

# Info Score — Article analysis

**Article:** no-site.com  
https://www.no-site.com

**Level:** Seconde / Première  
**Duration:** 55 min  
**Rules:** v0.1.0

## Info Score verdict



### Low reliability

weighted overall score : 0.494 · type : inconnu · language : en

**Neutral summary :** This text is a GoDaddy domain-parking page announcing that the domain no-site.com is registered but still available for purchase. It contains no informational content: no factual claims, sources, viewpoints, or analysis to evaluate.

## Session schedule — 55 minutes

---

### ① Setting the stage (5 min)

Project the article to students, without showing the Info Score verdict. Hook question: « Without yet knowing the analysis, what impression does this article leave on you? Why? »

### ② Guided analysis (15 min)

Presentation of the six Info Score criteria. Verdict restitution: **D**. Discussion of the sub-scores:

Criterion	Weight	Score	Bar	Munich
Fact / commentary separation	0.20	0.45		art. 1
Source traceability	0.20	0.20		art. 3
Plurality of viewpoints	0.18	0.27		art. 7
Expression of uncertainty	0.14	0.40		art. 5
Tone and lexicon	0.14	1.00		art. 8
Contextualisation	0.14	0.85		art. 1

### ③ Group work (20 min)

Students, in groups of 3 or 4, apply the same grid to an article of their choice (local newspaper, French press, English-language press). Each group assigns a sub-score and cites a literal extract that justifies it.

### ④ Pooling (10 min)

Each group presents its analysis. Debate on the differences between groups for the same article.

### ⑤ Synthesis and written record (5 min)

The teacher formalises on the board the two or three criteria that proved most discriminating for the articles studied. Students write down the formula: « A reliable piece of information is not one that pleases; it is one whose **source can be traced**, whose **uncertainty is acknowledged**, and whose **facts are distinguished from commentary**. »

## Methodological notes

---

This is a GoDaddy domain-parking placeholder page, not a news article or journalistic content. No factual claims, sources, opinions, or analysis are present. The single external hyperlink points to a commercial review platform (Trustpilot), not to verifiable source material. Most EMI assessment criteria are inapplicable here by nature.

---

## Appendix — Student self-assessment grid

---

To be detached and filled in for the article studied in group.

**Analysed article :** \_\_\_\_\_

**Source :** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

Sources are named and verifiable	yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	partial	<input type="checkbox"/>	no	<input type="checkbox"/>
Opinions are distinguished from facts	yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	partial	<input type="checkbox"/>	no	<input type="checkbox"/>
Several viewpoints are represented	yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	partial	<input type="checkbox"/>	no	<input type="checkbox"/>
The text acknowledges what it does not know	yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	partial	<input type="checkbox"/>	no	<input type="checkbox"/>
The tone remains measured and professional	yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	partial	<input type="checkbox"/>	no	<input type="checkbox"/>
Context (historical, geographical) is provided	yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	partial	<input type="checkbox"/>	no	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Overall grade proposed by the group :** A  B  C  D  E

**Justification in one sentence :**

---

---