



COURSE DESCRIPTION

Formative Assessment and Feedback in the Age of AI

A quiz tells you who got it wrong, not why. Five days on the five strategies that close that gap, and on where AI genuinely helps.

DURATION 5 days · 25 hours	LANGUAGE English (B1+)	GROUP SIZE Max 20 participants
DAILY SCHEDULE 09:30–15:00 Monday to Friday, with a break for lunch	AUDIENCE All school levels No specific prerequisites — open to all teachers and school staff.	CERTIFICATE Attendance + Europass Mobility
COURSE CENTRES Antalya · İstanbul · İzmir · Mersin · Budapest · Bremen · Rome Dates and cities of the scheduled sessions are listed on the course page.		

01 Overview

A quiz tells you who got it wrong, not why. This week you take one task you already set your students and rebuild the assessment around it, using AI where it genuinely saves you time and not where it only produces more of the wrong thing.

- **Monday** — you write success criteria for your task and test them against sample answers you generate and correct yourself.
- **Tuesday** — you build a diagnostic question in which every wrong option points to a misconception your class really has.
- **Wednesday** — you rewrite machine-drafted comments until each one tells the student what to do next, and book the lesson time in which students act on them.
- **Thursday** — you put the same piece of work through a peer review round and an AI assistant, then design a peer protocol in which nobody is a passenger.
- **Friday** — you set up a self-assessment routine that still works when every student has an assistant, and rehearse the colleague group you will keep it going with.

You go home with success criteria and checked sample answers for your own task, a tested diagnostic question, a set of comments before and after rewriting, a peer review protocol, a self-assessment routine, and a one-page request for the meeting time to continue with colleagues. If you cannot bring a task of your own, a sample one is supplied on the first day, and paper versions of every activity are provided.

02 Course description

Most classrooms already collect more evidence about learning than anyone acts on. A quiz result, a show of hands, a set of exit tickets — the information arrives, and then the next lesson happens the way it was already planned. Adding AI to that does not fix it. It makes the collecting faster.

The framework the week runs on has a shape worth knowing. Three questions — where the learner is going, where the learner is right now, and how to get there — cross with the three people who can act on them: the teacher, the learner's peers, and the learner. That grid produces five strategies: clarifying what counts as success, engineering tasks that elicit evidence of learning, providing feedback that moves learners forward, activating students as learning resources for one another, and activating students as owners of their own learning. Dylan Wiliam and Marnie Thompson set it out in 2007, and the week takes one strategy per day.

AI enters at the points where it changes what this work costs in teacher time, and the week is equally clear about where it does not. It can produce a set of contrasting sample answers in minutes; building that set by hand used to take a teacher years. It can draft a quiz from a topic or a PDF in a few minutes — but the distractors it writes are merely plausible, and a plausible distractor only tells you a student guessed. It can write thirty comments in the time it takes to write one, which is precisely the risk: a large share of feedback leaves performance worse than no feedback at all, and Day 3 looks at why.

Everything runs on one task you already set your own students. By Friday that task has success criteria that separate strong work from work that is merely adequate. It has a question whose every wrong option maps onto a misconception your class genuinely has. And it has three routines around it: feedback with response time written into the lesson, a peer review protocol, and self-assessment that still works when every student has an assistant of their own.

The honest scale of it: the gain from this work is real, modest and slow, and Friday looks at the evidence. This is a week that starts that work, not one that finishes it — which is why the last session is spent building the group you will keep it going with.

03 Learning outcomes

- 01 Write learning intentions and success criteria for one of your own tasks, and test whether they actually separate strong work from middling work using three contrasting sample answers.
- 02 Build a diagnostic question in which every wrong option corresponds to a misconception your own students genuinely have, then read what the pattern of responses tells you.
- 03 Judge machine-drafted feedback against one test — does it tell the student what to do next, and does it leave the thinking to the student — and rewrite the comments that fail it.
- 04 Write response time into a lesson plan, so that feedback is something students act on rather than something they are handed.
- 05 Run a peer review round with a shared group goal and individual accountability, the two conditions cooperative-learning research attaches to group work.
- 06 Teach a self-assessment routine that still does its job when every student has an AI assistant in their pocket.
- 07 Draft a one-page plan for a monthly teacher learning community in your own school, with the first three agendas written.

04 Methodology

One task, all week

every exercise runs on a single assignment — your own, or a sample task if you prefer — rather than a case study. What you build early in the week you test later on.

Evidence before tools	each day names the pedagogical decision first and the software second, so the routine survives a tool changing its interface, its pricing or its owner.
Something written every day	six short documents you can use in your own classroom the following week — success criteria, a diagnostic question, a feedback rule, a peer protocol, a self-assessment routine, a community plan.
Named tools, no allegiance	you work with a quiz or polling platform such as Kahoot and with whichever general-purpose assistant your school permits. Neither is presented as the answer; the live quiz rounds also work with a paper set of answer cards.

05 Daily programme

Day 1

What you are actually asking for — learning intentions and success criteria

- **Warm-up and introductions, the grade you would give:** everyone marks the same short sample answer, written for the course, and posts a grade. The spread across the room is usually two or three grades wide. Introductions run off that disagreement instead of round the table, and the disagreement is the day's subject.
- The difference between a learning intention and the activity that carries it: why stating the task at the start of a lesson is not stating the goal, and what changes when the goal is written first and the activity designed backwards from it.
- **Success criteria a student can actually use:** working through Sadler's condition, that the student has to hold a notion of quality roughly like the teacher's, and testing each criterion for whether it separates good work from adequate work or merely describes the task.
- **Where AI changes the economics:** generating a set of contrasting sample answers — one strong, one middling, one weak — for your own task in minutes, using the assistant your school permits. Building this set by hand used to take years of collected student work. Participants then edit what comes back, because a model's idea of weak work is not the same as your class's.
- **Self-assessment rehearsal:** a short self-assessment routine tried on the group's own work from earlier in the day, as a first pass before Friday's full version
- **Output:** for one task, a learning intention, success criteria that discriminate, and three contrasting sample answers you have checked and corrected yourself.

Day 2

Finding out what they know — questions that reveal rather than fill time

- **Warm-up, the misconception museum:** in pairs, participants trade the one wrong answer their students produce every single year, and each tries to reconstruct the reasoning behind the other's. The collection becomes the raw material for the rest of the day.
- **The diagnostic question:** designing an item where the answer tells you whether to move on or stop, and where each wrong option is attached to a specific, named misconception rather than being merely incorrect.

- What the AI builders actually do, tested live on a sample topic: tools such as Kahoot will generate a full set of questions from a topic, a PDF or a slide deck in a few minutes. Participants run a sample topic through one, then compare the generated wrong options against the misconceptions collected in the warm-up. The gap between the two is the session's finding: the machine writes plausible distractors, and a plausible distractor only tells you a student guessed.
- **Running the item on the room:** the group answers each other's questions live on a quiz or polling platform, then reads the response pattern together — not who got it wrong, which the platform reports, but what the pattern of wrong choices says about what they were thinking, which it does not.
- **Output:** one diagnostic question on your own topic, every wrong option mapped to a named misconception, tested on the group and revised after.

Day 3

Feedback that causes thinking — and the risk of producing much more of it

- **What the feedback research actually found:** Kluger and DeNisi's review of the feedback literature, in which more than a third of feedback interventions left performance worse than giving no feedback. The pattern behind the failures — feedback that pointed at the person rather than at the work.
- **Grades and comments together:** Butler's studies, in which comments alone produced gains while grades alone and grades-with-comments did not, in a pattern Butler read as students attending to the score rather than the comment when both are given together.
- **Why this becomes urgent now:** the constraint that used to limit feedback was the teacher's evening. AI removes that constraint, which means it is now trivially easy to produce far more of exactly the kind of feedback the research found made things worse.
- **The rewriting workshop:** participants take machine-drafted comments on Day 1's sample answers and rewrite each one against a single test — does it say what to do next, and does it leave the thinking to the student. Forms of this kind are worked through as models: for example, the work is returned uncorrected with a note such as "five of these answers are wrong, find them and fix them."
- **The part that is not optional:** booking the lesson time in which students respond to the feedback. A feedback routine with no response slot is a marking routine with better wording.
- **Where this course stops:** what a school may automate in assessment, what pupils have to be told, and where their work goes are the subject of AI-Assisted Learning for the 21st Century Classroom. Today is only about whether the comment works.
- **Output:** one set of comments in two versions, before and after rewriting, plus the response slot written into a real lesson plan.

Day 4

Handing the work to the class — students as learning resources for one another

- The question that will be asked in your staffroom: if an assistant gives a student instant feedback at any hour, why run peer review at all. Participants argue it both ways before testing it.
- **Testing it:** the same piece of work goes through a structured peer round and through an AI assistant, and the group compares what each noticed, what each missed, and what each left the student to do.

- **Why the giver gains:** the student writing the feedback has to hold the success criteria against someone else's work, which is less emotionally loaded than holding them against their own — the part of peer assessment no assistant can take over, because the benefit is in the doing.
- Two conditions from cooperative-learning research, applied here to peer work: a group goal, so that students work as a group rather than merely in one, and individual accountability, so there are no passengers. Both are designed into the protocol rather than hoped for.
- **Running a "two stars and a wish" round:** practising the format on the Day 1 sample answers, including what to do when the wish is wrong, and how comments in student language differ from comments in teacher language.
- **Output:** a peer review protocol for one of your lessons, with the criteria rewritten in your students' language and the accountability rule stated.

Day 5

The student doing it without you, and keeping it going at home

- **Students as owners of their own learning:** setting up traffic lights and the routines around them, including the failure every teacher meets — students show green when they know they are lost — and the move that fixes it, which is asking the green cards to explain the idea to the yellow and red ones.
- **The problem an assistant creates here:** a student can now get where am I right now answered for them, without ever making the judgement themselves. Teaching them to use it to check a judgement they have already made, and designing one routine that still works on that basis.
- **The honest scale of this work:** William's own programme was tested in a randomised trial across 140 English secondary schools. The effect was positive and reliable, it was equivalent to a couple of months of additional progress, and it came from two years of teachers meeting monthly in small groups. It is worth knowing what size of thing is being claimed here, and what produced it.
- **Teacher learning community rehearsal:** in groups of five, participants run one full cycle of the meeting they intend to hold at home. Each names the single technique they are committing to, what they expect to go wrong with it, and what evidence they will bring back next month; the group's job is to hold each person to one specific next action rather than to agree with them. The cycle is the thing being taken home, not the notes.
- **Trying it out:** the self-assessment routine tried and revised on your own work
- **The one thing you cannot do alone:** drafting a single-page request to whoever controls meeting time in your school — what is being asked for, how long it takes, and what the first three meetings would cover.
- **Output:** a revised self-assessment routine, and a one-page plan for a monthly teacher learning community — the request itself, with its first three agendas written.
- Course evaluation and feedback survey; certificates.

PLEASE NOTE

Sessions run from 09:30 to 15:00, Monday to Friday, with a break for lunch. Timings can shift a little to suit the venue and the group.

Course activities and content may vary depending on participants' needs and the trainer leading the session; any changes are at the trainer's discretion. If there is a specific topic you would like included, please let us know — content-related requests must reach us at least 3 weeks before the course start date so we can confirm them in time.

06 Materials

- Wiliam and Thompson's five key strategies of formative assessment, used as the working structure of the week rather than summarised in an opening slide.
- Black and Wiliam on classroom assessment — both the 1998 review and the shorter Phi Delta Kappan article that popularised it, kept distinct from one another.
- Kluger and DeNisi's review of when feedback fails, worked through on Day 3 as the reason the week is cautious about producing more feedback.
- Butler's studies on what happens when comments are handed over alongside a grade.
- A worked template carried through the week: one task, its success criteria, its diagnostic question, its feedback rule, its peer protocol and its self-assessment routine, filled in day by day and taken home completed.
- Hands-on use of a quiz or polling platform such as Kahoot on Day 2, and of whichever general-purpose AI assistant your school permits on Days 1, 3 and 4 — or paper cards throughout, for anyone whose school blocks these.

07 How to prepare

- It helps to bring one task you set your students — the worksheet or assignment brief itself — since every exercise runs on it; if you cannot, a sample task is supplied on Day 1.
- There is no need to bring student work: three contrasting sample answers are generated and checked together in the room on Day 1.
- A laptop is more useful than a tablet, since most of the week is drafting and editing.
- If you plan to use Kahoot or an AI assistant, it helps to have an account set up before you travel; paper versions of every activity are also provided.
- Some schools block AI assistants on staff accounts; the paper route works just as well if that applies to you.
- AI rules differ from one country and one school to the next, and they are moving quickly. If you already know what your ministry or school permits with pupil work, that is useful background — but nothing here needs pupil work or waits for it.

08 After the course

- Participants will receive their Certificate of Attendance and the co-signed Europass Mobility document.
- Participants will complete a general course evaluation and event survey.
- Participants will receive course materials, videos, photos, and PDF documents in both digital and print formats.
- Follow-up support: self-evaluation materials are provided. Depending on the group, an email group may be set up so that participants can keep exchanging ideas.

09 Why this is Erasmus+ eligible

The Erasmus+ Programme Guide names digital transformation as a horizontal priority, stating that "the Erasmus+ programme plays a key role in supporting citizens of all ages in acquiring the digital skills and competences they need to live, learn, work, exercise their rights, be informed, access online services, communicate, critically consume, create and disseminate digital education content" (Erasmus+ Programme Guide 2026, Part A – Priorities of the Erasmus+ Programme, p. 8).

10 What the course fee covers

INCLUDED IN THE COURSE FEE

- 25 hours of training and course materials
- Certificate of Attendance + Europass support
- On-site local support throughout the week

ARRANGED SEPARATELY BY THE PARTICIPANT

- Travel to the host city — invitation letter on request
- Accommodation — we share recommended options
- Travel & health insurance

ISSUED BY

Erasmus Mobility Academy

OID E10304561

Cumhuriyet Mah. 1637 Sk. Yaşar Şahin Apt. No:3/2
Yenişehir/MERSİN

info@erasmusmobilityacademy.com

+90 530 319 40 65

COURSE PAGE

erasmusmobilityacademy.com/courses/formative-assessment-and-feedback-in-the-age-of-ai

ABOUT ERASMUS MOBILITY ACADEMY

Erasmus Mobility Academy (OID: E10304561) is an Erasmus+ training provider offering professional development courses for educators, school staff and youth workers across Europe. Our courses are designed for international mobility — open to participants travelling from a country other than the host country — and support schools in building lasting institutional capacity. We provide structured learning, logistical guidance and certification with Europass.