

Review: where the checklist breaks

40 minutes

Evaluating Online Content

Outcome 2.4

Outcome 2.5

WHAT THIS LESSON DOES

Red-team your own checklist. Build a source that passes every check and still should not be trusted, swap it with another group, and find out how many got through. Then mend the shared checklist from the holes they found and save the improved version.

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 sources built to defeat it, and find where it fails (LOs 2.4, 2.5)
- Build a source that passes every check on the class checklist and still should not be trusted
- Amend and save an improved shared checklist that catches what got through

BEFORE THE BELL

- Retrieve the class checklist the class way and display it in the class's own agreed wording . Do not substitute a cleaner version, because the lesson tests the checks this class actually wrote. If a group cannot find theirs, put the shared one on the board.
- Decide groups of three or four in advance, and decide which group's source goes to which. The swap has to take seconds.
- Say the invention rule in the first minute and enforce it immediately: everything invented, no real outlet, no real person, no real product, and nothing leaves the room. That rule is what makes attacking the checklist legitimate rather than mischief.
- Agree the class saving method. The mended checklist is reached back for later in the course, so a browser tab on a shared device is not good enough.
- One device per group for the maker. Without devices, groups write the card on A4: headline, byline, date, evidence line, admission and rot. Everything after that step is unchanged.
- One device per group with the maker open; paper cards as the fallback; a slip for each group's written answer key
- Board space for the what-would-it-have-had-to-ask sentences
- Teacher device with the list-builder ready; the class saving method set up

Review: where the checklist breaks

HOW THE LESSON RUNS

3 min	introduction	Start
4 min	content	Examine and discuss
12 min	activity	Hands-on: build a source that beats the checklist
7 min	activity	Swap and hunt
8 min	activity	Hands-on: Mend the checklist
3 min	content	Make sense
2 min	content	Reflect
1 min	summary	What you covered

TEACHING MOVES

- Push groups off their first idea. Most reach for a shocking claim, which their own checklist kills instantly. The builds that work look dull and pass easily.
- As you circulate during the build, check that every group has written down the one line naming its rot before the swap. A group with no answer key has not decided what it was testing, and the reveal turns into an argument instead of a finding.
- Count out loud how many rots got through. A checklist that caught two of six is the most useful result this class has produced so far, and naming the number stops a miss feeling like a failure.
- If a hunting group says "trust it" and the rot was real, do not soften it. That is the checklist failing, which is what the lesson was booked to find.
- Write every what-would-it-have-had-to-ask sentence on the board during the reveals. The mend step runs on them and cannot run without them.
- Freeze the mended list at minute six of that step and use the last two minutes to save it.
- If nothing got through, mend from what the authors tried and the checklist stopped: which check did the work, and is it worded strongly enough?

WHAT TO WATCH FOR

- Building something obviously fake: it fails the checklist in ten seconds and teaches nothing.
- No written answer key, so the reveal becomes an argument about what the rot was.
- Naming a real outlet, person or product on a card: stop it the first time it appears.
- Adding checks that no card actually beat, which lengthens the list without strengthening it.
- Letting the mend overrun so the improved list is never saved.

DIFFERENTIATION

- Support: give a stuck group one rot from the hands-on notes, never the list.
- Support: a group that struggles to build can start from the last rot in the hands-on notes (accurate, well sourced, four years out of date on a topic that moved) as their own, so that all they have to make is a card that ticks every other box around that one flaw.
- Extension: build a second card that beats the mended checklist, and report whether it still fails.
- Extension: hunt a second group's card after finishing the first.