

1.5 Independent learning: goals, sources and checks

Name: _____ Class: _____ Date: _____

Total: 24 marks

KEY WORDS independent learning 自主学习 • learning goal 学习目标

Objective

Set a checkable learning goal, evaluate a source and review an independent-study result. This is original GAC003-aligned practice, not an official assessment. All people, records and source cards are fictional.

1 Key knowledge and worked examples

■ Key knowledge: take responsibility for the check

Independent learning 自主学习 means taking responsibility for preparation, progress and review while using permitted support. A **learning goal** 学习目标 names an intended outcome, its conditions and a review point. Include a quality check as well as a task to complete.

A source's location is not proof that every claim is true. Check who produced it, what evidence it supplies, whether it answers your question and what its limits are. A listener's agreement does not establish accuracy unless the explanation is checked against the material.

■ Source A: two fictional source cards

Card 1 is *School Rainwater Trial*, written by the named campus facilities team in 2025 and listed in the school library catalogue. It reports one trial week: 100 litres were collected and 60 litres used for garden watering. It supplies the dated collection and use log. It gives no annual costs or evidence from other schools. Its claim is limited to showing that some collected water was reused in that week.


Card 2 is an unsigned blog post, *Rainwater Solves Every Bill*, with no date or linked records. It says every school can remove its entire annual water bill by collecting rain. It gives no costs, collection figures or comparison. The cards are practice texts, not real publications.

■ Source B: Ming's goal and review

Ming's goal is: "By Friday I will give a two-minute summary of Card 1 without reading. I will compare its main claim, two supporting facts and one limit with the card, then record anything missing."

On Wednesday he prepared notes and gave a two-minute summary to a partner. He correctly stated the 100 litres collected and 60 litres used, but said that the trial proved annual bills would disappear. The partner repeated that claim. Ming then checked the card and noticed that annual costs were not reported. He revised the claim to describe reuse in the one trial week. There has been no new unaided summary yet.

■ Worked example: a completed talk can still need revision



Known: Ming completed the two-minute activity and recalled two figures. The unsupported annual-bill claim means the first summary did not yet meet the accuracy check. Partner repetition preserved the error rather than testing it.

The later source comparison identified the missing limit. Revising the claim is useful, but it does not establish a successful new summary without notes. Before Friday, Ming should schedule another unaided summary and compare the claim, figures and limit with Card 1. The check needs a recorded result, not a promised success.

2 Practice

2.1 Identify ONE task/condition and ONE quality check in Ming's stated goal. [2]

2.2 State TWO evidence features that make Card 1 more useful than Card 2 for checking what happened in the trial week. Do not rely on the library listing alone. [2]

2.3 Describe the two facts Ming recalled accurately and the unsupported conclusion in his first summary. [3]

2.4 State a feasible next task, the content it should check and a review point that respects Friday's goal. Do not invent a new result. [3]

3 Exam-style questions

3.1 Evaluate THREE claims: "The library listing proves every statement on Card 1"; "Finishing two minutes proves the summary is accurate"; "A partner repeating the claim proves annual bills will disappear". Give a reasoned correction for each using the supplied material. [6]

Solutions

2.1 Give a two-minute summary without reading by Friday. Compare its main claim, two supporting facts and one limit with the card and record omissions. Naming the deadline alone does not earn the task mark.

2.2 A named team is accountable for the report and provides a dated collection/use log. It supplies specific figures for a defined week, unlike Card 2's unsupported general claim. Accept two distinct evidence-based features; named authorship alone does not guarantee truth.

2.3 100 litres were collected. 60 litres were used for garden watering. The first summary wrongly inferred that annual bills would disappear, despite no annual costs being reported.

2.4 Schedule another two-minute summary without notes before Friday, for example Thursday after class in an available slot. Check the main claim, collected/used figures and one-week/no-annual-cost limit against Card 1. Record the check result that day and decide what still needs revision. Do not assume the example slot is available; accept a conditional plan to confirm it.

3.1 Award 2 per correction: evidence or limit, implication. A catalogue identifies where the report is found, not proof of each claim; inspect its log and limits. Two minutes establishes completion, while the false annual-bill claim demonstrates an accuracy gap; use the source comparison. The partner repeated the same unsupported claim without a record check; repetition supplies no annual-cost evidence and cannot establish that conclusion.

3.2 Local analytic rubric, $8 \times B1$: completed activity; accurate reported fact; annual-bill error; source comparison identified it; named evidence feature of Card 1; relevant scope limit; specific next unaided task and recorded check; coherent truthful 80–110 word account. Example: "I gave Wednesday's two-minute summary and recalled that the trial collected 100 litres and used 60 for watering. I also claimed that annual bills would disappear. My partner repeated that claim, but checking Card 1 showed that annual costs were not reported. The dated log makes the card useful for checking its one trial week; its library listing does not prove every wider claim. I revised my conclusion to describe reuse during that week. Before Friday I will confirm an available slot, summarise again without notes and compare the claim, figures and limit, recording any remaining error."