This task asks students to assess the validity of a YouTube video ("Genetic engineering: The world’s greatest scam"), which contains multiple claims related to the risks associated with GMOS. The video was posted by @GreenpeaceVideo, the official YouTube account for Greenpeace International – an “independent campaigning organization that uses peaceful protest and creative communication to expose global environmental problems”. The account has 160,000+ followers. The producers of this video do not include any source information for many of these claims, either in the video notes or within the script of the video itself. Additionally, the video distinguishes GMO-related imagery with negative graphics, including symbols similar to the nuclear waste graphic. Lastly, given that the video was originally posted in 2009, all of the statistics need to be verified before using. Students are asked whether this video is a reliable source of information about GMO risks. Strong answers will identify that the video is not a reliable source of information given the lack of credible evidence to support the claims within the video and the inherent bias associated with its producers and the purpose of the video.

**Mastery**

Student clearly articulates a sound reason and complete explanation about why the video is not a reliable source of information. Reasons include:

- @GreenpeaceVideo doesn’t provide any credible evidence to support their claims
- Greenpeace International has an inherent bias in producing this video – to dissuade individuals from using or supporting GM technologies or GMO products

**Emerging**

Student does not effectively evaluate the source of the video, but does fully explain another significant problem of the video, including:

- Although the video uses statistics, it does not provide information about the sources of those statistics
- Negative imagery and graphics associated with GM technologies and GMO products

**Beginning**

Student does not identify any relevant aspects of the video that affect its credibility.
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