



Integration of AI-powered tools and methodologies in the VET sector

BLOCK C

AI Applications in Professional and Personal Projects

Modules 9–12

Work Package 2 - Training Modules Development

KA210-VET · Erasmus+ · Pr Nr.: 2025-1-DE02-KA210-VET-000364083



Co-funded by
the European Union



Emphasys
TRAINING CENTRE



Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

Pr Nr.: 2025-1-DE02-KA210-VET-000364083

AI Applications in Professional and Personal Projects

About the Project

AI in ACTION – Integration of AI-powered tools and methodologies in the VET sector is an Erasmus+ project supporting Vocational Education and Training (VET) professionals in understanding and effectively using Artificial Intelligence. It focuses on making AI practical and accessible for teaching, learning, communication, content creation and everyday professional tasks.

The project combines essential AI knowledge with **hands-on activities and real VET examples**, helping participants use AI tools effectively, understand their possibilities and limitations, critically evaluate their outputs, and integrate AI responsibly into their work.

Who is it for?

The training programme is designed for **VET educators, trainers, mentors and administrators**, including those with little or no previous AI experience. It progressively develops participants' knowledge, practical skills and confidence through tasks connected to real VET contexts.

The Training Programme

The AI in ACTION training programme consists of **16 modules divided into 4 thematic Blocks**, with **each module designed as a 90-minute learning session**. The programme progresses from AI foundations to content creation, professional applications, and the responsible and sustainable use of AI.

Participants combine theoretical understanding with **practical exercises, demonstrations, discussions and hands-on tasks**. They learn how to select and apply AI tools for different purposes, evaluate AI-generated outputs and transfer what they learn to their own professional environments.



The four Blocks are:

Block A – Foundations of AI and Large Language Models

Introduces the foundations of AI, Large Language Models and effective prompting.

Block B – Generative AI Tools for Text, Audio & Visual Content

Moves into hands-on production using AI for professional text, voice and narration, music, video and visual content.

Block C – AI Applications in Professional and Personal Projects

Explores local AI models, agentic workflows, AI-powered data analysis, value creation and the development of participants' own AI implementation projects.

Block D – AI Strategy, Ethics, Funding and Sustainability

Addresses responsible AI use, deepfakes and misinformation, environmental sustainability, and the impact of AI on future skills and career pathways.

Together, the four Blocks create a **step-by-step learning journey from understanding AI to applying it in practice and integrating it responsibly into professional work.**

About Block C

Block C focuses on applying AI to professional and personal projects, moving from using AI tools to building practical systems and making informed decisions with AI. Participants explore local AI models and agentic workflows, use AI to analyse data and generate insights, evaluate where AI can create value, and develop their own AI implementation project.

By the end of the Block, participants will have gained practical experience in **using AI for real professional needs** and created a clear implementation plan for applying AI in their own work.

Block C includes four modules:

Module 9: Small Language Models (SLMs) and Agentic Workflows

Module 10: AI-Powered Data Analysis and Insights Generation

Module 11: Creating Value with AI - The Value Matrix Approach

Module 12: Personal AI Project Development and Implementation



Contents

9

MODULE 9

Small Language Models (SLMs) and Agentic Workflows**10**

MODULE 10

AI-Powered Data Analysis and Insights Generation**11**

MODULE 11

Creating Value with AI - The Value Matrix Approach**12**

MODULE 12

Personal AI Project Development and Implementation

AI Applications in Professional and Personal Projects

Block Overview

Block C moves from *making things with AI* to *building systems and making decisions with AI*. Participants learn to run private, local AI and build small agentic assistants (Module 9), analyse real institutional data safely (Module 10), decide systematically which AI uses are worth their time using the Value Matrix (Module 11), and finally design and launch a personal AI implementation project that carries the whole training into their daily practice (Module 12). Module 12 is the capstone of the entire programme: everything from Blocks A and B becomes input material.

Modules	9. Small Language Models (SLMs) and Agentic Workflows 10. AI-Powered Data Analysis and Insights Generation 11. Creating Value with AI - The Value Matrix Approach 12. Personal AI Project Development and Implementation
Total duration	Each Module is planned for 90 minutes
Target group	VET educators, trainers, mentors, administrators; Blocks A–B completed
Materials needed	Laptop per participant; LM Studio or Ollama installed on at least half the machines (send installation instructions one week ahead); sample datasets prepared (anonymised attendance/grades CSV, workshop-materials usage sheet); printed Value Matrix worksheets; printed Project Canvas
Block outcome	Each participant leaves with a working local AI setup or custom assistant, a completed data-analysis exercise on realistic VET data, a personal Value Matrix of AI opportunities, and a one-page implementation plan for a real project with a 30-day commitment



BLOCK C · AI APPLICATIONS IN PROFESSIONAL AND PERSONAL PROJECTS

MODULE 9

Small Language Models (SLMs) and Agentic Workflows

Small Language Models (SLMs) and Agentic Workflows

Module Overview

Duration	90 minutes
Format	Two-part hands-on lab: local AI + build-your-own agent
Prerequisites	Module 3 (model landscape, parameters); LM Studio/Ollama ideally pre-installed
Materials	Laptops (8 GB+ RAM recommended for local models), LM Studio or Ollama installers offline on USB as backup, ChatGPT/Claude accounts for the agent activity, Agent Design Sheet handout

Learning Objectives

By the end of this module, participants will be able to:

1. Explain what a Small Language Model is and when “small and local” beats “large and cloud”.
2. Install and run a local model with LM Studio or Ollama and hold an offline conversation with it.
3. Name the privacy, cost and resilience arguments for local AI in a VET institution - and its quality limits.
4. Define an agentic workflow through its three components: goal, tools, memory.
5. Build a working micro-agent (Custom GPT or Claude Project) that solves one concrete recurring task.
6. Decide, for a given task, between: frontier cloud model, local SLM, or agent - using clear criteria.

Session Plan

Time	Segment	Method
0–10 min	Recap + provocation: “Could your institution run AI with no internet and no US cloud?”	Plenary
10–25 min	Input: SLMs and local AI - why, what, how	Presentation
25–45 min	Practical Task 1: Run a model on your own laptop	Individual/pairs
45–55 min	Input: Agentic workflows - goal, tools, memory	Presentation
55–80 min	Practical Task 2: Build a tiny agent	Individual/pairs
80–90 min	Decision framework + wrap-up	Plenary

Theoretical Input Part 1: SLMs and Local AI (15 min)

■ What is a Small Language Model?



Co-funded by
the European Union

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

Pr Nr.: 2025-1-DE02-KA210-VET-000364083

Small Language Models (SLMs) and Agentic Workflows

The same technology as the frontier models (Module 3), scaled down: roughly 1–8 billion parameters instead of a trillion. Small enough that the model file (a few GB) fits on a normal laptop and runs on its CPU/GPU. Examples: **Phi-3 mini**, **Llama 3 8B**, **Gemma 2 2B**, **Mistral 7B**, **DeepSeek-Coder** (for code).

■ Why a VET institution should care - the four arguments

1. **Privacy.** The data never leaves your machine. Trainee-related material, confidential industry blueprints from employer partners, internal documents - all can be processed with zero cloud exposure. This dissolves most of the GDPR problem from Module 3.
2. **Cost.** No subscription, no per-question cost. One-time hardware you already own; only electricity.
3. **Resilience and access.** Workshops with poor connectivity, mobile training units, secure facilities where cloud tools are blocked - local AI works offline.
4. **Sovereignty.** No dependence on a US or Chinese provider changing prices, terms or availability.

■ The honest trade-off

An 8B local model is *noticeably* weaker than a frontier model: shallower reasoning, more hallucination, weaker in smaller languages. But it is **fine for many real jobs**: summarising, rewriting, drafting routine texts, translation gisting, brainstorming, classification. The Module 3 rule returns: *frontier model for hard tasks, small model for repeatable ones* - now extended with: *local model for private ones*.

■ The tools

- **LM Studio** (lmstudio.ai) - graphical app; browse models, click download, chat. The friendliest entry point.
- **Ollama** (ollama.com) - command-line first: `ollama run llama3:8b` downloads and starts a chat. Easily scripted; the tinkerer's choice.
- **GPT4All** - another one-click option.

Practical Task 1: Run a Model on Your Own Laptop (20 min)

Steps (LM Studio path - mirror instructions provided for Ollama):

1. Open LM Studio → Discover tab → search “Llama 3 8B” (or “Phi-3 mini” on weaker laptops) → download the recommended quantised version.
2. Load the model → open a chat.
3. **Test 1 - capability:** give it a real task from your prompt library (Module 4). Rate the output against what the frontier model produced in Module 3's comparison activity.
4. **Test 2 - privacy demonstration:** turn off Wi-Fi. Ask another question. It still answers. *This* is the moment that lands - nothing you type here goes anywhere.



Small Language Models (SLMs) and Agentic Workflows

- 5. Test 3 - limits:** ask something hard (multi-step reasoning, or a question in a smaller EU language). Observe where it degrades.

Pairs discussion: name one document or dataset in your institution you were never willing to paste into ChatGPT. Could you now process it locally? What would you do with it?

Fallback if installs fail: facilitator demo machine on the projector + participants pair up; the exercise works with one machine per 3–4 people.

Theoretical Input Part 2: Agentic Workflows (10 min)

Definition: an agentic workflow is when you give a model not just a question, but **a goal and the tools to reach it**, letting it take multi-step actions.

The three components:

- **Goal** - what success looks like (“produce a lesson hook”, “screen these applications against criteria”).
- **Tools** - what it may use: web search, file reading, code execution, your uploaded documents.
- **Memory** - what it retains across steps and sessions (instructions, reference files, conversation history).

The agent loop: Goal → Plan → Tool call → Observe result → Next step → Final answer.

What you can build today, without coding:

- **ChatGPT Custom GPT** - a guided assistant for one task: name + instructions + optional reference files.
- **Claude Project** - files + standing instructions + skills; every conversation in the project inherits them.

Why this matters for educators: a well-built micro-agent converts your one best prompt (Module 4) into a *reusable colleague-tool* that anyone in your team can use identically - prompt craft becomes institutional capacity.

Practical Task 2: Build a Tiny Agent (25 min)

Goal: build a Custom GPT (chatgpt.com) or Claude Project (claude.ai) that solves ONE concrete recurring problem from your own work.

Worked example to demonstrate first - “The Lesson Hook Generator”:

“You are a master teacher. Whenever I type a lesson topic, generate a 2-minute ‘Hook’ to start my class. Format it exactly like this: 1. A Surprising Fact: one weird, mind-blowing, or historical fact about this topic. 2. The Room Question: one open-ended question that will instantly spark a debate or get trainees talking. Keep the tone energetic!”

Five steps to build (Agent Design Sheet):

1. **Name it** - a name your colleagues would understand.
2. **Write the goal in one sentence** - if you can’t, the agent is too broad; narrow it.



Small Language Models (SLMs) and Agentic Workflows

3. **Add the “how to behave” instructions** - role, exact output format, tone, negative constraints (“never invent norm numbers”; “always answer in [language]”).
4. **Upload reference files** - your curriculum extract, terminology list, style example (no personal data!).
5. **Test with 3 real inputs - then refine.** The refinement pass separates working agents from demos.

Agent ideas by role: *Trainer:* differentiated-worksheet maker; diagnostic roleplay engine (“act as a faulty machine”). *Assessor:* rubric generator; feedback phraser (strict but supportive). *Administrator:* meeting-minutes formatter; multilingual parent-announcement writer. *Coordinator:* Erasmus+ evaluator-simulator (Module 5, Genre 4, as a permanent tool).

Share-back (5 min): three volunteers demo their agent live with an input shouted from the room.

Closing: The Decision Framework (10 min)

One flipchart, three columns - when to use what:

Use a frontier cloud model when...	Use a local SLM when...	Build an agent when...
The task is hard: complex reasoning, long documents, high-stakes drafting	Data is private or confidential	The same task recurs weekly+
Quality of a single output matters most	You're offline or connectivity is poor	Colleagues should get identical quality
No sensitive data involved	The task is simple and repeatable	The task has a stable format and rules
-	Budget is zero	You already have one proven prompt for it

Exit ticket: “One task I’ll move to a local model: . **One task I’ll turn into an agent:** .”



BLOCK C · AI APPLICATIONS IN PROFESSIONAL AND PERSONAL PROJECTS

MODULE 10

AI-Powered Data Analysis and Insights Generation

AI-Powered Data Analysis and Insights Generation

Module Overview

Duration	90 minutes
Format	Levelled hands-on data lab with realistic VET datasets
Prerequisites	Modules 3–4 (privacy rules, prompting); no statistics background required
Materials	Laptops; prepared anonymised sample datasets (CSV: trainee attendance + grades; workshop material consumption; course evaluation survey with free-text comments); ChatGPT (with data analysis / code interpreter) or Claude accounts; Data Privacy Pre-Flight checklist handout

Learning Objectives

By the end of this module, participants will be able to:

1. Describe the five levels of AI-supported data analysis and place any task on the right level.
2. Run a complete analysis conversation: upload data → explore → question → chart → insight → verify.
3. Formulate analytical questions in plain language and iterate toward useful answers.
4. Analyse *qualitative* data (free-text survey comments) - often the most neglected asset in education.
5. Apply the verification discipline: AI-computed numbers are checked before they are reported.
6. Apply the privacy pre-flight: anonymisation before any upload; local/enterprise routes for sensitive data.

Session Plan

Time	Segment	Method
0–10 min	Discussion: What do you currently do with your data?	Plenary
10–25 min	Input: The five levels of AI data analysis	Presentation
25–35 min	Input + demo: privacy pre-flight, then a live analysis	Demo
35–70 min	Practical Task: The Data Lab (3 guided exercises)	Pairs
70–85 min	Insight presentations + verification cross-check	Plenary
85–90 min	Wrap-up: your institution's data map	Individual

Opening Discussion: What Do You Currently Do? (10 min)

Questions for the room: What data does your work actually generate? (Attendance, grades, workshop material usage, machine logs, evaluation forms, application numbers...) Who looks at it? What questions never get answered because analysis takes too long? Collect the unanswered questions on flipchart - the Data Lab will answer some of them today.



AI-Powered Data Analysis and Insights Generation

Framing input: VET institutions are data-rich and analysis-poor. The bottleneck was never data - it was the analyst. That bottleneck just moved.

Theoretical Input: The Five Levels of AI Data Analysis (15 min)

Level	What it is	Best for	Tools
1 - Copy & paste	Drop numbers into the chat, ask in plain language	Tiny tables, sanity checks	ChatGPT, Claude, Le Chat
2 - Upload a file	Attach CSV/Excel; the chat reads and answers	Weekly summaries, finding the one outlier	Claude, ChatGPT
3 - Dedicated data tool	Purpose-built data chat that writes and runs real code, draws real charts	Comparisons, charts, trend lines	ChatGPT Code Interpreter, Julius AI, Rows AI
4 - Notebook + AI pair	Google Colab/Jupyter with AI writing Python alongside you	Repeatable, reusable analyses	Colab + Claude/Copilot
5 - ML models	Pretrained models for clustering, forecasting, anomaly detection	Specialised: predict scrap rates, group learners	Hugging Face Spaces

Also name the everyday layer: AI built into Excel and Google Sheets (formula generation, insight suggestions) and NotebookLM for document-collection Q&A - often the lowest-friction entry point for colleagues.

Critical concept - where the numbers come from: at Level 1–2 the model may *estimate* answers linguistically (hallucination risk on arithmetic!); at Level 3+ it writes and executes actual code, so calculations are real even though *interpretation* still needs checking. **Rule: for any number you will report to others, use Level 3 or higher, or verify manually.**

Privacy Pre-Flight + Live Demo (10 min)

Pre-flight checklist (before ANY upload):

1. Names removed or pseudonymised (Student001...)? ID numbers gone?
2. Could individuals be re-identified by combination (the only female trainee in group X)?
3. Free tool or enterprise/local route - does the data classification allow this tool?
4. Do I have the right to use this data for this purpose at all?

Live demo (facilitator, 7 min): upload the anonymised attendance+grades CSV to a Level-3 tool and run this conversation arc: “Describe this dataset - what columns, how many records, any quality problems?” → “Is there a relationship between attendance and final grade? Show a chart.” → “Which trainees’ patterns changed most between semester 1 and 2?” → “Draft three sentences I could put in a team meeting slide about this.” Show one verification: recompute one number with a spreadsheet formula on screen.



AI-Powered Data Analysis and Insights Generation

Practical Task: The Data Lab (35 min)

Pairs. Three exercises, rising difficulty. Sample datasets provided; participants with own (pre-anonymised!) data may substitute it.

■ Exercise 1 - First contact (Level 2, ~8 min)

Upload the attendance/grades CSV. Ask: “Summarise this dataset. What are the 3 most interesting things you notice?” Then drill into one finding with two follow-up questions. **Skill practised:** letting the AI explore before you interrogate.

■ Exercise 2 - The chart that answers a question (Level 3, ~12 min)

Choose one real question from the opening flipchart (or: “Which workshop consumes disproportionate material per trainee?” using the materials dataset). Get a chart that answers it. Iterate on the chart itself: “make it comparable per trainee”, “sort descending”, “label the outlier”. Export the chart. **Skill practised:** iterating on analysis like iterating on prompts - first chart is a draft.

■ Exercise 3 - The qualitative goldmine (~15 min)

Upload the course-evaluation dataset with free-text comments. Run: “Categorise all comments into themes. Count them. Quote the two most representative comments per theme, anonymised.” → “What do dissatisfied respondents mention that satisfied ones don’t?” → “Draft three concrete improvement actions this data supports - and name one action the data does NOT support.” **Skill practised:** text analysis at scale - and asking the model to mark the limits of the evidence, the highest-value verification habit.

Insight Presentations + Verification Cross-Check (15 min)

Each pair presents **one insight + its chart** in 60 seconds. Then the twist: the *presenting* pair must state how they verified the key number, and one *other* pair recomputes it live (spreadsheet or recount). Any mismatch is a teaching gift, not an embarrassment - celebrate the catch.

Debrief points: correlation $\neq$ causation (attendance→grades is the classic trap - discuss confounders); small VET cohorts mean noisy statistics - say “in this group” not “always”; an insight without a possible action is trivia.



BLOCK C · AI APPLICATIONS IN PROFESSIONAL AND PERSONAL PROJECTS

MODULE 11

Creating Value with AI - The Value Matrix Approach

Creating Value with AI - The Value Matrix Approach

Module Overview

Duration	90 minutes
Format	Decision-making workshop: framework input + individual mapping + peer challenge
Prerequisites	Modules 1–10 (the matrix organises everything encountered so far)
Materials	Printed A3 Value Matrix worksheets, sticky notes, dot stickers for voting, calculators/phones, Value Case template handout

Learning Objectives

By the end of this module, participants will be able to:

1. Explain why “what CAN AI do?” is the wrong question and “where DOES it pay?” is the right one.
2. Score AI use cases on the two Value Matrix axes: **Value created** and **Effort/Risk to implement**.
3. Classify use cases into the four quadrants - Quick Wins, Strategic Bets, Fill-Ins, Money Pits - and derive the right action for each.
4. Quantify value honestly: time saved × frequency, quality gained, new capability enabled - minus verification cost.
5. Build a personal Value Matrix of 8–12 use cases from their own work.
6. Select and defend the top candidate that becomes their Module 12 project.

Session Plan

Time	Segment	Method
0–10 min	Provocation: the enthusiasm trap	Plenary discussion
10–30 min	Input: The Value Matrix - axes, quadrants, scoring	Presentation + worked examples
30–40 min	Input: Quantifying value honestly	Presentation
40–65 min	Practical Task 1: Build your personal Value Matrix	Individual
65–80 min	Practical Task 2: Peer challenge round	Pairs
80–90 min	Dot-vote gallery + selecting your Module 12 candidate	Plenary

Opening Provocation: The Enthusiasm Trap (10 min)

Question to the room: “In the last three days you learned perhaps thirty tools and techniques. If you try to adopt all of them, how many will you still be using in three months?” (Honest answer: close to zero.) The enemy of AI adoption is not scepticism - it is **unfocused enthusiasm**. Tool-hopping consumes energy, produces demos rather than results, and burns colleagues’ goodwill. The cure is a portfolio decision: pick few, pick well, go deep. That is what the Value Matrix does.



Creating Value with AI - The Value Matrix Approach

Theoretical Input Part 1: The Value Matrix (20 min)

■ The two axes

Vertical - Value created (low → high). Value has three currencies, and only the first is usually counted:

1. **Time saved:** hours per occurrence × occurrences per year.
2. **Quality gained:** better differentiation, fewer errors, more professional output, faster feedback to trainees.
3. **New capability:** things that simply didn't happen before - narrated handouts for dyslexic learners, multilingual parent communication, analysed evaluation comments.

Horizontal - Effort & Risk to implement (low → high). Includes: learning curve, setup time, subscription cost, ongoing **verification cost** (never zero - Module 2's "fluent but wrong"), data-privacy complexity, institutional approval needed, and colleague change-management.

■ The four quadrants and their actions

Quadrant	Profile	Action
Quick Wins (high value, low effort)	Prompt-level uses of tools you have: differentiated worksheets, email drafting, quiz banks, meeting summaries	Start this week. Build habits and credibility here
Strategic Bets (high value, high effort)	Local AI for confidential data, an institutional assistant agent, systematic data analysis, course-wide narrated materials	Plan properly: pilot, budget, allies, timeline. One at a time
Fill-Ins (low value, low effort)	Fun visuals, background music, one-off assets	Fine when spare energy exists; never displaces a Quick Win
Money Pits (low value, high effort)	Tools chosen for novelty; automating a task done twice a year; anything needing daily fights with IT for marginal gain	Name them and refuse them. Knowing what NOT to do is the matrix's biggest gift

■ Worked examples (score live with the room)

- *"Generate a quiz bank per module with my Module 9 agent"* - Value: 2h/module × 20 modules/year = 40h + quality (more question variety). Effort: agent already built; verification ~15 min/quiz. → **Quick Win**.
- *"Narrate all core handouts in three languages"* - Value: new capability (accessibility + inclusion), high. Effort: consent protocol, tooling ~€22/mo, production+QA time, institutional sign-off. → **Strategic Bet**.
- *"AI-generate a birthday video per colleague"* - Value: smiles. Effort: low. → **Fill-In**.
- *"Fine-tune our own institutional LLM"* - Value: unclear vs. a good agent + files. Effort: extreme. → **Money Pit** for a single VET school (may differ for a national provider).

Creating Value with AI - The Value Matrix Approach

Theoretical Input Part 2: Quantifying Value Honestly (10 min)

The minimum arithmetic (Value Case template):

- Hours saved per occurrence × occurrences per year = gross hours.
- Minus: verification time per occurrence × occurrences (be honest - safety-relevant content verifies slowly).
- Minus: annualised setup + subscription + learning time (year 1).
- = **Net hours year 1** (and note year 2, when setup drops out).

Beyond arithmetic - two honesty checks:

1. **The counterfactual check:** would the time saved actually flow into teaching quality - or just evaporate? Value claims need a destination.
2. **The skill-erosion check (from Block A):** does this use erode a skill that I - or my trainees - must keep? If yes, the “saving” may be a cost.

Practical Task 1: Build Your Personal Value Matrix (25 min)

Instructions:

1. Brainstorm 8–12 candidate AI use cases from *your own* work. Mine your week’s artefacts: prompt library (M4), text workflows (M5), audio/visual assets (M6–8), your agent (M9), your data map (M10). One sticky note per use case, formulated concretely (“weekly multilingual parent bulletin via agent”, not “use AI for communication”).
2. Score each: Value 1–5 (using the three currencies + arithmetic where possible) and Effort/Risk 1–5.
3. Place all notes on your A3 matrix.
4. Run the two honesty checks on your top-right candidates; move notes that fail.
5. Mark: your best **Quick Win** (green), your one **Strategic Bet** (blue), and your most tempting **Money Pit** (red - naming the temptation matters).

Practical Task 2: Peer Challenge Round (15 min)

Pairs exchange matrices. The challenger’s job is *not* to be nice - it is to test placements with four standard challenges:

1. “Show me the arithmetic for this value score.”
2. “What did you forget in the effort score - verification? approval? colleagues?”
3. “Which skill might this erode?”
4. “Why is this not a Money Pit?”



Creating Value with AI - The Value Matrix Approach

Owner defends or moves the note. Swap roles after 7 minutes. **Rule: any note moved during challenge is a win, not a loss.**



BLOCK C · AI APPLICATIONS IN PROFESSIONAL AND PERSONAL PROJECTS

MODULE 12

Personal AI Project Development and Implementation

Personal AI Project Development and Implementation

Module Overview

Duration	90 minutes (capstone)
Format	Structured project sprint: canvas → build → pilot plan → commitment
Prerequisites	All Modules 1–11; the selected project candidate from Module 11
Materials	Printed Project Canvas (A3), laptops with full tool access, Responsible AI Checklist (from Block D if already delivered; otherwise the short version below), 30-Day Plan cards, participants' Block A learning-goal cards from Module 1

Learning Objectives

By the end of this module, participants will be able to:

1. Convert a Value Matrix candidate into a concrete, scoped project using the AI Project Canvas.
2. Define success criteria that are observable within 30 days.
3. Build or assemble the project's first working version ("walking skeleton") within the session.
4. Design a small, honest pilot: with whom, for how long, measuring what, with which fallback.
5. Pre-clear the risk and compliance dimensions: privacy route, verification protocol, disclosure, skill-erosion guard.
6. Commit publicly to a 30-day implementation plan with a named accountability partner.

Session Plan

Time	Segment	Method
0–10 min	Framing: from training to practice - why most training dies in week 2	Plenary
10–30 min	The AI Project Canvas - walkthrough + individual completion	Individual with coaching
30–60 min	Build sprint: the walking skeleton	Individual, facilitator circulates
60–75 min	Pilot design + risk pre-clearance	Individual + checklist
75–88 min	Commitment round: 60-second pitches + accountability pairs	Plenary
88–90 min	Return of Module 1 learning goals + close	Plenary



Personal AI Project Development and Implementation

Opening: Why Most Training Dies in Week 2 (10 min)

The honest statistics of professional development: without a concrete artefact, a deadline and a witness, transfer to practice collapses within days of returning to normal workload. This module installs all three: an artefact (your walking skeleton, built today), a deadline (the 30-day plan) and witnesses (your accountability partner and, where applicable, the project's national teams). Frame explicitly: **the deliverable of this whole training is not knowledge - it is your running project.**

The AI Project Canvas (20 min)

Walk through the canvas with one worked example, then participants complete their own. Facilitators circulate and coach; the most common intervention is *narrowing scope*.

The AI Project Canvas - nine boxes:

Box	Guiding question	Worked example (multilingual parent bulletin)
1. Problem	What concrete pain, for whom, how often?	Parent info reaches non-native-speaker families late or not at all; monthly
2. Users	Who touches the output? Who must accept it?	Me, class teachers, ~60 families in 4 languages; school head must approve
3. AI solution	Which tool/technique from the training, exactly?	Claude Project agent (M9): fixed template, few-shot with 2 past bulletins, DeepL final pass (M3)
4. Success criteria	Observable within 30 days	2 bulletins shipped in 4 languages; prep time ≤ 45 min each; ≥ 3 positive family responses
5. Data & privacy route	What data flows where? (M3/M10 rules)	No personal data in prompts; generic announcements only; free tier acceptable
6. Verification protocol	Who checks what before release? (M2: fluent ≠ correct)	I verify facts/dates; native-speaker colleague spot-checks one language per issue
7. Effort & cost	Setup + per-use, honestly (M11 arithmetic)	Setup 3h (today) + 45 min/issue vs. 3h before; €0
8. Risks & fallback	What breaks, and then what?	Translation error → spot-check protocol; agent unavailable → saved prompt as manual fallback
9. First step TODAY	What exists by end of this session?	Agent built, one real bulletin drafted in 2 languages

Scope test before building: if Box 9 cannot be done today and Box 4 cannot be observed in 30 days, the project is too big - cut it in half. ("Version 2 is allowed to exist. Version 0 must exist *today*.")

Build Sprint: The Walking Skeleton (30 min)

Heads-down build time. Everyone assembles the smallest end-to-end working version of their project - ugly is fine, incomplete is fine, but it must run once on real input.

Typical build patterns (facilitator cheat-sheet):



Personal AI Project Development and Implementation

- **Agent-based projects (most common):** build the Custom GPT/Claude Project (M9 five steps) → run on one real input → one refinement pass.
- **Content-pipeline projects:** produce asset #1 of the series with the full pipeline (M5 text workflow, or M6/M8 media pipeline) and document the pipeline as a reusable recipe.
- **Data projects:** perform the analysis once end-to-end on the real (anonymised) dataset (M10 conversation arc) and save the question sequence as the reusable protocol.
- **Local/private-AI projects:** get the model running (M9), process one real confidential document, write the 5-line internal how-to for colleagues.

Facilitator role: unblock fast (accounts, tools), enforce scope, and require every participant to have *run the skeleton once on real input* before minute 30. Fast finishers: second refinement pass, or start Box 6's verification protocol as a written checklist.

Pilot Design and Risk Pre-Clearance (15 min)

Pilot design (write on canvas margin): pilot group (who exactly - one class, one colleague, one bulletin cycle?) · duration (2–4 weeks) · measurement (the Box 4 criteria, plus one qualitative question you will ask users) · fallback trigger (“if X happens, I revert to the old way and diagnose”).

Risk pre-clearance - the short Responsible AI Checklist (full version in Module 13):

- No personal data enters non-approved tools; privacy route from Box 5 confirmed.
- Human verification before anything reaches learners, parents or employers - protocol from Box 6 written down.
- AI involvement disclosed where appropriate.
- Licences checked for anything published (M7/M8 rule).
- Skill-erosion guard: this project does not remove a learning experience trainees need.
- Institutional alignment: the person in Box 2 who “must accept it” has been identified - and will be contacted in week 1, not week 4.



Thank you.

Block C · AI Applications in Professional and Personal Projects

KA210-VET · Erasmus+ · Pr Nr.: 2025-1-DE02-KA210-VET-000364083



Co-funded by
the European Union



Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.