Team 1 AI Reflection

Reflections:

Alford, Sam:

Model: Claude Opus 4.5, ChatGPT-5.2
Chat log: https://claude.ai/share/8669b780-39ea-4856-8e38-fd054521ca16, https://chatgpt.com/share/696abcd3-815c-800e-96cc-81586aaca352

I used both Claude and ChatGPT to generate a project schedule and re-word/edit constraints, respectively. I had Claude generate multiple options for a potential project timeline template using the information from our product overview and objectives at the time. In final editing, I used ChatGPT to analyze constraints that the group felt were inaccurate and create new constraints that satisfied our needs while working within the context of our product.

Claude was given the RFP template as well as our product overview and objectives. The goal for this was to generate a functional template that I could use rather than a complete finished timeline, that's why I emphasized making multiple examples. ChatGPT was given just the RFP with instructions to make new constraints in place of the inaccurate ones. This was kept intentionally simple as I did not want the AI to change or affect anything else.

Claude surprised me by making a whole interactive React timeline and powerpoint presentation as two of the given examples. Both were surprisingly well done and polished but neither of which are compatible with a word document format and were very much overkill. An additional context specifying the need for it to fit within the document could have been used to prevent these examples. It also took a surprisingly long time (around 2 minutes) to produce this output as it spent most of its time making those two large files. As a result, Claude was generally unhelpful after the first prompt as it made only incompatible files or put in too much effort like with the Excel spreadsheet with a full color coordinated Gantt chart, which was a good idea but did not match the simple, sleek format of our RFP. I decided to go with the Excel table and provided additional context of the course outline and to ensure that it is easily transferable to a Google document, which resulted in a working table template with some correct dates but needed many manual corrections to integrate it into the document.

I was generally unconfident about the AI's output, which pushed me away from using it for the most part. My role in the group was mostly organizational and editing/review, both of which I would rather do myself or had to do myself to

make sure the AI output actually made sense and worked within the document. Anything generated by AI either by me or another group member had to be thoroughly looked over and in the final edit we found so many inconsistencies and logical errors. I don't believe these were from ineffective prompting on our end as most prompts did provide usable writing but in the same output, have contradictory statements. There was even a point during review where I had missed a logical error because the AI writes with confidence and will tie their writing to other parts of their own writing, making it seem like it fits within the context of the document while potentially ignoring or not considering previous information.

Quality prompts for me came down to simplicity of the task. ChatGPT was given a simple prompt and minimal context was able to produce exactly what I was looking for, whereas Claude with more context and a more detailed prompt ended up generating mostly unusable content. I believe this is mostly because ChatGPT had a simple, direct task when Claude had an open-ended task where it was up to it to determine what examples to provide. In hindsight, providing restrictions to Claude and being more detailed about what examples I was looking for would have helped or potentially solved these issues. That is why the next prompt to Claude was used to not only eliminate other outputs but reiterate the importance of compatibility with a Google document.

The AIs did maintain contextual understanding during the conversation and both were able to criticize/explain their output well. My conversations with both AI were very short, only a couple prompts, as I used them for direct tasks or for templates, both needing editing and approval through me. This allowed them to not miss earlier context easily and output more or less what I wanted. You can see this clearly with Claude, who was able to see where there was missing information from his previous output in comparison to the new context and change it immediately. You can also see with ChatGPT how it was able to analyze its output and explain why this works within the context as well as how it fulfills the needs of the prompt.

Cohen, Aaron:

Model: Gemini 3 thinking
Chat log: https://gemini.google.com/share/9a9a0380932e

Using the Gemini 3 thinking model, I was able to gain a better understanding of the assignment requirements by making it explain sections on the rubric and give examples for content on certain areas of the RFP that I was unclear about. As

well, in combination with Sam's section, I was able to get a rough outline of the project timeline, and compared my results with his while he worked on the final version of the timeline that was submitted.

The major use of AI for me however was to reword and expand certain sections of the document. In addition to reading the entire document myself and making edits by hand to all sections (cutting out incoherent AI generated sentences, irrelevant paragraphs, and rewording sections for clarity), AI was used to give a better basis for some paragraphs and points made in the document when the original wording was too dense/incoherent for me to understand.

Context: Regarding the context of the chat log I used, the AI was given the template for the RFP, the two examples, our problem statement, and the course outline spreadsheet. It is important for me that the AI can consume and understand sources of truth in its context before generating useful output for me, thus no instructions were given until the context was primed. Furthermore, as the document we were writing is extremely malleable, it is important not to pollute the context with the WIP document, thus I was careful in my prompts to only paste the section I was editing. This allowed the AI to focus specifically on the area that I was interested in and not get distracted by other document details (that were subject to change anyways).

There were no surprising artifacts generated from my chats with the AI as I was only interested in using it to reword sections of the document that had already been present. However I did find it interesting that it was able to give me an apt description of the VicMap software that was useful to include in the final version of the RFP.

I believe that the rough draft of the RFP that was done with AI was not entirely useful. While I was going through making edits by hand as mentioned previously, there was a large amount of content that I had to delete, or reword due to incoherence (the AI was generating "slop"). I found the AI to be the most helpful in rewording paragraphs that I had already edited, or when I gave it clear directions and constraints to start some of the rewording for me. I was not confident in the AI's behaviour which is why I made edits to all sections that it generated after it was finished.

The AI was not given the opportunity to criticize its own output, instead I repeated prompts at times to ensure the output was more concise. I find it easiest to work with a pattern where I instruct the AI to make something for me and then I control

the iteration. All the AI needs to do is generate useful output, and it is easy to transform existing content with the following pattern: “Can we reword this section to have less jargon and align better with what we're working on? …. (paste paragraph below)”. A prompt can be determined to be effective if the output is useful. To determine if the output is useful, you need to read it and use your own cognitive ability to consider if it makes sense or not.

Context in the conversation was maintained well. This can be seen in the response to my prompt “Ok, then expand this point: Data will be pulled from VicMap for the city planners using the system.”. The response was bad since I wanted the AI to finish the sentence, but instead it used the context to generate the section once over to align with the rubric. Repeating my instructions to actually fill in the blank eventually did work with the prompt: “I want you to finish the text for this bullet point: Data will be pulled from VicMap for the city planners using the system....”

Green, Ian:

Model: ChatGPT
Disclaimer: The model used in a free OpenAI account is obfuscated and the only two options to use are the free ChatGPT and paid ChatGPT Go options.
Chat log: https://chatgpt.com/share/6966eacc-4f74-8011-af2f-025197d3fdb6

I used ChatGPT to generate paragraphs for the first two sections of the RFP: the product overview and project objectives. I used concrete language that avoided ambiguity in my prompts to lay out ground rules for the AI output, before generating small parts of the larger RFP with more descriptive prompts of the details of our work. Instead of giving AI access to the rubric and example RFPs, I decided to keep the chat log contained and specific to the task at hand, to hopefully circumvent overwhelming the AI with too much information and therefore reducing the quality and accuracy of its output.

The overall goal of AI use in this project was to get a rough draft on the page, something that I find to be the most daunting part of writing by myself. Regardless of the output quality of ChatGPT, I find it much easier to work with text that has already been written than to write original work.

The initial drafts produced by the AI used strong rhetoric on topics where it did not have adequate context or understanding. In the first version of the product overview, ChatGPT says that due to road obstructions, citizens have "mistrust toward both the city and construction operators." This kind of language makes for

a weak argument, with no substantial evidence to back it up. Similarly, when prompted to generate paragraphs for the project objectives section, an entire paragraph was written about evolving construction conditions, a topic that was neither prompted for, nor relevant to the users of our future service. Additional prompting and iterations of the paragraphs fixed these issues, but it should be noted that the accuracy and quality of the output did not match the quantity that ChatGPT generated.

I believe that I approached this project with an appropriate mindset for using AI properly. Instead of treating it as a substitute for my work, I used it as an assistant tool to help me overcome the initial barrier of starting to write. This was particularly useful in helping my procrastination and getting early ideas onto the page. However, I found multiple pitfalls that needed adjustment and iteration in order to get any sort of useful output. I believe I should rely less on AI during the rough drafting stage, while my writing style and abilities are still developing. Overreliance at this part of my journey diminishes my ability to independently structure and articulate ideas. Instead, AI would be more effective as a revision tool, helping me to use better language and grammar, and improve clarity of my writing. This approach would also help to reduce the loss of context and nuance found when getting AI to write the initial structure and ideas of a paper. Overall, AI was useful for a limited portion of this project, but my future use should be more targeted and intentional, focusing on improvement to what I have already written rather than generation.

Lin, Sung-Yu :

Model: Claude Opus 4.5

Chat log:https://claude.ai/share/e6cdc9fe-0e70-49ca-b15d-23cc0aa886d5

I used Claude to generate and improve several parts of this RFP document, mainly the sections about Victoria's current systems, Intended Users of the System, Known Interaction With Systems Within or Outside the Organization, Known Constraints to Development, and the glossary of terms, as my position for the team was making the rough draft for the whole RFP. My approach was to give Claude information about Victoria's construction communication problems and then ask it to make changes through follow-up questions, like making paragraphs shorter or using simpler language.

Claude was decent at creating detailed first drafts but definitely needed a lot of work to rephrase or check if the content was even relevant. It spits out a lot of information and just throws them on your face. I think it’s good to understand the concept. However, without human review and editing, it’s like reading through a book that a kid wrote. It’s kind of all over the place.

One big problem was getting Claude to write in plain English that regular people could understand. The AI's first attempts often used complicated words and confusing or redundant sentences that would be hard for readers to follow. Sometimes AI would mention things that aren’t really that relevant or produce sentences with the lack of purpose.

The best prompts were specific and direct. Vague requests like "write the whole section for me" created content that was too broad, while specific instructions like "change Emergency Services and Municipal Departments to Emergency Services and bus drivers" gave me way better output (Even though I only wrote that in the review section). Writing out specific pieces worked way better than asking Claude to write entire sections all at once.

Claude can remember information that I mentioned earlier in our conversation and connect new sections appropriately. However, I noticed that when our conversation got really long, Claude occasionally would get confused by all the prompts and make repeated problems that weren't intended.

One surprising issue was that Claude sometimes had trouble handling competing instructions. When I asked for content to be both thorough and short, AI would often focus too much on one thing and ignore the other. This meant I had to guide it back to a middle ground by giving more specific instructions about what to prioritize.

Overall, as Claude was very helpful for a starting point that sped up the writing process, technology definitely hasn't reached to a point that we can trust AI to do tasks on their own. The AI worked best for creating rough drafts and basic structure that I could then shape to fit what we actually needed, rather than creating finished writing right from the get-go. To add on top of that, how good the results were depended a lot on how clearly I explained what I wanted, and I learned that being direct and asking for small pieces at a time consistently worked better than vague requests.