Making AI output reviewable

An anonymized account of educational-content workflow work.

1. **Source material**
2. **AI-assisted draft**
3. **Human review**

THE PROBLEM

Educational content needs subject-matter review. A fluent draft may still omit a necessary step or introduce an error. The workflow must help a reviewer inspect and correct the result.

MY CONTRIBUTION

Worked on AI-powered exercise analysis, lesson generation and automated content workflows while leading a distributed engineering team. Integrated language-model services into the content process and reviewed output quality.

THE APPROACH

01 **Start from the material:** connect the task to the content being analyzed rather than relying only on a general request.

02 **Make review explicit:** give a human reviewer a clear opportunity to inspect an output, describe an issue and request a revision.

03 **Keep the claim narrow:** generated content is a draft to evaluate. A plausible answer is not evidence that it meets an expert's standard.

WHAT THIS DEMONSTRATES

Engineering judgment around AI integration, content workflows and human review. The focus is the process around the model: connecting a real task to a useful, inspectable output.

SCOPE OF EVIDENCE

Company, product and internal architecture details are intentionally omitted. The diagram is a generic explanation, not a reproduction of the proprietary system. No source code, educational content or internal screenshots are shared. No production-adoption, accuracy or time-saving claim is made.

henry@sztanski.com / henrynawrocki.com