

Lab 3: Agent Session Log — Stakeholder Map + Report Compilation

Mia Chen (Instructor Example) | SE 395-2: AI Tools for Social Impact | October 3-5, 2026

Tool: Claude (claude.ai with GitHub integration) · Repository: se395-team6-o-town-compost

Duration: ~90 minutes across two sessions · 18 exchanges

Role: Stakeholder map (individual section) + report compilation (team role)

PHASE 1: INDIVIDUAL SECTION — STAKEHOLDER MAP (FRIDAY, OCTOBER 3)

MIA (PROMPT 1)

Read the partner brief files in the partner-brief folder. I need to understand everything we know about O-Town Compost before I start my section. I am responsible for the stakeholder map.

READ partner-brief/organization-overview.md

READ partner-brief/class-visit-transcript.md

READ partner-brief/project-areas.md

CLAUDE

I have read all three partner brief files. Here is what we know about O-Town Compost that is relevant to stakeholder mapping:

Organization: For-profit food waste recycler founded by Charlie Pioli. 4 full-time staff (Charlie, Erin the GM, Stephen in warehouse, Erik managing fleet). Operates in 7 Florida cities. Over 14 million pounds composted to date.

Service lines: Six distinct service types: residential (bucket pickup/swap, \$24-42/month), commercial/food service (custom proposals), office (\$85-160/month with step-cans), multi-family (property managers), events (zero-waste with on-site ambassadors), and farm dumpster composting.

Key relationships mentioned in the visit:

- Farm partners who receive donated compost: 4Roots Farm, Froot Farm, Everoak Farm
- Lake Nona / Tavistock community partnership (discounted residential rates)
- Alachua County government (free food waste drop-off program funded by Circular Economy Grant)
- Schools and community gardens (compost donations)
- Fleet Farming (Erik came from there; they receive event compost)

Tensions Charlie mentioned: Contamination from events using wrong serviceware. Difficulty tracking commercial leads. Small team stretched across wide geography.

Where would you like to start?

MIA (PROMPT 2)

Help me organize the stakeholders. I want to split them into primary (direct, regular interaction) and secondary (indirect or occasional). For each one I need: who they are, what the relationship looks like in practice, and what they need from O-Town Compost.

CLAUDE

Here is a draft stakeholder map based on the partner brief:

Primary stakeholders: residential subscribers, commercial/food service clients, event clients, and farm partners. Each of these interact with O-Town on a weekly or per-engagement basis and have direct service relationships.

Secondary stakeholders: municipal governments, schools/community gardens, employees (drivers, warehouse), and prospective customers (leads).

[Provided detailed breakdown for each with needs and relationship descriptions]

MIA (PROMPT 3)

That is a good start but it feels too clean. Where are the tensions? Charlie talked about how event clients use the wrong serviceware and it messes up the compost quality. That is a direct tension between serving event clients and keeping farm partners happy. What other tensions exist between stakeholder groups?

CLAUDE

Good catch. Here are the tensions I see in the data:

1. Event clients vs. farm partners (contamination). Events generate revenue but also the highest contamination risk. PLA bioplastic cups look compostable but are not. Every contaminated event load threatens compost quality for farm partners. Charlie has to choose between rejecting contaminated loads (losing revenue, frustrating clients) or processing them (compromising quality).

2. Growth vs. service quality. Expanding to new cities brings more residential subscribers (volume) but stretches the four-person team. More cities mean more routes, more customer service inquiries, more driver logistics. Residential subscribers need reliable weekly pickups. If growth outpaces hiring, reliability suffers.

3. Residential vs. commercial allocation. Residential is high-volume, low-margin (~\$30/month per household). Commercial is lower-volume but higher-margin (custom pricing). Erin's time spent answering residential FAQ questions is time not spent closing commercial deals. These two customer groups compete for the same scarce resource: staff attention.

4. Municipal partners vs. independence. Government partnerships (Lake Nona, Alachua County) bring scale and credibility but may come with reporting requirements, price constraints, or political risk. If a county contract ends, the volume loss could be significant.

MIA (PROMPT 4)

The municipal tension is interesting but I am not sure we have enough evidence for it from the visit. Charlie mentioned the Lake Nona and Alachua County partnerships positively. I do not want to speculate about risks he did not mention. Can you flag that as an open question instead?

CLAUDE

You are right. I was extrapolating beyond what Charlie actually said. The Lake Nona partnership was presented as a success (community-wide initiative, discounted rates), and the Alachua County program is grant-funded with a defined timeline. There is no evidence of tension there.

I will move the municipal dependency question to "open questions" as something to ask in the next partner meeting: *"How dependent is your revenue on municipal partnerships? What happens when the Alachua County grant period ends?"*

MIA (PROMPT 5)

Good. One more thing. I want to include the employees as stakeholders. Charlie listed job postings starting at \$17/hour for residential drivers and \$24-28 for CDL commercial drivers. Those are real numbers. But I do not know much about driver retention or satisfaction. What questions should I ask about this?

CLAUDE

For the employee stakeholder section, here is what you know vs. what you need:

What you know: Pay ranges (\$17/hr residential, \$24-28/hr CDL commercial). Benefits for full-time (32+ hrs): 401k with 3% match, \$800/month healthcare stipend, YMCA membership, PTO. Routes start 4-5 AM for commercial drivers. They are actively hiring for both driver roles and a regional sales rep.

What you do not know (open questions):

- What is the driver turnover rate? Is the early morning start time a retention issue?
- How many drivers do they have across seven cities? Are some cities served by the same drivers doing long routes?

- The careers page includes a testimonial from "Christy, O-Town's first driver." Is she still with the company?
- With only four named staff and active hiring, are they currently understaffed?

MIA (PROMPT 6)

OK, I think I have enough to write my section. Create the stakeholder map as a markdown file. Put it in discovery/findings/stakeholder-map-mia.md. Include the primary and secondary tables, the tensions section with the three we confirmed, and the open questions. 400-600 words.

WRITE discovery/findings/stakeholder-map-mia.md (487 words)

CLAUDE

Created the file at discovery/findings/stakeholder-map-mia.md. It includes:

- Primary stakeholders table (residential, commercial, event, farm partners)
- Secondary stakeholders table (municipal, schools/gardens, employees, prospects)
- Tensions section (3 confirmed: contamination, growth vs. quality, residential vs. commercial)
- Open questions for next partner meeting (5 questions)

487 words total. Want me to read it back so you can review before pushing?

MIA (PROMPT 7)

Yes, read it back to me.

READ discovery/findings/stakeholder-map-mia.md

CLAUDE

[Read back the full stakeholder map content for review]

MIA (PROMPT 8)

In the tensions section, change "compromising quality" to "risking the relationship with farm partners." It is more specific. Also, in the open questions, add one about whether they have considered hiring a part-time customer service person to take pressure off Erin.

EDIT discovery/findings/stakeholder-map-mia.md (2 changes)

CLAUDE

Done. Changed "compromising quality" to "risking the relationship with farm partners" in the contamination tension. Added open question: "Has the team considered hiring a part-time

customer service role to handle residential inquiries and free Erin for commercial sales and operations?"

MIA (PROMPT 9)

Looks good. Commit my stakeholder map and push it.

```
RUN git add discovery/findings/stakeholder-map-mia.md
```

```
RUN git commit -m "Add stakeholder map section - Mia"
```

```
RUN git push origin main
```

CLAUDE

Committed and pushed your stakeholder map. The push succeeded.

End of Phase 1. Notice how Mia pushed back when the AI speculated beyond the evidence (prompt 4), added her own insight about the employee stakeholder angle (prompt 5), and asked for specific edits rather than accepting the first draft (prompt 8). This is 9 exchanges with genuine iteration on a single section.

PHASE 2: COMPILING THE TEAM REPORT (SUNDAY, OCTOBER 5)

MIA (PROMPT 10)

Pull the latest changes. My teammates should have pushed their individual sections by now. I volunteered to compile the team report.

```
RUN git pull origin main
```

CLAUDE

Pulled latest. 6 new files from your teammates since your last session:

- discovery/findings/operations-map-alex.md (Alex Torres — operations map)
- discovery/findings/pain-points-jordan.md (Jordan Reeves — pain points and bottlenecks)
- discovery/findings/opportunity-analysis-sam.md (Sam Okafor — opportunity analysis)
- discovery/findings/conversation-log-alex.md
- discovery/findings/conversation-log-jordan.md
- discovery/findings/conversation-log-sam.md

All four individual sections are now in the repo. Ready to compile.

MIA (PROMPT 11)

Read all four individual sections: Alex's operations map, Jordan's pain points, my stakeholder map, and Sam's opportunity analysis. Give me a summary of what each person covered and flag anything that overlaps or contradicts across sections.

READ discovery/findings/operations-map-alex.md

READ discovery/findings/pain-points-jordan.md

READ discovery/findings/stakeholder-map-mia.md

READ discovery/findings/opportunity-analysis-sam.md

CLAUDE

Here is a summary of all four sections:

Alex (Operations Map, 523 words): Mapped all six service lines with pricing, workflow, and tools. Highlighted Stopsuite for routing, Stripe for billing, customer portal at accounts.o-towncompost.com. Strong on the operational detail. Open questions about CRM usage and the handoff between sales and operations.

Jordan (Pain Points, 591 words): Identified five bottlenecks: team size vs. geography, manual commercial sales pipeline, high-touch event coordination, repetitive customer education, and manual diversion reporting. Quoted Charlie directly on losing track of leads. Strong section with clear evidence.

Mia (Stakeholder Map, 487 words): Primary and secondary stakeholder tables with needs. Three confirmed tensions plus open questions. Employee stakeholder angle with driver compensation data.

Sam (Opportunity Analysis, 548 words): Three opportunities ranked: FAQ automation (high impact, high feasibility), commercial proposal drafting (high impact, medium feasibility), diversion report generation (medium impact, high feasibility). Deprioritized route optimization since they already use Stopsuite. Each opportunity has risks identified.

Overlaps and connections:

- Jordan's "repetitive customer education" bottleneck connects directly to Sam's FAQ automation opportunity. Good alignment.
- Jordan's "manual commercial pipeline" bottleneck connects to Sam's proposal automation opportunity. Also aligned.
- Alex mentions Stopsuite for routing. Sam correctly deprioritized route optimization because of this. They clearly read each other's work.

One small contradiction: Alex says office pricing "starts at \$85/month for 10 or fewer employees." Jordan says Erin "fields many of the same questions by phone and email" without

distinguishing residential from commercial inquiries. Worth clarifying in the compiled report whether the FAQ burden is primarily residential or across all lines.

MIA (PROMPT 12)

Good catch on the FAQ distinction. Jordan's section focuses on residential FAQ. Let me add a note to make that clearer in the compiled version. Now, compile all four sections into a single report. The structure should be: introduction (framing who O-Town Compost is and how we gathered info), then the four sections in order (operations, pain points, stakeholder map, opportunity analysis), each with the author's name, then a conclusion with the top 3 priorities. Write it as a polished document, not four sections pasted together. Add transitions between sections so it reads as one report.

CLAUDE

Before I write, a few decisions:

- **Introduction:** I will frame it around the class visit and the four research areas. Should I mention the team name (Ripple Consulting) and date?
- **Conclusion priorities:** Sam already ranked three opportunities. Should the conclusion use his ranking or should it synthesize across all four sections?
- **Word count:** The four individual sections total about 2,050 words. With an introduction, transitions, and conclusion, the compiled report will be roughly 2,400-2,600 words (about 5 pages). Does that sound right?

MIA (PROMPT 13)

Yes, include the team name and date. For the conclusion, use Sam's ranking but support it with evidence from the other sections. Like, the FAQ automation is the top priority not just because Sam says so but because Jordan identified it as the biggest time sink and my stakeholder map shows how it affects Erin's ability to serve commercial clients. The word count range sounds right. Write it.

WRITE deliverables/lab3-report-team6.md (2,487 words)

CLAUDE

Created the compiled report at deliverables/lab3-report-team6.md. Structure:

- Introduction (who O-Town Compost is, how we gathered information, what this report covers)
- Section 1: Operations Map (by Alex Torres) — all six service lines, tools, workflows
- Section 2: Pain Points and Bottlenecks (by Jordan Reeves) — five bottlenecks with evidence
- Section 3: Stakeholder Map (by Mia Chen) — tables, tensions, open questions
- Section 4: Opportunity Analysis (by Sam Okafor) — three ranked opportunities with risks

- Conclusion: Top 3 Priorities — cross-referenced across all four sections

2,487 words. Transitions connect each section to the next. The conclusion ties Sam's priorities back to Jordan's bottlenecks and your stakeholder tensions. Want me to read it back?

MIA (PROMPT 14)

Read me the introduction and the conclusion only. I trust the middle sections since those are our original work. I want to make sure the framing is right.

READ deliverables/lab3-report-team6.md (lines 1-18, 95-120)

CLAUDE

[Read back the introduction and conclusion sections]

The introduction frames O-Town Compost as a company that "started with a pitchfork and a Camry" and scales to 14 million pounds composted, then explains the four research areas. The conclusion ranks FAQ automation first, supported by Jordan's bottleneck analysis and the stakeholder tension between residential support and commercial sales. Commercial proposal drafting second, diversion report generation third.

MIA (PROMPT 15)

The introduction is good but the phrase "started with a pitchfork and a Camry" is a direct quote from Charlie. Put it in quotation marks and attribute it to him. Also in the conclusion, change "we recommend" to "we identified" because these are not formal recommendations yet, they are priorities for the proposal phase.

EDIT deliverables/lab3-report-team6.md (2 changes)

CLAUDE

Done. Added quotation marks and attribution: Charlie described starting the company "with a pitchfork and a Camry." Changed "we recommend" to "we identified" in the conclusion (3 instances).

MIA (PROMPT 16)

Good. Commit the compiled report and push it. Use the message "Add compiled team report - Mia (compiler)."

RUN git add deliverables/lab3-report-team6.md

RUN git commit -m "Add compiled team report - Mia (compiler)"

```
RUN git push origin main
```

CLAUDE

Committed and pushed. The compiled report is now in the repo at deliverables/lab3-report-team6.md.

PHASE 3: EXPORTING THE CONVERSATION LOG

MIA (PROMPT 17)

Now I need to export this conversation as my session log. Save it as discovery/findings/conversation-log-mia.md. Include all my prompts and your responses, the files you read and wrote, and the git commands you ran. I want someone reading it to be able to follow exactly what I did and why.

```
WRITE discovery/findings/conversation-log-mia.md (full conversation export)
```

CLAUDE

Created the conversation log at discovery/findings/conversation-log-mia.md. It includes all 17 exchanges so far: your prompts, my responses, every file read/write/edit action, and every git command. The log covers both sessions: your individual stakeholder map work on Friday and the report compilation on Sunday.

MIA (PROMPT 18)

Commit and push the conversation log. Then I will download it from GitHub for the Canvas submission.

```
RUN git add discovery/findings/conversation-log-mia.md
```

```
RUN git commit -m "Add conversation log - Mia"
```

```
RUN git push origin main
```

CLAUDE

Pushed. Your conversation log is in the repo. To download it for Canvas: go to github.com, navigate to discovery/findings/conversation-log-mia.md, click the download button (or the raw button and save), and upload it to the Canvas assignment.

What this session demonstrates: Mia's log covers the full Lab 3 workflow across two sittings. In Phase 1 (9 exchanges), she built her individual section with genuine iteration: she

pushed back on unsupported claims (prompt 4), added her own research angles (prompt 5), and made targeted edits (prompt 8). In Phase 2 (7 exchanges), she pulled her teammates' work, reviewed it for overlaps and contradictions, and compiled a polished team report with cross-referenced conclusions. In Phase 3 (2 exchanges), she exported and pushed the conversation log itself. The session shows 18 total exchanges with critical thinking, not a single prompt and copy-paste.