

Title: Appendix D for “Lateral reading: College students learn to critically evaluate internet sources in an online course”

Authors: Joel Breakstone (1), Mark Smith (1), Priscilla Connors (2), Teresa Ortega (1), Darby Kerr (1), Sam Wineburg (1)

Date: February 23rd, 2021

Note: The material contained herein is supplementary to the article named in the title and published in the Harvard Kennedy School (HKS) Misinformation Review.

Appendix D

Three-level rubric used to score student responses to Task 3 (see Appendix A)

(2) MASTERY	Student does <u>all</u> of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Raises a question about the trustworthiness of the group/funder/sponsor behind the website• Provides at least one correct and relevant reason why the site is unreliable (e.g., explains conflict of interest/influence of funders or lack of transparency about funding or describes purpose/motivation of the organization)• Shows evidence of lateral reading (e.g., references other websites)
(1) EMERGING	Student identifies the website’s group/funder/sponsor as problematic but either: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Does not provide a completely correct explanation• Does not show evidence of lateral reading <p>OR</p> Student questions the reliability of the site because it promotes ideas/content refuted by established science. <p>OR</p> Student reads laterally but comes to an incorrect conclusion.
(0) BEGINNING	Student rejects the source based on incorrect or irrelevant considerations without questioning the organization behind the page. For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Appearance (presence of ads, donations tab, Flash Player, poor web design)• Critiques information on site instead of the organization behind the site (e.g., student says content is biased; disagrees with the content/perspective; site lacks evidence, etc.) <p>OR</p> Student argues that the site is reliable.