

LESSON 10

How content is published, and the rise of AI content

40 minutes

Evaluating Online Content

Outcome 2.2

WHAT THIS LESSON DOES

Explore the shift from traditional gatekept publishing to open online sharing, including the role of AI. Through class activities, judge invented content as human-made, machine-made or both, and investigate a real example for its origins and generation method.

CURRICULUM OUTCOMES

Outcome	What the specification asks for
2.2	Investigate how digital media content is published on the internet and the potential role of new technologies in content creation.

WHAT STUDENTS SHOULD BE ABLE TO DO

- Investigate how digital media content is published and the role of new technologies including AI (LO 2.2)
- Commit to a verdict on whether invented items were likely made by a human, a machine, or both
- Work out who published a real piece and what evidence suggests machine-generated content

BEFORE THE BELL

- Prepare a simple board diagram contrasting traditional and digital publishing paths (talk track only; students get two short paragraphs).
- Have three safe, ordinary digital content examples ready to project as the default for Your turn (or be ready to read the in-pack council-notice fallback).
- Have the interactive activity open on the teacher device.
- Teacher device with the interactive activity ready on the board
- A device each, students signed in; the board shows the join code
- Three safe board examples ready to project (or the in-pack council-notice fallback ready to read aloud); student devices optional if already open on a safe piece

How content is published, and the rise of AI content

HOW THE LESSON RUNS

4 min	introduction	Start
5 min	content	Examine and discuss
4 min	activity	Hands-on: human, machine, or both?
13 min	activity	Class Play: everyone answers
8 min	activity	Your turn
3 min	content	Make sense
2 min	content	Reflect
1 min	summary	What you covered

ANSWERS AND LOOK-FORS

- Item 1: product review, Machine The timing, empty superlatives, lack of concrete detail and brand-new account together point to machine-generated text, not a real buyer writing from experience. One tell alone would not be enough; the cluster is what makes the call fair.
- Item 2: match-day caption, Human The inside jokes, uneven spelling and very local detail are hard for a machine to invent without being fed the whole story. Messy writing is not proof on its own, but combined with a lived, specific moment it points to a person posting from the bus home.
- Item 3: how-to short, Both The words were drafted by a machine and the filming, voice and edits are human. A lot of everyday content now sits in this middle: AI helps with a draft or image, and a person shapes, records or publishes it. Spotting both is as useful as spotting pure human or pure machine.
- Item 4: local news note, Human A named reporter, a named official, a date and a checkable link are the marks of ordinary human news publishing. Nothing here needs a machine to explain it. Human does not mean perfect; it means a person is visible and accountable for the piece.
- Item 5: concert crowd image, Machine These glitches (warped hands, unreadable signs, repeated faces) are one cluster that still appears on some generated images. Absence of glitches does not prove human. Weigh the cluster plus the missing photographer. If the image looked clean, you would still ask who took it, whether an original post exists, and what reverse-image or source check you would run next.

TEACHING MOVES

- Lead the hands-on activity as a whole-class discussion on the board; force a public commit before each reveal, with 20 seconds pair-lock first.
- Core live set is items 1 to 3; park 4 and 5 as rapid-fire only if time remains so the close is protected. If item 1 already ran long, run items 2 and 3 as commit-plus-one-tell only and never drop Your turn for optional items.
- Default Your turn to the three projected examples; use the in-pack council-notice fallback if nothing is projected; devices are optional, not required.
- Harvest student verdicts quickly in Make sense to highlight publisher plus process plus evidence.

WHAT TO WATCH FOR

- Students rush to verdicts without pointing to tells; ask for specific evidence each time.
- Misuse of the both category; clarify it requires clear marks from both human and machine.
- Assuming all smooth content is AI; discuss that humans can also produce polished work.
- Treating finger or sign glitches as proof forever; absence of glitches does not prove human.

DIFFERENTIATION

- Support: Offer sentence starters such as The evidence for machine generation is...
- Extension: If devices are available and the class is fast, challenge pairs to judge a second real example after the board piece.
- Support: Allow paired work for the Your turn activity if needed.