



WORKFLO
by TechnoGroup.ai

Prove capability, not attendance.

12 sample missions that turn your teams
into confident AI builders — one week at a time.

SAMPLE EDITION — ILLUSTRATIVE CASE STUDIES

- Every mission ends in a real work artifact — not a certificate.
- An AI coach guides each employee. It never just gives answers.
- AI proposes scores with evidence. A human always signs off.

HOW THIS WORKS

Missions, not courses.

Courses prove attendance. Missions prove capability.

Each week, an employee takes on one real challenge from their own job. An AI coach guides them — asking questions, critiquing drafts, never doing the work for them. By Friday they have built a real artifact, recorded a 60-second explanation, and earned a scored entry in a skill portfolio their manager can see.

THE WEEKLY LOOP

Challenge → AI Coach → Build → Test → Present (60s) → Scored with evidence → Human sign-off → Portfolio

How to read each case study

Every case study runs across two pages. Page one shows the pain, the mission week, one real coach moment, the artifact, the scoring rubric, and the pilot target. Page two breaks the week into daily tasks with end-of-day checkpoints, plus three assessment milestones: plan locked (Tuesday), tested on real work (Thursday), and scored & signed (Friday). Four cases come from agribusiness, three from education businesses, and five apply to any industry.

WHY THE COACH NEVER JUST ANSWERS

An answer helps once. A guided build changes how someone works. The coach explains its reasoning, pushes employees to verify against their own data, and refuses shortcuts that create risk — that is what makes the resulting skill real and the artifact trustworthy.

A NOTE ON THE NUMBERS

These 12 case studies are sample missions built from common, expensive workflows — not client stories. Every outcome is written as a pilot target and is measured during your sprint, so the results deck we build afterwards contains your numbers, not ours.

The 12 missions

01	The Export Document Checker	Agribusiness · Export
02	The Daily Price Intelligence Brief	Agribusiness · Procurement
03	The Farmer Question Playbook	Agribusiness · Field Force
04	The Grading Standards Guide	Agribusiness · Quality
05	The Follow-Up Engine	Education Business · Admissions
06	The Question Bank Builder	Education Business · Content
07	AI Grading with Human Sign-Off	Education Business · Assessment
08	The Territory Pricing Analysis	Any Industry · Sales
09	The Variance Report Autopilot	Any Industry · Finance
10	The Ticket Mining Mission	Any Industry · Support
11	From SOP to Training Module	Any Industry · HR & L&D;
12	The Campaign Content Kit	Any Industry · Marketing

CASE STUDY 01 · AGRIBUSINESS · EXPORT

The Export Document Checker

Built by: Trade Operations Executive

THE PAIN

One wrong phytosanitary certificate or mismatched invoice can hold a container at port for days. Your ops team checks every document set by hand, and errors still slip through during peak season.

THE MISSION — ONE WEEK

Mon — Mission brief: list every document in your last 5 shipments and the 3 most common errors.

Tue — With the coach, turn those errors into a written verification checklist with pass/fail rules.

Wed — Build it: use AI to cross-check one real (anonymised) document set against the checklist.

Thu — Test on 3 more shipments. Log what AI caught, missed, and flagged wrongly.

Fri — Record a 60-second walkthrough. Submit checklist + error log to your portfolio.

AI COACH MOMENT

Employee: "Can you just check these documents for me?"

Coach: "I can check with you. First, tell me: which two fields caused your last shipment delay? Let's make those the first rules in your checklist."

ARTIFACT PRODUCED

A reusable pre-shipment verification checklist plus an AI cross-check workflow the whole ops team can run.

SCORED ON (AI proposes with evidence — a manager confirms)

Checklist completeness · Error-catch accuracy · Quality of AI verification prompts · Clarity of walkthrough

PILOTTARGET

Pilot target: cut document rework and port-hold incidents on checked shipments — measured against the previous quarter's error log.

CASE STUDY 01 · THE EXPORT DOCUMENT CHECKER

The week in detail

About 45–60 minutes a day, inside the working day — no classroom time.

DAILY TASKS & CHECKPOINTS

MON

Map the problem

- Gather the document sets from your last 5 shipments.
- List every document type and who prepares it.
- Write down the 3 errors that caused real delays.

End of day: A one-page document map + error shortlist.

TUE

Design the checklist

- With the coach, turn each error into a pass/fail rule.
- Name the source of truth for every rule (contract, LC, plant-protection requirement).
- Order rules by cost of failure.

End of day: Draft checklist reviewed by the coach for gaps.

WED

Build the AI cross-check

- Anonymise one real document set.
- Prompt AI to check it against your rules — every flag must cite the exact field.
- Refine prompts until flags cite evidence correctly.

End of day: First AI-checked shipment with a flag report.

THU

Test and log

- Run 3 more shipments through the workflow.
- Log every result: caught, missed, or false flag.
- Adjust rules where AI misfired.

End of day: Test log with accuracy counts.

FRI

Present and score

- Record a 60-second walkthrough of one real catch.
- Submit checklist, workflow, and test log.

End of day: Portfolio entry live.

ASSESSMENT MILESTONES

M1 · TUE Plan locked.

Evidence: Verification checklist with pass/fail rules and named sources, coach-reviewed.

M2 · THU Tested on real work.

Evidence: 3-shipment test log with caught / missed / false-flag counts.

M3 · FRI Scored & signed.

60-second presentation + artifact submitted. AI proposes the rubric score with evidence; the manager confirms or edits — the manager's score is final. Portfolio entry created.

CASE STUDY 02 · AGRIBUSINESS · PROCUREMENT

The Daily Price Intelligence Brief

Built by: Commodity Procurement Officer

THE PAIN

Buyers negotiate worth millions while price data sits scattered across mandi reports, broker WhatsApp messages, and international indices. Whoever has the cleaner picture wins the negotiation.

THE MISSION — ONE WEEK

Mon — Mission brief: name your 3 key commodities and every price source you actually use.
Tue — With the coach, design a one-page daily brief format: prices, spreads, 7-day trend, one insight.
Wed — Build the AI workflow that turns raw source data into that brief.
Thu — Run it for two mornings. Compare the brief against what your desk knew without it.
Fri — Record a 60-second explanation and add one negotiation-prep sheet built from the brief.

AI COACH MOMENT

Employee: "What will soybean prices do next month?"

Coach: "I won't predict markets for you. But look at your own 7-day spread data — what does the widening gap between local and import parity tell you before tomorrow's call?"

ARTIFACT PRODUCED

A repeatable daily price brief plus a negotiation-prep sheet grounded in the buyer's own sources.

SCORED ON (AI proposes with evidence — a manager confirms)

Source coverage · Accuracy of the brief · Business relevance of insights · Responsible AI use

PILOT TARGET

Pilot target: every buyer walks into negotiations with the same one-page picture — brief prepared in minutes, not hours.

CASE STUDY 02 · THE DAILY PRICE INTELLIGENCE BRIEF

The week in detail

About 45–60 minutes a day, inside the working day — no classroom time.

DAILY TASKS & CHECKPOINTS

MON

Map your sources

- List your 3 commodities and every price source you use.
- Note each source's update frequency.
- Rate each source: trusted, noisy, or hearsay.

End of day: Source map with trust ratings.

TUE

Design the brief

- Sketch the one-page format: prices, spreads, 7-day trend, one insight.
- Agree with the coach what makes an insight decision-ready.

End of day: Approved brief template.

WED

Build the workflow

- Feed yesterday's raw source data to AI using your template.
- Force structure: every number must name its source.
- Iterate until the brief survives your own fact-check.

End of day: First AI-drafted brief, fact-checked.

THU

Run it live

- Produce the brief two mornings in a row, before 09:00.
- Note one decision the desk made differently because of it.

End of day: Two dated briefs + one decision note.

FRI

Present and score

- Build one negotiation-prep sheet from the briefs.
- Record a 60-second explanation and submit.

End of day: Portfolio entry live.

ASSESSMENT MILESTONES

M1 · TUE Plan locked.

Evidence: Approved brief template in which every number names its source.

M2 · THU Tested on real work.

Evidence: Two dated live briefs plus one documented decision they changed.

M3 · FRI Scored & signed.

60-second presentation + artifact submitted. AI proposes the rubric score with evidence; the manager confirms or edits — the manager's score is final. Portfolio entry created.

CASE STUDY 03 · AGRIBUSINESS · FIELD FORCE

The Farmer Question Playbook

Built by: Field Sales / Agronomy Representative

THE PAIN

Your 40 field reps answer the same 50 farmer questions every week — dosage, timing, resistant varieties, credit terms. Answers vary by rep, and wrong answers cost trust and repeat sales.

THE MISSION — ONE WEEK

Mon — Mission brief: collect this week's 15 most-asked farmer questions from your own calls.
Tue — With the coach, draft clear answers — then verify each one against the official product manual.
Wed — Build the playbook: question, verified answer, and what to say when the answer is "ask an agronomist."
Thu — Field-test 5 answers in real conversations. Note where farmers pushed back.
Fri — Record a 60-second summary. Submit the playbook for your region.

AI COACH MOMENT

Employee: "Write the answer about pesticide dosage."

Coach: "Dosage answers must come from the label, not from me. Open the product manual — what does it say for that crop stage? Now let's make that answer farmer-friendly."

ARTIFACT PRODUCED

A verified regional Q&A; playbook — the seed content for a company-wide field advisory assistant.

SCORED ON (AI proposes with evidence — a manager confirms)

Question coverage · Answer accuracy vs. manuals · Escalation judgement · Clarity for farmers

PILOTTARGET

Pilot target: consistent, verified answers across every rep in the region — and a measured drop in escalations to head-office agronomists.

CASE STUDY 03 · THE FARMER QUESTION PLAYBOOK

The week in detail

About 45–60 minutes a day, inside the working day — no classroom time.

DAILY TASKS & CHECKPOINTS

MON

Collect real questions

- Log the 15 most-asked questions from this week's farmer calls.
- Tag each: product, agronomy, credit, or other.

End of day: Tagged question list.

TUE

Draft and verify

- Draft answers with the coach.
- Verify every product answer against the official label or manual.
- Mark the questions that must go to an agronomist.

End of day: Verified draft answers + escalation list.

WED

Build the playbook

- Format each entry: question → verified answer → source → escalation rule.
- Rewrite every answer in farmer-friendly language.

End of day: Playbook v1.

THU

Field-test

- Use 5 answers in real farmer conversations.
- Note pushback and confusion — word for word.

End of day: Field notes on 5 answers.

FRI

Present and score

- Revise the weak answers.
- Record a 60-second summary and submit the playbook.

End of day: Portfolio entry live.

ASSESSMENT MILESTONES

M1 · TUE Plan locked.

Evidence: Verified answer set with sources, plus a clear escalation list.

M2 · THU Tested on real work.

Evidence: Field notes from 5 real conversations, including what confused farmers.

M3 · FRI Scored & signed.

60-second presentation + artifact submitted. AI proposes the rubric score with evidence; the manager confirms or edits — the manager's score is final. Portfolio entry created.

CASE STUDY 04 · AGRIBUSINESS · QUALITY

The Grading Standards Guide

Built by: Quality Manager

THE PAIN

Produce grading depends on whoever is on shift. Two inspectors, same lot, two grades — and every dispute with a supplier or buyer starts there.

THE MISSION — ONE WEEK

Mon — Mission brief: photograph 20 graded samples across your quality bands (pass, borderline, reject).
Tue — With the coach, write the visible criteria that separate each band. Argue the borderline cases.
Wed — Build a photo-based grading guide: criteria, example images, common mistakes.
Thu — Test it: two colleagues grade the same 10 samples using the guide. Compare agreement.
Fri — Record a 60-second walkthrough. Submit the guide and the agreement scores.

AI COACH MOMENT

Employee: "Can AI just grade the samples from photos?"

Coach: "Eventually — but a model is only as good as your standard. Look at these two borderline photos: what exactly makes one a Grade B? Name it, and it becomes a rule."

ARTIFACT PRODUCED

An illustrated grading standards guide plus an inspector-agreement baseline — the foundation for image-assisted grading later.

SCORED ON (AI proposes with evidence — a manager confirms)

Criteria precision · Image example quality · Inspector agreement gain · Honest reporting of disagreements

PILOTTARGET

Pilot target: measurably higher inspector agreement on the same lots — fewer grading disputes with suppliers and buyers.

CASE STUDY 04 · THE GRADING STANDARDS GUIDE

The week in detail

About 45–60 minutes a day, inside the working day — no classroom time.

DAILY TASKS & CHECKPOINTS

MON

Photograph the bands

- Photograph 20 graded samples across pass, borderline, and reject.
- Label every photo with the grade given and by whom.

End of day: Labelled photo set.

TUE

Name the criteria

- With the coach, write the visible criteria for each band.
- Argue every borderline photo until the rule becomes explicit.

End of day: Draft criteria per band.

WED

Build the guide

- Pair each criterion with example photos and common mistakes.
- Add a one-page quick card for the inspection line.

End of day: Illustrated guide v1.

THU

Run the agreement test

- Two colleagues grade the same 10 samples using the guide.
- Compute agreement — before vs. after the guide.

End of day: Agreement scores logged.

FRI

Present and score

- Fix the criteria where graders still disagreed.
- Record a 60-second walkthrough and submit.

End of day: Portfolio entry live.

ASSESSMENT MILESTONES

M1 · TUE Plan locked.

Evidence: Written, explicit criteria for every grade band, coach-reviewed.

M2 · THU Tested on real work.

Evidence: Inspector agreement scores on the same 10 samples, before vs. after.

M3 · FRI Scored & signed.

60-second presentation + artifact submitted. AI proposes the rubric score with evidence; the manager confirms or edits — the manager's score is final. Portfolio entry created.

CASE STUDY 05 · EDUCATION BUSINESS · ADMISSIONS

The Follow-Up Engine

Built by: Admissions Counselor

THE PAIN

Most enquiries go cold after the first call. Counselors chase new leads and forget warm ones, and every lost enrolment is revenue you already paid marketing to find.

THE MISSION — ONE WEEK

Mon — Mission brief: pull your last 30 enquiries and mark where each one went silent.

Tue — With the coach, build a simple lead-scoring sheet: who to call first, and why.

Wed — Build a 5-message follow-up sequence for your top silent segment — in your institute's voice.

Thu — Send it to 10 real cold leads. Track replies and booked visits.

Fri — Record a 60-second summary of what worked. Submit sequence + results.

AI COACH MOMENT

Employee: "Write me a message that convinces parents to enrol."

Coach: "Convincing starts with why they went quiet. Of your 30 leads, how many stopped after fees came up? That segment needs a different first message than the ones who missed a call."

ARTIFACT PRODUCED

A lead-scoring sheet and a tested 5-message follow-up sequence, with real reply data attached.

SCORED ON (AI proposes with evidence — a manager confirms)

Segmentation logic · Message quality and brand voice · Measured reply rate · Ethical persuasion

PILOT TARGET

Pilot target: reactivate a measurable share of cold enquiries in week one — tracked as replies and booked campus visits.

CASE STUDY 05 · THE FOLLOW-UP ENGINE

The week in detail

About 45–60 minutes a day, inside the working day — no classroom time.

DAILY TASKS & CHECKPOINTS

MON

Map the silence

- Pull your last 30 enquiries.
- Mark the exact step where each one went quiet.

End of day: Drop-off map.

TUE

Score the leads

- Build the lead-scoring sheet with the coach: who first, and why.
- Pick your single largest silent segment.

End of day: Scoring sheet + target segment.

WED

Write the sequence

- Draft 5 messages for that segment in the institute's voice.
- Cut anything that pressures instead of helps.

End of day: Sequence approved against brand voice.

THU

Send and track

- Send to 10 real cold leads.
- Track replies and booked visits the same day.

End of day: First response data.

FRI

Present and score

- Record a 60-second summary of the results.
- Submit the sequence + response data.

End of day: Portfolio entry live.

ASSESSMENT MILESTONES

M1 · TUE Plan locked.

Evidence: Lead-scoring sheet plus a chosen target segment with reasoning.

M2 · THU Tested on real work.

Evidence: Reply and booked-visit data from 10 real sends.

M3 · FRI Scored & signed.

60-second presentation + artifact submitted. AI proposes the rubric score with evidence; the manager confirms or edits — the manager's score is final. Portfolio entry created.

CASE STUDY 06 · EDUCATION BUSINESS · CONTENT

The Question Bank Builder

Built by: Curriculum Content Lead

THE PAIN

Writing 100 quality exam questions takes your team weeks. Buying question banks means generic items that don't match your syllabus or difficulty curve.

THE MISSION — ONE WEEK

Mon — Mission brief: pick one syllabus unit and define your quality rubric for a "good question."

Tue — With the coach, generate 30 draft questions — then reject at least a third, with written reasons.

Wed — Build the full set: 100 items tagged by topic, difficulty, and skill.

Thu — Quality pass: a colleague blind-reviews 20 random items against your rubric.

Fri — Record a 60-second explanation of your quality process. Submit bank + review scores.

AI COACH MOMENT

Employee: "Generate 100 questions on this chapter."

Coach: "Generating is the easy part. First, show me one question you consider excellent and one you'd reject. What's the difference? That difference becomes our quality filter."

ARTIFACT PRODUCED

A 100-item tagged question bank plus a written quality rubric your whole content team can reuse.

SCORED ON (AI proposes with evidence — a manager confirms)

Syllabus alignment · Difficulty balance · Rejection-reason quality · Reviewer agreement score

PILOT TARGET

Pilot target: a full unit question bank in one week instead of several — at a quality level your own reviewers sign off on.

CASE STUDY 06 · THE QUESTION BANK BUILDER

The week in detail

About 45–60 minutes a day, inside the working day — no classroom time.

DAILY TASKS & CHECKPOINTS

MON

Define quality

- Pick one syllabus unit.
- Write your rubric for a good question with the coach.

End of day: Quality rubric.

TUE

Generate and reject

- Generate 30 draft questions.
- Reject at least 10 — each with a written reason.

End of day: Rejection log: your quality filter in action.

WED

Build the bank

- Scale to 100 items.
- Tag every item by topic, difficulty, and skill.

End of day: Tagged bank v1.

THU

Blind review

- A colleague reviews 20 random items against the rubric.
- Fix every failed item and note the failure pattern.

End of day: Review scores logged.

FRI

Present and score

- Record a 60-second explanation of your quality process.
- Submit the bank + review scores.

End of day: Portfolio entry live.

ASSESSMENT MILESTONES

M1 · TUE Plan locked.

Evidence: 30 drafts with 10+ written rejections proving the quality filter works.

M2 · THU Tested on real work.

Evidence: Blind-review scores on 20 random items, with fixes applied.

M3 · FRI Scored & signed.

60-second presentation + artifact submitted. AI proposes the rubric score with evidence; the manager confirms or edits — the manager's score is final. Portfolio entry created.

CASE STUDY 07 · EDUCATION BUSINESS · ASSESSMENT

AI Grading with Human Sign-Off

Built by: Academic Coordinator

THE PAIN

Teachers spend evenings grading, feedback arrives late, and marks drift between graders. But nobody trusts — or should trust — fully automated marks.

THE MISSION — ONE WEEK

Mon — Mission brief: choose one assignment type and write its rubric as explicit criteria and marks.

Tue — With the coach, run AI grading on 10 past (anonymised) submissions — AI must show its evidence per criterion.

Wed — Compare AI marks to the original teacher marks. Investigate every gap larger than 10%.

Thu — Build the workflow: AI proposes mark + evidence, teacher confirms or edits. Teacher's mark is final.

Fri — Record a 60-second walkthrough. Submit the moderation report.

AI COACH MOMENT

Employee: "Can we let AI finalise the marks to save time?"

Coach: "No — and that's a feature. AI proposes with evidence; your teacher decides in seconds instead of minutes. Look at submission #7: do you agree with the evidence AI cited?"

ARTIFACT PRODUCED

A working propose-and-confirm grading workflow plus a moderation report comparing AI and teacher marks.

SCORED ON (AI proposes with evidence — a manager confirms)

Rubric quality · AI-teacher agreement analysis · Workflow practicality · Judgement on where AI fails

PILOT TARGET

Pilot target: grading turnaround cut from days to hours on the pilot assignment — with the teacher's mark always final.

CASE STUDY 07 · AI GRADING WITH HUMAN SIGN-OFF

The week in detail

About 45–60 minutes a day, inside the working day — no classroom time.

DAILY TASKS & CHECKPOINTS

MON

Write the rubric

- Choose one assignment type.
- Convert its expectations into explicit criteria and marks.

End of day: Machine-readable rubric.

TUE

Run the comparison

- AI grades 10 anonymised past submissions.
- Require cited evidence for every criterion score.

End of day: AI marks + evidence table.

WED

Investigate the gaps

- Compare AI marks to the original teacher marks.
- Investigate every gap over 10% — decide who was right.

End of day: Gap analysis with verdicts.

THU

Build the workflow

- Wire the flow: AI proposes mark + evidence → teacher confirms or edits.
- Time a teacher using it on 5 fresh submissions.

End of day: Working workflow + timing data.

FRI

Present and score

- Write the moderation report.
- Record a 60-second walkthrough and submit.

End of day: Portfolio entry live.

ASSESSMENT MILESTONES

M1 · TUE Plan locked.

Evidence: AI marks with cited evidence on 10 past submissions.

M2 · THU Tested on real work.

Evidence: Working confirm-or-edit workflow, with per-submission timing data.

M3 · FRI Scored & signed.

60-second presentation + artifact submitted. AI proposes the rubric score with evidence; the manager confirms or edits — the manager's score is final. Portfolio entry created.

CASE STUDY 08 · ANY INDUSTRY · SALES

The Territory Pricing Analysis

Built by: Sales Executive

THE PAIN

Your reps discover competitor price moves from customers — usually after losing the deal. Pricing intel lives in their heads and dies when they leave.

THE MISSION — ONE WEEK

Mon — Mission brief: list your territory's top 3 competitors and every intel source you have.
Tue — With the coach, structure a comparison: product, price, terms, and where you win or lose.
Wed — Build the analysis sheet with AI — and mark every number as verified or estimated.
Thu — Pressure-test it in one real deal conversation this week.
Fri — Record a 60-second summary: your three sharpest talking points. Submit the sheet.

AI COACH MOMENT

Employee: "Tell me my competitors' prices."

Coach: "I don't know your local market — you do. You mentioned losing two deals on payment terms, not price. Let's build the comparison around terms first and see what that changes."

ARTIFACT PRODUCED

A living territory pricing sheet with verified-vs-estimated flags, plus three tested win/loss talking points.

SCORED ON (AI proposes with evidence — a manager confirms)

Source honesty (verified vs. estimated) · Analysis depth · Deal relevance · Talking-point quality

PILOT TARGET

Pilot target: every rep enters price conversations with the same current picture — and win/loss reasons finally get written down.

CASE STUDY 08 · THE TERRITORY PRICING ANALYSIS

The week in detail

About 45–60 minutes a day, inside the working day — no classroom time.

DAILY TASKS & CHECKPOINTS

MON

Gather what you know

- List your top 3 competitors and every intel source.
- Mark every fact as verified or estimated.

End of day: Honest intel inventory.

TUE

Structure the comparison

- Build the sheet with the coach: product, price, terms, win/lose.
- List what's missing and how you'll get it.

End of day: Comparison structure approved.

WED

Fill and flag

- Complete the sheet with AI research support.
- Keep verified/estimated flags on every single number.

End of day: Filled sheet, honestly flagged.

THU

Use it in a deal

- Take the sheet into one live customer conversation.
- Note which point actually moved the customer.

End of day: Deal note logged.

FRI

Present and score

- Write your 3 sharpest talking points.
- Record a 60-second summary and submit.

End of day: Portfolio entry live.

ASSESSMENT MILESTONES

M1 · TUE Plan locked.

Evidence: Approved comparison structure built around real win/loss reasons.

M2 · THU Tested on real work.

Evidence: One live deal note showing the sheet used in a real conversation.

M3 · FRI Scored & signed.

60-second presentation + artifact submitted. AI proposes the rubric score with evidence; the manager confirms or edits — the manager's score is final. Portfolio entry created.

CASE STUDY 09 · ANY INDUSTRY · FINANCE

The Variance Report Autopilot

Built by: Finance Analyst

THE PAIN

Every Monday, an analyst spends half a day rebuilding the same variance report: export, clean, pivot, comment, format. The thinking takes 30 minutes; the assembling takes four hours.

THE MISSION — ONE WEEK

Mon — Mission brief: document every step of the current report, with time spent per step.
Tue — With the coach, decide which steps AI should do, which stay human, and which should not exist.
Wed — Build the workflow: raw export in, draft report with variance commentary out.
Thu — Run it on real data in parallel with the manual report. Diff every number.
Fri — Record a 60-second walkthrough. Submit workflow + the parallel-run comparison.

AI COACH MOMENT

Employee: "Automate my whole report."

Coach: "Let's not automate a bad process. Your step list shows two reconciliations that exist because of one upstream naming mess. Fix that first — then the automation gets simpler and safer."

ARTIFACT PRODUCED

A rerunnable report workflow plus a parallel-run audit proving the numbers match.

SCORED ON (AI proposes with evidence — a manager confirms)

Process documentation · Number accuracy (zero unexplained diffs) · Commentary quality · Time saved, measured

PILOTTARGET

Pilot target: report assembly time cut from hours to under 30 minutes — verified by a side-by-side parallel run, not a claim.

CASE STUDY 09 · THE VARIANCE REPORT AUTOPILOT

The week in detail

About 45–60 minutes a day, inside the working day — no classroom time.

DAILY TASKS & CHECKPOINTS

MON

Document the process

- Write every step of the current report, with minutes spent.
- Mark each step: thinking, assembling, or fixing an upstream mess.

End of day: Timed process map.

TUE

Decide the split

- With the coach, sort steps: AI does, human does, should not exist.
- Fix one upstream issue instead of automating around it.

End of day: Automation plan approved.

WED

Build the workflow

- Wire it: raw export in → draft report with commentary out.
- Force AI to flag any number it cannot trace to the export.

End of day: First automated draft.

THU

Parallel run

- Produce the manual and automated reports on the same data.
- Diff every number and explain every difference.

End of day: Zero unexplained diffs.

FRI

Present and score

- Record a 60-second walkthrough.
- Submit the workflow + parallel-run audit.

End of day: Portfolio entry live.

ASSESSMENT MILESTONES

M1 · TUE Plan locked.

Evidence: Approved automation plan, including one upstream fix.

M2 · THU Tested on real work.

Evidence: Parallel-run diff on real data with zero unexplained differences.

M3 · FRI Scored & signed.

60-second presentation + artifact submitted. AI proposes the rubric score with evidence; the manager confirms or edits — the manager's score is final. Portfolio entry created.

CASE STUDY 10 · ANY INDUSTRY · SUPPORT

The Ticket Mining Mission

Built by: Customer Support Lead

THE PAIN

Your team answers the same questions hundreds of times, but nobody has time to study the tickets. The knowledge base is outdated and new agents take months to ramp.

THE MISSION — ONE WEEK

Mon — Mission brief: export your last 200 (anonymised) tickets.

Tue — With the coach, cluster them: what are the real top 10 issues, in customer language?

Wed — Build a draft-reply library for the top 10 — accurate, on-brand, with escalation rules.

Thu — Agents use the library for one day. Track edits: which drafts survived contact with reality?

Fri — Record a 60-second summary. Submit the library + edit statistics.

AI COACH MOMENT

Employee: "Write perfect replies for everything."

Coach: "Perfect replies come from real tickets, not from me. Your cluster #3 — billing confusion — is 22% of volume. Read five of those tickets: what exact words do customers use? Start the reply there."

ARTIFACT PRODUCED

A top-10 issue map and a field-tested draft-reply library with escalation rules.

SCORED ON (AI proposes with evidence — a manager confirms)

Clustering accuracy · Reply quality after field test · Escalation judgement · Use of real ticket evidence

PILOT TARGET

Pilot target: first-response time drops on the top 10 issues, and new agents ramp with a tested library instead of tribal knowledge.

CASE STUDY 10 · THE TICKET MINING MISSION

The week in detail

About 45–60 minutes a day, inside the working day — no classroom time.

DAILY TASKS & CHECKPOINTS

MON

Export and prepare

- Export your last 200 tickets and anonymise them.
- Remove junk, spam, and duplicates.

End of day: Clean ticket set.

TUE

Cluster the pain

- Cluster with AI into the top 10 issues, in customer language.
- Sanity-check every cluster against your own experience.

End of day: Issue map approved.

WED

Write the library

- Draft replies for the top 10, each with an escalation rule.
- Match the tone of your best past replies.

End of day: Draft-reply library v1.

THU

One-day field test

- Agents use the library for one full day.
- Track every draft: kept, edited, or rejected.

End of day: Edit statistics.

FRI

Present and score

- Revise the worst-performing drafts.
- Record a 60-second summary and submit.

End of day: Portfolio entry live.

ASSESSMENT MILESTONES

M1 · TUE Plan locked.

Evidence: Top-10 issue map in customer language, sanity-checked.

M2 · THU Tested on real work.

Evidence: One-day field-test statistics: kept / edited / rejected per draft.

M3 · FRI Scored & signed.

60-second presentation + artifact submitted. AI proposes the rubric score with evidence; the manager confirms or edits — the manager's score is final. Portfolio entry created.

CASE STUDY 11 · ANY INDUSTRY · HR & L&D;

From SOP to Training Module

Built by: HR / L&D; Manager

THE PAIN

Your SOPs are accurate and unread. Training means someone presenting slides once — then hoping. Nobody can prove who actually learned what.

THE MISSION — ONE WEEK

Mon — Mission brief: pick one high-stakes SOP people keep getting wrong.
 Tue — With the coach, turn it into a scenario: a realistic situation where the SOP decides the outcome.
 Wed — Build the module: scenario, decision points, feedback, and a 5-question check.
 Thu — Run it with 5 employees. Watch where they hesitate or fail.
 Fri — Record a 60-second summary. Submit the module + first completion data.

AI COACH MOMENT

Employee: "Turn all 40 SOPs into courses."

Coach: "One first. Which SOP failure cost you most last quarter? A module people finish and pass beats 40 modules nobody opens. Let's make that one excellent, then template it."

ARTIFACT PRODUCED

A scenario-based training module with a knowledge check and real first-cohort completion data.

SCORED ON (AI proposes with evidence — a manager confirms)

Scenario realism · SOP accuracy · Learner completion and scores · Quality of the reusable template

PILOT TARGET

Pilot target: one high-stakes SOP with proven completion and pass data — and a template that turns the next SOP into a module in a day.

CASE STUDY 11 · FROM SOP TO TRAINING MODULE

The week in detail

About 45–60 minutes a day, inside the working day — no classroom time.

DAILY TASKS & CHECKPOINTS

MON

Pick the SOP that hurts

- Choose one high-stakes SOP people keep getting wrong.
- Collect 2 real incidents it caused.

End of day: SOP + incident notes.

TUE

Write the scenario

- Turn the incidents into one realistic decision scenario with the coach.
- Define what right and wrong decisions look like.

End of day: Scenario script approved.

WED

Build the module

- Assemble: scenario, decision points, feedback, 5-question check.
- Keep completion time under 20 minutes.

End of day: Module v1.

THU

Run the cohort

- 5 employees complete it while you watch.
- Note every hesitation and failure point.

End of day: First completion data.

FRI

Present and score

- Fix the module and extract the reusable template.
- Record a 60-second summary and submit.

End of day: Portfolio entry live.

ASSESSMENT MILESTONES

M1 · TUE Plan locked.

Evidence: Approved scenario script grounded in 2 real incidents.

M2 · THU Tested on real work.

Evidence: Completion and score data from a live 5-person cohort.

M3 · FRI Scored & signed.

60-second presentation + artifact submitted. AI proposes the rubric score with evidence; the manager confirms or edits — the manager's score is final. Portfolio entry created.

CASE STUDY 12 · ANY INDUSTRY · MARKETING

The Campaign Content Kit

Built by: Marketing Executive

THE PAIN

One campaign needs a landing page, five emails, ten posts, and three ad variants. Your team either misses deadlines or ships off-brand AI filler that all sounds the same.

THE MISSION — ONE WEEK

Mon — Mission brief: write the campaign's one-page brief — audience, promise, proof, offer.
Tue — With the coach, define brand-voice guardrails: 5 rules, 5 forbidden phrases, 2 example rewrites.
Wed — Build the kit: every asset generated inside the guardrails, then human-edited.
Thu — Review pass: mark every line as kept, edited, or rejected. Compute your edit rate.
Fri — Record a 60-second summary of what AI did well and badly. Submit kit + edit stats.

AI COACH MOMENT

Employee: "Generate the whole campaign."

Coach: "First show me one paragraph of past copy your audience loved. What makes it yours? Those patterns become guardrails — otherwise I'll hand you the same content every competitor is shipping."

ARTIFACT PRODUCED

A complete campaign kit plus written brand-voice guardrails and an honest edit-rate report.

SCORED ON (AI proposes with evidence — a manager confirms)

Brief quality · Guardrail sharpness · Asset consistency · Honest edit-rate reporting

PILOT TARGET

Pilot target: full campaign kit in one week with a falling edit rate — proof the team is directing AI, not cleaning up after it.

CASE STUDY 12 · THE CAMPAIGN CONTENT KIT

The week in detail

About 45–60 minutes a day, inside the working day — no classroom time.

DAILY TASKS & CHECKPOINTS

MON

Write the brief

- Write the one-page brief: audience, promise, proof, offer.
- Attach one past piece your audience genuinely loved.

End of day: Campaign brief.

TUE

Set the guardrails

- With the coach, write 5 voice rules and 5 forbidden phrases.
- Add 2 example rewrites: generic AI copy → your voice.

End of day: Guardrails doc.

WED

Generate inside the lines

- Produce every campaign asset with the guardrails applied.
- Human-edit each asset before it counts as done.

End of day: Full kit v1.

THU

Measure the edits

- Mark every line: kept, edited, or rejected.
- Compute the edit rate per asset type.

End of day: Edit-rate report.

FRI

Present and score

- Record a 60-second summary of what AI did well and badly.
- Submit the kit + edit statistics.

End of day: Portfolio entry live.

ASSESSMENT MILESTONES

M1 · TUE Plan locked.

Evidence: Guardrails doc with rules, forbidden phrases, and example rewrites.

M2 · THU Tested on real work.

Evidence: Edit-rate report per asset type from the full kit.

M3 · FRI Scored & signed.

60-second presentation + artifact submitted. AI proposes the rubric score with evidence; the manager confirms or edits — the manager's score is final. Portfolio entry created.

NEXT STEP

The 12–Week AI Capability Sprint

One pilot cohort. Twelve missions. A portfolio of proof.

Pick 25 employees across 3–5 roles. Each completes one mission per week, chosen from this booklet and customised to your workflows in the first onboarding session. Managers see progress in a live dashboard; you see the artifacts.

WHAT YOU GET

Weeks 1–2 — Workflow mapping. We turn your 3 most expensive manual workflows into custom missions.

Weeks 3–10 — Mission cycles. One artifact per employee per week, coached, scored, and manager-confirmed.

Weeks 11–12 — Results review. Time saved, artifacts shipped, and a verified skill portfolio per employee — measured against the pilot targets, with your numbers.

WHY START WITH A SPRINT

A sprint is small enough to approve this month and real enough to prove value: 25 people, 12 weeks, and every claim in the final review backed by an artifact someone on your team actually built.

[Book a mission demo](#). We will build one mission for your team before the meeting — and you can watch one of your people complete it live.

[Your name] · [email] · [phone] · [website]