

Build Your First Supervised AI Twin Workflow

Turn one recurring task from a blank-page burden into a reliable review task. By the end, you will have run, corrected, tested, and saved a bounded AI workflow you can use again.

WHAT'S INSIDE

- Run one bounded first draft
- Build an approved source packet
- Set boundaries and keep authority human
- Practice with a complete example
- Review, correct, and approve the result
- Run three skill-building variations
- Save the workflow and repeat it

01 Run one bounded first draft

An AI twin is not a digital replacement for you. It is a supervised workflow that uses approved material to prepare repeatable work while you retain judgment, approval, and accountability.

Choose one starter assignment

- Email: Using the approved source packet, draft a 180-word email that explains the main idea and ends with one practical question.
- Meeting brief: Organize the approved notes into decisions, open questions, action items, and missing owners.
- Content outline: Turn the approved source into a clear outline without adding claims, examples, or conclusions.
- Weekly update: Convert the approved status notes into a concise update organized by progress, blockers, and next actions.

Pick the first assignment for which you already have permitted, non-sensitive source material. If none is ready, use the complete practice packet in Section 04.

1

START

Open your permitted AI workspace

Go to the AI system you are allowed to use, sign in if your setup requires it, and open a new conversation or blank workspace. You will paste the source packet and assignment into its main text input. This guide does not require a particular product.

2

NEXT

Gather a small source packet

Collect the current note or document, two or three approved examples when available, and a short voice rule. Approved means you are permitted to use the material and willing to treat it as a source. Do not include private or confidential material unless its use is explicitly permitted.

3

PASTE

Give the system one exact job

Copy the quick-start prompt below into the text input. Replace the bracketed instructions with your selected assignment and source material, then submit it.

PROMPT

You are preparing a first draft for human review. You do not have authority to approve, publish, promise, or decide anything.

ASSIGNMENT: [Paste one starter assignment from the menu.]

APPROVED SOURCE PACKET: [Paste the current source material.]

VOICE EXAMPLES: [Paste up to three approved examples, if available. Use them only for style unless they are also identified as factual sources.]

RULES: Use only the approved source packet for factual statements. Do not invent personal stories, statistics, customer results, product claims, decisions, owners, dates, or missing details. Mark uncertain or unsupported material as [REVIEW]. Follow the requested format and keep the language direct and useful.

RETURN: First, the requested draft. Second, a short Review flags list identifying missing information, uncertainty, or instructions you could not satisfy from the sources.

1

LOOK

Check whether you received a review task

A useful result follows the assigned format, stays inside the supplied material, and makes uncertainty visible. It does not need to be perfect. It needs to give you something concrete and bounded to inspect.

2

CHANGE

Correct one meaningful weakness

Find one unsupported claim, vague phrase, missed instruction, or tone problem. Tell the system exactly what is wrong and what boundary the revision must obey.

3

TRY AGAIN

Request a controlled revision

Ask for a revised draft that changes only the flagged issue and preserves accurate material. Compare the two versions before approving anything.

Your first success is not autonomous output. It is moving a real task from a blank page to a draft you can responsibly review.

02 Build an approved source packet

The quality of the workflow depends more on what sits behind it than on how convincingly the output resembles you. Keep truth sources, style examples, task instructions, and boundaries visibly separate.

PACKET PART	INCLUDE	KEEP OUT
Current input	The note, meeting record, or approved material to be transformed	Unrelated documents and background noise
Truth sources	Material the draft may use for factual statements	Claims you have not checked or authorized
Voice examples	Two or three examples that demonstrate desired tone or structure	Examples whose facts should not be reused in the new draft
Output specification	Audience, format, length, required sections, and desired ending	Vague requests such as “make it great”
Boundaries	Prohibited inventions, required review flags, and human approval point	Private or confidential information without explicit permission

TEMPLATE

SOURCE PACKET NAME: [Task and date or version]

CURRENT INPUT: [Material being transformed]

APPROVED TRUTH SOURCES: [Material allowed to support factual statements]

VOICE EXAMPLES: [Style references only, unless also listed as truth sources]

OUTPUT REQUIRED: [Format, audience, length, required sections, and ending]

PROHIBITED: No invented stories, statistics, results, claims, decisions, owners, dates, or missing details.

REVIEW RULE: Mark uncertainty as [REVIEW]. A human must verify and approve the final result before use.

More material is not automatically better. A smaller approved packet with a clear task is easier to inspect than a pile of documents with unclear authority.

03 Set boundaries and keep authority human

Presence is where the system may represent or assist you. Authority is what an accountable human must approve or decide. Write that distinction into the assignment instead of assuming the system will infer it.

WORK	PERMITTED PRESENCE	HUMAN AUTHORITY
First-draft email	Organize approved thinking into the requested format	Confirm truth, implication, tone, and release
Meeting brief	Separate decisions, questions, actions, and missing owners	Verify the record and decide what happens next
Format adaptation	Transform approved material into another format	Confirm that no new claim was introduced
Decision memo	Prepare information and organize options from approved notes	Make and communicate the decision
Public, customer, financial, or sensitive message	Prepare a draft only within explicit permission and boundaries	Deliberately verify every consequential statement before use

CHECKLIST

Before running the task, confirm all six conditions:

- The deliverable is recurring and clearly defined.
- You already know how to judge a good result.
- The source material is approved and permitted.
- The system is prohibited from inventing missing information.
- Uncertainty must be marked for review.
- A named human review point exists before the result is used.

Increase review friction as consequences rise. A low-risk internal outline may need a quick scan. A public claim, customer promise, financial statement, sensitive message, unfamiliar factual assertion, or use of private information deserves deliberate verification.

If truth, money, trust, privacy, safety, or an important relationship is involved, the system may prepare the work, but it does not receive final authority.

04 Practice with a complete example

Use this exercise if you do not yet have a suitable live task, or if you want to test the method before using your own material.

1

OPEN
Start a fresh run

Open a new conversation or blank workspace in your permitted AI system.

Run the complete practice prompt

Copy and submit the prompt exactly as written.

PROMPT

You are preparing a first draft for human review.

APPROVED SOURCE NOTE: People think an AI twin is a clone. It should carry the repeatable parts of the work while the person remains accountable. Make the distinction between presence and authority clear.

ASSIGNMENT: Using only the approved source note, draft a 180-word email. Open with the misconception, explain the presence-versus-authority distinction, and end with one practical question.

VOICE GUIDE: Be direct, practical, clear, and free of hype.

BOUNDARIES: Do not introduce personal stories, statistics, customer results, current product claims, guarantees, or facts absent from the source. Do not imply that the system owns judgment or works without review. Mark uncertain material as [REVIEW].

RETURN: The draft followed by Review flags.

Inspect the result

Your wording may differ, so evaluate the behavior rather than looking for an exact match. Watch especially for polished phrases that quietly broaden the claim. For example:

“Your AI twin makes your expertise available at any hour and handles your content automatically.”

That sentence sounds smooth, but “available at any hour” may suggest live access or guaranteed service, while “automatically” hides the review process. Polish is not proof.

SCRIPT

Revise the draft. Remove any implication of guaranteed availability, autonomous operation, or transferred judgment. State instead that the system can prepare useful work from approved material for human review, and that a human retains judgment and approval. Do not add new claims. Preserve the requested length, structure, and practical closing question.

Use this as the benchmark

A bounded correction could say: “An AI twin can prepare useful work from approved material for human review. It extends your workflow, but it does not inherit your judgment.”

A practical closing question could be: “What recurring draft could your system prepare today so you can spend your time improving it instead of starting from zero?”

The lesson is in the correction: changing context, boundaries, and judgment produces a more trustworthy result than merely asking for smoother writing.

05 Review, correct, and approve the result

Review is part of the workflow, not an inconvenience added after it. Use the same sequence every time.

CHECKLIST

- Scope: Did the result perform only the assigned task?
- Source: Can every factual statement be traced to the approved packet?
- Invention: Did it create a story, statistic, result, claim, owner, date, or decision?
- Truth: Is each statement accurate within the limits of the source?
- Implication: Could polished language suggest a guarantee, authority, access, or capability the source does not support?
- Tone: Is the result recognizably consistent with the approved examples without copying irrelevant facts?
- Format: Did it follow the requested audience, length, sections, and ending?
- Privacy: Was every included piece of information permitted for this use?
- Authority: Is final approval or decision still clearly human?

Choose one review decision

- Approve: Every consequential statement is supported, the boundaries were followed, and you accept responsibility for the result.
- Revise: The task is still valid, but specific passages need controlled correction.
- Hold: Required information is missing, the sources conflict, or the consequence exceeds the workflow's review level.

SCRIPT

Revise only the issues listed below. Preserve supported material and the assigned format.

ISSUES: [List the exact unsupported claim, missed instruction, tone problem, or risky implication.]

REVISION RULES: Use only the approved source packet. Do not guess. Replace unsupported statements with sourced statements or remove them. Mark unresolved gaps as [REVIEW]. Return the revised draft and a brief list of what changed.

Read the revised version again. A correction request can improve one passage while accidentally changing another, so approval belongs after the revision, not before it.

06 Run three skill-building variations

One successful draft proves the workflow can run. These variations teach you how to control it.

Variation 1: Change the format without changing the facts

PROMPT

Using only the approved draft below, convert it into a five-point internal outline. Preserve the meaning of every supported claim. Introduce no new facts, examples, promises, or conclusions. Mark anything that cannot be transferred cleanly as [REVIEW].

APPROVED DRAFT: [Paste the approved result.]

Look for factual drift. A new format should not quietly become permission for new claims.

Variation 2: Test behavior when information is missing

PROMPT

Organize the approved meeting notes into Decisions, Open Questions, Action Items, and Missing Owners. Do not guess owners, dates, decisions, or commitments. If a required detail is absent, mark it [REVIEW: missing detail].

APPROVED NOTES: The team agreed to revise the draft. Pricing remains unresolved. A customer follow-up is needed.

A good result identifies the unresolved pricing question and missing ownership rather than manufacturing certainty.

Variation 3: Separate voice from truth

PROMPT

Revise the approved draft to match the structure and tone of the voice examples. Treat those examples as style references only. Do not carry their facts, stories, results, or claims into the new draft. Keep all factual content limited to the approved truth source.

APPROVED TRUTH SOURCE: [Paste the source for this task.]

VOICE EXAMPLES: [Paste two approved examples.]

DRAFT TO REVISE: [Paste the current draft.]

Compare the result with the previous version. The voice may become more recognizable, but the factual boundary should remain unchanged.

You now have three distinct controls: source controls what may be claimed, instructions control what work is performed, and human review controls what earns approval.

07 Save the workflow and repeat it

Do not save only the polished output. Save the operating instructions that made the output reviewable. This turns a successful experiment into a repeatable assignment.

TEMPLATE

TWIN JOB: [Name of recurring deliverable]

PURPOSE: Prepare [specific output] for human review.

APPROVED INPUTS: [Current input and truth sources]

VOICE REFERENCES: [Approved style examples]

REQUIRED OUTPUT: [Audience, format, length, sections, and ending]

MUST NOT: Invent stories, statistics, results, product claims, promises, owners, dates, decisions, or absent facts.

UNCERTAINTY RULE: Mark unsupported or missing material as [REVIEW].

HUMAN CHECKPOINT: [Who verifies truth, consequence, tone, privacy, and final use]

APPROVAL RULE: The result is a draft until the accountable human approves it.

Your repeatable sequence

1. Select one recurring, clearly judged deliverable.
2. Assemble the approved source packet.
3. Load the saved Twin Job instructions.
4. Run the first draft.
5. Review scope, source, truth, implication, tone, privacy, and authority.
6. Request a controlled revision or hold the result.
7. Approve only after the final human check.

Finish line

CHECKLIST

You have completed the guide when all of these are true:

- You ran one complete assignment in an AI workspace.
- You used approved material rather than an unbounded request.
- You found and corrected at least one meaningful weakness.
- You kept consequential judgment and approval human.
- You tested at least one variation.
- You saved a reusable Twin Job with sources, instructions, boundaries, and a review point.

You do not need a digital personality wandering around looking for employment. You need one carefully supervised workflow that prepares useful work without confusing presence with authority.

Want the reasoning behind the workflow?

For optional deeper context, visit the AI Insights library and look for the companion article, “My AI Twin Works While I Don’t”:

<https://chuckgoetschel.com/ai-insights>

INSTAGRAM · FACEBOOK · TIKTOK · YOUTUBE · CHUCKGOETSCHEL.COM

Let the twin handle the repetition. Keep truth, judgment, and approval close.