

Practical examples for teachers

Related content: M1-TI-MLC4 – Clear Context and Structured Questioning Techniques (Prompting)

Exercise 1 – for the teacher’s own learning

Objective: to experience how the building blocks of a prompt change the relevance and usability of an AI answer.

Title: From a one-line request to a structured prompt

Exercise: rewriting a vague prompt for one of your own lessons and comparing the two answers.

Duration: 20–25 minutes

Form of work: individual work

Tools: ChatGPT, Claude, Gemini or another generative AI tool

Instructions:

1. Choose a topic you will teach in the coming weeks. Write a one-line prompt, e.g. “Make a worksheet about welding safety.” Save the answer.
2. Open a new chat. Rewrite the request using the building blocks (template below). Save the answer.
3. Compare the two answers using four criteria: relevance to your learners, correct level, technical accuracy, and how much editing would still be needed.
4. Iterate once: add one constraint or one example (e.g. attach an earlier worksheet you like) and observe the change.
5. Finally, ask the model: “What information did you have to guess in my first prompt?” and compare its list with your building blocks.

Prompt template

Act as ... (role). Create ... (task). The learners are ... (level). After the lesson they should be able to ... (objective). Context: ... (time, equipment, curriculum, attached file). Format: ... (table, length, number of items, language). Check that ... (evaluation criteria).

Lessons learnt:

- The structured prompt almost always gives a more usable result, because the model has fewer things to guess.
- Examples and constraints are often more effective than additional explanation.
- The model’s own list of “guesses” is a quick diagnostic tool for improving future prompts.

Exercise 2 – classroom work with students

Objective: to develop learners’ ability to formulate clear, context-rich questions and to evaluate AI answers critically.

Title: Prompt detectives

Exercise: learners improve a vague, trade-related prompt in pairs and compare the answers.

Duration: 30–35 minutes

Form of work: pair work, then whole-class discussion

Tools: school-approved AI tool (teacher-led demonstration or learner accounts, depending on school rules), projector

Instructions:

1. The teacher shows a vague prompt related to the learners' trade (e.g. "How do I fix a car?") and its AI answer on the projector.
2. In pairs, learners list what is missing: who is asking, what exactly the task is, what the situation is, and what kind of answer is needed.
3. Each pair rewrites the prompt using at least four building blocks (role, task, context, format).
4. The improved prompts are tested (by the pairs or by the teacher on the projector). Pairs also add the sentence: "Ask me clarifying questions before you answer."
5. Whole-class discussion: which prompt worked best and why? Which answer contained errors or missing safety information?

Lessons learnt:

- A precise question is a professional skill: in the workshop, too, the quality of the instruction determines the quality of the work.
- AI answers what we ask – if we do not ask about protective equipment, it may not mention it.
- Comparing answers trains critical evaluation: fluent text is not the same as correct text.

Notes for teachers:

- Follow the school's rules and the providers' age requirements. If learner accounts are not permitted, demonstrate from the teacher's account.
- Remind learners never to enter personal data (names, addresses, photos of classmates) into prompts.

Copyright © 2026 VITA Consortium

This work may be reused and adapted under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License (CC BY-SA 4.0).



Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the National Agency.