



DAILY PROGRAMME

AI-Assisted Learning for the 21st Century Classroom

DURATION 5 days · 25 hours	DAILY SCHEDULE 09:30–15:00 Monday to Friday, with a break for lunch	LANGUAGE English (B1+)
COURSE CENTRES Antalya · İstanbul · İzmir · Mersin · Budapest · Bremen · Rome Dates and cities of the scheduled sessions are listed on the course page.		GROUP SIZE Max 20 participants

Week at a glance

DAY 1 What the tool is actually doing - AI foundations and applications	DAY 2 Where AI belongs in a lesson - AI pedagogy	DAY 3 The four decisions Europe treats as high-risk - ethics of AI	DAY 4 What you owe the pupil - a human-centred mindset	DAY 5 Taking it back - AI for professional development
---	--	--	--	--

Day by day

Day 1

What the tool is actually doing - AI foundations and applications

- **Warm-up, AI or Not:** the group sorts everyday school systems into AI, not AI, and cannot tell - attendance software, spellcheck, the panel in the learning platform that flags a struggling pupil, the exam add-on that marks multiple choice, the translation tool the office uses for letters home. The disagreements set the day's agenda. The activity is taken from the European Commission and OECD's AI literacy framework, where it is written for pupils; here it runs with adults.
- **Two different machines, two different failures:** what a predictive system is doing when it flags a pupil, and what a generative system is doing when it writes a comment about one. Why the first fails quietly and consistently, and the second fails loudly and unpredictably.
- **Why a wrong answer reads well:** pattern completion, confident tone, invented citations, plausible but non-existent detail. Participants run the same subject-specific request on the general-purpose assistant their own school permits - in practice ChatGPT, Microsoft Copilot, Google Gemini or Claude, and often more than one in the same room - and the group collects the errors into one shared set. Running several assistants side by side on one request is itself the lesson: they do not agree, and the disagreement is visible to anyone.

- **Accept, revise or reject:** applying the test to that shared set - consulting a trusted source, judging it against what the task actually required, and writing down the reason for each decision. The reason is the point; the verdict on its own is not teachable.
 - **Output:** a one-page note on a single tool already in use in your school - what it is for, what it is not for, and what you would need to check before trusting it with something that matters.
-

Day 2

Where AI belongs in a lesson - AI pedagogy

- **Warm-up, four corners:** participants move to AI only, AI-supported, human only or not sure as the trainer reads out tasks from a teacher's actual week, from writing a parent email to deciding a borderline grade. The not sure corner is where the day starts.
 - **Taking a unit apart:** one unit you teach, broken into its real steps - choosing the focus, finding sources, setting the task, drafting, giving feedback, redrafting, assessing. Each step marked for what AI could automate, what it could support, and what carries the learning and must stay in human hands.
 - The three uses teachers reach for first, each tried on your own unit: drafting differentiated versions of a task, adapting a text for reading level or a second language, and producing first-draft formative comments. In every case the review step is written into the workflow before the workflow is used.
 - **Reading a tool instead of its marketing:** taking the teacher-facing platforms colleagues actually recommend - MagicSchool AI, Diffit, Curipod, Khanmigo and whatever is already built into your learning platform - and going to their published documentation rather than their front page. What does the provider itself say about who the tool is for, how it decides what a pupil sees next, what data it needs, and what it states it cannot do? Where a school cannot obtain that documentation at all, the absence is itself the finding, and it is one a purchasing decision should turn on.
 - **Where this course stops:** adapting one lesson across content, process and pace, with AI tools as drafting aids, is the work of The Role of Artificial Intelligence in Personalized Learning. This week decides whether a step should be automated at all, which is the decision that comes first.
 - **Output:** one teaching sequence for a real unit, marked step by step, with the human review point named at each place AI enters.
-

Day 3

The four decisions Europe treats as high-risk - ethics of AI

- Where the rules already sit, in plain terms. Inferring pupils' emotions with AI has been prohibited in education since February 2025. Transparency duties on AI-generated content, deepfakes and chatbots have applied since 2 August 2026. The AI-literacy duty on schools as deployers (organisations that use an AI system), rewritten in 2026, is now a duty to take measures rather than to guarantee a result. Four education uses are listed as high-risk - deciding admission, evaluating learning outcomes, deciding the level of education a pupil gets, and monitoring pupils during tests - with the obligations attached to them deferred to December 2027. Participants mark which of the four, if any, already happen in their own school, and who currently signs them off. This is not compliance training and not legal advice; it is a map of where the serious decisions sit.
- **Building the marking workflow:** this week writes one marking rule to decide where the human review sits - designing feedback and assessment in depth is the work of Formative Assessment and Feedback in the Age of AI. Participants write a feedback and marking procedure for one class - the request they will make of the tool, the rubric it works from, the review rule, and the sentence that tells pupils what was drafted by a machine.

- **Running it against sample answers:** the course supplies a set of pupil responses written for the course, at a range of levels, across several subjects, including answers in the style of a pupil working in a second language. Each participant runs their own workflow over the set, then compares the machine's comments with their own professional judgement on the same scripts. Where it helped, where it was confidently wrong, and where it was unfair to a particular kind of pupil.
 - **Why detection is not evidence:** participants run the same texts through the free detectors pupils and teachers actually reach for, GPTZero and ZeroGPT, and see the verdicts disagree in front of them. Both were among the seven commercial detectors in the peer-reviewed study that ran 91 TOEFL essays written by non-native English speakers: more than half were misclassified as AI-generated, and 97.8% were flagged by at least one of the seven detectors; essays by American eighth-graders were almost all correctly identified as human. For a mixed-language European classroom that is not a margin of error, it is a pattern with a direction. What a school can defensibly do instead - assessment design, evidence of process, and a conversation with the pupil.
 - **What must never go into the tool:** working through the guidelines' privacy questions on the workflow just built, and identifying who at your own school answers a data protection question.
 - **Output:** a written marking and feedback rule for one class, including what pupils are told.
-

Day 4

What you owe the pupil - a human-centred mindset

- **Equity audit:** the same request run across different pupil profiles - an invented profile for a fluent writer and one working in a second language, a confident reader and a struggling one, and a pupil with additional needs - with the differences documented. The recurring finding to look for is the point at which personalisation quietly becomes a smaller task with a lower ceiling.
 - **What the class sees:** the names, faces, examples and reading passages a tool produces for a lesson, and who is missing from them. Turning that from a private worry into a lesson pupils can run themselves.
 - **Telling pupils, in their own words:** drafting a short statement for your class - which tools are used here, what for, what happens to work that goes into them, and what a pupil does if they think a decision about them was wrong. Written at the age of the class you actually teach, not in policy language.
 - **The conversation with families:** what to say when a parent asks whether their child's work goes into an AI system, who can see it, and whether a machine had a hand in the grade - and what your school is in a position to answer honestly today.
 - **Output:** the pupil-facing statement, plus a plan for the lesson in which you introduce and discuss it.
-

Day 5

Taking it back - AI for professional development

- **Where the week actually reached:** scoring yourself against the framework's Acquire descriptors in all five aspects, and naming what the Deepen level would require. An honest map of a starting point, not a claim to have finished.
- **Two columns:** the European Commission's guiding questions are printed one column for the teacher and one for the school. The week's open items get sorted the same way - what you can change on your own, what needs one willing colleague, and what only somebody with a budget or a signature can answer.

- **Writing the request:** one page for the person who decides. What is being asked for, which of the guidelines' questions it answers, what it costs, and what continues to happen if nothing changes.
- **Planning the session you will run at home:** the forty minutes with colleagues after you get back, built around the five documents you are carrying rather than a slideshow about the trip.
- **Where to keep learning:** the free European instruments for continuing this on your own, including SELFIE for Teachers, the Commission's free self-reflection questionnaire on digital competence, and the European School Education Platform.
- 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.

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/ai-assisted-learning-for-the-21st-century-classroom