

# lab-07-workflow-agents

- [Lab 07: Workflow Agents in Action](#)
  - [Objectives](#)
  - [Prerequisites](#)
  - [Lab Structure](#)
  - [Scenario 1: Backlog Generation \(15 minutes\)](#)
    - [Context](#)
    - [Part A: Standard Copilot Chat](#)
    - [Part B: Backlog Generator Agent](#)
    - [Comparison Questions](#)
  - [Scenario 2: Architecture Review \(15 minutes\)](#)
    - [Context](#)
    - [Setup](#)
    - [Part A: Standard Copilot Chat](#)
    - [Part B: Architecture Reviewer Agent](#)
    - [Comparison Questions](#)
  - [Scenario 3: Test Strategy \(15 minutes\)](#)
    - [Context](#)
    - [Part A: Standard Copilot Chat](#)
    - [Part B: Test Strategist Agent](#)
    - [Comparison Questions](#)
  - [Group Discussion \(If in Workshop Setting\)](#)
  - [Key Takeaways](#)
    - [Agents Excel At:](#)
    - [Agents Are Not:](#)
    - [When Agents Shine:](#)
  - [Challenge Exercise \(Optional\)](#)
  - [Next Steps](#)
  - [Additional Resources](#)

## Lab 07: Workflow Agents in Action

**Module:** 3

**Duration:** 45 minutes

**Part:** Advanced GitHub Copilot (Part 2)

### Objectives

By the end of this lab, you will:

- Apply custom agents to real development workflows
- Compare agent outputs to standard Copilot Chat responses
- Evaluate reliability and consistency differences
- Understand when agents provide meaningful value over ad-hoc prompting

### Prerequisites

- Completion of [Lab 06: Custom Agents Intro](#)

- VS Code with GitHub Copilot extension
- Access to the TaskManager workshop repository
- Familiarity with the three custom agents (Architecture Reviewer, Backlog Generator, Test Strategist)

## Lab Structure

You'll work through **3 workflow scenarios**, each testing a different agent. For each scenario, you'll:

1. **First:** Use standard Copilot Chat (no agent)
  2. **Second:** Use the appropriate custom agent
  3. **Compare:** Document differences in quality, structure, and consistency
- 

## Scenario 1: Backlog Generation (15 minutes)

### Context

Your team wants to add a **notification system** to the TaskManager application. Users should receive notifications when:

- A task is assigned to them
- A task deadline is approaching
- A task status changes

You need to break this down into user stories with acceptance criteria.

---

### Part A: Standard Copilot Chat

#### Instructions:

1. Open Copilot Chat (no agent selected)
2. Use this prompt:

Create user stories for a notification system in the TaskManager app.  
Users should get notifications when tasks are assigned, deadlines approach, or status changes.

Include acceptance criteria.

1. **Record the output** (copy/paste into a document or note the structure)

#### Questions to consider:

- How are the stories formatted?
  - Are acceptance criteria specific and testable?
  - Is the output consistent with agile best practices?
-

## Part B: Backlog Generator Agent

### Instructions:

1. Switch to **Agent Mode**
2. Select **Backlog Generator** from the agent dropdown
3. Use the same (or similar) prompt:

Create user stories for a notification system in the TaskManager app.  
Users should get notifications when tasks are assigned, deadlines approach, or status changes.

#### 1. Record the output

### Expected agent behavior:

- User stories in "As a... I want... So that..." format
- Specific, testable acceptance criteria
- Story points or sizing estimates
- Dependencies identified
- INVEST principles applied

---

## Comparison Questions

Aspect	Standard Chat	Backlog Generator Agent
<b>Story Format</b>	[Your observation]	[Your observation]
<b>Acceptance Criteria Quality</b>	[Your observation]	[Your observation]
<b>Completeness</b>	[Your observation]	[Your observation]
<b>Consistency</b>	[Your observation]	[Your observation]
<b>Ready for Sprint Planning?</b>	[Your observation]	[Your observation]

### Reflection:

- Which output would you prefer to present to your product owner?
- Would the agent output save you revision time?
- How much manual cleanup is needed in each case?

---

## Scenario 2: Architecture Review (15 minutes)

### Context

A team member has submitted a pull request that adds a new **NotificationService** in the **Application** layer. You want to ensure it follows Clean Architecture and DDD patterns before approving.

---

### Setup

Create a sample file to review (or use an existing Application service):

**File:** src/TaskManager.Application/Services/NotificationService.cs

```
namespace TaskManager.Application.Services;

public class NotificationService
{
    private readonly ITaskRepository _taskRepository;
    private readonly IEmailService _emailService;

    public NotificationService(ITaskRepository taskRepository, IEmailService emailService)
    {
        _taskRepository = taskRepository;
        _emailService = emailService;
    }

    public async Task NotifyTaskAssignedAsync(int taskId, string assigneeEmail)
    {
        var task = await _taskRepository.GetByIdAsync(taskId);
        if (task != null)
        {
            await _emailService.SendAsync(assigneeEmail, "Task Assigned",
                $"You have been assigned task: {task.Title}");
        }
    }
}
```

---

## Part A: Standard Copilot Chat

### Instructions:

1. Open Copilot Chat (no agent)
2. Open the NotificationService.cs file
3. Prompt:

Review this NotificationService for Clean Architecture compliance and suggest improvements.

### 1. Record the feedback

---

## Part B: Architecture Reviewer Agent

### Instructions:

1. Switch to **Agent Mode**
2. Select **Architecture Reviewer** from dropdown
3. Same prompt:

Review this NotificationService for Clean Architecture compliance and suggest improvements.

### 1. Record the feedback

#### Expected agent behavior:

- Structured review (Strengths, Concerns, Violations, Recommendations)
  - Layer-specific analysis (Application layer rules)
  - DDD pattern evaluation
  - Dependency direction checks
  - Specific, actionable recommendations
- 

### Comparison Questions

Aspect	Standard Chat	Architecture Reviewer Agent
Review Structure	[Your observation]	[Your observation]
Depth of Analysis	[Your observation]	[Your observation]
Actionable Recommendations	[Your observation]	[Your observation]
Consistency with Standards	[Your observation]	[Your observation]
Ready to Use in PR Review?	[Your observation]	[Your observation]

#### Reflection:

- Did the agent identify issues standard chat missed?
  - Is the agent's format more useful for code review comments?
  - Would you trust this agent's review as a first pass?
- 

### Scenario 3: Test Strategy (15 minutes)

#### Context

You're implementing a new feature: **Task Assignment**. A task can be assigned to a user, and the assignment should:

- Validate that the user exists
- Validate that the task exists
- Record assignment timestamp
- Emit a domain event (TaskAssigned)

You need a test strategy.

---

### Part A: Standard Copilot Chat

#### Instructions:

1. Open Copilot Chat (no agent)
2. Prompt:

Propose test scenarios for a task assignment feature.  
Validate user and task exist, record timestamp, emit domain event.

### 1. Record the test scenarios

---

## Part B: Test Strategist Agent

### Instructions:

1. Switch to **Agent Mode**
2. Select **Test Strategist** from dropdown
3. Same prompt:

Propose test scenarios for a task assignment feature.  
Validate user and task exist, record timestamp, emit domain event.

### 1. Record the test scenarios

### Expected agent behavior:

- Categorized tests (unit, integration, edge cases)
- AAA pattern (Arrange, Act, Assert) descriptions
- Specific test names
- Edge cases and boundary conditions
- Error handling scenarios
- Testability recommendations

---

## Comparison Questions

Aspect	Standard Chat	Test Strategist Agent
<b>Test Organization</b>	[Your observation]	[Your observation]
<b>Coverage Completeness</b>	[Your observation]	[Your observation]
<b>Edge Case Identification</b>	[Your observation]	[Your observation]
<b>Test Naming Clarity</b>	[Your observation]	[Your observation]
<b>Ready to Implement?</b>	[Your observation]	[Your observation]

### Reflection:

- Did the agent identify edge cases you hadn't considered?
- Is the agent's categorization helpful?
- Would you feel confident implementing tests from the agent's output?

---

## Group Discussion (If in Workshop Setting)

### Share your findings:

1. Which agent provided the most value?
2. Did agents catch issues that standard chat missed?
3. Were the structured outputs more useful than free-form responses?
4. What are the limitations of agents?

---

## Key Takeaways

### Agents Excel At:

- ✓ **Structured, repeatable workflows** (reviews, planning, analysis)
- ✓ **Consistency across team members** (same agent = same format)
- ✓ **Encoding domain expertise** (architecture, testing, product practices)
- ✓ **First-pass automation** (reduce manual work)

### Agents Are Not:

- ✗ **Always correct** - You're still accountable
- ✗ **Replacements for human judgment** - They're assistants
- ✗ **One-size-fits-all** - Use the right agent for the job

### When Agents Shine:

- **Code reviews** (automated first pass)
  - **Backlog grooming** (consistent story format)
  - **Test planning** (comprehensive coverage)
  - **Documentation generation** (structured outputs)
  - **Knowledge transfer** (encode team practices)
- 

## Challenge Exercise (Optional)

### Try this:

Create a **custom scenario** for your own work:

1. Identify a repetitive workflow in your daily work
2. Use standard Chat to perform it
3. Then use the most relevant agent (or imagine what agent you'd need)
4. Compare the results

**Bonus:** Draft an agent definition for a workflow you need. (You'll formalize this in Labs 08-09.)

---

## Next Steps

In [Lab 08: Agent Design](#), you'll learn **how to design effective agents** — instruction components, iteration loops, and governance.

---

## Additional Resources

- [Agent Scenario Examples](#)
- [Custom Agent Catalog](#)
- [Agent Workflow Patterns Diagram](#)