AI SUMMIT HANDS-ON LAB

Exercise 1: From Public Source to Client-Facing Communication

Grounding • Source Selection • Primary Law • Verification • Optional: Visuals, Info Restraint

PARTICIPANT PACKET

The official exercise is 20 minutes. You will use Source A first, then use Sources B1 and B2 for Round 2. Source B2 is current statutory text, intentionally adding a different kind of authority to the source set. Source C and the infographic activity are optional early-finisher extensions; do not use Source C with the core materials.

Suggested prompts are provided, but you are free to experiment with different approaches.

Workshop data rule

Do not enter real client, case, employee, personnel, or other confidential information into the AI tool used for this exercise. All source material is public.

Recommended time 20 minutes + optional early-finisher extensions

Best group size 3–6 participants per table

Participant outcome A revised, source-grounded client-facing explanation plus a completed verification audit — built entirely from public Maryland sources, without client data.

Start here

Today's constraint

Use only the sources provided in each round. Do not ask the AI to independently research Maryland law or search the web. Do not enter real client information.

Scope: This exercise stops at the pre-filing 10-day notice. Later post-judgment eviction notices are intentionally out of scope.

Scenario

Your organization wants a short public-facing resource for a Maryland tenant who has received a landlord notice about unpaid rent and does not understand what it means. You are not advising a particular person. You are creating general information from official public sources.

Core 20-minute work product

- A Round 1 plain-language explanation of approximately 150–200 words.
- A revised Round 2 explanation of approximately 150–200 words using extra sources.
- A three-item change log identifying what changed, which new source caused the change, and why the change matters.
- A claim audit of the five most consequential statements in the revised explanation.

What good work looks like

☐ A reader can tell what document or stage of the process is being discussed.

☐ Deadlines and numbers match the source exactly and are not turned into a different kind of deadline.

☐ The output distinguishes what can happen from what will happen.

☐ Any rule, right, defense, remedy, or recommendation is source-supported or clearly labeled as an inference.

☐ The revised explanation improves because the source set improved — not merely because the prose changed.

☐ The output does not imply the source set is a complete list of tenant rights or defenses.

SOURCE A Round 1 — Build the first version

SOURCE A

Information for Tenants — DC-CV-082TBR

Maryland Courts • Rev. 10/2024 • Use the section “Landlord Claims Tenant Failed to Pay Rent.”

Open official Maryland Courts source

Task

Using only Source A, create a first draft of the public-facing explanation. Keep this round intentionally narrow: one explanation, approximately 150–200 words.

Baseline prompt — use this first

You are helping create general public legal information for a Maryland tenant who has received a notice from a landlord about unpaid rent.

Use ONLY the source I provide. Do not browse the web and do not rely on outside legal knowledge. If the source does not establish something, do not add it. Do not give case-specific legal advice. Preserve qualifications such as “may,” “can,” and “if.”

Create a 150–200 word plain-language explanation for a reader with no legal training.

For each substantive statement, be prepared to identify the part of the source that supports it.

Human review — before you get another source

☐ Highlight the two sentences you consider most important to a tenant.

☐ Circle every number or time period in the AI output and verify it against Source A.

☐ Mark one sentence you would revise before publishing this explanation.

☐ Note one important legal or practical question the brochure does not answer clearly enough for this communication. Do not assume that silence means no other issue exists.

Save this version

Do not overwrite Round 1. You will compare it with the next version after additional sources are added.

SOURCES B1 + B2 Round 2 — Add the actual notice + primary law

SOURCE B1

Notice of Intent to File a Complaint for Summary Ejectment (Failure to Pay Rent) — DC-CV-115

Maryland Courts • Rev. 10/2024 • This is the actual notice form discussed in Source A.

Open official Maryland Courts source

SOURCE B2

Real Property § 8-406 — Rental Licensing in Repossession Actions

Maryland General Assembly • Current law • Use subsections (a)–(c).

Open current Maryland statutory text

Task

Give the AI Sources B1 and B2 in the same conversation. Ask it to re-evaluate the first draft rather than simply start over. Source B2 is primary law, not a client-facing explanation.

Revision prompt

I am adding two official sources: the actual Maryland Courts notice and current Maryland statutory text. Re-evaluate the Round 1 draft using all supplied sources.

Revise only where the new sources warrant a change. Do not add outside legal knowledge or assume these sources exhaust all tenant rights or defenses. Keep the audience focused on a tenant who has received the pre-filing notice.

If the statute suggests a practical next step, distinguish what the law directly requires from what you infer. Do not turn a legal issue into an automatic defense or outcome unless the sources say that.

Return: A. a revised 150–200 word explanation; B. a THREE-ITEM change log identifying the old idea, new idea, source, and why it matters; and C. one important question the sources still do not answer.

Compare Round 1 and Round 2

☐ Which change in the three-item log matters most to the reader?

☐ Did Round 1 turn any possible future event into something that sounded inevitable?

☐ Did the new sources correct, qualify, or add important info that Source A did not cover?

☐ Did the model rewrite anything for style rather than because the evidence changed?

☐ What did the statute add that neither court-facing source told the tenant? Did the model overstate what the statute means?

Source-selection question

Was Round 2 better because the AI "reasoned harder," or because the source set included a different kind of authority? Which Round 1 omissions were source-selection problems rather than AI failures?

CORE: Claim audit — verify before you publish

Choose the THREE most consequential claims in the revised Round 2 explanation. Classify each one and decide whether to keep, revise, or remove it.

Classification key

D = directly supported by a supplied source • I = reasonable inference, but not stated directly
U = unsupported by the supplied sources • ? = you cannot tell

Claim from final output	Supporting source	D/I/U/?	Keep / revise / remove	Notes

High-risk details to verify separately

☐ Every number, time period, and deadline.

☐ Whether the document is itself a court filing, a pre-filing notice, or an eviction notice.

☐ Any statement about what a landlord, tenant, or court must do.

☐ Any statement about a right, defense, remedy, eligibility rule, or guaranteed outcome, especially a claim that an issue automatically wins or defeats a case.

☐ Every form number, phone number, URL, and referral resource.

☐ Any sentence where the AI changed “may/can” into “will/must,” or vice versa.

FINISHED EARLY? KEEP EXPLORING

The official 20-minute exercise ends after the claim audit and facilitator debrief. If your table finishes the core work quickly, choose one of the optional add-ons below. You do not need to complete either one.

OPTIONAL ADD-ON — More context is not always better

SOURCE C

Housing Cases

Maryland Courts • Current site • This page spans pre-filing, court, judgment, warrant, and eviction stages.

Open current Maryland Courts source

Use this source to test scope, not just freshness: current later-stage rules are useful context, but they do not automatically belong in a communication for someone who has only received the pre-filing notice.

Task

Add Source C to the same conversation. Test whether a broader, current procedural overview improves a resource for someone who has only received the pre-filing notice. Your goal is information restraint, not comprehensiveness.

More-context prompt

Add Source C to the source set. First sort any new information into three stages: (1) pre-filing notice, (2) after a court case or judgment, and (3) warrant/eviction.

Then review the verified Round 2 explanation for a tenant who has received the pre-filing notice but has not necessarily had a court case filed yet.

Do not make the resource longer simply because more information is available. Decide what belongs NOW, what might belong in a brief “what may happen next” section, and what should be LEFT OUT of this communication.

Return: (1) up to three suggested additions or changes that genuinely belong in this pre-filing communication, and (2) up to three later-stage facts you deliberately leave out, with a one-sentence explanation for each omission.

OPTIONAL ADD-ON — Create an infographic

Use only verified content

Start from the revised Round 2 explanation after your claim audit. The infographic is a new publication: generating a visual does not preserve verified wording automatically, so check it again after generation. **Note**: Not all AI tools can generate images.

Infographic sample prompt

Create a one-page, portrait infographic for a Maryland tenant who has received a pre-filing notice about unpaid rent. Use ONLY the verified content I provide below. Do not add new legal information, deadlines, phone numbers, URLs, or recommendations.

Design requirements:
- 8.5 x 11 inch portrait layout suitable for printing and viewing on a phone.
- Plain, calm, professional visual style.
- Make the meaning of the pre-filing notice immediately clear.
- Use no more than four short content panels.
- Do not use branding that could imply the infographic is an official court publication.
- Do not use imagery that implies the tenant has been evicted or lost a court case.
- Keep all text large and legible; do not rely on color alone to communicate meaning.
- Include a short general-information/not-legal-advice footer.

Before generating, show me the exact text you plan to place in the infographic so I can approve and verify it. After approval, generate the visual without changing that text.

Visual verification

☐ Compare every word in the generated image with the approved text.

☐ Verify numbers, deadlines, phone numbers, URLs, and form numbers again.

☐ Check whether size, placement, color, or imagery makes a qualified statement look absolute or urgent in a misleading way.

☐ Confirm the visual does not make the pre-filing notice look like an eviction order.

☐ Confirm no invented logos, seals, citations, QR codes, legal resources, or contact info.

☐ Confirm the output remains useful/legible even if printed in black and white.

☐ Create or verify alt text if the infographic will be posted digitally.

Core debrief — what actually made the work better?

- What changed when the actual notice form was added?
- What did § 8-406 add that the court-facing materials omitted?
- Was the missing licensing issue an AI failure or a source-set problem?
- Which source was best for which job?
- Could you use this workflow Monday using only public information?

Use-it-Monday pattern

Start with an authoritative public source → draft → add a task-specific source and, when needed, current primary law → revise with a change log → audit consequential claims.

Extra context or a new format creates another verification task.

Your transfer idea

Name one public source from your own work that could support a similar workflow:

What useful work product could you create from it without using client information?