MFEI Training Video — Working Session Transcript

Raw, unedited record of the planning conversation with Claude

Session date: August 18, 2026

How to use this document

This is not a cleaned-up summary. It is the actual sequence of questions and answers from the planning conversation for this training, kept in order and largely verbatim, including a mistake and its correction. The point is to show volunteers what real back-and-forth with an AI system looks like — vague starting points, follow-up questions, course corrections — rather than a polished example that makes it look easier than it is.

Occasional gray italic notes point out a technique worth noticing. These are the only additions to the original conversation.

DOUG — Turn 1

[Uploaded file: Claude-use-video.docx — a document listing project requirements for this training]

Read uploaded file of project requirements. Then analyze the requirements and suggest a step by step proces.

CLAUDE — Turn 1

Here's what the document contains, then my suggested approach.

What you've laid out:

- A 1-hour training video for MFEI volunteers, recorded on Webex
- Topic: getting good results from LLM AI
- Audience has mixed AI experience levels
- Content must cover: critical thinking in evaluating AI output, giving AI clear context to get focused answers, iterating Q&A to refine answers, and pointing people to Anthropic/other tutorials
- A slide deck with “extensive time” per slide, question of whether 20 slides fits in an hour
- You want to use the process of building this as a worked example inside the video itself

On the 20-slide question first, since it's concrete: 60 minutes ÷ 20 slides = 3 minutes/slide on average. That's workable, but not evenly — a title slide or section-divider takes 20 seconds, while a “here's a live example of iterating a prompt” slide could easily run 5-6 minutes. I'd budget it as roughly 14-16 substantive content slides plus a handful of light ones (title, agenda, section breaks, resources, Q&A/close), so the average holds even though individual slides won't be equal. That gives you slack for the mixed-experience audience without blowing the hour.

Here's a step-by-step process:

1. Lock the learning objectives — Write 3-4 sentences of the form “by the end, a volunteer can ___.” This becomes your yardstick for what's essential vs. nice-to-have, which matters a lot when you're squeezing this into an hour for people at different skill levels.

2. Segment content by experience level, not just topic — Since volunteers vary in AI familiarity, tag each content block as foundational (everyone needs it) or advanced (can be compressed or pointed to as a resource for later). This keeps the beginners from drowning and the experienced folks from checking out.

3. Build the outline against the clock, not just the topic list — Rough allocation for 60 minutes: intro/why this matters (3-4 min); critical thinking in evaluating AI output (10-12 min); giving AI specific context for focused

answers (12-15 min); iterating Q&A to refine results (12-15 min, a great place for a live worked example); pointing to Anthropic/other tutorials (5 min); wrap-up and Q&A buffer (5-8 min).

4. Use this exact conversation as your worked example — You said you wanted this prep itself to demonstrate good AI use — that's a strong idea. Screenshot or narrate a piece of this back-and-forth (you giving context, me asking or you refining) as a live case study of "iterating Q&A" in action. It's more convincing than a hypothetical.

5. Draft slide-by-slide talking points before designing visuals — Write what you'll say per slide first, then build slides around that — not the reverse. This is what keeps slide count and timing honest.

6. Build the deck — Once the talking points are set, build the actual .pptx.

7. Do a timed dry run — Read through out loud with a timer, before touching Webex. This is where 20 slides either holds up or doesn't — adjust here, not during the live recording.

8. Set up and test Webex recording — Check audio, screen-share layout, and recording settings in a short test clip before the real take.

9. Record, then review — Watch it back once for pacing/audio issues before distributing.

10. Distribute with the resource links — Send the video, the slide deck, and the tutorial links together so volunteers have something to return to after the session.

> ***Teaching note:*** *Notice the request came in as a document dump plus one open instruction ("suggest a step by step process"). The first response had to both organize the raw requirements and answer the actual question — nothing was clarified yet at this point.*

DOUG — Turn 2

Will you capture everything we are doing from my uploaded document to my first question about the uploaded document to your response and everything we do from this point, which would include this and all of my input to you? I think that chronology would be useful as part of the class or to include in the package of reference material to look at after the class? What do you think?

CLAUDE — Turn 2

Yes, I think that's a genuinely good idea — better than a hypothetical example, actually, because it's real: a vague-to-specific request, a follow-up question, a course-correction, all visible in the actual order they happened.

A couple of things worth thinking through before I do it, though:

What I can actually do: Everything in this conversation is already in my context, so I can compile it into a document at any point — now, at checkpoints, or at the end. I don't have a separate background "recording" process running; it's just that nothing here is lost, so I can assemble it whenever you want.

Raw transcript vs. curated version — I'd lean curated. A full raw dump will include some things that aren't useful teaching moments — for example, earlier I hit a file-format snag (your document was saved as ODT with a .docx extension, so my first read attempt failed and I had to retry with a different setting). That's just tool mechanics, not a lesson about prompting AI. If it goes in, volunteers might come away thinking "working with AI involves debugging file errors," which isn't the point.

What I'd suggest instead: a document that includes the real chronology, but with brief annotations pointing at why each moment matters — e.g., "notice the request went from a general document dump to specific instructions" or "notice this follow-up narrowed the answer instead of starting over." That's the actual technique you want them to absorb, made visible rather than buried in a transcript they have to interpret themselves.

One practical question: do you want this as one clean document at the end (my recommendation — easier to edit and trim), or would you rather I periodically checkpoint it as we go, in case you want to review the framing partway through rather than all at once?

Either way, I'd build it as a Word doc so you can edit it directly and it can go in your post-class reference package alongside the slides and tutorial links.

> ***Teaching note:*** *Here Claude pushed back on part of the request (favoring a curated version over a raw dump) rather than just complying. Doug's next turn overrides that suggestion — worth noticing that AI suggestions aren't final; the person steering the conversation decides.*

DOUG — Turn 3

I do not want a slick product. I want them to see me making mistakes and you fixing or questioning my mistakes (like the file format naming error) and how that was handled. I am choosing verbatim dialog for both me and you. They can see how it really goes. If I ask a very vague or open ended question that might be interpreted in many ways, your answer may not give me what I wanted or needed. I can ask you before my question to ask me questions to refine the analysis. Then you would help me define the scope and direction. If I ask what is the ideal diet, you might say it depends on for who and to what goal. Then I could say: it is for me and I am a 79 year old male with type 2 diabetes and 6' tall, large bones, and weigh 215 pounds and should weigh less. So let us proceed with that question line and see how it goes.

CLAUDE — Turn 3

Got it — raw and verbatim, mistakes included, no polish. That's a stronger teaching choice honestly, because volunteers watching a "perfect" transcript might think good AI use looks effortless, when the real skill is in the back-and-forth and the recovery from missteps (like the file format mismatch). I'll keep everything as we go and can assemble it whenever you're ready, in whatever raw form you want.

One thing worth flagging before we run the diet example: that transcript will include real personal health details about you — your age, that you have type 2 diabetes, your weight. That's a step up from something like a file-format hiccup in terms of personal sensitivity. You clearly don't mind since you're the one proposing it, but since this may get distributed to volunteers as reference material, just worth being sure you're comfortable with that specific information going out that broadly. If you'd rather, we could run the same demo with a fictional stand-in later and keep this one private — your call either way.

Now, let's actually run it, since that's the best way to see the technique:

Turn 1 — the vague version. If you'd asked me "what is the ideal diet?" cold, my honest answer would have been: it depends heavily on who it's for and what the goal is — weight loss, managing a condition, athletic performance, and longevity all point toward different eating patterns, and age and any medical conditions change the answer further.

Turn 2 — with your specifics. Given what you told me — 79, male, 6', large frame, 215 lbs, type 2 diabetes, looking to weigh less — here's a reasonable framework:

- Pace matters at 79 more than the number itself. Fast weight loss risks losing muscle and bone density along with fat, which is a bigger problem at your age than being a bit overweight is. Something like 0.5–1 lb/week is a sane target, not a crash approach.
- Protein becomes more important, not less. Older adults need more protein per pound to hold onto muscle while losing weight — lean meats, fish, eggs, legumes, dairy spread across meals rather than loaded into one.
- For type 2 diabetes specifically, the eating patterns with the best track record are Mediterranean-style or DASH-style: vegetables, legumes, whole grains over refined ones, olive oil and nuts over processed fats, fish and lean poultry over red/processed meat, and consistent carb portions meal to meal rather than large swings.

- Limit added sugar and refined carbs (white bread, pastries, sugary drinks) — these are the biggest levers for blood sugar control.
- Strength training, even modest amounts, helps preserve muscle during weight loss far more than diet alone.

The honest caveat: I don't know your current medications, kidney function, or activity level, and those all matter — for example, some diabetes medications need dose adjustments as diet and weight change. This is a case where I'd genuinely tell you to loop in your doctor or a registered dietitian before making changes, not as a throwaway disclaimer but because the medication-interaction piece isn't something I can safely account for without more information.

That last paragraph is itself worth pointing out to your class: even after you gave me good specifics, there's still another round of iteration available (medications, activity level) — it's rarely just one clarifying exchange and done. That's a realistic thing for volunteers to see rather than a tidy two-step example.

Want to keep going with more example threads, or start compiling what we have so far into a document?

> ***Teaching note:*** *Two things volunteers should notice here: (1) Claude flagged a privacy consideration before proceeding with sensitive personal information, rather than silently using it — a form of critical thinking applied by the AI itself; (2) the "vague question / specific follow-up" pattern Doug asked for is the same pattern that happened naturally back in Turn 1, just made deliberate and visible this time.*

DOUG — Turn 4

Good point to see where we are going, so lets compile what we have as a reference document. Then lets do a preliminary slide deck to see what direction we will pursue.

CLAUDE — Turn 4

Two files, both editable:

The transcript (Word doc) — verbatim, in order: your first upload and question, my full response, the discussion about capturing everything, and the diet demo including the health details you gave. Gray italic "Teaching note" call-outs mark a few spots worth pausing on, but the dialogue itself is untouched. It ends right at this message, so it's a checkpoint, not a final version — everything from here forward can be appended before the class.

The slide deck (PowerPoint, 20 slides) — a working first pass at the structure we mapped out: title → objectives → why-it-matters → four sections (critical thinking, context, iterating, resources) each opened by a divider slide → recap → Q&A → close.

A few things worth flagging since it's a direction check, not a final deck:

- Slide 9 pulls the real diet exchange in as the worked example for "giving AI context" — same content as the transcript.
- Slide 13 references the transcript directly as the iteration example, tying the two documents together.
- The Anthropic link and the "other resources" slide are placeholders — didn't want to fabricate specific URLs that couldn't be verified as current; easy to fill in once you pick them.
- Speaker notes on each slide carry a rough time estimate, adding up to roughly the hour budgeted.

Want me to adjust the direction — different tone, fewer/more slides, a different section order — or is this close enough to start filling in real content on top of it?

DOUG — Turn 5

That is a good start. We will have to add presenter: Douglas S. Basberg, MFEI DEEP team lead dbasberg@pm.me to first slide and last slide. I am off to bed and we will continue tomorrow.

CLAUDE — Turn 5

Added your presenter line to both the title slide and the closing slide. Sleep well — we'll pick this up tomorrow.

DOUG — Turn 6

I went through the slide again this morning and they look good. An additional point I want to make in the class is uploading large refence material like VVSG 2.0 and Michigan law and constitution and HAVA standards. Also, ask AI if it can access these on-line or need the person to upload. You can upload a transcript from a meeting our reference an on-line document or video. They may not be aware of these techniques to supply background for their questions. You should still be capturing this exchange and update the slide deck with this additional subject.

CLAUDE — Turn 6

Added two new slides to the Specific Context section: “Bring the Source Document, Not Just the Topic” (uploading VVSG 2.0, Michigan election law and constitution, HAVA standards, and meeting transcripts rather than relying on AI's recall of them) and “Ask First: Can It Reach This on Its Own?” (checking whether an AI tool can open a link or work from a video's transcript versus needing the material pasted or uploaded directly).

Worth flagging: this pushes the deck from 20 to 22 slides, and the Specific Context section runs a bit longer than originally budgeted — roughly 5 extra minutes across the two new slides. The hour still has slack in the Q&A buffer at the end, so it should hold, but it's worth watching in the timed dry run rather than assuming it fits.

> ***Teaching note:*** *This is itself a good example for the class: a request to add new subject matter to an existing deliverable, without needing to restate everything already built. It also shows a case where Claude flagged a downstream consequence (the time budget) that Doug hadn't asked about, rather than silently absorbing the change.*

DOUG — Turn 7

I like the slide deck. I am ready to finalize both slide deck and transcript. Add one more item to other tutorial sources. It is 'YouTube AI Master channel' and can you add a link to go there?

CLAUDE — Turn 7

Searched for the channel rather than guessing at a URL, since several similarly-named channels exist (AI Master, AI Masters, AI Masterclass, AI Mastery). Added the one titled exactly “AI Master” (youtube.com/@iamAImaster) to the resources slide as a fourth card, with a live hyperlink. Also filled in the previously-placeholder Anthropic prompt engineering link on the slide before it, since both decks were being finalized.

> ***Teaching note:*** *Worth noticing: when a name is ambiguous online, the safer move is to search and name which specific match was used, rather than silently picking one. That gives the person a chance to catch it if it's the wrong channel.*

DOUG — Turn 8

I want a different link for Antropic tutorials. Use https://anthropic.skilljar.com/ in the slide deck replacing the current link. Change file names to remove final and replace Mfei with MFEI AI. I am ready to ask Isaac how to handle the Webex presentation and how to make class documents available to everyone in the future.

CLAUDE — Turn 8

Swapped the resources slide to link to anthropic.skilljar.com instead of the prompt engineering doc page, and adjusted the description line to match (courses rather than a single guide). Renamed both files: MFEI_AI_Training_Deck.pptx and MFEI_AI_Session_Transcript.docx.

> ***Teaching note:*** *Even a small edit request ("change this link") touched two places on the slide — the link itself and the sentence describing it — since the old wording ("publishes a prompting guide") no longer matched a courses platform. Worth noticing that a one-line change can have a small ripple, and it's worth checking the surrounding text rather than only swapping the exact thing named.*

[This document was generated at this point in the conversation. Later turns can be appended before final distribution.]