



CLIL LESSON PLAN

Behind the Screen: Detecting Misinformation Online



LESSON OVERVIEW

Subject(s)	Digital Literacy and Civic Education
Age Group	11–14 years
Duration	90 minutes
CEFR Level	B1–B2



LEARNING OBJECTIVES

Content Objectives

- Define and distinguish misinformation and disinformation.
- Apply credibility criteria to evaluate online sources (author, evidence, date, purpose).
- Identify bias, emotional language, and missing evidence in digital texts.
- Explain why reliable information matters for participation in society (citizenship).

Language Objectives

Vocabulary: misinformation, disinformation, credibility, bias, evidence, claim, source, verify, fact-check, manipulate, algorithm, perspective, reliability, headline, clickbait, sponsored content

Language structures:

- Evaluation with modals: may/might/could be, must be, cannot be
- Argumentation frames: The evidence suggests..., This claim is supported by..., In contrast..., Therefore...
- Passive/reporting structures: It is claimed that..., It is reported that...
- Reading: analysing short digital posts/articles
- Listening: listening to peer reasoning in group work
- Writing: writing an evidence-based credibility judgement
- Speaking: defending evaluations using academic frames



COMMUNICATION SKILLS



- **Reading** - Reading short posts/articles; extracting claims and evidence; reading a checklist/rubric.
- **Listening** - Listening to group members' reasoning; listening to mini-debate viewpoints.
- **Writing** - Writing an analysis paragraph and completing an evaluation checklist.
- **Speaking** - Explaining how/why a source is reliable/unreliable; presenting group decision.

GRAMMAR, VOCABULARY & PRONUNCIATION

Grammar & syntactic structures

- Modals for certainty and evaluation (may/might/must/cannot)
- Cause-effect connectors (because, therefore, as a result)
- Contrast connectors (however, although, whereas)
- Reporting/passive forms (It is claimed that...)

Vocabulary

See CALP list above + classroom phrases (BICS) below.

Pronunciation, intonation & fluency

- Stress in academic words: credibility, reliability, evidence
- Sentence stress for emphasis during justification ("because...", "the evidence shows...")

Language of Learning (CALP)

academic language

- Evaluating sources using criteria
- Using evidence/justification language
- Describing bias and reliability

Language for Learning (BICS)

class language, useful phrases, giving instructions

- "Can you explain your reason?"
- "I agree/disagree because..."
- "Let's check the evidence/date/author."
- "Please summarise your group's decision."

Language Through Learning (not planned)

Emerging vocabulary from real examples (platform terms, trending topics, current events).

COGNITION

LOTS (remembering, understanding, applying)

- Define misinformation/disinformation.
- Identify author/date/source type.
- Apply a credibility checklist to one source.

HOTS (analyzing, evaluating, creating)

- Analyse persuasive language and missing evidence.
- Evaluate reliability using multiple criteria.
- Create a class “Credibility Checklist” and justify each criterion.

GUIDING QUESTIONS FOR TEACHERS

- Are students using evidence, not just opinions, to justify reliability?
- Can they distinguish claim vs. evidence?
- Are they transferring the checklist to a new text independently?
- Are migrant learners supported with sentence frames and word banks?

CULTURE

Context / citizenship / intercultural elements / cultural awareness / multiple perspectives / life skills

- How does this topic relate to everyday life or current events?
- Are there intercultural, citizenship, or global perspectives included?
- Are life skills (e.g. collaboration, decision-making) addressed?
- Links to everyday life: students meet misinformation daily (social media, messaging apps).
- Citizenship: discuss how misinformation affects communities, elections, public health.
- Intercultural: compare how news is shared/verified across countries and languages.
- Life skills: responsible sharing, critical awareness, respectful disagreement.

21ST-CENTURY SKILLS

BICS-Related Skills

- Communication (turn-taking, asking for clarification)
- Collaboration (roles in group tasks)
- Social & cross-cultural skills (respectful debate)
- Initiative (checking before sharing)

CALP-Related Skills

- Critical thinking
- Problem-solving
- Information literacy
- Media & ICT literacy
- Productivity & accountability

- Leadership & responsibility

METHODOLOGY

Duration	Lesson Flow	Activities	Materials Needed	AI Tools Integration
10'	Warm-up Activities	<p>LESSON FLOW: Activate prior knowledge + pre-teach vocabulary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Show two headlines (one reliable, one clickbait). Students vote: "More reliable / less reliable" and give one reason. • Mini word-sort: claim / evidence / opinion / source (match terms to simple definitions). <p>Vocabulary support is introduced explicitly through a multilingual mini-glossary and teacher modelling. Key terms are presented with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • simple definitions, • pronunciation practice, • visual/icon support, • translation where needed, • and example sentences in context. <p>Students repeat and reuse the vocabulary orally during pair discussion and again later in the lesson during source evaluation and reflection tasks to reinforce retention and CALP development.</p> <p>Proposal:</p> <p>Pedagogical Purpose</p> <p>Students will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activate prior experience with online news (Civic Education) • Recognise persuasive vs informative language (Language & Literature) • Begin distinguishing claim vs evidence (argument structure) • Develop foundational CALP vocabulary for source evaluation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Projector, printed headlines, word cards, mini glossary. 	ChatGPT (teacher) generates 2-3 simplified definitions + example sentences for key terms at B1/B2.



Duration	Lesson Flow	Activities	Materials Needed	AI Tools Integration
		<ul style="list-style-type: none">Practice justification using academic sentence frames <p>This phase sets up:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">critical media literacyargument analysiscredibility evaluation <p>Phase 1: Headline Reliability Vote (5–7 minutes)</p> <p>Step 1: Display Two Headlines</p> <p>Example pair:</p> <p>Headline A (Reliable Style): “Local Council Approves New Recycling Initiative After Public Consultation”</p> <p>Headline B (Clickbait Style): “You Won’t Believe What the Government Is Hiding About Recycling!”</p> <p>Step 2: Silent Analysis (1 minute)</p> <p>Students individually write:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Which headline seems more reliable?Why? <p>No discussion yet — this ensures independent reasoning.</p> <p>Step 3: Pair work (5 min)</p> <p>Students compare their answers and justification - for non native students this is the rehearsal time for both context and language - they can also use their L1 for the initial discussion before using L2 in front of their peers.</p> <p>Step 3: Vote + Justification</p> <p>Students vote by raising hands or moving to two sides of the room. Pairs do not need to agree on the same answer. After voting, students briefly prepare their justification with a partner using the provided sentence frames before selected students share their reasoning with the class. But instead of “Why?”, require structured justification:</p> <p>Provide sentence frames:</p>		



Duration	Lesson Flow	Activities	Materials Needed	AI Tools Integration
		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• “Headline A/B appears more reliable because...”• “The language suggests that...”• “The headline uses emotional/neutral wording.” <p>Subject Integration Made Explicit</p> <p>Language & Literature Focus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Identify exaggeration• Analyse tone (neutral vs emotional)• Recognise rhetorical devices• Identify vague language <p>Teacher prompts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Which headline uses emotional appeal?• Which one provides specific information?• Which contains vague wording? <p>Before responding in whole-class discussion, students discuss their ideas in pairs using the provided sentence frames. This rehearsal time allows multilingual learners to organise their thinking, practise academic vocabulary, and gain confidence before speaking publicly.</p> <p>Civic Education Focus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Why is reliable information important in society?• What happens if citizens rely on sensational headlines?• How can headlines influence public opinion? <p>Phase 2: Language Analysis Mini-Task (Deeper CALP Layer)</p> <p>Highlight specific words:</p> <p>From Headline B:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• “You won’t believe”• “Hiding” <p>Ask:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• What emotion does this phrase trigger?		



Duration	Lesson Flow	Activities	Materials Needed	AI Tools Integration
		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Does it provide evidence?• What is missing? <p>Students first reflect individually and make brief notes. They then discuss their ideas in pairs before sharing responses with the whole class. Multilingual learners may initially discuss ideas in their stronger language (L1) before reformulating them in English/host-country language using the provided academic sentence frame.</p> <p>Students complete: “The phrase ‘___’ attempts to ___ but does not provide ___.” This introduces: Claim vs emotional manipulation.</p> <p>Phase 3: Mini Word-Sort (Academic Vocabulary Activation) Target Vocabulary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• claim• evidence• opinion• source <p>Step 1: Matching Task (Pairs) Students receive: Term cards + definition cards. Step 1: Collaborative Vocabulary Activation</p> <p>Before receiving formal definitions, students first try to explain the vocabulary terms using their prior knowledge, examples, synonyms, antonyms, gestures, drawings, or home-language support where helpful.</p> <p>Suggested organisation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Term 1 – whole-class brainstorming;• Term 2 – small-group discussion;		



Duration	Lesson Flow	Activities	Materials Needed	AI Tools Integration
		<ul style="list-style-type: none">Terms 3 and 4 – individual thinking followed by pair comparison. <p>The teacher collects all suggestions without immediately confirming correctness. Students then compare their ideas with the formal academic definitions provided by the teacher.</p> <p>Formal definitions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Claim – A statement that something is true.Evidence – Facts or data that support a claim.Opinion – A personal belief or judgement.Source – The origin of information. <p>Students then match the terms to the definitions and practise pronunciation through choral repetition, pair repetition, and short oral examples using the target vocabulary.</p> <p>Step 2: Apply to Headlines Now connect vocabulary to real text.</p> <p>Ask:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">What is the claim in Headline B?Is there evidence?What is the source?Is the headline presenting fact or opinion? <p>Students first write brief individual notes using keywords or short phrases. They then compare and rehearse their answers in pairs before sharing with the class. This rehearsal stage supports multilingual learners by allowing them time to organise ideas, practise academic vocabulary, and refine responses before public speaking.</p> <p>Students answer using frames:</p>		



Duration	Lesson Flow	Activities	Materials Needed	AI Tools Integration								
		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• “The claim is that...”• “There is no evidence provided because...”• “The source is unclear/identified.” <p>Make the CALP Shift Explicit Teacher writes on the board:</p> <table><tr><th>Informal</th><th>Academic</th></tr><tr><td>It sounds fake</td><td>It lacks credible evidence</td></tr><tr><td>It feels dramatic</td><td>It uses emotionally loaded language</td></tr><tr><td>It’s not clear</td><td>The source is unspecified</td></tr></table> <p>Students practice replacing informal comments with academic phrasing. Students first read the academic phrases chorally with teacher support, focusing on pronunciation, stress, and intonation. Key vocabulary items (e.g. “credible”, “evidence”, “emotionally loaded language”) are practised separately before students repeat the full sentences individually and in pairs. Students then use the phrases orally in short pair discussions by replacing informal comments with academic alternatives. The teacher models pronunciation and provides corrective feedback where needed. This visibly demonstrates BICS → CALP progression.</p>	Informal	Academic	It sounds fake	It lacks credible evidence	It feels dramatic	It uses emotionally loaded language	It’s not clear	The source is unspecified		
Informal	Academic											
It sounds fake	It lacks credible evidence											
It feels dramatic	It uses emotionally loaded language											
It’s not clear	The source is unspecified											
30'	Main Activities	<p>LESSON FLOW: Source Investigation (group work)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Groups receive 2 short texts (e.g., a post + a short article screenshot).• Use a credibility checklist: author, date, purpose, evidence, tone, links/sources.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Source pack, credibility checklist worksheet, sentence frames, highlighters.	ChatGPT (teacher or students if allowed) proposes a credibility checklist; students evaluate it and improve it (AI literacy + critical thinking).								



Duration	Lesson Flow	Activities	Materials Needed	AI Tools Integration
		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Write a group judgement paragraph using frames: "This source may/may not be reliable because... The evidence is... However..." <p>Proposal:</p> <p>Pedagogical Purpose</p> <p>Students will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Analyse structure and language of real digital texts (Language & Literature)• Evaluate reliability using democratic/media criteria (Civic Education)• Apply a structured credibility framework• Produce a justified academic judgement paragraph (CALP)• Distinguish between claim, evidence, opinion, and manipulation <p>This is where students move from spotting clickbait → to structured evaluation.</p> <p>Phase 1: Text Distribution & Role Assignment (5 minutes)</p> <p>Step 1: Materials</p> <p>Each group receives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Text A: A short social media post (possibly emotional or vague)• Text B: A short news-style article screenshot• Credibility checklist worksheet• Highlighters (2 colours) <p>Texts should contrast:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• identifiable vs unclear author• referenced evidence vs vague claims• neutral tone vs emotional tone <p>Step 2: Assign Roles (Structured Collaboration)</p> <p>To ensure inclusion and accountability:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Reader (reads text aloud)		



Duration	Lesson Flow	Activities	Materials Needed	AI Tools Integration
		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Evidence Finder (highlights factual support)• Tone Analyst (identifies emotional language)• Recorder (writes checklist notes) <p>This supports 21st-century collaboration skills.</p> <p>Phase 2: Structured Credibility Checklist (10–12 minutes)</p> <p>Students evaluate each source using the checklist.</p> <p>Checklist Categories (Explicitly Linked to Subjects)</p> <p>1. Author</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Is the author named?• Is the organisation identifiable?• Are qualifications mentioned? <p>Civic Education link: transparency & accountability in democracy.</p> <p>2. Date</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Is the publication date visible?• Is the information current or outdated? <p>Civic Education link: outdated information can distort public understanding.</p> <p>3. Purpose</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Inform? Persuade? Entertain? Sell?• Is it sponsored? <p>Language & Literature link: author's intention.</p> <p>4. Evidence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Are statistics, expert quotes, or references included?• Are links provided? <p>Language & Literature link: claim vs evidence structure.</p> <p>5. Tone & Language</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Neutral or emotionally loaded?		



Duration	Lesson Flow	Activities	Materials Needed	AI Tools Integration
		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Use of exaggeration?• Vague language? <p>Students highlight:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Yellow = evidence• Pink = emotional language <p>Phase 3: Deep Analysis Prompts (HOTS Layer) After checklist completion, ask groups:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• What is the main claim?• What evidence supports it?• What evidence is missing?• Does tone influence credibility?• Would this source influence public opinion? <p>The discussion questions are displayed on the board/screen throughout the activity so that students can refer to them during group discussion. Groups are given rehearsal time to discuss and prepare their responses before any whole-class sharing takes place. This allows multilingual learners to rehearse both content and academic language in a lower-pressure setting before public speaking. Now they move from identification → evaluation.</p> <p>Phase 4: Academic Judgement Paragraph (CALP Production) Task:</p> <p>Students first discuss their ideas collaboratively in groups using the provided sentence frames and credibility checklist. After the group discussion and rehearsal stage, each student individually writes their own academic judgement paragraph evaluating the source.</p> <p>This structure allows students to support one another during planning and language rehearsal while ensuring that every learner</p>		



Duration	Lesson Flow	Activities	Materials Needed	AI Tools Integration
		<p>independently practises CALP writing skills.</p> <p>.</p> <p>Required Sentence Frames:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• “This source may/may not be reliable because...”• “The author claims that...”• “The evidence provided includes...”• “However, the source lacks...”• “The tone suggests that...”• “Therefore, this source should/should not be considered credible.” <p>Model Structure (Teacher Example)</p> <p>“This source may not be reliable because the author is not clearly identified. The author claims that the information reveals a hidden danger to public safety. However, the source does not provide verifiable evidence or expert references to support this claim. The evidence provided includes emotional language rather than factual support. The tone suggests that the purpose is to persuade or alarm readers rather than inform them objectively. Therefore, this source should not be considered fully credible.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Teacher and students then highlight:• modal verb;• reporting structure;• contrast connector;• evidence-based language;• academic vocabulary;• justified conclusion. <p>Language support remains visible throughout the activity in the form of sentence-frame posters, grammar reference cards, and model examples displayed on the board or screen. Students are encouraged to use these supports independently according to their</p>		



Duration	Lesson Flow	Activities	Materials Needed	AI Tools Integration
		<p>language needs during discussion and writing tasks.</p> <p>Examples of displayed support include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• modal verbs for evaluation (may, might, must, cannot);• contrast connectors (however, although);• reporting structures (“The author claims that...”);• evidence-based sentence starters (“The evidence suggests...”). <p>Highlight:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• modal verb• contrast connector• academic vocabulary• justified conclusion <p>Phase 5: Inter-Group Comparison (5 minutes)</p> <p>Groups first exchange and read one another’s written judgement paragraphs. The discussion prompts are displayed on the board/screen so students can refer to them during discussion: This introduces nuance — essential for CALP development.</p>		
20'	Main Activities	<p>LESSON FLOW: Create a “Credibility Checklist” product</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Groups create a 5–7 point checklist as a poster/slide.• Each criterion must include a short academic explanation (“This matters because...”). <p>Proposal:</p> <p>Pedagogical Purpose</p> <p>Students will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Synthesize evaluation criteria from previous analysis• Transform implicit reasoning into explicit academic principles	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• A3 paper/markers OR laptops/tablets.	Canva AI supports infographic layout and icons; students must justify design choices (clarity, accessibility).



Duration	Lesson Flow	Activities	Materials Needed	AI Tools Integration
		<ul style="list-style-type: none">Justify why credibility standards matter in democratic societiesProduce a structured academic product (poster/slide)Use cause-effect and justification language (CALP) <p>This is the shift from: “We analysed a source” → to → “We can now design criteria for evaluating any source.”</p> <p>Phase 1: Recalling Evaluation Criteria (3–4 minutes) Before creating the checklist, guide recall. Teacher asks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">What criteria did we use earlier?Which criteria were most important?Which criteria helped you change your opinion? <p>Students first make individual notes of the criteria they remember. They then compare and discuss their ideas in pairs or small groups before sharing responses publicly. This rehearsal stage gives multilingual learners time to organise both content and academic language before whole-class discussion.</p> <p>Write responses on board under categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">AuthorDateEvidencePurposeToneSources/Links <p>Now move from remembering → to prioritising.</p> <p>Phase 2: Task Instructions (Clear Academic Expectations) Task: Each group creates a 5–7 point Credibility Checklist.</p>		



Duration	Lesson Flow	Activities	Materials Needed	AI Tools Integration
		<p>Groups select their criteria from the evaluation categories analysed earlier in the lesson (e.g. author, evidence, tone, purpose, date, sources/links). Students must discuss and justify why certain criteria are essential for evaluating credibility and why others may be less important in a particular context.</p> <p>After creating their checklist, groups compare their ideas with a teacher-provided academic/media-literacy reference checklist and discuss similarities, differences, and missing elements.</p> <p>Requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Each criterion must be written as a clear statement.• Each must include a short academic explanation: <p>“This matters because...”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Language must be formal (no “it feels fake”).• Visual clarity (structured layout). <p>Phase 3: Modelling Academic Level (Critical for CALP)</p> <p>Before students begin, model one example:</p> <p>The teacher first models one or two justification examples as a whole-class activity. Students collaboratively suggest improvements to weak examples before constructing stronger CALP-level versions together. This modelling stage clarifies expectations for academic language, justification structure, and level of detail before students begin independent/group work.</p> <p>Weak version:</p> <p>“Check the author.”</p> <p>Strong CALP version:</p> <p>“Verify the author’s identity and qualifications.”</p>		



Duration	Lesson Flow	Activities	Materials Needed	AI Tools Integration
		<p>This matters because transparent authorship increases accountability and credibility.”</p> <p>Highlight:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Verb precision (verify, examine, evaluate)• Academic noun phrases (authorship, accountability, credibility)• Cause-effect reasoning <p>Phase 4: Structured Writing Support</p> <p>Provide scaffolding frame:</p> <p>Criterion Template:</p> <p>1. Evaluate ____.</p> <p>This matters because ____.</p> <p>Encourage use of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• credibility• transparency• bias• reliability• manipulation• evidence-based• accountability• public trust <p>Key academic vocabulary is supported through visible classroom resources, including mini-glossaries, pronunciation modelling, multilingual translation support where needed, and short contextual definitions. Students rehearse selected terms orally in pairs before using them independently in checklist explanations and discussions.</p> <p>Example High-Level Checklist Items</p> <p>The first checklist item is modelled and completed collaboratively with substantial teacher guidance. For the following items, support is gradually reduced so that students increasingly generate criteria explanations and academic justification more independently.</p>		



Duration	Lesson Flow	Activities	Materials Needed	AI Tools Integration
		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Identify the author and their credentials. This matters because qualified authors are more likely to provide accurate and accountable information.• Examine the evidence provided. This matters because claims without evidence reduce reliability.• Check the publication date. This matters because outdated information may misrepresent current issues.• Analyse the tone and language. This matters because emotionally loaded language may indicate persuasive intent rather than objective reporting.• Verify external sources and references. This matters because cross-referencing strengthens credibility. <p>Phase 5: Language & Literature Integration</p> <p>Students must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Use precise verbs (analyse, evaluate, verify, examine)• Avoid informal vocabulary• Apply nominalisation (credibility, reliability, transparency) <p>Teacher challenge: "Can you replace one verb with a more academic alternative?"</p> <p>Civic Education Integration</p> <p>After checklist creation, ask:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Why are credibility standards important in a democracy?• What happens if citizens do not apply these criteria?• Who benefits from misinformation? <p>Groups are given thinking and rehearsal time to discuss the questions and prepare responses collaboratively before any whole-class sharing takes place.</p>		



Duration	Lesson Flow	Activities	Materials Needed	AI Tools Integration
		<p>Students may use the displayed sentence frames and vocabulary support to rehearse academic language and organise their ideas before speaking publicly.</p> <p>Encourage groups to add a final statement:</p> <p>“Responsible citizens should apply these criteria before sharing information.”</p> <p>This makes the civic dimension explicit.</p> <p>Phase 6: Visual Production (Optional Digital Integration)</p> <p>Students create:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A3 poster (analogue) OR• Slide/infographic using Canva AI <p>Whether creating a paper poster or digital infographic, students must justify their visual-layout decisions, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• use of headings,• icons/symbols,• colour coding,• spacing,• and information organisation. <p>Students explain how these choices improve clarity, accessibility, and communication of information. This connects the activity to visual literacy and multimodal communication.</p> <p>Phase 7: Mini-Presentation (5 minutes)</p> <p>Each group presents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• One criterion they consider most important• Why it has the greatest impact <p>Before presenting publicly, groups are given rehearsal time to organise their ideas and practise using the academic sentence frames. Multilingual learners may first rehearse in pairs or small groups before speaking to the whole class.</p> <p>Sentence frames:</p>		



Duration	Lesson Flow	Activities	Materials Needed	AI Tools Integration
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “We prioritised ___ because...” • “Without ___, information may...” <p>This reinforces oral CALP.</p>		
15'	Wrap-Up Reflection & Sharing	<p>LESSON FLOW: Share + reflect</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quick gallery walk: groups leave one sticky note feedback on another group's checklist. • Exit ticket: "One strategy I will use before sharing info is..." <p>Proposal:</p> <p>Pedagogical Purpose</p> <p>Students will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluate peer-produced credibility criteria (Language & Literature) • Engage in respectful academic dialogue (Civic Education) • Reflect on personal responsibility in information sharing • Use structured feedback language (CALP) • Demonstrate transfer from theory → practice <p>This phase shows whether students can:</p> <p>Apply analytical knowledge to real-life digital behaviour.</p> <p>Phase 1: Structured Gallery Walk (5–7 minutes)</p> <p>Step 1: Set Clear Feedback Criteria</p> <p>Before walking, provide feedback sentence frames to ensure academic tone.</p> <p>Before beginning the gallery walk, briefly review key academic terminology used in the task, including singular/plural forms such as “criterion/criteria.” The teacher explains the origin and academic usage of these forms and models pronunciation through short oral repetition activities to strengthen students’ confidence with formal academic language.</p> <p>Sticky Note Format:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sticky notes, wall space. 	Optional DeepL for bilingual key vocabulary support for migrant learners (teacher-prepared glossary).



Duration	Lesson Flow	Activities	Materials Needed	AI Tools Integration
		<p>Each group must leave:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• One positive comment• One constructive suggestion <p>Provide sentence stems:</p> <p>Positive feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• "This criterion is effective because..."• "Your explanation clearly shows..."• "The strongest element of your checklist is..." <p>Constructive suggestion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• "You could clarify..."• "One way to improve this is..."• "It might be helpful to include..." <p>This ensures peer feedback is analytical, not superficial ("Nice poster!").</p> <p>Step 2: Analytical Focus</p> <p>Students must evaluate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Are the criteria clearly written?• Is there academic justification?• Are civic implications visible?• Is language formal and precise? <p>This reinforces subject integration:</p> <p>Language & Literature:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Clarity of expression• Academic tone• Structure of explanation <p>Civic Education:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Responsibility framing• Democratic relevance• Accountability language <p>Phase 2: Debrief Discussion (3–4 minutes)</p> <p>After the gallery walk, ask:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Which criterion appeared most frequently?• Which explanation was strongest?• Did any checklist include something new?		



Duration	Lesson Flow	Activities	Materials Needed	AI Tools Integration
		<p>Students are first given individual thinking time to review their notes and identify possible responses. They then discuss ideas in pairs or small groups to rehearse academic language and refine explanations before participating in whole-class discussion.</p> <p>Then ask a higher-order question: "If everyone in society used these checklists, what might change?"</p> <p>Students respond using:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• "Public trust might increase because..."• "Misinformation could decrease if..." <p>Now civic implications become explicit.</p> <p>Phase 3: Exit Ticket – Personal Transfer (5 minutes)</p> <p>Instead of a simple sentence, structure the reflection to require CALP reasoning.</p> <p>Original:</p> <p>"One strategy I will use before sharing info is..."</p> <p>Expanded to:</p> <p>Students complete:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• "Before sharing information, I will ____."• "This strategy is important because ____."• "If I ignore this strategy, the consequence may be ____." <p>Encourage vocabulary use:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• verify• cross-check• credibility• source• manipulation• misinformation• evidence <p>Strong Example (Model)</p> <p>"Before sharing information, I will verify the original source. This strategy is important because secondary posts may</p>		



Duration	Lesson Flow	Activities	Materials Needed	AI Tools Integration
		<p>misrepresent the original claim and spread misinformation. If I ignore this strategy, the consequence may be contributing to the spread of unreliable information online."</p> <p>Highlight:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Cause-effect reasoning• Academic vocabulary• Ethical awareness		
15'	Evaluation & Feedback	<p>LESSON FLOW: Teacher assessment + student self-assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Teacher observation checklist: use of CALP frames, evidence use, collaboration.• Student self-assessment: "I can evaluate a source using criteria" (1-4 scale) + "I used to think / Now I think" reflection. <p>Proposal:</p> <p>Pedagogical Purpose This phase ensures that students can:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Apply credibility criteria independently• Use academic evaluation language (CALP)• Distinguish claim vs evidence clearly• Justify judgements logically• Reflect on how their understanding has developed <p>This is where we check: Have students moved from opinion-based reactions to structured academic evaluation?</p> <p>PART 1: Teacher Assessment (Formative Observation) Instead of general participation, focus on explicit CALP indicators.</p> <p>A. Use of CALP Frames (Language & Literature) Teacher observes whether students use:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Observation sheet, self-assessment slip.	ChatGPT generates differentiated sentence starters for reflection (B1 vs B2).



Duration	Lesson Flow	Activities	Materials Needed	AI Tools Integration
		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Modal verbs for evaluation (may, might, must, cannot)• Academic connectors (however, therefore, in contrast)• Evidence-based language (The source claims... The evidence suggests...)• Nominalised vocabulary (credibility, reliability, manipulation) <p>These observations inform future language support and scaffolding. If students experience difficulty using particular grammatical structures or academic vocabulary, the teacher revisits these forms through additional modelling, guided practice, sentence frames, and short language-focused mini activities in subsequent lessons.</p> <p>Example strong student output: "Although the article presents a strong claim, it lacks verifiable evidence. Therefore, its credibility may be limited."</p> <p>This demonstrates academic register.</p> <p>B. Evidence-Based Reasoning (Language & Literature) Teacher checks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Do students distinguish between claim and evidence?• Do they refer to specific textual elements?• Are they avoiding vague statements ("It seems fake")? <p>Strong example: "The claim is not supported by data or expert citation, which reduces its reliability."</p> <p>C. Civic Understanding (Civic Education) Teacher looks for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Awareness of public impact• Recognition of responsibility before sharing		



Duration	Lesson Flow	Activities	Materials Needed	AI Tools Integration																								
		<ul style="list-style-type: none">Understanding of democratic implications <p>Example evidence: “If unreliable sources spread widely, public trust in institutions may decrease.”</p> <p>D. Collaboration & 21st-Century Skills</p> <p>Teacher observes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Equal participationRole fulfilmentRespectful academic disagreementUse of structured discussion language <p>Suggested Observation Checklist (Template-Friendly)</p> <table><tr><th>Criteria</th><th>Strong</th><th>Developing</th><th>Needs Support</th></tr><tr><td>Uses academic evaluation language</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Clearly distinguishes claim vs evidence</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Provides justified conclusion</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Connects reliability to civic responsibility</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Collaborates respectfully</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr></table> <p>This makes assessment visible and transparent for evaluators.</p>	Criteria	Strong	Developing	Needs Support	Uses academic evaluation language				Clearly distinguishes claim vs evidence				Provides justified conclusion				Connects reliability to civic responsibility				Collaborates respectfully					
Criteria	Strong	Developing	Needs Support																									
Uses academic evaluation language																												
Clearly distinguishes claim vs evidence																												
Provides justified conclusion																												
Connects reliability to civic responsibility																												
Collaborates respectfully																												



Duration	Lesson Flow	Activities	Materials Needed	AI Tools Integration
		<p>PART 2: Student Self-Assessment</p> <p>Section A: Competency Scale (1-4)</p> <p>Students rate themselves:</p> <p>1 = Not yet 2 = With support 3 = Mostly independently 4 = Independently and confidently</p> <p>Before self-assessment begins, the teacher checks understanding of the statements through brief discussion, simplified paraphrasing, and multilingual translation support where needed. Key academic vocabulary is clarified to ensure that students can accurately reflect on their own learning and confidence levels.</p> <p>Statements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• I can evaluate a source using clear credibility criteria.• I can distinguish between claim and evidence.• I can justify my judgement using evidence.• I can explain why credibility matters in society.• I can use academic language to analyse digital texts. <p>This supports metacognitive awareness.</p> <p>PART 3: "I Used to Think / Now I Think" Reflection (HOTS)</p> <p>This reflection shows conceptual growth.</p> <p>Students complete:</p> <p>"I used to think that reliable information was..."</p> <p>Now I think that credibility depends on..."</p> <p>Encourage inclusion of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• evidence• source• bias• accountability• transparency• verification		



Duration	Lesson Flow	Activities	Materials Needed	AI Tools Integration
		<p>Strong Example:</p> <p>“I used to think that information was reliable if it looked professional. Now I think credibility depends on evidence, author transparency, and purpose.”</p> <p>This demonstrates conceptual shift — a key CALP goal.</p> <p>Optional Higher-Level Reflection (B2 Extension)</p> <p>Students answer:</p> <p>“My understanding of misinformation has evolved because...”</p> <p>or</p> <p>“The most important criterion for evaluating information in a democracy is... because...”</p> <p>This strengthens Civic Education integration.</p>		