

## Rubric for Fact-Checking

## WRT | Fall 2017: “Reading the Stream” unit

			
<b>Is the chosen claim being checked clearly articulated, its context explained, and appropriate for the scope of the post?</b>	The claim and its context are clearly identified through detailed description and selectively embedded links. The research required is within the allotted word count; the post is neither too long nor too short.	The claim is identified and its context described. The research required is within the allotted word count, though the chosen claim might not have been the best choice given the research required to fact-check it.	The claim is difficult to understand or identify, not worthy of a fact-check, and/or the post is underdeveloped.
<b>Does the post incorporate and clearly describe fact-checking techniques?</b>	The post demonstrates that the writer looked up previous work about the claim, went upstream to locate original sources, and read sources laterally in order to thoroughly check the chosen claim. The post is persuasive and demonstrates diligence as the writer describes her web searching processes specifically and links to relevant content.	The post demonstrates that the writer used some of the fact-checking techniques from the unit, but perhaps could have used them more effectively to arrive at more persuasive conclusions about the claim or could have described them more specifically or with better selected links.	The post either does not go far enough to utilize the fact-checking techniques discussed, or the writer doesn't describe her web-searching process clearly.
<b>Does the post include media, including images, video, sound, and or other embedded content?</b>	The post includes carefully-selected and properly-formatted media that enhances the fact-checking process described in the post.	The post includes media, though perhaps some of the choices could have been more appropriate than others or could have been incorporated more effectively to reflect its content.	Media is either minimal, missing, or inappropriately arranged in the post.
<b>Is the post organized and well-written?</b>	The post is easy to find on the site, has distinguishable ¶s, has been proofread, and includes tags.	The post is easy to find on the site, has distinguishable ¶s, and has been proofread, though some errors are noticeable.	The post is either difficult to find, contains multiple sentence-level errors, or is otherwise disorganized.