborative, and innovation-driven. Talent Stratify's perspective is that organizational structures should evolve hand-in-hand with technological deployment, ensuring that the formal design of the company (reporting lines, team configurations, decision rights) and its informal norms (culture, communication flows) both support and leverage an AI-augmented workforce.

One immediate implication of AI is the reconfiguration of job roles and teams. When certain tasks are automated or handled by AI, the remaining human tasks may cluster into

new roles. For example, if AI handles first-level IT support queries, the human IT staff may be reorganized into a tier focusing on complex cases and infrastructure planning. This could lead to a smaller number of more expert roles (job enrichment) or the creation of entirely new roles like “AI support strategy lead” who monitors AI performance and continuously improves the AI-human workflow. The Future of Jobs 2023 report highlights that the fastest-growing job titles are indeed in areas related to technology and digitalization. This includes roles such as AI and Machine Learning Specialists, Big Data Analysts, Process Automation Experts and further reflects how organizations are adding new positions to manage and capitalize on AI systems[33]. These roles often cut across traditional department boundaries. For instance, an AI specialist might work closely with marketing teams to implement personalization algorithms, or with operations teams to optimize supply chains. Thus, organizations may shift toward more cross-functional team structures, where experts in AI, data, and domain-specific knowledge work together on end-to-end processes. This is a departure from siloed functions and requires a design that encourages horizontal collaboration.

Another design implication is the need for agile and flexible structures. The rapid pace of AI innovation means companies might have to pivot or adjust roles frequently as new capabilities become available. Rigid hierarchies and narrow job descriptions can become obstacles. Leading organizations are experimenting with agile methodologies beyond IT in the form of creating multi-disciplinary squads or “fusion teams” that can rapidly prototype AI solutions and implement them (WEF, 2023). In workforce planning terms, scenario-based org design is useful: envision multiple future states (e.g. if AI achieves X level of capability, how would we restructure?), so the organization can morph instead of being caught flat-footed. One example is creating an AI Center of Excellence that sits centrally to guide AI strategy and deployment across business units. This hub can disseminate best practices, ensure consistency in AI tools, and coordinate training efforts. It effectively becomes a new node in the organizational structure, interfacing with all departments.

Crucially, governance and risk management structures must be updated to incorporate AI oversight. The integration of AI into decision processes raises important questions about accountability, ethics, and compliance. Organizations should consider establishing committees or roles responsible for AI governance. For instance, a Chief AI Ethics Officer or an AI Governance Board that reviews major AI use cases for fairness and alignment with company values. The NIST AI



Risk Management Framework (RMF), released in 2023, provides a template for such governance. It outlines core functions (such as Map, Measure, Manage, and Govern) and principles of trustworthy AI (like validity, fairness, transparency)[9]. Embedding the RMF into organizational processes might mean requiring that any new AI system goes through a risk assessment and documentation process before deployment, similar to how financial controls or cybersecurity measures are mandated. It also involves training a cadre of employees in AI risk awareness which effectively drives and reinforces a culture of responsible AI. This responsibility culture is part of organizational design at the cultural level: encouraging employees at all levels to flag issues (for example, if an AI tool seems to be making biased recommendations) and establishing clear protocols for escalation and remediation.

The physical and digital workplace will also need redesign. As AI tools proliferate, ensuring the technology infrastructure supports seamless human-AI interaction is key. That might involve new software platforms integrated with AI assistants, redesigning workflows in enterprise systems to incorporate AI suggestions, or even the layout of workspaces to accommodate new types of work (e.g. fewer people doing routine data entry, more doing creative collaboration perhaps requiring different spaces or digital whiteboards). Additionally, many companies will need to reengineer processes to fully leverage AI. A classic pitfall is to simply bolt AI onto an existing workflow without changing the workflow itself, leading to suboptimal results or confusion. Instead, processes should be revisited: if AI can do step 2 and 3 of a process in seconds, maybe steps 1 and 4 can be changed to take advantage of that speed, or the sequence can be altered. This is essentially the “redesign” part of our theme. Basically, nAI can prompt a fresh look at how work gets done, eliminating legacy steps that no longer add value and inserting new steps where human judgment is critical.

Another impact area is decision rights and spans of control. AI provides rapid analytics and recommendations, which can push decision-making downwards (since junior employees armed with AI insights can make decisions that previously required senior analysis). This could empower front-line staff,

effectively widening spans of control for managers because their teams can operate more autonomously with AI support. Alternatively, in some cases decisions might become more centralized if AI is used primarily by specialists at the center. Each organization should carefully design who has authority to act on AI outputs. For example, if an AI flags a financial fraud risk, does a compliance officer act on it, or is it automatically handled by the system with later auditing? These choices have structural implications for departments like Finance, Compliance, IT, etc.

Workforce composition might also change, leading to design changes in terms of talent ecosystem. Companies may rely more on contractors or gig workers for certain AI-related tasks (like labeling data or managing temporary AI projects). Integrating these non-traditional workers requires thinking about how to include them in communication loops and training. Some organizations are creating hybrid teams of full-time staff and external experts for AI projects, which challenges traditional HR policies and team integration practices.

On the cultural side, organizational design should incorporate mechanisms to maintain employee engagement and innovation. AI can sometimes produce a fear of the unknown among staff, so transparent communication channels are critical. That might mean regular town halls about the company's AI strategy, or setting up innovation councils where employees can suggest AI use cases and pilot them. Far from being a purely top-down technological push, the best outcomes arise when employees contribute to how AI is implemented. This flattens hierarchies in a productive way: good ideas for AI can come from any level, and those closest to the work often see the opportunities and pitfalls most clearly. Embedding such feedback loops into the organizational DNA, for instance, via internal crowdsourcing platforms or innovation challenges can accelerate AI adoption and get buy-in.

Finally, organizational design must address inclusion and equity in the AI era. Research shows, for example, that women and certain demographic groups may be more exposed to task automation (ILO, 2025[34]). High-income country data indicates female employment has a higher share in jobs at risk from AI (e.g. women in clerical roles), which could exacerbate gender disparities if not managed[34]. Companies should be proactive: design redeployment and upskilling programs specifically targeting at-risk groups, and track diversity metrics through the transition. The organizational responsibility is to ensure AI doesn't



inadvertently widen gaps. This could be reflected in goals or KPIs for managers – e.g. tying part of performance evaluation to how well a leader reskills and retains their team through technological changes. On a global scale, the IMF’s work suggests that countries (and by extension, companies operating in those countries) that handle the skill shifts well will see broad gains, whereas those that don’t invest in human capital may witness polarization[35]. By incorporating equitable workforce development into organizational strategy, companies not only fulfill a social responsibility but also safeguard their future talent pipeline.

In essence, AI transformation is as much an organizational design challenge as it is a technical one. Companies need to consciously redesign their structures, processes, and governance to maximize the benefits of human-AI collaboration. This might mean creating new teams, flattening decision-making hierarchies, instituting new governance bodies, and fostering a culture where technology is embraced responsibly. Organizations that succeed in this redesign will be more resilient and innovative, with the capacity to continuously evolve as AI capabilities grow. Those that cling to rigid models may struggle to fully realize AI’s potential or maintain employee engagement. Talent Stratify’s guidance is to treat organizational design as a dynamic, ongoing process – much like software is iteratively developed, so too should the organization be iteratively tuned for the age of AI.

## 5. Realignment Scenarios and Change Management

Even with careful planning in assessments, role design, reskilling, and organizational structure, the AI-driven transformation of work ultimately succeeds or fails based on how well people actually transition. This is where realignment scenarios and change management come to the forefront. Realignment involves developing and analyzing possible future scenarios for how the workforce could be redeployed or reorganized, and making strategic decisions

about which path to pursue. Effective change management then ensures that once the direction is set, the change is implemented smoothly, with employees brought along rather than left behind. This human-centric approach is vital to maintain morale, productivity, and the institutional knowledge that employees carry.

Scenario planning for workforce realignment is a powerful tool to anticipate different outcomes. For instance, an organization might outline a “best-case” scenario in which AI automation frees up 20% of employees’ time, and those employees are then reskilled to expand the business (such as by providing new services or targeting new markets). Another scenario might be a “disruptive” one where a significant portion of roles become redundant in their current form; the realignment plan there could include strategies like internal mobility programs, voluntary separation packages for those near retirement, and accelerated retraining bootcamps for others to move into open roles. By creating these scenarios, leadership can weigh the financial, operational, and human implications of each and prepare accordingly. This also allows for contingency plans. If AI adoption accelerates faster than expected, is there a plan to quickly stand up a retraining initiative or to shift affected employees into temporary project roles while they train? If adoption is slower (as WEF data suggests it often is – companies only moved from 33% to 34% of tasks automated from 2020 to 2023[36], slower than anticipated), the scenario might focus on how to remain competitive and not fall behind.

One constant across scenarios is the need for active change management. Humans naturally experience uncertainty and resistance in times of change, especially when job roles and identities are in flux. Prosci’s ADKAR model provides a clear framework for managing these people-side transitions. ADKAR stands for Awareness, Desire, Knowledge, Ability, and Reinforcement which are the five outcomes individuals need to successfully change (Hiatt, 2006[37]). Let’s briefly apply ADKAR to an AI workforce transformation:

- **Awareness:** Employees must first be aware of why the change is happening, the business rationale for AI integration and what problems it aims to solve. Building awareness involves transparent communication from leadership about the vision (e.g., “We are introducing AI in our customer service process to improve response times and free you from repetitive inquiries, so we can provide better service and develop your skills for more complex work.”). Without awareness of the need for change, rumors and fear fill the gap. Regular town halls, internal newsletters, and manager one-on-ones at the early stages of the initiative help convey urgency and benefits.



- **Desire:** Awareness on its own doesn't guarantee that employees want to change. Fostering desire means addressing the personal "what's in it for me." For example, if AI is coming, how will it make each person's work more rewarding, or how will it help secure the company's future (and thus their job security)? It may also involve acknowledging fears (job loss, skill obsolescence) and providing reassurance or incentives. In an AI rollout, one might build desire by involving employees in pilot programs (people often become more excited when they get to experiment with new tools), recognizing and rewarding early adopters, and clearly outlining career paths post-AI (so individuals see that learning to work with AI leads to advancement, not unemployment). According to Noy & Zhang's findings, workers exposed to ChatGPT in an experiment became more excited (even as some concern rose) about AI's potential[38] – suggesting that hands-on experience can boost willingness to change. Managers should tap into intrinsic motivations (e.g. curiosity to learn new tech, pride in being cutting-edge) as well as extrinsic (e.g. performance bonuses tied to successful adaptation).
- **Knowledge:** This corresponds to the training element by providing workers the knowledge of how to change. In our context, that means the specific skills and behaviors needed to work in the new AI-augmented processes. If a salesperson is now expected to use an AI tool for lead scoring, knowledge means training them on that tool, perhaps with simulations or practice sessions until they are comfortable. It might also include knowledge of new policies (e.g., how to override an AI decision, or guidelines for using AI outputs responsibly). During the change, organizations should deliver targeted education (workshops, e-learning, FAQ documents) and ensure support resources are available (like a helpdesk for AI tool queries or peer "AI champions" who can coach others on the job). As noted earlier, training for AI is essential across all levels (OECD, 2023[25]), and change management integrates that training into the rollout plan, rather than leaving it ad-hoc.

- **Ability:** Knowledge and ability are closely linked, but ability is about turning knowledge into action. It is effectively the competency required to perform in the new environment. One might know in theory how to use a new system, but not be adept at it when the pressure is on. Building ability may require practice in a low-stakes setting. For instance, a company could run a parallel period where employees use the AI tool but still also do the old process, to gain confidence before fully switching. Or assign mentors to employees as they transition to ensure they can apply what they learned. In terms of redeployment, ability also covers whether employees can actually perform in the new roles they've been trained for. If someone moves from an assembly line job to a robot maintenance technician after reskilling, there should be a period of on-the-job training where they work under an experienced tech until they can handle it solo. Organizations should be realistic in timeline expectations, giving people time to build proficiency.
- **Reinforcement:** Lastly, to sustain the change, reinforcement mechanisms must be in place. This can include ongoing coaching, refresher training, performance metrics aligned with the new way of working, and recognition of success. For example, if the call center has integrated an AI assistant for agents, managers should continuously monitor key metrics (resolution time, customer satisfaction) and provide feedback. If metrics slip, diagnose whether it's due to improper tool use or other factors and address it. Also, Celebrate wins when AI augmentation leads to breakthroughs. This signals to everyone that the change is positive and here to stay. Finally, reinforcement involves ensuring that there is no drift back to old habits; sometimes employees might revert to manual processes out of habit unless the old way is actively phased out and the new way is solidified through standard operating procedures and accountability.

Applying ADKAR in the AI context ensures that change management is structured and empathetic, focusing on individual transitions as the building blocks of organizational change[39]. Leaders and change practitioners should identify where along the ADKAR spectrum their workforce currently is (for instance, a survey might reveal high awareness but low desire due to anxiety). Interventions can then be targeted: maybe more town halls and listening sessions to boost desire, or more hands-on workshops to improve knowledge and ability.

Beyond ADKAR, it's worth noting the importance of engaging stakeholders at all levels in the change. The ILO has underscored the value of social dialogue which



involves engaging workers' representatives and managers in shaping the response to AI[40]. In a company context, that could mean involving employee committees or unions in planning retraining programs or setting AI usage policies. When people feel they have a voice, they are more likely to support the change. Additionally, clear and honest communication about the timeline and impact of changes is crucial. Uncertainty is the enemy of calm; if layoffs or role changes are expected, it is often better to communicate the criteria and support being offered, rather than letting the grapevine run wild. Many firms roll out AI in phases (perhaps starting with a pilot team) which can then serve as change ambassadors to the rest of the organization.

Realignment scenarios also need to account for the human element. For example, consider a scenario where a factory introduces advanced robotics (AI-driven) that can handle 30% of assembly tasks. A realignment plan might be: rather than laying off 30% of workers, reduce overtime, retrain a portion of staff as robot technicians, and use the remaining freed capacity to increase production or customize products (thus potentially increasing market share and keeping employment stable). Change management in this scenario would involve clearly explaining the plan to factory workers: "Robots will do these specific repetitive tasks; no one is losing their job. Instead, we will train 50 of you in robotics maintenance and safety monitoring. The rest of you will rotate to more complex assembly work and quality control that robots can't do. Our output goal is to increase by 20%, which will secure our plant's competitiveness and your jobs." Then, follow through with the promised training and perhaps even involve some workers in selecting or testing the new robots (to build buy-in and expertise).

Finally, monitoring and adaptability are key. As changes roll out, leadership should monitor not just performance metrics but also employee sentiment. Pulse surveys, town hall Q&As, and informal management check-ins can surface issues early – maybe the workload in a redesigned role is too high, or perhaps employees have discovered a creative new way to leverage an AI tool that could be shared company-wide. Change management doesn't end on a go-live date; it transitions into continuous improvement. Reinforcement stage

naturally blends into normal operations, but smart organizations keep a change team or task force active for an extended period to handle any follow-up adjustments.

In conclusion, realignment scenarios provide the strategic options for how to redeploy talent in an AI-transformed organization, and change management ensures that whichever path is chosen is executed with attention to the people involved. By applying structured models like ADKAR and maintaining clear, compassionate communication, companies can navigate the uncertainty of transformation. The result is a workforce that not only survives the introduction of AI, but is truly aligned with the new direction – confident in their roles, equipped with the right skills, and emotionally committed to the organization’s future. This is the essence of elevating the workforce through AI transformation: treating employees as partners in change, investing in their growth, and managing the journey with the same rigor and care as the technology implementation itself.

## References

Autor, D. H., Levy, F., & Murnane, R. J. (2003). The Skill Content of Recent Technological Change: An Empirical Exploration. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 118(4), 1279–1333. DOI: 10.1162/003355303322552801.

Brynjolfsson, E., Li, D., & Raymond, L. (2023). Generative AI at Work. NBER Working Paper No. 31161, National Bureau of Economic Research. (Study on the productivity impact of a conversational AI assistant in customer support).

Eloundou, T., Manning, S., Mishkin, P., & Rock, D. (2023). GPTs are GPTs: An Early Look at the Labor Market Impact Potential of Large Language Models. OpenAI Technical Report (arXiv:2303.10130). (Occupational exposure analysis for GPT-based AI in the U.S. labor market).

Georgieva, K. (2026). New Skills and AI Are Reshaping the Future of Work. IMF Blog, International Monetary Fund, 14 January 2026[1]. (Analysis by the IMF Managing Director on global job exposure to AI and skills demand).

Hiatt, J. (2006). ADKAR: A Model for Change in Business, Government and our



Community. Loveland, CO: Prosci Research. (Introduces the ADKAR change management model: Awareness, Desire, Knowledge, Ability, Reinforcement.)

International Labour Organization (ILO). (2025). Generative AI and Jobs: A Refined Global Index of Occupational Exposure. ILO Working Paper No. 140, 20 May 2025[41][7]. (Global task-level assessment of generative AI's impact on occupations; "one in four jobs" exposure finding.)

NIST. (2023). AI Risk Management Framework (1.0). National Institute of Standards and Technology, U.S. Department of Commerce[9]. (Voluntary framework for incorporating trustworthiness and risk management in AI system design and deployment.)

Noy, S., & Zhang, W. (2023). Experimental evidence on the productivity effects of generative artificial intelligence. *Science*, 381(6654), 187-192[18]. DOI: 10.1126/science.adh2586. (Randomized experiment showing ChatGPT's impact on writing tasks: 40% time reduction, quality improvement.)

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2023). OECD Employment Outlook 2023: Artificial Intelligence and the Labour Market. OECD Publishing, Paris[42][25]. (Examines AI's likely job impacts, finding 27% of jobs at high automation risk and calling for training and trustworthy AI policies.)

PwC. (2025). The Fearless Future: 2025 Global AI Jobs Barometer. PricewaterhouseCoopers Insights[12][13]. (Analyzes AI's impact on jobs, wages, and skills across industries; finds AI adoption correlates with higher productivity growth and wage premiums.)

World Economic Forum (WEF). (2023). The Future of Jobs Report 2023. World Economic Forum, Geneva[22][36]. (Projects labor market trends for 2023–2027, including tech-driven job churn of 23%, net job displacement, slower than expected automation pace, and growth in AI-related roles.)

[1] [23] [24] [27] [29] [30] [31] [35] New Skills and AI Are

## Reshaping the Future of Work

<https://www.imf.org/en/blogs/articles/2026/01/14/new-skills-and-ai-are-reshaping-the-future-of-work>

[2] [6] [7] [20] [34] [40] [41] One in four jobs at risk of being transformed by GenAI, new ILO–NASK Global Index shows | International Labour Organization

<https://www.ilo.org/resource/news/one-four-jobs-risk-being-transformed-genai-new-ilo%E2%80%93nask-global-index-shows>

[3] [10] THE SKILL CONTENT OF RECENT TECHNOLOGICAL CHANGE: AN EMPIRICAL EXPLORATION

<https://economics.mit.edu/sites/default/files/publications/the%20skill%20content%202003.pdf>

[4] [5] GPTs are GPTs: An early look at the labor market impact potential of large language models | OpenAI

<https://openai.com/index/gpts-are-gpts/>

[8] [25] [28] [32] [42] OECD Employment Outlook 2023 | OECD

[https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/oecd-employment-outlook-2023\\_08785bba-en.html](https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/oecd-employment-outlook-2023_08785bba-en.html)

[9] AI Risk Management Framework | NIST

<https://www.nist.gov/itl/ai-risk-management-framework>

[11] [12] [13] [21] AI Jobs Barometer | PwC

<https://www.pwc.com/gx/en/services/ai/ai-jobs-barometer.html>

[14] [15] [17] Generative AI and Worker Productivity | MIT Sloan



<https://mitsloan.mit.edu/centers-initiatives/institute-work-and-employment-research/generative-ai-and-worker-productivity>

[16] AI improved the productivity of a Fortune 500 software company : Monthly Labor Review : U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics

<https://www.bls.gov/opub/mlr/2024/beyond-bls/ai-improved-the-productivity-of-a-fortune-500-software-company.htm>

[18] [19] [38] Experimental evidence on the productivity effects of generative artificial intelligence - PubMed

<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/37440646/>

[22] [26] [33] [36] The Future of Jobs Report 2023 | World Economic Forum

<https://www.weforum.org/publications/the-future-of-jobs-report-2023/digest/>

[37] [39] The Prosci ADKAR® Model | Prosci

<https://www.prosci.com/methodology/adkar>