



Work Package 4 Module 4

Low-risk formative AI-supported feedback and assessment

Instructor notes

Module basis

Duration: 2 hours

Mode: face-to-face primarily, with TEL support

Core aim: Participants are expected to develop the ability to select and use appropriate AI tools and prompts for the provision of pedagogically sound feedback and assessment on L2 writing

Assessment is formative and practice-based, and integrated throughout the workshop

Group size: ideally 15–25 participants

Time	Content	
0-5 min	Ice breaker	Reflection (Mentimeter)
5-15 min	Presentation module 4	
15-45 min	Activity 1: Testing and evaluating feedback	Comparison notes
45-75 min	Activity 2: Finding a useful prompt	Best prompt card
75-100 min	Activity 3: Classroom scenarios	Guidelines
100-115 min	Activity 4: Roadmap for own use	Reflection for future implementation
115-120 min	Assessment Questionnaire: AI feedback	Key takeaways

Before the session: instructor preparation

1. Prepare Mentimeter Poll or equivalent for Activity 0: Icebreaker – warm-up, Use a scale (1–10): 1 = Strongly disagree, 10 = Strongly agree, and insert the following statement: “Within five years, AI will provide better feedback on foreign-language writing than most language teachers.”
2. Prepare a Mentimeter QR code to be presented at the beginning of Activity 0: Icebreaker.
3. Check that ChatGPT and Google Gemini are accessible.
4. Print or share student handouts. Keep the instructor key separate.
 - Instructions for Activity 1, 2, 3, and 4



Work Package 4 Module 4

Low-risk formative AI-supported feedback and assessment

- Print the CEFR-scale in your preferred language:
<https://www.coe.int/en/web/common-european-framework-reference-languages/table-2-cefr-3.3-common-reference-levels-self-assessment-grid>
 - Handout 1: Print the table for comparison notes for Activity 1: “Reach a group judgement”
 - Handout 2: Examples for learner texts for Activity 1 and 2
 - Handout 3: List of examples for prompts for Activity 2
 - Handout 4: Scenarios for Activity 3
5. Prepare link to questionnaire for final assessment and evaluation
 6. Decide whether participants may use personal accounts (alternatives to ChatGPT). Do not require anyone to enter personal data into AI tools.

Activity 0: Ice breaker – warm-up (5 minutes)

Purpose and timing

5 minutes. This activity enables participants to reflect critically on future challenges relating to AI and feedback in foreign language writing.

Procedure

1. Start the presentation in Mentimeter and ask participants to respond individually. Display the results.
2. Put participants into pairs or small groups and let them discuss and explain their position.
3. Make a transition to the workshop: “The aim of this workshop is not to decide whether AI or teachers provide ‘better’ feedback. We will explore where AI-supported feedback can add value, where its limitations and risks lie, and what teacher expertise is needed to use it effectively and responsibly.”

Activity 1:

Purpose and timing

30 minutes. This activity enables participants to evaluate AI-generated feedback on student writing samples against pedagogical criteria (accuracy, appropriateness for proficiency level, alignment with learning objectives).

Procedure

1. Put participants into pairs or small groups.
2. Let the groups choose one of the suggested learner texts.
3. Go through the different steps below:



Work Package 4 Module 4

Low-risk formative AI-supported feedback and assessment

- ❖ Read the learner text and note the learner's stated CEFR level (A2–C1) and consider what kind of feedback would be appropriate at this level (e.g. accuracy, tone, register).
- ❖ Generate feedback with two AI tools, ChatGPT and Google Gemini.
 - i. ChatGPT: <https://chatgpt.com/>
 - ii. Google Gemini: <https://gemini.google.com>
- ❖ All pairs and groups use the following prompt for generating feedback: *Provide formative feedback on this text*
- ❖ Compare the AI-generated feedback: Read both responses carefully. Identify important similarities and differences. Do not assume that the feedback is correct simply because it was generated by AI.
- ❖ Evaluate the feedback by discussing the following questions:
 - Appropriateness: Language used in the provided feedback (ok for language level?)
 - Usefulness: Does the feedback help the learner understand what they are doing well and what they could improve?
 - Accuracy: Are the corrections, explanations, and suggestions linguistically correct? Does the AI identify actual problems, or does it unnecessarily change acceptable language?
 - Tone: Is the feedback clear, supportive, constructive, and appropriate for the learner?
 - CEFR alignment: Is the feedback appropriate for the learner's proficiency level? Does it focus on language features and communicative abilities that are reasonable to expect at this CEFR level?
 - Learner agency: Does the feedback encourage the learner to think, revise, and make decisions independently, or does the AI effectively do the work for the learner?

4. Let the groups fill in the comparison notes in the student handout 1 “Reach a group judgement”

Important: Participants should not modify the prompt at this stage. The purpose is to compare what the two tools produce under the same conditions.

Activity 2: Finding a pedagogically useful prompt

Purpose and timing

30 minutes. This activity enables participants to design and refine effective prompts that elicit targeted, constructive feedback on specific aspects of L2 writing.



Work Package 4 Module 4

Low-risk formative AI-supported feedback and assessment

Procedure

1. Let the participants work in the same pairs or small groups as in Activity 1.
2. Let them select a feedback focus and CEFR level for the same learner text from Activity 1.
3. Provide the groups the list with example prompts for inspiration.
4. Let the participants modify the Activity 1 prompt, and test it iteratively in either ChatGPT or Google Gemini.
5. Let the participants evaluate the resulting feedback based on the criteria from activity 1, and refine the prompt.
6. Ask groups to identify 3–5 characteristics of an effective and reusable prompt based on their testing.
7. Let the participants create their “Best prompt” card and share with the other groups.

Activity 3: From AI dilemmas to responsible classroom guidelines

Purpose and timing

25 minutes. This activity supports the transition from analysing an ethical dilemma to producing concrete, actionable classroom guidelines. It enables participants to reflect critically on transparent classroom policies for AI use for feedback on written assignment.

Procedure

1. Put the participants in groups of three or four and let them take different roles in their group work:
 - Moderator – Presenter of the scenario, leads the discussion
 - Guideline collector – Records the main ideas and formulates the final guidelines
 - Ethics monitor – Raises questions about fairness, privacy, transparency, authorship, learner autonomy, accountability, and assessment.
 - Policy maker – Identifies problems and suggests practical solutions.
2. Provide to each group one of the four classroom scenarios from handout 4. If possible, distribute the scenarios so that all four are discussed across the workshop.

Scenario 1: When does feedback become rewriting? – authorship and learner ownership

Scenario 2: The AI says I should change it – accuracy, dependence, and learner agency

Scenario 3: Free AI feedback for everyone? – privacy, access, and fairness

Scenario 4: Can I grade what AI has helped improve? – formative feedback and assessment validity

3. Let the groups analyse their scenario and discuss it using four perspectives:
 - How could AI-generated feedback support language learning?



Work Package 4 Module 4

Low-risk formative AI-supported feedback and assessment

- What could go wrong or negatively affect learning?
- What issues related to fairness, transparency, privacy, authorship, responsibility, or assessment arise?
- What should teachers and learners do to make AI-supported feedback responsible and pedagogically meaningful?

Ask each group to select one guideline from another group that they would add to their own classroom policy.

Activity 4: Planning for an AI-supported formative assessment roadmap

Purpose and timing

15 minutes. This activity enables participants to design a road map for a low-risk, formative assessment workflow that integrates AI feedback into their existing language teaching or learning practice, e.g., peer review, AI review or teacher review.

Procedure

1. Let the participants work in pairs or groups and present the roadmap.
2. Go through the six steps and make clear that the participants should discuss how this roadmap could be applied in their own learning or teaching practise.

Important: They don't have to fill in the roadmap during the workshop, but they can use it as a basis for discussion on how it roadmap could be modified for own purposes.