FAST-16 Projects: Working Well with AI

Provider: 7formations | Course: FAST-16 | Instructor: Wadood Chaudhary | One capstone and two mini projects

Projects extend the labs into habits trainees keep. Mini projects run between sessions; the capstone is completed during and within seven days after session 3. All material is fictional or sanitized. Scoring uses **Not yet**, **Meets**, and **Strong**; completion needs Meets on every capstone criterion. One resubmission is allowed.

Suggested reading for the projects: Laurence Lars Svekis, *AI Literacy for All Employees* (2026), chapters 6, 7, 13, and 15.

Never include real customer, patient, or employee information (G.L. c. 93H, 201 CMR 17.00).

Capstone: My Ask-Check-Own Playbook

Brief. Build a playbook for one recurring task in your role that a coworker could follow on their first day: how to ask the AI well, how to check what comes back, and how to own and document the result.

Deliverables

1. Two tested prompts for the task (four elements and a gap rule), each with a sample output and the follow-ups that improved it.
2. A W2-style evaluation record for one real-type output (fictional or sanitized), with at least one error found and typed, and one verification technique used.
3. W4 Safe AI workflow card (final) for the task.
4. A one-page lesson from a case: pick one of the seven cases from Lab 3 and explain how your workflow would prevent the same failure.
5. W5 Ask-check-own pocket card.

Step plan

Step	When	What you do
1	After session 1	Pick the task; draft and test two prompts
2	After session 2	Run a five-step evaluation on one output; record it
3	Session 3	Build and peer-test W4
4	Within 7 days of session 3	Write the case lesson; assemble and submit

Rubric

Criterion	Not yet	Meets	Strong
Prompting	Elements missing; no gap rule	Four elements, gap rule, two useful follow-ups	A partner reused the prompt unchanged

Criterion	Not yet	Meets	Strong
Evaluation	Steps skipped	All five steps recorded; error typed correctly	Traces the error to a prompt fix and rechecks
Verification	None	At least one technique (source trace, recalculation, lateral reading)	Uses two techniques, including checking a citation exists
Workflow	Steps vague	All five steps specific to the task	Escalation path and discard trigger stated
Case lesson	Summary only	Lesson linked to a specific safeguard	Links to a policy or law where relevant

Example of strong versus weak work (fictional inside-sales rep, Bayside Precision Parts)

Element	Weak	Strong
Prompt	"Write a lead-time email."	"I'm an inside-sales rep at a CNC shop. Using only the order status below, write a three-sentence email to the customer's buyer giving the new ship date and the reason. If something isn't in the status, write [CHECK]. --- [status, no account numbers] ---"
Evaluation	"Looks good."	"Accuracy: ship date matches ERP. Completeness: missing the partial-shipment option, added. Relevance: answers the buyer's question. Bias: none. Judgment: send."
Document	(none)	"Drafted with Copilot Chat; dates checked against ERP by me."

Mini project 1: Prompt Before-and-After Gallery

Brief. Collect five weak prompts (your own or invented, no private data) and rewrite them. For each, show both outputs and say what changed.

Rubric

Criterion	Not yet	Meets	Strong
Rewrites	Fewer than four elements in most	All five rewrites use the four elements	Each uses a different technique
Comparison	Outputs missing	Both outputs shown with one change noted	Notes an error the weak prompt caused

Mini project 2: Verify Three Claims

Brief. Ask an approved assistant three factual questions about your industry in Massachusetts (for example, a licensing rule or a safety standard). Verify each answer with SIFT and record what you found.

Rubric

Criterion	Not yet	Meets	Strong
Verification	Asked the AI to confirm itself	Each claim traced to an official or independent source	Notes one claim that was partly right and how
Record	Missing sources	Source, date, and verdict for each	Explains which SIFT move did the work