

**Rubric for Fact-Checking**

**WRT | Spring 2018: “Reading the Stream” unit**

|   |    |   |    |
|---|---|--|---|
| <b>Is the fact being checked clearly articulated, its context explained, and appropriate for the scope of the post?</b> | The source and its info/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 source is identified and its info/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 source and its info/context is difficult to understand or identify, not worthy of a fact-check, and/or the post is underdeveloped.                    |
| <b>Does the post incorporate and articulate fact-checking techniques?</b>   | The post demonstrates that the writer looked up previous work about the fact in question, went upstream to locate original sources, and read sources laterally in order to thoroughly check it. The post is concise, 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 concise, persuasive answers 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 web-searching processes clearly. |
| <b>By the post's conclusion has the author summarized the degree of consensus surrounding the fact in question?</b>     | The post thoroughly explains the degree to which this fact in question is generally not disputed by people (1) in a position to know and (2) who can be relied on to accurately tell the truth.   | The post resolves the issues surrounding the chosen fact in question, though it may not thoroughly summarize consensus or use knowledge from a variety of people in a position to know or who are reliable for accuracy.   | The post does not resolve the issue surrounding the chosen fact in question. Readers cannot confidently determine whether the fact-check was successful.  |
| <b>Does the post use the affordances of WP, including embedded links, images, video, sound, and or other content?</b>   | The post includes carefully-selected and properly-formatted media that enhances the fact-checking process described in the post. Readers can follow along clearly and quickly.  | 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.  |