FAST-04 Projects: AI Productivity with Microsoft Copilot and Google Gemini

Provider: 7formations | Course: FAST-04 | Instructor: Wadood Chaudhary | One capstone and two mini projects

Projects turn the four suite workflows (inbox, meetings, documents and slides, spreadsheets) into habits with measured results. 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. Sandbox or sanitized material only; never real customer, patient, or employee data (G.L. c. 93H, 201 CMR 17.00). Follow employer policy on recording and transcription.

Capstone: My 30-Day Productivity Playbook

Brief. Extend your W5 playbook into a 30-day trial. Document five recurring tasks across at least three of the four areas (mail, meetings, documents/slides, spreadsheets), run each at least three times, log time including checking and errors caught, run a personal permissions check, and present results and decisions to your manager.

Deliverables

1. Playbook (five tasks): steps, prompt, check, data rules, owner.
2. Run log: 15+ runs (3 per task) with time by hand (baseline), time with AI, checking time, errors caught, errors found later.
3. Permissions self-check: list of files or folders you own that are shared org-wide or by link, and what you changed (no file contents).
4. Recording/transcription note: which of your meetings may be transcribed under policy and which may not.
5. Results page (one page): time saved per task after checking, error patterns, keep / adjust / stop decisions.
6. Two live demos (session 4) and a 5-minute share-back to your manager or team.

Step plan

Step	When	What you do
1	Session 1-3	Pick tasks; record baselines by hand
2	Session 4	Finalize playbook; demo two tasks
3	Days 1-14	Run each task at least twice; log
4	Days 15-25	Adjust prompts and checks; third run; permissions self-check
5	By day 30	Results page; share-back; submit

Rubric

Criterion	Not yet	Meets	Strong
Accuracy checking	Checks missing from runs	Every run logged with its check and errors	Error trends drive prompt or process changes
Permissions awareness	No self-check	Self-check done; over-shared items fixed or reported	Team habit proposed (e.g., quarterly sharing review)
Applied playbook	Fewer than five tasks or areas	Five tasks across three areas, complete fields	Tasks reusable by a coworker without help
Measured value	No baseline or checking time omitted	Baseline and checking time for every run	Includes at least one honest "stop" or redesign
Communication	No share-back	Clear one-page results and share-back	Manager decision recorded (adopt, expand, stop)

Strong vs weak example (one task)

	Weak	Strong
Task	"Meetings"	"Weekly ops stand-up recap (internal, transcribed with notice per policy)"
Prompt	"Summarize"	Decisions / actions (owner, date, or 'not stated') / open questions; 12 lines max
Check	none	Line-by-line vs transcript; owners confirmed; relative dates converted
Time	"Saves an hour"	Baseline 35 min; AI 2 min + check 12 min = 14 min; saved 21 min; 2 owner errors caught in 3 runs
Decision	none	Keep; added "owner not stated" rule after run 2

Mini project 1: Recap Error Catalogue

Brief. Using sandbox or policy-approved internal meetings only, collect three AI recaps and mark every error by type. Build a short catalogue of error types and the prompt or check changes that reduce them.

Deliverables. Three marked recaps (sanitized; no names beyond roles), error counts by type, two prompt changes tested, a one-paragraph team guideline.

Step plan. (1) Confirm policy and consent; (2) generate recaps; (3) mark errors; (4) change prompts; (5) retest; (6) write guideline.

Rubric

Criterion	Not yet	Meets	Strong
Error marking	Errors missed	Every error marked by type	Errors linked to transcript lines
Improvement	No changes tested	Two prompt changes tested	Error count reduction shown

Criterion	Not yet	Meets	Strong
Policy	Consent not addressed	Consent and policy confirmed for each meeting	Guideline names meetings never to transcribe

Strong vs weak example. Weak: "The AI got some owners wrong." Strong: "Across three recaps, 4 of 9 errors were owners assigned to the person who raised an item rather than the one who took it. Adding 'owner = person who agreed to do it; if unclear, write owner not stated' cut owner errors to 1."

Mini project 2: Spreadsheet Answer Audit

Brief. Take a non-sensitive work spreadsheet (or the sandbox workbook) and ask the assistant five plain-language questions. Verify every answer manually and document where and why they differ.

Deliverables. Five questions; assistant answers with formula or pivot shown; manual results; difference analysis; a "how to prepare a sheet for AI questions" checklist (clean table, one header row, no merged cells, no totals in data).

Step plan. (1) Clean a copy of the sheet; (2) ask; (3) verify each by formula or pivot; (4) explain differences; (5) write the checklist.

Rubric

Criterion	Not yet	Meets	Strong
Verification	Answers not checked	All five checked manually	Checks reproducible by a coworker
Diagnosis	Differences unexplained	Each difference explained (filter, blanks, duplicates, method)	Data fixed and questions re-asked
Data handling	Sensitive data used or original altered	Non-sensitive copy; original untouched	Preparation checklist adopted by the team

Strong vs weak example. Weak: "AI said North Shore, I said Metro West, so AI is wrong." Strong: "The AI respected the leftover LTL filter (North Shore −$6,300). With filters cleared, Metro West dropped most (−$6,500, −11.6%), driven by FTL. The tool was right for the data it saw; the sheet was wrong. Added 'clear filters' to the checklist."