

## LAWYERLY

# Prompt 4: Impact Audit

Stress-testing whether your training changes behaviour or just builds knowledge that fades by the following week

---

This is the final prompt and the one most training fails on. It tests whether your training produces changed behaviour or just knowledge transfer that decays within days. A learner who can pass an assessment on Friday but reverts to their old approach on Monday has been trained in recall, not capability, and the risk your organisation was trying to mitigate is still there.

If you've already run Prompts 1 through 3, use the same materials and learner context. If you're starting here, fill in the context sections below.

## Before you run this prompt

Attach your training materials in Claude (course outlines, slide decks, facilitator guides, learning objectives, assessment materials, SCORM exports, or whatever you have to hand). Then copy the prompt below and fill in the sections marked in **[square brackets]** with your specific details. The more context you provide, the more useful the output will be.

### PROMPT 4

---

*Copy everything below this line into Claude*

## Context for Claude

Using the same materials and learner context from the previous prompts, I need you to assess what this training will produce in terms of changed behaviour, not just knowledge transfer.

If you haven't run the previous prompts, provide the learner context here:

**Role and seniority level:** *[e.g. mid-level compliance officers]*

**Jurisdiction(s):** *[e.g. UK, US, EU, multi-jurisdictional]*

**The specific regulation or obligation:** *[name it]*

**What compliance looks like in practice:** *[what they're expected to do differently after this training]*

## What I need you to do:

- 1.** For each learning objective stated in the materials, assess whether it describes a knowledge outcome (the learner can recall or explain something) or a behavioural outcome (the learner can do something differently in their work). If the majority of objectives are knowledge-based, the training is building recall, not capability, and I need to know the ratio.
- 2.** For each knowledge-based objective, suggest what a behavioural equivalent would look like. "Understand the requirements of the GDPR" is knowledge. "Identify when a client request creates a data processing obligation and initiate the correct workflow before proceeding" is behaviour. Reframe the knowledge objectives into behavioural ones so I can see the gap between what we're currently building and what we should be building.
- 3.** Assess what a learner would be able to do differently one week after completing this training. Not what they'd remember, but what they'd do. If the honest answer is "recall the key points" or "pass an assessment," the training is building short-term memory, not long-term behavioural change. Tell me what the realistic one-week outcome is based on the current design.
- 4.** Identify where the training builds knowledge without building the judgement to apply it. Regulatory compliance often requires the learner to exercise discretion (when to escalate, how to assess risk, what constitutes a reportable event versus a routine query). If the training teaches the rules but not the judgement framework for applying them in ambiguous situations, that's a critical gap. Flag where we're teaching rules without teaching judgement and suggest where scenario-based decision exercises could be introduced.
- 5.** Assess the assessment design. Is it testing recall (multiple choice on policy content) or application (scenario-based questions where the learner must make a decision with incomplete information)? If the assessment only tests recall, it's measuring the wrong thing and I need to know what a better assessment would look like for this specific content.
- 6.** Flag where the training ends without a transfer mechanism. Transfer is what bridges the gap between the training environment and the working environment. This could be a post-training action plan, a follow-up scenario sent two weeks later, a manager briefing guide, or a structured peer discussion. If the training ends and the learner goes back to their desk with nothing to anchor the learning to their daily work, the decay curve starts immediately. Tell me where the transfer gaps are and what mechanisms would close them.
- 7.** Identify any elements of the training that are designed for compliance evidence (proving the training happened) rather than learning outcomes (changing what people do). Things like mandatory completion tracking, knowledge checks that can be retaken until passed, and

certificate-driven structures that prioritise throughput over impact. I'm not asking you to remove these (they may be regulatory requirements), but I need to know where the compliance architecture is working against the learning architecture so I can design around it.

**8.** Finally, give me a single honest assessment: based on everything you've reviewed across all four prompts, what is the one structural change that would have the greatest impact on whether this training changes behaviour? Not the longest list of fixes. The one thing that, if we changed it, would shift the most.

---

*Built for legal learning at Lawyerly. Stress-tested across healthcare, aviation, and financial services regulatory training. Works for any regulated industry. If you want to talk about what these surfaced for you, I'm at [tiffany@lawyerly.es](mailto:tiffany@lawyerly.es).*

[lawyerly.es](https://lawyerly.es)