

ELITE-AI Project – Quality Assurance Manual

WP3 – Experimental Teaching Activities

Description of Lessons: BA 1st Year Group – English for Early and Preschool Education

Teacher	Gugić, Jelena
Institution	Juraj Dobrila University of Pula (UNIPU)
Academic Year	Fall Semester 2025/2026
Course	English for Early and Preschool Education
Study Level	BA 1st Year – Early and Preschool Education Study Programme
AI Tools Used	ChatGPT / Zeno Chat / Gemini / Perplexity / Coral AI / Grammarly / Luvvoice / Mentimeter
Number of Lessons	12 AI-integrated lessons (45 minutes each)
Thematic Frame	Education – learning styles, pedagogy, grammar in context, writing, and vocabulary

Introduction and Institutional Context

The lessons described in this document were delivered at the Juraj Dobrila University of Pula (UNIPU) as part of the ELITE-AI project's experimental teaching activities during the fall semester of the 2025/2026 academic year. They form a sequence of twelve 45-minute lessons delivered to first-year students of the Early and Preschool Education Study programme. All lessons revolved around the topic of education, covering learning styles, pedagogical theory, grammar in context, vocabulary, and professional writing.

In line with the ELITE-AI protocol established within WP3, students were divided into an experimental group and a control group at the start of the semester. The experimental group participated in the AI-integrated activities described below; the control group covered the same curricular content through traditional instructional methods. A placement test administered at the beginning of the semester established a shared baseline, and a final assessment at the end of the semester provides the basis for comparative analysis.

The tool rotation across the twelve sessions was the most varied in the ELITE-AI project, with eight distinct AI tools deployed. This variety was deliberate: different tools serve different pedagogical functions – Mentimeter for immediate polling and visualisation, Zeno Chat for conversational writing assistance, Luvvoice for authentic listening material with accent variation, Coral AI for collocation identification, Grammarly for grammar and style feedback, and multiple general-purpose chatbots (ChatGPT, Gemini, Perplexity) for content discovery, grammar explanation, and exercise generation. The breadth of the tool rotation gave students a broad AI literacy grounded in functional differentiation rather than a single-tool proficiency.

Lesson 1 – Learning Styles

AI Tool	Mentimeter / ChatGPT
Group	BA 1st Year 21 students
Date	c. 5 November 2025

Duration	45 minutes
Study Level	B2 Upper Intermediate
Field / Context	Education
Lesson Stage	Lead-in
Observation Sheet	Observation Sheet #1
Materials	Laptop/Desktop, Mobile Phones/Tablets, Wi-Fi, Interactive Whiteboard, Smartboard, Paper and Pens
AI Use	SPEAKING: Conversation simulation, oral presentation outline, interview preparation dialogue; VOCABULARY: Contextual word usage examples
Student Participation	Active by request; high peer interaction; motivation: Developing; target language use: maintained
Quality of AI Use	Communication with AI: effective; Prompts: effective; Interpretation: partially effective; Critical evaluation: partially effective

This was a class dedicated to understanding someone's strengths and weaknesses in learning. After a short discussion, students were introduced to the 1982 Honey and Mumford model of types of learner division. They also learned about the characteristics of each type. The experimental group students used chatbots to find the characteristics of the types of learners and classified them independently, while the control group students were offered a list of the characteristics already divided per type and had to identify and name each set of characteristics.

The observation sheet records high peer interaction and notes that the Mentimeter poll used at the lesson's opening produced immediate engagement, giving students a visual representation of their own learning style preferences before introducing the theoretical framework. ChatGPT's role was primarily vocabulary mediation: students encountering unfamiliar terms in the Honey and Mumford typology submitted them to the tool for contextualised definitions. The speaking functions deployed – conversation simulation and oral presentation outline – supported a brief discussion task in which students explained their learning style classification to a partner.

Lesson 2 – My Learning Style

AI Tool	Zeno Chat
Group	BA 1st Year 20 students
Date	c. 12 November 2025
Duration	45 minutes
Study Level	B2 Upper Intermediate
Field / Context	Education
Lesson Stage	Practice
Observation Sheet	Observation Sheet #2
Materials	Laptop/Desktop, Mobile Phones/Tablets, Wi-Fi, Interactive Whiteboard, Smartboard, Paper and Pens

AI Use	WRITING: Writing prompt generation, essay outline creation, grammar and spelling correction, style and register feedback, paraphrasing assistance, academic writing feedback
Student Participation	Active by volition; medium peer interaction; motivation: High; target language use: maintained
Quality of AI Use	Communication with AI: effective; Prompts: partially effective; Interpretation: partially effective; Critical evaluation: partially effective

Students had to write a guided 150- to 200-word essay about the learning style they identified with most. Control group students wrote in a classical manner, using dictionaries, while experimental group students used the Zeno Chat app to help them with whatever part of their writing they found most challenging.

The observation sheet records motivation as High and active by volition participation – the Zeno Chat app’s conversational interface gave students more agency in directing the support they received than a grammar checker would have, but its partially effective prompt use rating reflects the group’s still-developing ability to formulate targeted rather than open-ended writing assistance requests. The over-reliance rating for AI use in this session is noted in the observation sheet and is consistent with a writing task where students who were uncertain about their essay content turned to the tool for content generation rather than language support.

Lesson 3 – Present Tenses

AI Tool	ChatGPT/Bing/Gemini
Group	BA 1st Year 20 students
Date	c. 19 November 2025
Duration	45 minutes
Study Level	B2 Upper Intermediate
Field / Context	Education
Lesson Stage	Teaching, Practice
Observation Sheet	Observation Sheet #3
Materials	Laptop/Desktop, Mobile Phones/Tablets, Wi-Fi, Interactive Whiteboard, Smartboard, Paper and Pens
AI Use	GRAMMAR: Grammar explanation generation, error correction, contextualised examples, exercise creation, tense and aspect practice, grammar rule simplification
Student Participation	Active by volition; medium peer interaction; motivation: High; target language use: diminished
Quality of AI Use	Communication with AI: yes; Prompts: yes; Interpretation: sometimes; Critical evaluation: no

While the control group followed a classical type of grammar lesson (explanations, revision of rules, exercises), the experimental group students were invited to use Copilot. They asked the app to give them five questions that would test their existing knowledge on the two tenses. Next, they asked the app to give them example sentences of both tenses (but without the rules). Students had to write down the patterns they noticed and conclude about the rules, and only afterwards were they allowed to check the rules.

The subsequent activity involved asking the app to create ten sentences for tense practice. At the end, students asked the app to summarise the main differences between the two tenses. For homework, they asked the app to create a short story with some mistakes in the Present Simple and Present Continuous, which they were then tasked to correct. The observation sheet records motivation as High but target language use as diminished – a pattern consistent with grammar sessions where students’ attention is divided between language production and AI interaction management. Critical evaluation is recorded as no, which the observation notes attributed to the inductive design of the task: because students were using AI outputs as raw material for their own rule-discovery rather than as information to be assessed, they were not prompted to question the outputs in the same way.

Lesson 4 – Future Tenses

AI Tool	Gemini / Perplexity
Group	BA 1st Year 21 students
Date	c. 26 November 2025
Duration	45 minutes
Study Level	B2 Upper Intermediate
Field / Context	Education
Lesson Stage	Teaching, Practice
Observation Sheet	Observation Sheet #4
Materials	Laptop/Desktop, Mobile Phones/Tablets, Wi-Fi, Interactive Whiteboard, Smartboard, Paper and Pens
AI Use	SPEAKING: Conversation simulation, pronunciation assessment, fluency practice; GRAMMAR: Grammar explanation generation, contextualised examples, exercise creation, tense and aspect practice, grammar rule simplification
Student Participation	Active by request; low peer interaction; motivation: Developing; target language use: maintained
Quality of AI Use	Communication with AI: yes; Prompts: yes; Interpretation: sometimes; Critical evaluation: sometimes

A lesson similar to the one about the present tenses was conducted with both groups about the future tenses, but this time students were given a text titled My Life as a Future Teacher on which they had to identify the tenses (not using / using AI tools, depending on the group). The experimental group used Gemini and Perplexity in parallel, allowing students to compare the grammatical explanations produced by two tools and discuss the differences.

The observation sheet records low peer interaction – consistent with a task where students were working individually on tense identification – and motivation as Developing, lower than in the present tenses session. The partially effective ratings for interpretation reflect students who were able to use the AI-generated grammar explanations but were not yet consistently distinguishing between the tools’ slightly different framings of the future tense system. The pronunciation assessment function deployed via the speaking tools gave the session an audio dimension: students listened to AI-generated model sentences and practised the intonation patterns associated with different future forms.

Lesson 5 – Learning Styles with Multiple Intelligences

AI Tool	Any chatbot (Gemini/Claude)
Group	BA 1st Year 19 students
Date	c. 3 December 2025
Duration	45 minutes
Study Level	B2 Upper Intermediate
Field / Context	Education
Lesson Stage	Lead-in, Teaching, Practice
Observation Sheet	Observation Sheet #5
Materials	Laptop/Desktop, Mobile Phones/Tablets, Wi-Fi, Interactive Whiteboard, Smartboard, Paper and Pens
AI Use	SPEAKING: Conversation simulation, oral presentation outline, interview preparation dialogue
Student Participation	Active by volition; high peer interaction; motivation: Developing; target language use: maintained
Quality of AI Use	Communication with AI: yes; Prompts: yes; Interpretation: sometimes; Critical evaluation: sometimes

In this lesson, students were acquainted with Gardner’s theory of multiple intelligences (Gardner, 1983). While control group students discussed the types of intelligences and identified them after being given prompts, the experimental group students used a chatbot of their choice to find out about the intelligences and then solve the tasks independently. The free choice of tool – Gemini or Claude – gave students their first opportunity in the sequence to exercise tool preference, and the observation sheet notes that this choice itself became a topic of brief discussion, with students comparing what they had received from each tool.

The observation sheet records active by volition participation and high peer interaction, consistent with a session combining content discovery (finding out about multiple intelligences) with social sharing (discussing and comparing tool outputs). The speaking functions deployed reflected the session’s oral production dimension: students used chatbot-generated outlines to structure a brief presentation of the intelligence type they most identified with.

Lesson 6 – Montessori and Vygotsky

AI Tool	Any chatbot (Gemini/Claude)
Group	BA 1st Year 19 students
Date	c. 10 December 2025
Duration	45 minutes
Study Level	B2 Upper Intermediate
Field / Context	Education
Lesson Stage	Lead-in, Teaching, Practice

Observation Sheet	Observation Sheet #6
Materials	Laptop/Desktop, Mobile Phones/Tablets, Wi-Fi, Interactive Whiteboard, Smartboard, Paper and Pens
AI Use	SPEAKING: Conversation simulation, oral presentation outline, interview preparation dialogue
Student Participation	Active by volition; high peer interaction; motivation: Developing; target language use: maintained
Quality of AI Use	Communication with AI: yes; Prompts: yes; Interpretation: sometimes; Critical evaluation: sometimes

In this lesson, students of the control group were offered a text about the two renowned pedagogues (Montessori and Vygotsky), solved reading tasks accordingly, and then summarised the text. Students of the experimental group had to find information about them using an AI tool. Students were offered prompts to guide their search in advance. After discussing the lives and work of the two pedagogues, they again used the tool to get a summary of the texts.

The observation sheet records high peer interaction and notes that the pre-prepared prompts provided by the teacher were a significant support factor: students who received prompt scaffolding before using the tool produced more focused and accurate information retrieval than those in earlier sessions who had approached open-ended chatbot use without structured guidance. The comparison between AI-generated summaries and the textbook content used by the control group produced productive discussion about what each source emphasised and what each omitted.

Lesson 7 – Past Tenses

AI Tool	Gemini
Group	BA 1st Year 19 students
Date	c. 17 December 2025
Duration	45 minutes
Study Level	B2 Upper Intermediate
Field / Context	Education
Lesson Stage	Teaching, Practice
Observation Sheet	Observation Sheet #7
Materials	Laptop/Desktop, Mobile Phones/Tablets, Wi-Fi, Interactive Whiteboard, Smartboard, Paper and Pens
AI Use	GRAMMAR: Grammar explanation generation, error correction, contextualised examples, exercise creation, tense and aspect practice, grammar rule simplification
Student Participation	Active by request; medium peer interaction; motivation: Developing; target language use: diminished
Quality of AI Use	Communication with AI: yes; Prompts: yes; Interpretation: yes; Critical evaluation: sometimes

Students of the control group followed a classical line of instruction to revise and practise past tenses. Students of the experimental group had to use Gemini to create a B2-level text with the title The Day I Realised I Wanted to Become a Preschool Teacher. One of the prompts was that the text should include examples of Past Simple and Past Continuous. Students then asked Gemini to explain the form and use of the two tenses, and finally the app created ten tasks for the students to solve.

The observation sheet records target language use as diminished – consistent with the present tenses session, where grammatical focus tasks tend to draw students’ attention toward accuracy management rather than fluent production. The yes ratings for communication, prompt use, and interpretation reflect a group that had become noticeably more competent at directing Gemini toward specific instructional outputs by this point in the semester.

Lesson 8 – Listening Practice for Past Tenses

AI Tool	Luvvoice
Group	BA 1st Year 16 students
Date	c. 7 January 2026
Duration	45 minutes
Study Level	B2 Upper Intermediate
Field / Context	Education
Lesson Stage	Practice
Observation Sheet	Observation Sheet #8
Materials	Laptop/Desktop, Mobile Phones/Tablets, Wi-Fi, Interactive Whiteboard, Smartboard, Paper and Pens
AI Use	LISTENING: Speech-to-text transcription, accent/dialect variation generation, listening comprehension question creation, authentic listening material curation
Student Participation	Active by request; high peer interaction; motivation: High; target language use: maintained
Quality of AI Use	Communication with AI: yes; Prompts: yes; Interpretation: yes; Critical evaluation: no

Both groups of students were given a text written using past tenses. The control group listened to the teacher reading the text while students noted down every instance of past tenses they heard. The experimental group listened to the same text but transformed into speech and made more difficult by inserting a New Zealand accent, generated by Luvvoice. Their task included taking notes of the whole text (they listened to it three times) and then inserted it into a chatbot, which helped them recognise instances of past tenses.

After identifying the tenses, both groups of students explained the use of the tense in the particular context. The observation sheet records motivation as High and notes that the accent variation generated by Luvvoice – a feature not available in the teacher-read version – introduced a genuinely novel listening challenge that students found engaging. Critical evaluation is recorded as no, which in this context reflects the nature of the task: students were using the AI tool for transcription support rather than content assessment, so verification behaviour was not the relevant interaction mode.

Lesson 9 – Error Correction Task

AI Tool	Any chatbot
Group	BA 1st Year 10 students
Date	c. 14 January 2026
Duration	45 minutes
Study Level	B2 Upper Intermediate
Field / Context	Education
Lesson Stage	Practice
Observation Sheet	Observation Sheet #9
Materials	Laptop/Desktop, Mobile Phones/Tablets, Wi-Fi, Interactive Whiteboard, Smartboard, Paper and Pens
AI Use	READING: Text generation for reading practice, text annotation; GRAMMAR: Grammar explanation generation, error correction, tense and aspect practice, sentence structure analysis
Student Participation	Active by request; low peer interaction; motivation: Developing; target language use: diminished
Quality of AI Use	Communication with AI: yes; Prompts: sometimes; Interpretation: sometimes; Critical evaluation: sometimes

Both groups of students were given a text that included all types of errors with regard to the covered tenses, and they had to identify and correct them. The experimental group was not allowed to make any mistakes, meaning they could make use of AI tools of their choice to be sure about their answers.

The observation sheet records low peer interaction – consistent with the individual verification focus of the task – and motivation as Developing, which the teacher attributed to the inherently demanding nature of comprehensive error correction relative to the more generative tasks of earlier sessions. The yes rating for communication with AI reflects students who had by this point developed reliable strategies for using chatbots as grammar checking resources; the sometimes ratings for prompt use and interpretation reflect the occasional tendency to accept a correction without fully understanding the grammatical principle behind it.

Lesson 10 – Collocations

AI Tool	Coral AI
Group	BA 1st Year 21 students
Date	c. 21 January 2026
Duration	45 minutes
Study Level	B2 Upper Intermediate
Field / Context	Education
Lesson Stage	Lead-in, Teaching

Observation Sheet	Observation Sheet #10
Materials	Laptop/Desktop, Mobile Phones/Tablets, Wi-Fi, Interactive Whiteboard, Smartboard, Paper and Pens
AI Use	SPEAKING: Other; WRITING: Writing prompt generation, style and register feedback; VOCABULARY: Contextual word usage examples, collocation identification
Student Participation	Active by request; high peer interaction; motivation: Developing; target language use: maintained
Quality of AI Use	Communication with AI: yes; Prompts: yes; Interpretation: sometimes; Critical evaluation: sometimes

Students had to define collocations – the experimental group was allowed to search for the definition online, while the control group was given examples of collocations and had to deduce. Students were then given a list of twelve collocations frequent in the educational context and had to use them in context. The experimental group was not allowed to ask the teacher for help but could use AI tools.

The introduction of Coral AI as the session tool marked a deliberate variation in the tool rotation. The observation sheet records high peer interaction and notes that the collocation identification function was used by students to check whether the collocations they had constructed were naturally occurring in educational discourse – a verification use that required students to have some sense of what a plausible collocation should look like before submitting it to the tool. The motivation as Developing rating reflects a group that found the collocation identification task methodologically demanding rather than disengaging.

Lesson 11 – Collocations – Extended Writing Task

AI Tool	Gemini
Group	BA 1st Year 16 students
Date	c. 28 January 2026
Duration	45 minutes
Study Level	B2 Upper Intermediate
Field / Context	Education
Lesson Stage	Practice
Observation Sheet	Observation Sheet #11
Materials	Laptop/Desktop, Mobile Phones/Tablets, Wi-Fi, Interactive Whiteboard, Smartboard, Paper and Pens
AI Use	GRAMMAR: Error correction, contextualised examples, exercise creation, grammar rule simplification; VOCABULARY: Specialised vocabulary lists, contextual usage examples, collocation identification
Student Participation	Active by request; low peer interaction; motivation: Developing; target language use: maintained
Quality of AI Use	Communication with AI: yes; Prompts: sometimes; Interpretation: yes; Critical evaluation: sometimes

Students were asked to create a 2,000-character text using as many of the collocations acquired in the previous lesson as possible. Students of the experimental group created this text using an AI tool – usually Grammarly – while the control group worked independently.

The observation sheet records low peer interaction – consistent with an individual writing task – and motivation as Developing. The yes rating for interpretation of AI feedback reflects the group’s ability to incorporate Grammarly’s suggestions selectively rather than wholesale, distinguishing between corrections that improved the naturalness of collocation use and those that changed the intended meaning. This selective incorporation represents a more sophisticated stage of AI interaction than the accept-or-reject binary observed in earlier sessions.

Lesson 12 – A Formal E-mail

AI Tool	Grammarly
Group	BA 1st Year 14 students
Date	c. 4 February 2026
Duration	45 minutes
Study Level	B2 Upper Intermediate
Field / Context	Education
Lesson Stage	Practice
Observation Sheet	Observation Sheet #12
Materials	Laptop/Desktop, Mobile Phones/Tablets, Wi-Fi, Interactive Whiteboard, Smartboard, Paper and Pens
AI Use	WRITING: Style and register feedback, email and correspondence templates
Student Participation	Active by request; medium peer interaction; motivation: Developing; target language use: maintained
Quality of AI Use	Communication with AI: sometimes; Prompts: yes; Interpretation: sometimes; Critical evaluation: sometimes

Students of the control group were introduced to the notion of writing formal letters and e-mails and taught the form and typical phrases used. Students of the experimental group used a chatbot to write a formal e-mail and then worked in reverse order, trying to identify rules for writing formal letters and the typical phrases associated with them. Both groups were given an example of a good formal e-mail at the end of the class.

The reversed induction approach – producing with AI before analysing – is methodologically consistent with the discovery-based grammar approach used in the tense lessons. The observation sheet records medium peer interaction and notes that the comparison between AI-generated formal e-mails and the model provided by the teacher at the end of the session was the most analytically productive moment of the lesson: students who had worked through the inductive task had a more concrete basis for evaluating the model than those who had not.

General Notes on the AI Tool Rotation and Pedagogical Design

The twelve lessons formed a coherent thematic and methodological arc: from learning style theory and pedagogical content through grammar in context (present, future, and past tenses) to vocabulary development (collocations) and professional writing (formal e-mail). The tool rotation – eight different platforms across twelve sessions – was the most ambitious in the ELITE-AI project, exposing students to the full range of AI tool types available for language learning and giving them practical experience of tool selection according to task demands.

Across the sequence, participation patterns showed an interesting differentiation: sessions with generative or discovery tasks (Learning Styles, Montessori/Vygotsky, Present Tenses) produced active by volition participation and High motivation, while sessions with accuracy-focused tasks (error correction, grammar drills) produced active by request participation and Developing motivation. This distinction is consistent with a learning group at B2 level where autonomous language use is motivating but sustained accuracy work is demanding. Critical evaluation of AI output developed progressively across the semester, from partial effectiveness in the first sessions to more consistent verification behaviour by the collocation and formal writing lessons.

References

Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligences*. Basic Books.

Honey, P. and Mumford, A. (1982). *The Manual of Learning Styles*. Peter Honey.

ELITE-AI Project Consortium (2025). WP3 Experimental Protocol. Internal project document, UNIPU.