



DAILY PROGRAMME

Formative Assessment and Feedback in the Age of AI

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 you are actually asking for — learning intentions and success criteria	DAY 2 Finding out what they know — questions that reveal rather than fill time	DAY 3 Feedback that causes thinking — and the risk of producing much more of it	DAY 4 Handing the work to the class — students as learning resources for one another	DAY 5 The student doing it without you, and keeping it going at home
--	---	--	---	---

Day by day

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:** Wiliam'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.

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