

Strand 2 review: where the checklist breaks

40 minutes

Evaluating Online Content

Outcome 2.4

Outcome 2.5

WHAT THIS LESSON DOES

Test your shared checklist against three tricky sources that challenge its rules. Spot where it offers the wrong advice or none at all. Then update the checklist as a class to handle these difficult cases more effectively.

CURRICULUM OUTCOMES

Outcome	What the specification asks for
2.4	Compare information on a specific topic of interest from various sources in order to evaluate its reliability, validity, accuracy and timeliness.
2.5	Develop a checklist for evaluating and verifying information from a range of digital sources.

WHAT STUDENTS SHOULD BE ABLE TO DO

- Apply your evaluation checklist to real sources and find where it fails (LOs 2.4, 2.5)
- Record where the checklist gave the wrong steer or no steer on awkward sources
- Amend and save an improved shared checklist that handles the cases that beat it

BEFORE THE BELL

- Prepare the three awkward sources for display on the board.
- Ensure the class checklist is accessible or displayed prominently.
- Have the class source-evaluation checklist ready the class way (board or shared drive)
- Display the current class checklist on the board
- Student devices optional; three source texts ready on the board
- Teacher device with the list-builder interactive ready; class saving method set up

Strand 2 review: where the checklist breaks

HOW THE LESSON RUNS

4 min	introduction	Start
5 min	content	Examine and discuss
10 min	activity	Hands-on: stress-test the checklist
12 min	activity	Hands-on: mend the checklist
4 min	content	Make sense
3 min	content	Reflect
2 min	summary	What you covered

TEACHING MOVES

- Display the actual class checklist wording without altering it; do not invent a fixed four-check list on the student screen.
- Do not preview the three failure modes before the stress-test.
- Default stress-test path: Source A and Source C mandatory (verdict + one gap line each); Source B optional if time; kill-switch at minute 10 if only the two mandatory sources are done.
- Protect the full 12-minute mend: at most one new or reworded check per gap, freeze the list at minute 10, last 2 minutes for save only. Skip list-builder headings no gap pointed to.
- Use whole-class discussion to agree on minimal changes to the checklist from student gap lines, not a pre-labelled answer list.
- Model the list-builder activity briefly before groups contribute.

WHAT TO WATCH FOR

- Groups may try full write-ups and overrun; keep them to verdict + one gap line.
- Groups might accept the checklist without questioning it; encourage identifying 'no steer' cases.
- Overly complex new checks may be suggested; guide towards short, usable wording.
- Trying to fill every list-builder heading even when no gap pointed there; freeze lean and save.

DIFFERENTIATION

- Support: Provide a printed copy of the current checklist for reference during group work. Bolded trap facts in each source blurb help mixed-ability groups find the pressure point fast.
- Extension: Challenge students to suggest an additional check for a fourth source type, or tackle optional Source B.
- Support: Pair weaker groups with a peer who can explain the checks.