



How to use this document: This is an annotated exemplar submission for Spring Forward 2027 based on an accepted Spring CUE session. Each answer is written to score **4 (Established)** on the rubric. Annotations explain what makes each response strong. Use this as a model when crafting your own submission—do not copy it.

Q1. Session Title

85 characters max · Not scored · Appears in program

Fact-Check the Chatbot: Spotting Misinformation in the Age of AI

Why this scores 4: Clear, benefit-forward title under 85 characters. Uses a colon to balance hook with topic clarity. No jargon.

Q2. Conference Agenda Description

75–100 words · Not scored · Written for attendees, not reviewers

In this hands-on lab from KQED public media, participants explore why the strategies professional fact-checkers and journalists use to evaluate sources are more essential than ever in the age of AI. Through interactive activities, you'll unpack key misinformation definitions, practice lateral reading and reverse image search techniques, and play Share or Beware!—KQED's source evaluation game. Leave with free, classroom-ready resources, practical teaching strategies, and a fresh approach to helping students develop healthy skepticism and critical online reasoning skills across grade levels 3–12.

Why this scores 4: Written for attendees: answers who it's for, what you'll do, and what you'll leave with. Active verbs. Specific outcomes.

SCORED QUESTIONS — Rubric: 0 (Not Addressed) to 4 (Established)

Q3. Session Focus

150 words · Describe strategy, framework, or instructional approach featured

SCORE: 4 / 4

This session centers the Civic Online Reasoning (COR) framework developed by the Stanford History Education Group, combined with KQED's source evaluation pedagogy grounded in professional media literacy practice. COR moves away from traditional checklist approaches (e.g., CRAAP test) toward the lateral reading and verification techniques professional fact-checkers actually use. Rather than evaluating a source in isolation, lateral reading teaches students to leave a source quickly to search for what others say about it—a strategy

proven significantly more effective for detecting misinformation.

This session explicitly addresses AI-generated content as an extension of existing misinformation challenges, helping educators understand that the same evidence-informed strategies that work with human-produced misinformation apply equally to AI-generated content. The instructional model moves participants through a scaffolded 'we do / you do' progression, culminating in applied practice using KQED's Share or Beware! game—a gamified, real-world source evaluation experience.

Why this scores 4: Names a specific, well-defined framework (COR / Stanford SHEG). Explains the rationale for choosing it over alternatives. Connects explicitly to AI and the conference theme. Describes the instructional model clearly.

Q4. Problem of Practice

SCORE: 4 / 4

100–150 words · What meaningful challenge or problem of practice does this address?

Students across all grade levels increasingly encounter AI-generated content, algorithmic information, and sophisticated disinformation intentionally designed to be difficult to detect. Yet most educators lack confidence in teaching source evaluation skills that go beyond surface-level checklist approaches—and many are unsure how to frame AI-generated misinformation for their students.

This session addresses a foundational instructional challenge: research from the Stanford History Education Group found that students—including college students—performed significantly worse than professional fact-checkers at evaluating online sources because they use the wrong strategies. With AI now capable of generating convincing, human-like content at scale, this challenge has become urgent across every content area and grade level. Educators need pedagogical strategies that are evidence-informed, proven, and immediately applicable.

Why this scores 4: Grounds the challenge in evidence (Stanford research). Explains why the challenge is urgent and growing. Connects to educators' lived reality. Establishes stakes without being alarmist.

Q5. Implementation & Impact

SCORE: 4 / 4

250–300 words · Most important scoring question · Include authentic evidence of impact

KQED has implemented this framework through professional development workshops serving thousands of educators across California and nationally, including sessions at ISTE, NCTE, NCSS, and CUE. The Civic Online Reasoning approach embedded in this session is grounded in peer-reviewed research from the Stanford History Education Group, which demonstrated that lateral reading significantly outperforms traditional evaluation methods—including in studies where professional fact-checkers were compared directly to students and history professors.

In KQED professional learning sessions, post-session surveys show 87% of participants planned to use at least one strategy or resource in their classroom within two weeks of attending. Follow-up data from participating educators documented implementation across ELA, social studies, science, and library/information science contexts at grade levels 3–12.

The Share or Beware! game featured in this session has been piloted in multiple classroom settings and refined through multiple iterations based on educator and student feedback. Teachers who implemented it reported high levels of student engagement and meaningful discussions about reliability, credibility, and how AI-generated content fits into existing information ecosystems. Student artifacts from implementing classrooms

show evidence of students applying lateral reading unprompted during independent research tasks.

This session explicitly positions AI-generated content not as a new, separate problem requiring entirely new skills, but as an evolution of the information landscape students and educators already navigate. This framing reduces educator overwhelm, builds on existing instructional practice, and empowers educators with a coherent, transferable approach they can adapt across grade levels and content areas.

***Why this scores 4:** Multiple forms of evidence: quantitative (87% implementation rate), qualitative (educator and student feedback), peer-reviewed research citation, and artifact-level evidence. Describes real-world scale of implementation. Explains why the approach works—not just that it does.*

Q6. Practical Takeaways

SCORE: 4 / 4

150 words · What can participants directly apply in their context?

- A fully modifiable slide deck covering session content that educators can adapt for their own PD or classroom instruction
- Access to Share or Beware!, KQED's free, classroom-ready source evaluation game, with facilitation guidance and student materials
- A classroom-tested introduction to lateral reading, reverse image search, and data literacy techniques that transfer across content areas and grade levels
- A curated collection of free KQED lesson plans and media literacy resources, aligned to multiple subject areas and grade bands (Grades 3–12)
- Practical language and framing for discussing AI-generated content with students, including age-appropriate discussion prompts and vocabulary
- Access to KQED Teach, an online professional learning platform offering additional no-cost media literacy courses for educators

***Why this scores 4:** Every takeaway is specific, named, and actionable—not vague ("strategies and resources"). Includes tools, lesson plans, language, and a pathway to continued learning. Spans grade levels and contexts.*

Q7. Learner-Centered Design

SCORE: 4 / 4

150 words · UDL, accessibility, participant agency, multiple means of engagement

This session is designed with participant agency and flexible engagement as core principles. The agenda moves from direct instruction to collaborative discussion to supported practice to independent application, allowing participants with varying levels of prior knowledge to engage meaningfully at every stage.

Discussion-based sections invite participants to draw on their own classroom contexts and student populations, ensuring learning is anchored in each educator's specific instructional reality. The Share or Beware! game is explicitly designed to be modifiable for diverse student needs, and facilitators will highlight how strategies adapt for ELL students, students with learning differences, and varied grade levels.

All session resources are provided in accessible digital formats with alt text and captioned visuals. Participants are offered multiple means of engagement—individual reflection, partner discussion, and group collaboration—throughout the session, honoring varied participation preferences. The content itself is designed to be cross-curricular and grade-band flexible, making it accessible to educators from elementary through higher education.

Why this scores 4: Explicitly names UDL principles without just listing the acronym. Addresses multiple means of engagement, representation, and action. Connects to specific populations (ELL, learning differences). Mentions accessibility of materials directly.

Q8. Participant Engagement

SCORE: 4 / 4

100–150 words · How will participants actively engage? Move beyond passive listening.

This session maintains a 70/30 ratio of active participation to direct instruction. Engagement is structured across five distinct phases:

Opening check-in: Participants self-assess current confidence in teaching source evaluation, activating prior knowledge and establishing a personal learning baseline.

Collaborative discussion: Small-group conversation on what 'reliable source' means across content areas, grounded in participants' own classroom realities.

Supported practice (We do): Participants apply lateral reading, reverse image search, and data literacy strategies to real examples—including AI-generated content—with facilitation.

Game play (You do): Participants play Share or Beware! in small groups, making source evaluation decisions in a low-stakes, gamified context.

Closing reflection: Each participant identifies one strategy to implement and one resource to explore further before leaving.

Why this scores 4: Every engagement moment is named and explained—not just 'group discussion.' The 70/30 ratio signals intentional design. The progression from opening to closing mirrors sound instructional architecture.

Q9. Effective Technology Guidelines Domain Alignment

SCORE: 4 / 4

Select primary domain (required) + optional secondary domain.

Domain	Selection	Rationale (not provided in submission process — for exemplar purposes only)
Primary	Domain 2: Instructional Practice and Design	This session is fundamentally about instructional practice—equipping educators with evidence-informed pedagogical strategies (COR framework, lateral reading) that directly shape how they design instruction and make teaching decisions about source evaluation in AI-integrated environments.
Secondary	Domain 1: Learning Impact and Engagement	The session's gamified structure (Share or Beware!) and student-centered activities directly address how learners experience and engage with media literacy, and how technology-mediated information affects student learning outcomes.

Why this scores 4: Domain selection is accurate and explained—not just a checkbox. The rationale connects the specific session content to the domain definition, demonstrating the presenter understands what the domain means.

Question	Criterion	Score
Q3	Session Focus	4 / 4
Q4	Problem of Practice	4 / 4
Q5	Implementation & Impact	4 / 4
Q6	Practical Takeaways	4 / 4
Q7	Learner-Centered Design	4 / 4
Q8	Participant Engagement	4 / 4
Q9	Effective Technology Guidelines Domain Alignment	4 / 4
	TOTAL	28 / 28