



Claims on Twitter Rubric #2

This task asks students to compare two tweets that reference the same scientific study, “Quasi-extinction risk and population targets for the Eastern, migratory population of monarch butterflies”. This study concludes that there are multiple reasons why the monarch butterfly population is declining, citing an increase in pesticides being only one of the potential factors. GM Watch (@GMWatch) interprets the results as a clear causation between increased Roundup (herbicide) and reduced monarch butterfly populations, while the Alliance for Science (@ScienceAlly) references the complexity of the studies’ results. Some students might accept the articles these tweets link to as sound evidence based on their titles, without reading the scientific study they reference. However, upon investigation, one can see that the @GMWatch tweet is not accurately interpreting the study’s conclusion. Strong responses will discount the claim based on this reasoning.

Mastery

Student argues that the claim @GMWatch makes is not accurate by identifying:

- that the scientific study does not specifically reference Roundup or glyphosate
- that the study suggests multiple reasons for the decrease in monarch butterfly populations

Emerging

Student correctly identifies that the @GMWatch tweet is not accurate but does not fully explain their reasoning, or they rely on the statistics and simple “formulaic” tweet as evidence of its credibility.

Beginning

Student argues that the @GMWatch tweet is accurate or argues that the claim is inaccurate but does not identify the pieces of information outlined above.