

LESSON PLAN • SPEAKING + READING + WRITING

Human Rights: Balancing Principles

Safety, privacy and proportionate decisions

LEVEL	DURATION	CLASS
C1	70 minutes	Older teens / adults

Objectives

By the end of the lesson, students will be able to:

- Identify the rights and interests in tension in a public decision.
- Assess whether a restriction is necessary and proportionate.
- Write a balanced recommendation with safeguards and review mechanisms.

Materials

Student worksheet (pages 3–4), board or shared screen, pens; optional timer. All reading texts and scenarios are original fictional classroom examples.

Language focus

Reasoned deliberation, concessions and proportionality

1. Warm-up (7 minutes)

Put a fictional question on the board: Should a public library record visitors' identities to increase safety?

- Pairs share a short example; take two or three responses without putting anyone on the spot.

2. Language preparation (10 minutes)

Model the reasoning sequence: legitimate aim -> evidence -> less intrusive options -> safeguards -> review. Language: "Even if..., it does not follow that..."

- Students choose two useful expressions from the language bank on page 4 and rehearse them in pairs.

3. Reading for meaning (12 minutes)

Give students the fictional case on page 3. Read independently, then underline the main problem and the response. Ask learners to explain the case in one sentence.

- Do not provide the answer key yet; invite two different summaries.

TEACHER PLAN • CONTINUED

Teaching sequence

Human Rights: Balancing Principles • C1 • 70 minutes

4. Guided practice (15 minutes)

Students complete the five-item vocabulary match and four reading questions on page 3. Check in pairs first, then review answers as a class.

- Ask for the sentence or detail in the reading that supports each answer.
- For faster groups, ask whether the characters could have chosen another respectful solution.

5. Communicative task (17 minutes)

Use the role-play on page 4. Give each participant one minute to prepare their position; complete the discussion and agree on an action.

- A city council is debating mandatory ID checks for entry to a free public facility after security incidents.
- If working in threes, an observer records one effective expression and one suggestion for improvement.
- Learners present their agreed decision briefly to another pair.

6. Writing and feedback (6 minutes)

Students complete the page 4 writing task (170–200 words). Prioritize a clear point and practical example over perfect grammar.

- Ask students to underline one target-language expression and check whether their proposal answers the prompt.

7. Exit ticket (3 minutes)

Each learner writes one sentence explaining what they would change in the case and why. Collect two examples or ask for a volunteer summary.

Differentiation and classroom care

Support: allow preparation notes and sentence frames; pair less confident speakers with supportive peers. Stretch: require a counterargument, a limitation or a measurable next step.

Legal specifics vary by jurisdiction. Present this as structured ethical reasoning, not definitive legal advice.

Assessment

Look for (1) accurate understanding of the case, (2) two appropriate topic expressions, (3) respectful turn-taking, and (4) a specific, justified recommendation.

Optional extension / homework

Write the strongest reasonable objection to your recommendation, then answer it fairly.

STUDENT WORKSHEET • 1/2

Human Rights: Balancing Principles

C1 | Read the case, work with key vocabulary, and check your understanding.

A. Read the case

Fictional classroom case study

After several incidents of damaged equipment, a city library considers a rule requiring visitors to scan identification cards before entering reading rooms. The proposal has a legitimate aim: protecting a shared public space. Some staff members believe it would discourage vandalism and make investigations easier. Others ask whether the measure would actually prevent damage and point out that collecting identity records could deter visitors who value privacy. The library also serves people who lack standard identification.

Rather than choosing immediately between unrestricted access and universal surveillance, a review panel examines less intrusive alternatives. These include improved staff presence, secure storage for equipment and access logs limited to rooms containing valuable items. The panel also asks who would be allowed to see any collected data, how long records would be kept, and how visitors could challenge an unfair exclusion. Its recommendation is conditional: use targeted measures first, publish the evidence supporting any broader restriction, set clear retention limits and review the policy after a trial. The panel recognizes that rights are not always absolute in every circumstance; nevertheless, any limitation requires a convincing justification and meaningful safeguards. A workable decision must explain not only the benefit sought but also whose interests might be affected and how risks of misuse will be controlled.

B. Vocabulary match

Match the words (1–5) to the definitions (A–E). Write the correct letter.

WORD	DEFINITION
1. proportionate ____	A. fair procedures before an important decision is enforced
2. safeguard ____	B. careful and critical examination
3. due process ____	C. not more extensive than reasonably needed for a goal
4. legitimate ____	D. reasonable or justified within a given framework
5. scrutiny ____	E. a protection against misuse or harm

C. Check your understanding

1. What legitimate goal prompted the proposed rule?

2. Name two possible costs of collecting visitor identities.

3. What alternatives were considered?

4. Why was the recommendation conditional?

STUDENT WORKSHEET • 2/2

Speak, decide, write

Human Rights: Balancing Principles · C1

D. Role-play and decision

A city council is debating mandatory ID checks for entry to a free public facility after security incidents.

ROLE A

Safety adviser: explain the public-safety objective and evidence needed to support a restriction.

ROLE B

Rights adviser: test necessity, access barriers, privacy safeguards and fair appeals.

Your decision: Produce a recommendation using five headings: aim, evidence, alternatives, safeguards, review.

Useful language

- A legitimate aim does not automatically justify...
- A less intrusive alternative might be...
- This measure would be proportionate only if...
- Any restriction should be subject to...

E. Writing task

Write a 170-200-word balanced recommendation weighing safety, access and privacy. Include a condition for future review. Use the lines below or continue on separate paper.

F. Reflection

Which phrase helped you communicate respectfully or clearly? What would you improve next time?

TEACHER KEY

Answers and teaching notes

Human Rights: Balancing Principles · C1

B. Vocabulary matching

1 C · 2 E · 3 A · 4 D · 5 B

C. Reading comprehension — suggested answers

1. Protecting shared equipment and improving safety.
2. Privacy concerns and exclusion of people without standard ID.
3. More staff presence, secure equipment storage and limited room-specific logs.
4. It required evidence, limits, safeguards and a later review.

D. Speaking task — success criteria

Produce a recommendation using five headings: aim, evidence, alternatives, safeguards, review.

- Each speaker states a concern without personal attacks.
- The pair acknowledges at least one trade-off or limitation.
- The final decision names a specific action or safeguard.

E. Writing — sample response

The council has a legitimate interest in protecting public facilities, but that aim alone does not establish that universal identification checks are necessary. Before introducing a broad restriction, it should publish evidence linking the proposed measure to the problem and assess less intrusive options, including improved supervision and protection of specific equipment. A universal rule could create barriers for visitors without standard identification and raise concerns about retention and misuse of personal data. If narrowly targeted checks prove necessary, the policy should specify access controls, short retention periods, a fair appeals process and independent oversight. A time-limited pilot, followed by a public review of outcomes, would help determine whether the benefits justify the costs. Even a well-intentioned safety measure should remain proportionate, transparent and open to challenge. The review should involve staff and community members affected by the policy, not solely those responsible for security. Decision-makers must also consider unintended effects: a restriction that discourages legitimate visitors may weaken the facility's public purpose. Publishing a concise explanation of the chosen option and its limitations would make the decision more transparent, while leaving space for revision if evidence changes.

Teacher reminder

Legal specifics vary by jurisdiction. Present this as structured ethical reasoning, not definitive legal advice.

Further practice

Write the strongest reasonable objection to your recommendation, then answer it fairly.