FAST-03 Projects: Prompt Engineering for the Workplace

Provider: 7formations | Course: FAST-03 | Instructor: Wadood Chaudhary | One capstone and two mini projects

Projects turn the five-part card, the pass method, and the quality gate into tools trainees use after the course. 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: My Team's Tested Prompt Library

Brief. Build a prompt library of at least 8 tested prompts for recurring tasks in your team (or for Cape Harbor Inn's front desk if your role has no safe tasks). Every prompt uses the five-part card, is bound to a named source, carries a check step and gate rule, and has survived a partner cold test. Include a one-page "how we use prompts" guide for the team.

Deliverables

1. Task inventory (half page): 10+ recurring tasks; which 8 you chose and why; which you excluded (and the reason: data, judgment, or no source).
2. Library: 8+ entries in the W4 format (task, owner, source, prompt, check and gate rule, strip list, last tested, cold-test result).
3. At least two multi-pass entries (pass prompts written out).
4. Gate log: 6+ real or practice outputs gated with one-sentence reasons; at least one revise and one reject.
5. Cold-test evidence: questions your testers asked and the instructions you added.
6. Team guide (one page): where the library lives, how to use it, strip rules, the three doors, how to report an overshare, review schedule.

Step plan

Step	When	What you do
1	After session 1	Task inventory; draft 3 entries
2	After session 2	Add pass-method entries; run and log
3	Session 3	Gate drill; first cold tests
4	Within 10 days	Complete 8 entries; second tester; team guide; submit

Rubric

Criterion	Not yet	Meets	Strong
Structure	Entries miss parts or combine jobs	All entries five-part, one job each	Entries include "do not use for" lines

Criterion	Not yet	Meets	Strong
Source binding	Outside facts allowed	Every entry names and fences a source; Gaps rule	Forbidden additions named per task
Revision	No multi-pass entries or passes change facts	Two pass entries with tone-only later passes	Diff check built into the pass prompts
Gate	Reasons about style or missing log	6+ gated outputs with fact or data reasons	Gate findings fed back into prompt fixes
Reusability	No cold tests	Two cold tests; questions converted to instructions	Library retested in a second tool or after an update
Data safety	Restricted data in any entry	Strip list on every entry; report path in the guide	Sanitized input slots designed into prompts

Strong vs weak example (one entry)

	Weak	Strong
Task	"Customer emails"	"Reply to guest questions about a scheduled event"
Prompt	"Answer this email nicely."	Role (front-desk associate → guest); fenced fact sheet; one job; under 100 words, warm; "not in source → we'll confirm + Gaps"; "no dates, prices, or policies not in the sheet"
Strip list	none	names, contact details, children's details, health info, card digits, coworker remarks
Gate rule	none	"Reject if any fact isn't in the sheet or if the input wasn't sanitized; complaints go to the manager"
Tested	"works"	"2026-10-20, Copilot Chat; cold test by R. (asked 'which sheet?'; added 'current dated sheet from Events folder')"

Mini project 1: Thin-to-Strong Makeover Gallery

Brief. Collect five thin prompts (your own past ones, sanitized, or invented examples). Rebuild each with the five-part card, run both versions, and present a before/after gallery showing what changed in the output.

Deliverables. Five before/after pairs; for each: missing parts, output differences (facts invented, length, tone), and the one part that made the biggest difference.

Step plan. (1) Collect; (2) score the thin versions on the rubric; (3) rebuild; (4) run both in new chats; (5) write the gallery (one slide or half page per pair).

Rubric

Criterion	Not yet	Meets	Strong
Diagnosis	Missing parts not identified	Parts correctly identified for all five	Explains why each missing part caused a specific output problem

Criterion	Not yet	Meets	Strong
Rebuild quality	Rebuilds still thin	All five rebuilt with five parts	Rebuilds work for a partner cold
Evidence	No outputs compared	Outputs compared on facts, length, tone	Invented-fact counts tabulated before/after

Strong vs weak example. Weak: "The new prompt is better because it's longer." Strong: "The thin prompt produced 3 invented facts (rain date, shuttle, raffle); the rebuild produced 0. The Check line naming forbidden additions made the difference; removing it brought the rain date back."

Mini project 2: Pass-Method Playbook for One Pattern

Brief. Pick one workplace pattern (customer reply, internal summary, or read-ahead). Write a reusable four-pass playbook for it and demonstrate it on two different sanitized inputs.

Deliverables. Four pass prompts with placeholders; an assumptions prompt; two worked runs with diff checks; a one-paragraph "when to start a new chat" rule for this pattern.

Step plan. (1) Choose the pattern and reader; (2) write pass prompts; (3) run on input 1, diff check; (4) fix prompts; (5) run on input 2 in a new chat; (6) write the rule.

Rubric

Criterion	Not yet	Meets	Strong
Pass discipline	Later passes change facts	Passes 3 and 4 change tone or length only	Diff check shows zero fact changes in both runs
Reusability	Prompts tied to one input	Placeholders work on both inputs	A partner used the playbook on a third input
Chaining judgment	No new-chat rule	Clear rule tied to job and source	Rule includes a drift symptom to watch for

Strong vs weak example. Weak: four prompts that each say "make it better." Strong: pass 3 reads "Rewrite for [reader]: [tone], under [N] words. Do not add, remove, or change any facts; answer the same questions," followed by a diff table showing no fact changes.