



AI-NYELV TRAINING COURSE

AI for creating, adapting, and curating FL materials

1. Module Title

Module Title	Module 2: AI for creating, adapting, and curating FL materials
Module Duration	2 hours
CEFR level	B1–B2

2. Module Overview

Teaching skill being developed	Creating FL teaching materials using AI tools, adapting resources to different learner levels and contexts, and critically curating AI-generated content for pedagogical appropriateness, linguistic accuracy, and level suitability. Two AI-related skills are developed in depth: prompting and iteration (designing and progressively refining prompts to improve output quality) and source grounding (working with tools that anchor their output in a specific source text, and actively verifying where AI-generated content comes from, rather than receiving it passively). Participants develop principled prompt design skills and editorial judgement to use AI as a collaborative production partner, while retaining full pedagogical and authorial control.
Why this skill matters	Material development is one of the most time-consuming aspects of FL teaching. AI tools offer significant potential to accelerate the production of exercises, reading texts, speaking prompts, vocabulary lists, grammar explanations, listening materials, and assessment items. However, AI-generated materials can contain linguistic inaccuracies, register inconsistencies, cultural bias, inappropriate level calibration, fabricated or unverifiable information — a particular risk when a tool is not grounded in a specific source. Educators therefore need principled strategies for integrating AI into their material creation workflow, using it to



AI-NYELV TRAINING COURSE

AI for creating, adapting, and curating FL materials

	increase efficiency without compromising quality, authenticity, factual accuracy, or learner welfare.
How TEL supports learning	TEL supports participants by enabling real-time experimentation with AI generation tools, side-by-side comparison of single-attempt versus iteratively refined materials, and of ungrounded versus source-grounded outputs. Technology enhances learning through shared documents, AI-supported material generation across formats, and personalization — as participants can generate and evaluate materials for different CEFR levels, learner profiles, and skill areas.
Example of a TEL tool or approach relevant to this module.	Participants work with a small set of illustrative tools, each highlighting a different AI skill: <i>Google Gemini</i>, used in standard chat mode without an uploaded source, to illustrate output generated from general training data; and <i>NotebookLM</i>, used with a news article uploaded as a source, to illustrate retrieval-augmented, citation-backed generation — including its audio-overview feature, used to produce a listening-comprehension material from the same source. For instance, participants generate a vocabulary and comprehension activity from the same news article with both <i>Gemini</i> and <i>NotebookLM</i>, ask each tool to indicate where its content came from, and compare the two outputs for factual accuracy and source fidelity.
Alignment with DigCompEdu framework	The module primarily addresses <i>Area 2: Digital Resources</i>, as participants select, create, adapt, evaluate, and manage AI-generated FL teaching materials. It also connects to <i>Area 3: Teaching and Learning</i>, through the design of pedagogically grounded, multi-skill AI-assisted activities, and to <i>Area 4: Assessment</i>, through the critical evaluation of AI-generated feedback and assessment items.
Estimated workload	2 hours (face-to-face primarily, with hybrid extensions).



AI-NYELV TRAINING COURSE

AI for creating, adapting, and curating FL materials

3. Target Learners

Learner profile	Higher Education Instructors/Learners
Prior knowledge / prerequisites	Participants are expected to have basic digital skills, including browser use, searching online, opening shared documents, and interacting with online tools. No advanced technical knowledge of AI is required. Some prior experience with AI tools such as <i>ChatGPT</i> or <i>Google Gemini</i> is useful but not necessary. Familiarity with CEFR levels and basic FL pedagogy (task types, learner needs, level descriptors) is recommended. Completion of <i>Module 1 (Responsible, transparent, and policy-aware AI use in FL teaching)</i> is expected.
Learning context	Face-to-face with TEL support.
Accessibility & inclusion considerations	/
Group size	Ideally 10–20 participants. This allows pair work, small-group collaboration, and whole-class discussion.

4. Learning Outcomes - DigCompEdu

DigCompEdu Area	The module primarily addresses <i>Area 2: Digital Resources</i> , as participants select, create, adapt, evaluate, and manage AI-generated FL teaching materials. It also connects to <i>Area 3: Teaching and Learning</i> , through the design of pedagogically grounded, multi-skill AI-assisted activities, and to <i>Area 4: Assessment</i> , through the critical evaluation of AI-generated feedback and assessment items.
Learning Outcome 1	On successful completion, learners will be able to identify and evaluate AI tools suitable for FL material creation, adaptation, and curation, distinguishing tools that generate content from general training data from tools that ground their output in user-provided sources.



AI-NYELV TRAINING COURSE

AI for creating, adapting, and curating FL materials

Learning Outcome 2	On successful completion, learners will be able to adapt AI-generated materials through targeted editing, iterative prompt refinement, and active verification of an AI tool's stated information sources.
Learning Outcome 3	On successful completion, learners will be able to critically evaluate AI-generated FL materials for linguistic accuracy, level appropriateness, cultural sensitivity, pedagogical soundness, and factual grounding in verifiable sources.

5. Assessment Strategy

Assessment type	☐ Formative ☐ Summative ☐ Both
Assessment methods	Assessment is based on practical, process-oriented tasks completed during and after the session. During the face-to-face lesson, participants complete a 'prompt iteration log' (comparing a first-attempt and a refined prompt), a 'material quality audit card' (comparing a grounded and an ungrounded AI output for the same source), and a short multi-skill activity beyond writing (e.g., a listening or speaking task generated from the same source).
Digital tools used	Generative AI tools <i>Gemini</i> and <i>NotebookLM</i> .
Feedback approach	☐ Automated feedback ☐ Peer feedback ☐ Instructor feedback ☐ Self-assessment
Assessment rubric / criteria	Participants are assessed according to the following criteria: ● Prompting and iteration: produces prompts that are specific and meaningfully improved across iterations. ● Source awareness: appropriately questions and verifies an AI tool's claimed information sources, rather than passively accepting its output, and correctly distinguishes grounded from ungrounded responses. ● Adaptation quality: editorial decisions are well-reasoned and clearly annotated.



AI-NYELV TRAINING COURSE

AI for creating, adapting, and curating FL materials

Alignment with learning outcomes	The tool-comparison activity (<i>Gemini</i> vs. <i>NotebookLM</i>) assesses Learning Outcome 1. The 'prompt iteration log' and the edited materials assess Learning Outcome 2. The 'material quality audit card' and the source-verification step assess Learning Outcome 3.
----------------------------------	---

6.1 Motivation / Introduction Activities

Purpose	Activating participants' prior experience with AI-generated materials, surfacing common assumptions about quality and reliability, and motivating the need for critical curation and editorial skills.
Estimated duration	10 minutes.
Activities	'Spot the AI' Participants receive three FL teaching materials (e.g., reading texts or gap-fill exercises) at the same stated CEFR level. The three materials include: – a fully AI-generated text with no editing; – an AI-generated text carefully edited by a teacher; – a human-authored text. Participants work in pairs and decide: – Which material would you use as-is in your class? – Which material needs editing before use? – Which material is most appropriate for the stated CEFR level? – Which material, if any, could not be AI-generated? Results are briefly discussed in plenary.
TEL tools	/
Link to prior knowledge	This activity connects to participants' existing experience using tools such as <i>ChatGPT</i> or <i>Google Gemini</i> , as well as their intuitions about material quality, level appropriateness, and what makes a good FL exercise.

6.2 Information Presentation

Key content	1: What can AI do for FL material creation, across skills? (text generation for reading, listening scripts and audio overviews, speaking prompts and
-------------	--



AI-NYELV TRAINING COURSE

AI for creating, adapting, and curating FL materials

	roleplay scenarios, vocabulary lists, grammar explanations, assessment items, feedback scripts). 2: What can go wrong? (linguistic inaccuracies, register inconsistencies, cultural bias, inappropriate level calibration, fabricated or unverifiable information, pedagogically unsound task design). 3: Prompting and iteration (specificity, CEFR framing, learner profile, task type, comparing a first attempt with a structured, iteratively refined prompt). 4: Source grounding (retrieval-augmented vs. non-grounded generation; generating exercises and vocabulary from a real article or news item, with an example of a structured prompt; actively asking an AI tool where its information came from, rather than passively accepting its output).
Formats	☐ Video ☐ Interactive text ☐ Audio ☐ Infographics ☐ Slides ☐ Podcast ☐ Live demonstration
Accessibility supports	/
Estimated duration	30 minutes.
Source / attribution	Indicate the source of content used and any copyright or licensing considerations.

6.3 Application Activities

Application tasks	Task 1: 'First attempt vs. iterated prompt' (25 minutes) — prompting and iteration Groups use an AI tool (e.g., <i>Gemini</i>) to generate an FL exercise from a single, minimal prompt (for example, 'write a B1 grammar exercise about the present perfect'). They then redesign the prompt iteratively — specifying CEFR level, topic, register, exercise format, number of items, and an answer key — and regenerate the material. Groups compare the two outputs and log what changed and why in a 'prompt iteration log'. Task 2: 'Grounded or not? working from a source' (25 minutes) — source grounding
-------------------	---



AI-NYELV TRAINING COURSE

AI for creating, adapting, and curating FL materials

	Each group receives a short authentic news article. Using <i>Gemini</i> (without uploading the article, illustrating output generated from general training data) and <i>NotebookLM</i> (with the article uploaded as a source, illustrating retrieval-augmented, citation-backed generation), groups generate, from the same article: – a vocabulary list and a set of reading-comprehension questions; and – one material for a different skill — for example, a short listening passage built from <i>NotebookLM</i>'s audio-overview feature, or a set of speaking/discussion prompts based on the article's content. A model structured prompt is provided, for example: 'Using only the attached article, create 8 reading-comprehension questions for B1 learners and a 10-item vocabulary list with definitions in simple English. Do not add information that is not present in the article.' Before finalising either output, each group must explicitly ask the AI tool where the generated content came from (for example: 'Which sentences in the article support this question?'), compare the two answers, and flag any content that the ungrounded tool appears to have invented rather than drawn from the article.
Estimated duration	50 minutes.
Learner output	Each group produces: – a 'prompt iteration log' with at least two prompt versions and a rationale for the changes; – a completed 'material quality audit card' comparing the grounded and ungrounded outputs; – one reading/vocabulary material and one material for a different skill (listening or speaking), both annotated with the AI tool's stated sources.
Feedback method	Peer feedback: groups exchange 'prompt iteration logs' and 'audit cards' and comment on the quality of the iterations and the source-verification step.



AI-NYELV TRAINING COURSE

AI for creating, adapting, and curating FL materials

	Instructor feedback: facilitator highlights effective prompting strategies and exemplary cases of catching unverifiable AI content. Whole-class feedback: collect and discuss ‘the AI said this came from...’ moments, including cases where a tool could not actually point to a source.
Link to learning outcomes	Task 1 addresses Learning Outcome 2 (iterative prompt refinement). Task 2 addresses Learning Outcome 1 (distinguishing grounded from ungrounded tools), Learning Outcome 2 (source verification), and Learning Outcome 3 (evaluating factual grounding).

6.4 Collaboration Activities

Collaboration type	The Application Activities outlined above are collaborative (group work and discussion, collaborative problem-solving, peer review, debate, etc.)
Estimated duration	50 minutes (see above).
Learner roles	/
TEL tools	<i>Google Gemini</i> and <i>NotebookLM</i> (see above).
Inclusion notes	/

6.5 Reflection Activities

Reflection focus	Participants reflect on how AI changes material creation workflow, what new editorial and verification responsibilities source-grounded and non-grounded tools introduce, and how they would establish clear principles for prompting, iteration, and source-checking in their own practice.
Estimated duration	15 minutes.
Reflection format	☐ Journal ☐ Blog ☐ Questionnaire ☐ Discussion ☐ Video diary ☐ Peer sharing ☐ Portfolio entry
Guiding prompts	What changed between your first prompt and your refined prompt? What does this tell you about the role of iteration in AI-assisted material design?



AI-NYELV TRAINING COURSE

AI for creating, adapting, and curating FL materials

	• When you compared the grounded and ungrounded outputs today, what difference did you notice in reliability? What does this tell you about when to use a source-grounded tool versus a general-purpose one? • What is one principle you would include in your personal AI-use policy for material development — regarding prompting, source verification, or skill coverage?
--	--

6.6 Close / Review

Review activities	Feedback form.
Estimated duration	15 minutes.
Knowledge check	Participants individually complete a short feedback form, that doubles as a review of the module's content. The form combines: five Likert-scale items (1–5) revisiting the session's key points — clarity of content, the distinction between source-grounded and non-grounded AI tools, the usefulness of the prompting-and-iteration tasks, session pacing, etc.; a brief before/after confidence self-rating; and two open questions (most useful part of the module; what to change).
Next steps	Module 3: Pedagogically sound AI integration for language teaching and interaction.
Learner satisfaction / module evaluation	Captured directly through the feedback form described above: the Likert ratings and open questions provide both quantitative and qualitative input.