Claims on YouTube Rubric #2

This task asks students to assess the validity of a YouTube video ("GMOs 101 with Jeffrey Smith"), which contains multiple claims related to the risks associated with GMOS. The video was posted by @FoodRevolutionNetwork to promote a GMO Summit. Jeffrey Smith, the speaker in the video, is a self-published author, film producer, and well-known anti-GMO activist. The speaker makes uses strong language and imagery that targets the viewer’s emotions (e.g. "forcing DNA into other species", background sounds of animals in distress, “poisonous”, “weed killer”). Additionally, he oversimplifies processes and reasons, affecting the validity of those claims. For example, he claims that plants that have been genetically modified to include Bacillus thuringiensis resistance are “registered pesticides”, which is not true. Lastly, the purpose of the video is to promote an event and encourage individuals to purchase a product package. 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 inherent bias associated with the purpose of the video, lack of supporting evidence, and negative language and images.

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

- Jeffrey Smith and the producer (@FooRevolutionNetwork) have an inherent bias in producing this video – to promote participation in the GMO Summit and sell packages
- Negative images, language, and background sounds targeted at eliciting an emotional response from viewers
- Jeffrey Smith includes non-factual or misrepresented information in his claims

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
- The video was published in 2013 and therefore includes outdated information

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

This rubric was adapted from the Stanford History Education Group sheg.stanford.edu