

## 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."