FAST-02 Projects: Generative AI for Everyday Work

Provider: 7formations | Course: FAST-02 | Instructor: Wadood Chaudhary | One capstone and two mini projects

Projects turn the four work patterns (grounded drafting, summarizing, extracting, reusable helpers) into products trainees keep using. Scoring uses **Not yet / Meets / Strong**. Completion requires Meets on every capstone criterion; mini projects are formative unless the employer asks for scoring. One resubmission allowed. Fictional or sanitized material only; never real customer, patient, or employee data (G.L. c. 93H, 201 CMR 17.00).

Capstone: A Verified Work Pattern for My Team

Brief. Choose one recurring document task from your job (a notice, a summary, a comparison, or a status update). Build a complete, verified AI work pattern for it: a grounded prompt sequence, a saved helper, a verification routine, and before-and-after evidence that it helps. The result must be usable by a coworker without you.

Deliverables

1. Task profile (half page): what, how often, who reads it, sources used, data risks, and what is stripped before use.
2. Prompt sequence: the outline, fill, and polish prompts (or the extraction prompt) with the source-binding and missing-fact rules.
3. Helper specification (W4 format) and a screenshot or export of the configured helper in the approved tool (or the paper prompt card).
4. Verification routine: the five-fact check or cell audit adapted to the task, with one completed example.
5. Before-and-after log over at least two runs (W5 format) with a keep / adjust / stop decision.
6. A one-page "how to use this helper" sheet for coworkers.

Step plan

Step	When	What you do
1	After session 1	Choose the task; write the task profile; list data to strip
2	After session 2	Draft the prompt sequence; run once on sanitized or fictional input; five-fact check
3	After session 3	If the task includes tables or numbers, add the extraction and spreadsheet step
4	Session 4	Build the helper; partner cold test; first log entry
5	Within 10 days	Second run and log entry; write the coworker sheet; submit

Rubric

Criterion	Not yet	Meets	Strong
Grounding	Prompts allow outside facts or have no missing-fact rule	Source fenced; "use only"; "not in source" and Gaps line	Gaps routed to named owners; polish constrained to no new facts

Criterion	Not yet	Meets	Strong
Verification	No recorded check	Five facts (or every cell) checked, results recorded	Check built into the helper's output and the coworker sheet
Reusability	Partner couldn't run it	Partner ran the helper cold and got a usable result	Spec portable across two tools, or migration-ready
Data safety	Restricted data in prompts or helper files	Only approved, sanitized sources; strip list documented	Refusal rule in helper instructions tested
Value evidence	No log or no checking time	Two logged runs including checking; honest decision	Error trend tracked; process adjusted based on evidence

Example of strong vs weak work (fictional: weekly supplier comparison at Bayside Precision Parts)

Element	Weak	Strong
Task profile	"Compare quotes faster with AI."	"Weekly, 3 to 5 resin quotes; reader: purchasing lead; source: supplier quotes with bank details removed; risk: invented lead times and silent unit conversions."
Prompt	"Make a table of these quotes and pick the best."	Fixed 8 columns with units, blanks for missing, source column, "no totals or recommendations."
Verification	"Checked it, looked fine."	Cell audit log: 24 cells, 1 wrong (min order 50 vs 500), 0 invented after rerun.
Log	"Saves lots of time."	"By hand 45 min; with helper 6 min + 25 min audit = 31 min; saving 14 min; keep, with audit narrowed to price/lead/min cells after 4 clean weeks."

Mini project 1: The Two-Reader Summary Pack

Brief. Pick a long, non-sensitive document relevant to your job (a public regulation, a vendor manual, an internal SOP without personal data). Produce summaries for two different readers and a verification log.

Deliverables: chunk plan; two summaries (each with named reader, type, length); five-fact check per summary; coverage note.

Step plan: choose document → chunk by section → summarize each chunk → combine for reader A and reader B → five-fact check each → coverage check against headings.

Rubric

Criterion	Not yet	Meets	Strong
Reader fit	Same summary twice	Type, length, and emphasis differ by reader	Each ends with what the reader must do
Accuracy	Facts not checked	Five facts per summary checked; errors fixed	Includes a caught error and the prompt change that prevents it
Coverage	Not checked	Headings compared; omissions justified	Middle-section facts confirmed present

Strong vs weak. Weak: two summaries that differ only in length. Strong: a supervisor brief leading with "what changed and what to enforce this week," and a new-hire list of exact rules, both checked against the same five facts.

Mini project 2: The Extraction Audit Challenge

Brief. Build a comparison table from three or more fictional or public documents (for example, three public product spec sheets) and prove it has zero invented values.

Deliverables: column definitions with units; extraction prompt; audited table with marks; spreadsheet with formula-based comparison; two-sentence recommendation with unknowns stated.

Step plan: define columns → extract one document at a time → partner audit → fix and rerun → spreadsheet math → note.

Rubric

Criterion	Not yet	Meets	Strong
Table design	Columns undefined or units mixed	Defined columns, units, source column	Handles conversions explicitly
Audit	Partial	Every cell marked; zero invented	Error types analyzed (misread, invented, reversed)
Analysis	AI did the math	Formulas in spreadsheet	Sensitivity to unknowns shown

Strong vs weak. Weak: a table where a missing warranty period was filled with "1 year (standard)." Strong: the cell is blank, the note says "warranty not stated by Supplier B; request before ordering."