

BUILDING THE CRITERIA

One idea must land: judging without rules collapses into “depends what you count” — criteria, weighted and written BEFORE the evidence, are what make a judgment fair.

WE ARE LEARNING

To build and weight evaluation criteria — the judging rules for the unit's Verdict — and to turn each rule into a question that can test a real proposal.

CURRICULUM • SKILLS FOCUS

HASS skills strands: Questioning and researching
• Analysing •

EVALUATING

• Communicating and reflecting — applied to both Y7 liveability descriptors (SCSA, implementation 2026).

SPARK THE IMAGE + THE HARVEST

- **Show:** the mine-beside-town aerial — the unit's most confronting image, held back until now. 30 silent seconds. Then worry / surprise / question captured, a few harvested aloud.
- **Collect the seed ideas:** “what should a mine have to PROVE?” — every idea to the board, verbatim, kid language. This board becomes the raw material for the criteria. Don't sort yet.

CORE THE ARTICLE — JUDGING WITHOUT RULES

- **Hand out The Western Ledger.** Read it aloud (or paired reading) while students do their three marks. Point at the masthead first: “**this is fiction, built for this exact job — and it says so right there.**” That honesty is the program's brand.
- **The 90-second argument:** which town got it right? Pairs MUST pick. Then the punchline, delivered slowly: “notice what happened. Smart people, same facts, opposite answers. You weren't disagreeing about the towns — you were counting different things. That's why judges write their rules FIRST.”
- **The easter egg:** sharp students will spot Marla Creek — Joan's company from Unit 2, grown up. Reward the noticing; it's the same fictional world.

WORKSHOP BUILD, WEIGHT, DRAW

- **Bring the mission data in first:** read three or four of the adults' interview answers aloud — “what made you choose to live here” IS criteria talk, from their own kitchens. Add the strongest onto the board. **Then sort the board into piles** with the class calling the moves, and let them NAME each pile. Steer gently toward the five: **Environment • Economy • Community • Governance • Liveability.** “Governance” won't come from them — offer it when they invent “promises” or “checking up”: “there's a grown-up word for that pile.”
- **Weighting, teams of 3–4:** 20 points, no even spreads — at least one 6+, at least one 2-or-less. The argument IS the learning; let it run. Then the radar template: scores on the axes, dots joined, shape signed.
- **Gallery moment:** teams hold up radars. Every shape different — “that's perception, from Lesson 1, drawn in pen.”

LAND IT TEST QUESTIONS + THE GUT-LOCK

- One test question per criterion, question-word starts. Then exit item 3 — **the gut-lock** — matters most: verdict hunch recorded before any evidence exists. Lesson 5 will hold their gut against their rules and ask which one won. Collect or photograph these; you'll want them.

■ WHAT THE ARTICLE IS ENGINEERED TO DO

Marla Creek and Eddington are balanced on purpose: every gain has a cost, every cost has a gain, and both towns end unsure. Kylie's jobs and school sit against Robbie's creek and the families who left; Eddington's glass-clear creek sits against its closing shops. If a student finds “the right answer,” ask which sentence proves it — there isn't one, and discovering that is the lesson. The closing line — “*depends what you count, and who's counting*” — is the entire unit in nine words.

■ PROBING QUESTIONS WHILE YOU CIRCULATE

- “Your team gave Environment 7 and Economy 3 — would Kylie from the article sign your radar? Would Robbie?”
- “Is your test question answerable with evidence — or is it really an opinion wearing a question mark?”
- “Which criterion would an 80-year-old weight differently from you? (Lesson 1 never left.)”
- “If two criteria clash — big jobs, damaged creek — what does your weighting already tell you to do?”

■ THE HERITAGE QUESTION — HANDLE WITH RESPECT

A strong extension, raised carefully: “What about heritage — the story and meaning of the land itself, especially for Aboriginal communities? Should that be a sixth criterion, or part of every criterion?” In real WA approvals, heritage genuinely matters. Treat student answers seriously, follow your school's protocols for discussing Aboriginal perspectives, and don't rush it — a good unresolved question beats a rushed answer.

■ DIFFERENTIATION

Support: the five criterion names as pre-printed cards to sort ideas under; the article read aloud in full before marking. **Extend:** the heritage question above, plus: “design the sixth axis — what would the radar look like with it?”

■ RUNNING SHORT — THE CUT LINE

Cut the gallery moment and set test questions as the lesson's last five minutes rather than a full phase. Protect the article argument, the pile-sort naming, the weighting with no even spreads, and the gut-lock exit.

■ MISCONCEPTIONS TO WATCH

“More criteria = fairer” (five sharp beats ten mushy) · “the weighting is the RIGHT answer” (weights are values made visible — perception again; another good team can weight differently) · “the article has a winner” (it was built not to — that's the point).

