FAST-06 Projects: Occupation-Specific AI Role Labs

Provider: 7formations | Course: FAST-06 | Instructor: Wadood Chaudhary | One capstone and two mini projects

Projects extend the role playbook into daily practice. 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 applicant or employee records, client financial data, PHI, or customer personal information (G.L. c. 93H, 201 CMR 17.00).

Capstone: My Role Playbook in Use (21 days)

Brief. Put your ten-procedure playbook to work for 21 days. Use at least six procedures on real tasks (with sanitized inputs), log each use, improve procedures based on what you learn, and publish a team-ready version a same-occupation colleague has followed.

Deliverables

1. Playbook v2: ten procedure cards (W2 format) with changes marked.
2. Use log: 20+ uses across 6+ procedures (date, procedure, time by hand estimate, time with AI incl. check, issues caught).
3. Data-safety log: for each use, what was stripped (category only, never the data).
4. Two colleague tests: a same-occupation colleague followed two procedures cold; their notes.
5. Retire list: procedures dropped or marked "no AI" and why.
6. One-page summary for your manager: time saved, quality issues, recommended team adoption.

Step plan

Step	When	What you do
1	Days 1-7	Use six procedures; log every use
2	Days 8-14	Fix vague checks and steps; colleague test 1
3	Days 15-21	Continue use; colleague test 2; retire list
4	Day 21	Playbook v2, summary, submit

Rubric

Criterion	Not yet	Meets	Strong
Role relevance	Generic tasks	Ten procedures match real tasks in the job family	Colleagues adopt at least two
Verification	Checks vague	Every card has a concrete check; issues logged	Checks caught real errors, with prompt fixes recorded

Criterion	Not yet	Meets	Strong
Data safety	Sensitive data used	Role-specific data excluded; strip log complete	Placeholders and strip lists built into prompts
Usability	No colleague tests	Two cold tests passed	Colleague followed with no questions
Measured value	No log or no check time	20+ logged uses with check time	Honest retire list; team recommendation with numbers

Strong vs weak example (one card, bookkeeping)

	Weak	Strong
Task	"Client emails"	"Monthly variance explanation for small-business clients"
Data rule	"Be careful"	"Strip client and business names, account digits, SSN/EIN; use category totals and my notes only"
Prompt	"Explain this"	"Explain the top 3 variances in plain language using only my notes for causes; amounts exactly as given; 120 words"
Check	"Review it"	"Every amount matches the variance report; every cause appears in my notes; if not, delete the sentence"
Time	"Faster"	"By hand 15 min; AI 2 + check 4 = 6 min; 9 uses; 2 invented causes caught and removed"

Mini project 1: Sanitization Kit for My Role

Brief. Build a one-page sanitization kit for your occupation: what to strip, what to keep, placeholders, and five before/after examples (fictional).

Deliverables. Strip list by category; keep list; placeholder set (e.g., [PATIENT], [CLIENT], [ORDER #]); five fictional before/after pairs; a "when not to use AI at all" list.

Step plan. (1) List the sensitive data in your role; (2) map each to strip or keep; (3) design placeholders; (4) write examples; (5) peer check by a same-occupation colleague.

Rubric

Criterion	Not yet	Meets	Strong
Completeness	Categories missing	All role-specific sensitive categories covered	Includes indirect identifiers (dates plus first name, etc.)
Practicality	Hard to use	One page, usable at the desk	Adopted by the team or employer
Accuracy	Examples leak data	Five clean examples	Examples include tricky edge cases

Strong vs weak example. Weak: "Remove personal info." Strong: "Front office: strip names, DOB, phone, address, insurance IDs, appointment date with any name, tooth or treatment details tied to a person. Keep generic procedure names in templates only. Placeholders: [PATIENT], [DATE], [PHONE], [PROCEDURE]. Never use AI for: voicemail transcripts, referral letters, chart notes."

Mini project 2: Check-Step Upgrade

Brief. Take five procedures (yours or a colleague's) with weak checks and upgrade each to a concrete, testable check with an escalation rule. Prove each upgraded check catches a planted error.

Deliverables. Five before/after checks; for each, a fictional output with one planted error and evidence the new check catches it; escalation rule ("if X fails, do Y").

Step plan. (1) Collect weak checks; (2) name source and comparison; (3) plant errors; (4) test; (5) write escalation rules.

Rubric

Criterion	Not yet	Meets	Strong
Concreteness	Checks still vague	Each names a source and comparison	Each is sample-based or exhaustive as appropriate
Evidence	No test	Planted error caught for all five	Also tested on a real (sanitized) output
Escalation	None	Rule for each check	Rule includes who to tell

Strong vs weak example. Weak: "Make sure the status report is right." Strong: "Compare each line's status, date, and owner with the meeting notes. Any date not in the notes becomes TBD; any at-risk item shown green triggers a call with the item owner before sending. Test: planted 'PPAP expected Nov 10' was caught."