

	Outstanding	Acceptable	Good start, but needs some work	Incomplete
Part 1 - Formative Assessment				
Notes/discussion related to guiding questions	Notes/discussion indicate that students followed all of the guiding questions (13/13) and addressed them as they explored the website.	9/13 guiding questions are discussed. Students seem to be understanding the information, but are going off on tangents or not fully "getting" the ideas.	6/13 guiding questions are discussed. Students are exploring the website but only following the ideas minimally.	Fewer than 6 guiding questions are discussed. Exploration of the website is random and unproductive.
Discussion of bias for the energy-from-shale site	Students address bias and connect the for-profit status of the member companies with the likelihood of bias.	Students address bias, but are unsure of the connection between the backers and the opinions expressed.	Students address bias but guess randomly -- no connection between the backers and the content.	Students do not address bias.
Discussion of bias for the EIA site	Students identify this as a government site. Rich discussion of whether or not the government is biased.	Students identify this as a government site, and immediately conclude that it will be fair and balanced.	Students address bias, but do not recognize this as a government site, and/or accept without doubt claims of objectivity.	Students do not address bias.
3 guiding questions for content comprehension	Notes/discussion address all three questions -- students are focused and on-task.	Notes/discussion address 2/3 questions. Students are mostly on-task; any tangents are relevant.	Notes/discussion address 1 question. Students are distracted and mostly off-task.	Notes/discussion are not following the guiding questions -- students are off-task.
Summary of page content - fuels the economy: jobs, royalties, tax revenues; affordable energy for our needs; clean energy and environmental protection.	Student summary includes all three main ideas.	Student summary includes 2 main ideas.	Student summary includes 1 main idea.	Student summary missing.

	Outstanding	Acceptable	Good start, but needs some work	Incomplete
Facts vs. opinions	Student discussion demonstrates clear discernment between fact and opinion.	Student discussion demonstrates understanding of fact vs. opinion, but difficulty discerning them in the text.	Student discussion indicates lack of understanding of fact vs. opinion -- uncertainty how to even begin to discern.	Discussion does not address fact vs. opinion at all.
Part 2 - Formative Assessment				
Definition of Fracking includes 3 substances (water, sand, chemicals), and the process (high-pressure injection into shale to release oil and gas)	Student discussion/notes includes all 4 elements (3 substances + the process)	Student discussion/notes includes 3/4 elements.	Student discussion/notes includes 2/4 elements.	Student discussion/notes includes less than 2 elements.
Part 3 - Formative Assessment				
Notes/discussion related to guiding questions	Notes/discussion indicate that students followed all of the guiding questions (10/10) and addressed them as they explored the website.	7/10 guiding questions are discussed. Students seem to be understanding the information, but are going off on tangents or not fully "getting" the ideas.	4/10 guiding questions are discussed. Students are exploring the website but only following the ideas minimally.	Fewer than 4 guiding questions are discussed. Exploration of the website is random and unproductive.
Discussion of bias for the promised-land site	Students address bias and connect the agenda of the environmental NGO with the likelihood of bias.	Students address bias, but are unsure of the connection between the site sponsor and the opinions expressed.	Students address bias but guess randomly -- no connection between the site sponsor and the content.	Students do not address bias.

	Outstanding	Acceptable	Good start, but needs some work	Incomplete
Use of celebrity status	Discussion shows rich understanding of the influence of media and celebrities to influence audience opinion. Students separate the actor's personal opinions (unknown) from the character portrayed; recognize that Matt Damon is not personally advocating against fracking, at least not on this webpage.	Discussion of celebrity role is included, but weak -- focuses on the individual, rather than the larger idea of influence; confuses the actor's role with personal advocacy.	Discussion of celebrity role is acknowledged, but does not connect with the topic.	Celebrity role is not discussed.
Three main ideas: incidents of groundwater pollution have already occurred; no idea how safe or risky it is; lack of regulations for transparency to protect the public.	Student summary includes all three main ideas.	Student summary includes 2 main ideas.	Student summary includes 1 main idea.	Student summary missing.
Facts vs. opinions	Student discussion demonstrates clear discernment between fact and opinion.	Student discussion demonstrates understanding of fact vs. opinion, but difficulty discerning them in the text.	Student discussion indicates lack of understanding of fact vs. opinion -- uncertainty how to even begin to discern.	Discussion does not address fact vs. opinion at all.

	Outstanding	Acceptable	Good start, but needs some work	Incomplete
Part 4 - Formative Assessment				
Polarization vs. continuum and compromise (A 1&2)	Student discussion/notes contrast all-or-nothing claims vs. existence of a middle ground. Students are able to represent arguments on both sides of the debate.	Students can summarize info from both sites, but cannot infer further arguments or extend the debate.	Students do not recognize the difference in attitudes between the two sites regarding room for compromise.	The question is not addressed.
Part 5 - Formative Assessment				
Reduction of scaffolding	Notes/discussion demonstrates independent extension of the process -- incorporating new ideas into those already learned; evaluation of bias; discussion of both sides of the issue. At least 5 / 9 new ideas are added to pro-con sheet.	Notes/discussion show good on-task work, but lack of understanding of the details of the issues. 2 or 3 new ideas are added to pro/con sheet.	Students read the page but are not able to extend their thinking -- no new ideas gleaned. Unable to connect the rebuttals with industry claims.	No effort made.

	Outstanding	Acceptable	Good start, but needs some work	Incomplete
<b>Part 6 - Summative Assessment</b>				
Discussion of pros and cons	Pro-con sheet contains three main ideas for and against fracking. Answers to guiding questions (written summary and discussion) reflect deep understanding of both sides of the issue. Students are able to articulate arguments for and against, or to role-play either side.	Pro-con sheet contains 2/3 main ideas for and against fracking. Answers to guiding questions (written summary and discussion) reflect shallow-but-present understanding of both sides of the issue and a developing insight into arguments back and forth.	Pro-con sheet contains one main idea for and against fracking. Answers to guiding questions (written summary and discussion) reflect understanding of one side of the issue, but failure to argue both sides, or understanding of the concerns on each side is rudimentary and not fleshed out.	Pro-con sheet is not done. Notes/discussion show lack of effort, random web wandering, and lack of attention to the issue assigned. Students have no opinion about fracking.
Discussion of bias	Answers to guiding questions (written summary and discussion) provide concrete examples of bias on both sides: Clear explanation of the motivation of each side and how it influences their opinion.	Answers to guiding questions (written summary and discussion) provide vague examples of bias on both sides: students hint or guess at the motivation of each side, but are not clear or confident on how that motivation influences their opinion about fracking.	Written summary and discussion acknowledge bias only on one side. Student is unaware of his/her OWN bias.	Written summary and discussion do not acknowledge bias. Students do not address underlying agendas of the proponents of either side or show understanding of any connection between deeper agenda and opinion regarding fracking.
Final rating	Student rating is well-thought out and defensible. Students state an opinion and justify it.	Student rating is reasonable, but student is unable to defend it. Opinion is tentative; lacks confidence rooted in deep understanding of the issue.	Student rating is extreme and lacks justification; reflects student's own bias and failure to see the other side.	Student does not complete a rating; has no opinion regarding the issue.