

AI-NYELV WP4 – Module 2

Facilitator Talking Track

Slide 1 — Title slide

Welcome participants as they arrive. Once the group is settled, introduce yourself and the session.

Suggested opening:

"Welcome to Module 2 of the AI-NYELV training programme. Today's question is very practical: how do you actually use AI to create, adapt, and curate foreign language teaching materials — and how do you do it without losing control of quality?"

If participants do not know each other, allow 2–3 minutes for brief introductions. Ask each person to say their name, the language(s) they teach or work with, and one word for how they feel about AI in teaching right now. This surfaces prior attitudes without requiring a long discussion.

"We'll spend the first 20 minutes or so on the conceptual groundwork — what AI can do, what can go wrong, and the two skills we'll be developing. Then we'll move into the exercises, where you'll do the actual generating, auditing, and comparing."

Slide 2 — Section header: Key concepts

This is a section break — no content to present. Use it as a transition:

"Before the exercises, let's look at three things: what AI can actually do for FL material creation, where it tends to go wrong, and the two specific skills we'll be practising today."

Slide 3 — What AI can do for FL material creation

Walk through the three categories, but do not read every bullet aloud. Pick one item per category and give a concrete example from your own or a colleague's context.

Example anchor:

"I once asked a tool to generate a B2 reading text on climate policy. The result was fluent, but the vocabulary was clearly pitched at C1. This is exactly the kind of calibration issue we'll be auditing today."

Key message — state it explicitly before moving on:

AI can be a production partner across the full range of FL skill areas — not just grammar exercises. But output quality depends entirely on how you ask.

Invite a quick show of hands: "Who has used an AI tool to help prepare a lesson material before?" This anchors the session in participants' existing experience without requiring a long discussion.

Slide 4 — What can go wrong — and why it matters

Spend a moment on both columns. The left column (quality risks) will be familiar to most participants. The right column (accuracy risks) often surprises them.

The key point to land:

A tool may generate content it cannot subsequently point to a source for. This is not just an inconvenience — it means you cannot trust the material for classroom use without independent verification.

Ask the group:

"Has anyone here ever caught an AI tool making something up? What happened?"

Take 1–2 responses. Keep this brief — 2 minutes at most. This sets up the rationale for Exercise 3.

Slide 5 — Two AI skills for this module

This is the conceptual heart of the input section. Take your time here — approximately 5 minutes.

Prompting & iteration (left column)

Make the analogy explicit: a prompt is like a brief to a colleague. A brief that says "write me something about grammar" will produce something generic. A brief that specifies level, topic, audience, format, and constraints will produce something usable. Iteration is what happens when you review the first result and refine the brief.

Ask: "Has anyone already noticed a difference in quality between a vague and a detailed prompt?"

Source grounding (right column)

Distinguish the two conditions clearly — participants will encounter both in Exercise 3:

- *Gemini* with no source uploaded generates from its general training data. It may produce accurate content — or it may not. Crucially, it cannot reliably tell you where the content came from.
- *Gemini Notebook* with a source document uploaded will generate content anchored to that document and can point to the specific sentence that supports each claim.

Phrase to give participants:

"Always ask: where does this come from? Don't accept AI output passively."

Slide 6 — Tools used in this module

Introduce both tools. If participants are not yet familiar with *Gemini Notebook*, do a 2-minute live demonstration here: open notebook.google.com, upload a short text, generate a note, and show how it cites the source.

Common questions and suggested responses:

"Is <i>Gemini Notebook</i> free?"	Yes, the standard version is free with a Google account at notebook.google.com .
"What's the difference between <i>Gemini</i> and <i>Gemini Notebook</i> ?"	<i>Gemini</i> is a general-purpose chat tool — it generates from its training data. <i>Gemini Notebook</i> is a separate product where you upload documents and everything it generates is anchored to those documents.
"Can I use other tools instead?"	Yes, but the exercises are designed around the <i>Gemini</i> / <i>Gemini Notebook</i> comparison, which is the clearest way to demonstrate the grounded vs. non-grounded distinction.

Slide 7 — Section header: Exercises

Distribute the exercise worksheets now if you have not already done so. Remind participants that the three exercises are on separate worksheets. Also distribute the source article for Exercise 3 — participants can set it aside until needed.

Slide 8 — Exercise 1: Spot the AI (Introduction Activity)

Distribute the three materials (A, B, C). Do not tell participants anything about them yet.

Steps 1–2 (6 min)	Pairs work: tick the checklist and note at least one specific feature per material.
Step 3 (2 min)	Pairs write up their reasoning briefly.
Step 4 / plenary (4 min)	Reveal which material is which and discuss.

When revealing, do so one at a time — pause for reactions between each. The most productive discussion comes from participants who were wrong:

"What feature led you astray? What did you expect AI output to look like?"

Reflection prompt (read aloud if the discussion is thin):

"What does this exercise tell you about the limits of trusting AI-generated materials without review?"

Slide 9 — Exercise 2: First Attempt vs. Iterated Prompt (Application)

Step 1 (5 min)	Enter Prompt A exactly as written. Note the output briefly.
Step 2 (8 min)	Add specifications one at a time; note how the output changes after each addition.
Step 3 (7 min)	Complete the Prompt Iteration Log; compare both outputs across 5 criteria.
Step 4 / plenary (5 min)	Each group shares Prompt B and the single addition that made the biggest difference.

Reflection prompt:

"What does this exercise tell you about the relevance of prompting and iterative refinement?"

Slide 10 — Exercise 3: Grounded or Not? Working from a Source (Application)

Confirm that participants have the source article. They will use the same article for both steps, which is what makes the comparison valid.

Step 1 (5 min)	Generate with <i>Gemini</i> , no source uploaded. Ask the source-verification question.
Step 2 (8 min)	Upload to <i>Gemini Notebook</i> ; generate again. Ask the same follow-up question.
Step 3 (7 min)	Complete the Material Quality Audit Card; compare both outputs on 5 criteria.
Step 4 / plenary (5 min)	Groups share the most striking "the tool said this came from..." moment.

The source-verification step is pedagogically central — do not let groups skip it. When a tool cannot point to a specific source sentence, this is a concrete demonstration of the reliability gap between grounded and non-grounded generation.

Reflection prompt:

"What does this exercise tell you about the relevance of source grounding?"

Slide 11 — Section header: Reflection & close

Transition:

"Before we close, let's take 10–12 minutes to step back from the exercises and think about what this means for our practice."

Slide 12 — Reflection

Give participants 3–4 minutes to write a short individual response to one of the four prompts before opening to pairs or plenary. Writing first helps participants who find spontaneous discussion difficult.

If time is limited, prioritise prompts 2 and 3 — the grounding comparison and the iteration finding — as these connect most directly to the exercises just completed.

Suggested sequence for plenary:

- Ask for one response to prompt 2 (grounded vs. non-grounded) and one to prompt 3 (iteration).
- Then open prompt 4 (transparency/attribution) if time allows — this is often the one that generates the richest discussion about professional and institutional practice.

Slide 13 — Key takeaways

Read through the five takeaways with the group. Do not rush this — these are the points participants should leave with.

Invite participants to add one of their own: "Is there something from today's exercises that you would add to this list?" This closes the session on a generative rather than a summative note.

Point to the methodology handout: "These five principles are also in the handout you're taking away — along with the prompting framework, the source-grounding workflow, and the recommended resources."

Slide 14 — Questions

Open the floor.

Thank participants.