# Assessment, Differentiation, and Appendices

CivicOS Labs

 

 

 

 

# Pilot Assessment

**Teacher Edition · Assessment guidance for the Florida Pilot Kit**

This document explains how to assess student learning across the five Pilot Kit lessons. The Pilot Kit's assessment design is **portfolio-based, artifact-anchored, and rubric-evaluated**. Each lesson produces one student artifact; each artifact is evaluated against a defined rubric; together the five artifacts demonstrate cumulative skill growth.

The Pilot Kit is not a high-stakes assessment. It is a one-week introduction designed to let students practice civic-technology-literacy skills and let the educator see what each student can do. Use the assessment information formatively — to identify what students mastered, what they need more practice on, and what to revisit if you continue with the full curriculum (Phase 2 nine-week module or Phase 3 full-year edition).

---

## Assessment philosophy

The Pilot Kit assesses **capability, not credentials**. The artifacts demonstrate whether students can do the work — verify a claim, analyze a source, take a defensible position with evidence — not whether they can recite definitions.

Three principles:

1. **Process matters.** A correctly verified claim documented poorly is worth less than a partially verified claim documented carefully. The verification log, source analysis, and AI use disclosure are evaluated on the quality of the process, not just the conclusion.
2. **Honesty is rewarded.** Students who acknowledge uncertainty, disclose AI use, and admit what they don't know score higher than students who project false confidence. This is the discipline civic literacy actually requires.
3. **Real engagement counts.** Lesson 5's Civic Issue Brief should be evaluated on whether the student engaged seriously with a real issue, not whether they took the position the educator agrees with.

---

## The five portfolio artifacts and their rubrics

Each lesson produces one artifact. Below is a **summary rubric** for each, using a 4-point scale (Exemplary / Proficient / Developing / Beginning) appropriate for portfolio-level evaluation.

> **Authoritative per-artifact rubrics, answer keys, and model artifacts live inside each Teacher Edition lesson.** Each Teacher Edition includes a longer, lesson-specific rubric with more granular criteria appropriate for in-class evaluation of that single artifact, plus answer-key/scoring notes for self-checks and activities. Lessons 1–5 now include model proficient artifacts or concrete scoring anchors so teachers do not have to infer what acceptable work looks like. The summary rubrics here are

> appropriate for end-of-pilot portfolio review and for cross-lesson comparison; the lesson-specific rubrics are appropriate when grading a particular artifact. If the two sources differ in level count or criteria detail, **the lesson-specific rubric is authoritative for grading that lesson's artifact**; the summary here is for portfolio-level overview.

## Lesson 1 — AI Concept Map

| Criterion | Exemplary (4) | Proficient (3) | Developing (2) | Beginning (1) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Conceptual accuracy** | All four branches present with accurate, specific content | Four branches with mostly accurate content | Three branches present, or significant inaccuracies | Fewer than three branches; major misconceptions |
| **Vocabulary use** | Uses lesson vocabulary correctly and in context | Uses most vocabulary correctly | Uses some vocabulary; some misuse | Vocabulary missing or misused |
| **Specificity of examples** | Sub-branches include specific examples from the lesson | Some specific examples; some generic | Mostly generic statements | Vague or missing sub-branches |
| **Surprise / engagement** | Includes the "one thing that surprised you" with reflection | Includes a surprise note | Surprise note missing or perfunctory | No personal engagement evident |

## Lesson 2 — Source Verification Log

| Criterion | Exemplary (4) | Proficient (3) | Developing (2) | Beginning (1) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Claim identification** | Specific factual claim isolated and quoted exactly | Specific claim identified | Vague or paraphrased claim | No clear claim identified |
| **Source quality** | Two or more independent reliable sources, properly cited | Two sources cited | One source, or sources of mixed reliability | Zero or unreliable sources |
| **Comparison rigor** | Specific evidence from each source compared to the claim | General comparison done | Surface comparison | No comparison or incorrect comparison |
| **Honest finding** | Result documented honestly (correct, partially correct, wrong) with reasoning | Result documented | Result asserted without reasoning | No clear finding |

## Lesson 3 — Media Analysis

| Criterion | Exemplary (4) | Proficient (3) | Developing (2) | Beginning (1) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Source diversity** | At least three sources of different types analyzed | Three sources of mixed types | Two sources or all of same type | One source or sources insufficiently distinct |
| **Six-question rigor** | All six questions answered substantively for each source | Most questions answered for each source | Questions answered superficially | Questions skipped or answered with single words |

 

| Criterion | Exemplary (4) | Proficient (3) | Developing (2) | Beginning (1) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Bias identification** | Specific bias identified for each source, including sources student likes | Bias identified for most sources | Bias identified only for “other side” sources | Bias not identified or only generic |
| **Synthesis paragraph** | Pattern across sources articulated with insight | Pattern noted at surface level | Pattern paragraph perfunctory | Synthesis missing |

## Lesson 4 — AI Use Disclosure

| Criterion | Exemplary (4) | Proficient (3) | Developing (2) | Beginning (1) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Specificity of AI use** | Specific AI uses documented (which tool, which purpose, what happened) | AI uses documented at category level | AI uses documented vaguely | AI use not meaningfully described |
| **Honest distinction** | Clear distinction between AI assistance (legitimate) and AI authorship (not student work) | Distinction made | Distinction muddled | Distinction missing |
| **Reflection quality** | 3–5 substantive sentences on where AI helped, where avoided, what to do differently | Reflection present | Reflection brief or generic | Reflection missing |
| **Tone** | Honest, neither defensive nor performative | Mostly honest | Defensive or evasive | Dishonest or refusing to disclose |

## Lesson 5 — Civic Issue Brief (or approved equivalent: Letter to Public Official, Class Presentation)

The rubric below is calibrated for the recommended artifact (Civic Issue Brief). When the educator has approved an alternative artifact form (Letter or Presentation), apply the same criteria, calibrating expression to the chosen form: a Letter still demonstrates issue specificity, source quality, agency identification, position with evidence, AI Use Statement, and acknowledged uncertainty — but in epistolary form addressed to the responsible official; a Presentation demonstrates the same criteria through oral delivery with cited slides or talking points.

| Criterion | Exemplary (4) | Proficient (3) | Developing (2) | Beginning (1) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Issue specificity** | Real issue framed as specific researchable question | Real issue identified | Vague topic, not a question | Hypothetical or off-topic |
| **Source quality** | At least 3–5 verified sources, including official/government source | Three sources cited | Fewer than three sources or insufficient quality | Sources missing or unreliable |
| **Agency identification** | Correct responsible agency or official identified at right level of government | Agency identified | Wrong agency or wrong level | Agency not identified |

 

| Criterion | Exemplary (4) | Proficient (3) | Developing (2) | Beginning (1) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Position with evidence** | Position taken; defended from cited sources; counterclaim acknowledged | Position taken with some evidence | Position asserted without evidence | No clear position |
| **AI Use Statement** | Specific, honest AI Use Statement included | AI Use Statement included | AI Use Statement perfunctory | AI Use Statement missing |
| **Acknowledged uncertainty** | "What I Don't Know" section reflects honest reasoning about limits | Section completed | Section perfunctory | Section missing |

---

## Cumulative portfolio assessment

After all five lessons, the educator can assess the **portfolio as a whole** using these three lenses:

**Skill progression.** Did the student demonstrate growth from Lesson 1 to Lesson 5? Compare the AI Concept Map (general conceptual understanding) to the Civic Issue Brief (integrated application). Students whose Lesson 5 work clearly draws on Lessons 2, 3, and 4 are showing skill integration — the curriculum's core goal.

**Habit formation.** Across the five artifacts, does the student show evidence of a verification habit, source-evaluation habit, and disclosure habit? Look for these patterns in how they document their work, not just whether they got the right answer on any individual artifact.

**Civic engagement.** Does the Civic Issue Brief show real engagement with a real issue, or does it read as compliance with an assignment? Real engagement is the curriculum's longer-term goal; you are looking for evidence that the student treated the project as something that mattered.

For a complete scored example, see **Annotated_Sample_Portfolio**. That appendix shows one fictional student's five artifacts with teacher annotations and calibration notes for ELL and IEP/504-adapted portfolios.

---

## Pre/post assessment option

For settings that need a simple learning-gain measure, use **Pre_Post_Assessment** before Lesson 1 and after Lesson 5. It contains 15 questions covering AI concepts, hallucination, verification, source analysis, privacy, academic integrity, and civic agency identification.

Recommended reporting:

- Class average before the pilot
- Class average after the pilot
- Average point gain
- Three questions with the largest improvement
- Three questions needing reteaching

 

Do not report student names in pilot feedback unless your setting has a separate lawful reason to collect and share identifiable data.

---

## Answer key audit status

Every Student Edition Self-Check question has a corresponding answer-key entry in the matching Teacher Edition:

| Lesson | Student Self-Check count | Teacher answer-key status |
|---|---|---|
| Lesson 1 | 5 | Complete |
| Lesson 2 | 5 | Complete |
| Lesson 3 | 5 | Complete |
| Lesson 4 | 5 | Complete |
| Lesson 5 | 5 | Complete |

Lessons 3-5 now also include additional scored exemplars beyond the primary Proficient sample, including ELL-adapted and IEP/504-modified calibration examples.

---

## Reporting back to families and stakeholders

For homeschool families: the portfolio is the report.

For microschool / co-op contexts: a brief note per student summarizing portfolio strengths and growth areas is sufficient.

For classroom contexts: artifacts can be entered into your gradebook with the rubric scores; the cumulative portfolio assessment can be written as a short narrative.

For ESA documentation: the artifacts and rubric scores together are suitable evidence. The ESA templates provide supporting documentation language.

---

## Adapting assessment for IEP / 504 / differentiated learners

The artifacts and rubrics support differentiation:

- **Reading-level differentiation:** if a student is reading below grade level, evaluate the artifact's substance rather than its surface mechanics
- **Processing-time accommodations:** extend the time available for artifact production rather than reducing the substance expected
- **Multi-modal artifacts:** the AI Concept Map can be drawn, typed, dictated, or recorded; the Source Verification Log and Media Analysis can use templates with checkboxes; the Civic Issue Brief can be a written brief, a recorded presentation, or a visual artifact

 

- **Scaffolded artifacts:** for students who need more support, provide a partially completed template with prompts; the rubric still applies, calibrated to the student's IEP goals

See Differentiation Notes for full differentiation guidance.

---

## After the Pilot — what assessment data tells you

The Pilot Kit is, by design, a small evaluation surface. Five artifacts in five days does not produce statistically meaningful learning data. What it does produce is:

- A **clear sense of which students are ready** for more substantial civic technology work (Phase 2 or Phase 3 curriculum)
- A **clear sense of which students need more foundational work** before continuing — typically in source evaluation, written argumentation, or civic agency identification
- A **starting baseline** for the educator's own sense of what worked in the pilot and what to revise

The Pilot Feedback Form (the Pilot Feedback Form) is where you document the assessment-informed observations that go back to CivicOS Labs for the curriculum's continued development.

---

 

# Pre/Post Assessment

**Teacher Edition · Florida Pilot Kit**

Use this short assessment before Lesson 1 and after Lesson 5 to measure learning growth. It is not a high-stakes test. It gives the educator and CivicOS Labs a simple evidence point for whether students gained core AI literacy, verification, source-analysis, privacy, and civic-tech skills.

**Administration time:** 10-12 minutes
**Format:** 15 questions
**Recommended use:** same questions pre and post; compare aggregate class growth rather than individual grades
**Student privacy:** collect names only if your setting needs individual progress data. For pilot reporting, report anonymized aggregate results.

---

## Student Assessment

Choose the best answer unless the question asks for a short response.

1. A large language model is best described as: A. A person who answers questions online
   B. A computer system that predicts and generates language patterns
   C. A database that always looks up current facts
   D. A search engine that only gives verified sources

2. What is an AI hallucination? A. When AI refuses to answer
   B. When AI produces an answer that sounds confident but is false or unsupported
   C. When AI generates an image
   D. When AI asks the user a question

3. Why should factual AI answers be verified? A. AI is never useful
   B. AI answers are always biased against students
   C. AI can produce fluent answers without reliable evidence
   D. Verification is only needed for science topics

4. Which source would usually be strongest for checking whether dolphins are mammals? A. A random comment online
   B. A reputable aquarium, NOAA, or marine biology source
   C. A social media meme
   D. An AI answer with no citations

5. A claim is: A. The person or organization that created a source
   B. The evidence used to support an idea
   C. What the source wants the reader to believe
   D. The audience for a message

6. Missing context means: A. The source is always lying
   B. Important information needed to understand the claim is absent
   C. The source has no author
   D. The source is too long

7. Which set best matches the six-question source-analysis framework? A. Claim, evidence, source, audience, missing context, bias
   B. Title, author, font, color, date, picture
   C. Fast, slow, easy, hard, public, private
   D. Search, copy, paste, submit, grade, reflect

8. Bias is best understood as: A. A perspective or lean in how information is selected, framed, or omitted
   B. A sign that a source must be ignored
   C. Something only unreliable sources have
   D. A spelling mistake

9. Which information should not be typed into a commercial AI tool? A. A public article link assigned by a teacher
   B. A question about a vocabulary word
   C. Your full name, school, daily schedule, and address
   D. A general question about dolphins

10. The capability-vs-credential trap happens when: A. A student learns a skill but does not get a grade
    B. A student gets credit or completion without building the skill the work was supposed to develop
    C. A teacher allows students to revise
    D. A student uses a textbook

11. Which AI use is usually appropriate if assignment policy allows it? A. Asking AI to explain a confusing concept, then writing your own answer
    B. Submitting an AI-written essay as your own
    C. Copying AI math answers without doing the work
    D. Hiding AI use from the teacher

12. An AI Use Disclosure should include: A. Only the student's final grade
    B. The tool used, what it was used for, what work is the student's own, and how output was checked
    C. A promise never to use AI
    D. The student's private password

13. A civic agency is: A. Any website with an opinion
    B. A government office or public body responsible for a specific area of public work
    C. A private chat group
    D. A type of AI model

14. Which is the best researchable civic question? A. "Traffic is bad."
    B. "Why is everything unfair?"
    C. "Should the city review crosswalk safety near the school entrance?"
    D. "Technology is important."

15. Short response: Name one habit you should use before trusting an AI answer or public claim.

 

## Answer Key

1. B
2. B
3. C
4. B
5. C
6. B
7. A
8. A
9. C
10. B
11. A
12. B
13. B
14. C
15. Accept any accurate habit, including: verify with reliable sources; check official sources; identify the claim; compare evidence; look for missing context; ask who made the source; disclose AI use; do not enter private information.

---

## Scoring and Use

**Suggested scoring:** 1 point per item, 15 points total. For item 15, award credit for any defensible verification, source-analysis, privacy, or disclosure habit.

**Recommended interpretation:**

| Score band | Interpretation |
|---|---|
| 13-15 | Strong pilot mastery |
| 10-12 | Solid understanding; review weaker skill areas |
| 7-9 | Partial understanding; student needs continued practice |
| 0-6 | Foundational reteaching recommended |

**Pilot reporting metric:** report class average pre-score, class average post-score, average gain, and the three questions with the largest growth. Do not report student names unless your setting has a separate lawful reason to do so.

---

 

# Annotated Sample Portfolio

**Teacher Edition appendix · Florida Pilot Kit**

This appendix shows one fictional student's complete five-artifact portfolio. It is not a model students must copy. It is a calibration reference for teachers, administrators, ESA reviewers, and families who need to see how the five lessons connect.

**Fictional student:** Maya R.
**Grade band:** 7th grade, on-level reader
**Civic issue used in capstone:** traffic safety near school drop-off
**Overall portfolio rating:** Proficient, with Exemplary elements in Lessons 2 and 5

---

## Portfolio Arc at a Glance

| Lesson | Artifact | What the artifact proves | Teacher calibration |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | AI Concept Map | Student understands what AI is, what it does well, and where it fails | Proficient |
| 2 | Source Verification Log | Student can isolate a claim and verify it against real sources | Exemplary |
| 3 | Media Analysis | Student can compare source types and identify bias / missing context | Proficient |
| 4 | AI Use Disclosure | Student can document AI assistance without confusing it with authorship | Proficient |
| 5 | Civic Issue Brief | Student can apply all skills to a real civic issue | Proficient / approaching Exemplary |

---

## Artifact 1: AI Concept Map

**Student artifact excerpt**

Center: **AI / Large Language Model**

Branch 1 - What it is: - A computer system that predicts language patterns - Trained on large collections of text - Can generate answers that sound fluent

Branch 2 - What it is good at: - Explaining a topic in simpler words - Brainstorming questions - Summarizing when I already have a source to check

 

Branch 3 - What it is not good at: - Knowing if something is true by itself - Current information unless connected to tools - Math unless using a calculator or code tool - Personal or private advice

Branch 4 - How I should use it: - Verify factual claims - Do not type private information - Use it to help me think, not to replace my work

Surprise note: “I thought AI looked things up like Google. Now I understand it can make answers by predicting words, so the answer can sound confident and still be wrong.”

**Teacher annotation**

This is **Proficient**. It includes the required branches, uses vocabulary accurately, and shows the hallucination/verification connection. It would become **Exemplary** if the student added cross-links between branches, such as connecting “predicts language patterns” to “can sound confident and still be wrong.”

---

## Artifact 2: Source Verification Log

**Student artifact excerpt**

Claim checked: “Dolphins are fish because they live in water.”

Source 1: NOAA page about dolphins
Finding: NOAA describes dolphins as marine mammals.
Evidence: Dolphins breathe air, give birth to live young, and nurse their young.

Source 2: Encyclopedia entry about mammals
Finding: Mammals breathe air, are warm-blooded, and feed young with milk.
Evidence: These traits match dolphins.

Source 3: Aquarium education page
Finding: Dolphins live in water but are not fish.
Evidence: Fish use gills; dolphins use lungs.

Final judgment: The claim is wrong. Living in water does not make an animal a fish. Dolphins are mammals.

What I learned: “One detail can be true but the claim can still be wrong. Dolphins do live in water, but the conclusion is false.”

**Teacher annotation**

This is **Exemplary**. The student isolates the exact claim, uses multiple credible sources, compares the reasoning, and explains the difference between a true detail and a false conclusion. This artifact shows the verification habit clearly.

---

## Artifact 3: Media Analysis

**Student artifact excerpt**

Topic: phone restrictions in middle schools

Source 1 - AI overview: - Claim: phone limits can improve focus but may create safety concerns. - Evidence: general reasons, no specific source. - Source: AI response. - Audience: general student/teacher reader. - Missing context: no local policy, no data, no student voices. - Bias: sounds balanced but avoids conflict and details.

Source 2 - school district policy page: - Claim: phones must be silenced and away during instructional time. - Evidence: policy language. - Source: official district page. - Audience: students, families, staff. - Missing context: why the policy was chosen and how it affects students. - Bias: favors school-management perspective.

Source 3 - parent post: - Claim: students need phones for safety and family contact. - Evidence: one parent story. - Source: parent advocacy post. - Audience: other parents and school board members. - Missing context: classroom disruption and alternatives for emergencies. - Bias: strongly favors parent access.

Synthesis: “All three sources agree phones matter, but they focus on different problems. The AI gives a general overview. The district page gives the rule but not the debate. The parent post gives a real concern but not the classroom side. A careful citizen would need student voices, teacher experience, safety procedures, and data about classroom distraction.”

**Teacher annotation**

This is **Proficient**. The student applies all six questions and identifies bias in official and advocacy sources. It would become **Exemplary** with exact source titles, dates, and stronger evidence from each source.

---

## Artifact 4: AI Use Disclosure

**Student artifact excerpt**

AI service used: ChatGPT during class demonstration and once at home with parent permission.

What I used AI for: - Brainstorming possible local issues connected to school traffic - Asking what kind of public office handles crosswalks - Rewording my research question so it was more specific

What I did not use AI for: - I did not ask AI to write my Civic Issue Brief. - I did not paste my full name, school schedule, address, or private family information. - I did not copy AI sentences into my final brief.

How I checked the AI output: - AI said traffic safety could involve public works or transportation. I checked the city website and found the transportation/public works page.

What part is my own work: - The question, sources, position, and final writing are mine. AI helped me get unstuck at the beginning.

Reflection: “AI helped me start, but I had to verify the agency. This is capability use because I still did the research and made the decision. It would be credential-only if I let AI write the brief and pretended it was mine.”

**Teacher annotation**

 

This is **Proficient** with an Exemplary sentence in the reflection. The disclosure names tool, purpose, boundaries, verification, authorship, and privacy. It would become fully **Exemplary** if the student included dates, exact prompts, or a brief log of each AI interaction.

---

## Artifact 5: Civic Issue Brief

**Student artifact excerpt**

Question: Should the city review traffic safety near the school drop-off intersection?

Why it matters: Students walk near the same driveway where cars turn into the drop-off line. The issue matters because it affects student safety during a short but busy time each morning.

Responsible agency: The city public works / transportation department appears responsible for crosswalks and traffic signs. The school administration is also connected because it manages arrival procedures.

Sources: 1. City public works webpage about traffic safety requests 2. School handbook section on arrival and drop-off 3. Local news article about school-zone traffic safety 4. Student observation tally from one morning near the entrance

Key facts: - The city accepts traffic-safety review requests from residents. - The school handbook directs students to use designated entrances. - The local news article says visibility and driver speed are common school-zone concerns. - My observation tally counted many cars turning while students crossed nearby, but I only observed one morning.

Different perspectives: Parents may want clearer crossing procedures. Drivers may worry that a new crossing point slows traffic. The city may need evidence before changing signs or staffing a crossing guard.

Position: The school should collect arrival observations for one week and then request a city traffic-safety review. Asking for a review is better than demanding a specific fix because the city needs evidence first.

What I do not know: I do not know whether the city has studied this intersection before. I do not know the cost of a crossing guard or whether the road is city or county maintained.

AI Use Statement: I used AI to brainstorm possible agencies and make my question more specific. I verified the agency information on the city website. The writing and position are mine.

**Teacher annotation**

This is **Proficient, approaching Exemplary**. It is specific, local, agency-connected, multi-source, honest about uncertainty, and proportionate in its recommendation. It would become **Exemplary** with exact URLs/titles/dates, a named official or department contact, and a stronger counterargument section.

---

## What the Complete Portfolio Shows

This portfolio demonstrates the curriculum’s cumulative arc:

 

1. The student understands AI as a tool with limits.
2. The student can verify a factual claim.
3. The student can analyze multiple source types.
4. The student can disclose AI use honestly.
5. The student can apply all of those habits to a real civic issue.

When reviewing student portfolios, look for this arc. A student does not need perfect artifacts to show meaningful growth. The strongest portfolios show increasingly careful judgment, not just longer writing.

---

## Calibration Notes for Differentiated Portfolios

**ELL portfolio:** Score for reasoning and accurate use of the framework. Sentence frames, bilingual notes, simplified vocabulary, and oral clarification are appropriate supports.

**IEP / 504 portfolio:** Score the same underlying skills through the approved mode of expression. A recorded presentation, dictated disclosure, or two-source modified media analysis can meet the learning target if the student's accommodation plan supports that path.

**Advanced portfolio:** Look for deeper source precision, more careful agency identification, stronger counterarguments, and more explicit uncertainty handling.

---

 

# Differentiation Notes

**Teacher Edition · Differentiation guidance for the Florida Pilot Kit**

This document explains how to adapt the five Pilot Kit lessons for students with diverse learning needs — including students with IEPs, 504 plans, English language learners, students reading above or below grade level, and students with sensory or motor accommodations.

The Pilot Kit's structural design supports differentiation without requiring the educator to rewrite the lessons. Most adaptations involve adjusting **how** students engage with the content, **how long** they have to engage with it, and **what form** their artifact takes — while keeping the substantive learning goals intact.

---

## Differentiation principles

Three principles guide adaptation across all five lessons:

1. **Preserve the substance, vary the form.** A student dictating their AI Concept Map to a recording is meeting the same learning goal as a student typing it. The substance is the conceptual understanding; the form is whichever delivery the student can do best.
2. **Substitute, do not omit.** If a particular activity is inaccessible to a student, substitute an equivalent activity rather than skipping. Students who skip activities miss the practice the curriculum was designed to provide.
3. **Calibrate the rubric to the student.** Use the same rubric criteria for all students; calibrate the proficiency expectations to the student's IEP goals or 504 plan accommodations. A student with a writing-output accommodation can demonstrate "Proficient" through a shorter or differently structured artifact.

---

## Reading-level differentiation

The Pilot Kit's Student Edition reading is calibrated for Florida B.E.S.T. ELA grades 6–8 (Lexile range approximately **1050L to 1200L**). Students reading above or below this range need adaptation.

### For students reading above grade level

The Student Reading provides a foundation; encourage these students to read additional material on the lesson's topic and bring back what they learned to the discussion. Specifically:

- **Lesson 1:** read about a recent AI development from a trustworthy source (a major newspaper's tech section, a research lab blog) and bring a verification question to class
- **Lesson 2:** add a third source to the verification activity, ideally a primary source rather than a secondary one

 

- **Lesson 3:** add a fourth source type (academic / advocacy / social media / official) to the Media Analysis
- **Lesson 4:** read the curriculum's full Data Privacy Statement and AI Use Agreement; write a one-paragraph response on the policy choices documented there
- **Lesson 5:** extend the Civic Issue Brief by adding a "What I would do next" section identifying specific actions the student could take on their issue

### For students reading at grade level

The Student Reading is designed for this group. Standard pacing applies.

### For students reading below grade level

Several supports work well:

- **Read aloud or partner reading:** the educator reads the Student Reading aloud while students follow along; or pair the student with a stronger reader for partner reading
- **Pre-reading vocabulary preview:** introduce the lesson vocabulary before students encounter it in the reading; provide a vocabulary card per lesson with definitions in plain language
- **Chunk the reading:** read one section at a time; after each section, pause to discuss before moving on
- **Audio support:** if the school provides text-to-speech tools, use them; the curriculum's Markdown format works well with TTS engines
- **Adjusted artifacts:** allow the AI Concept Map, Media Analysis, and Civic Issue Brief to use diagrams, drawings, or recorded voice notes in addition to or instead of writing
- **Rubric calibration:** evaluate the substance demonstrated, not the surface mechanics; spelling and conventional grammar are not the lesson's learning objectives

---

## IEP / 504 accommodation patterns

These patterns address common accommodation categories. Always defer to the student's individual IEP or 504 plan; the items below are starting points, not replacements for individualized planning.

### Processing-time accommodations

- Extend timing on the artifact-producing activities (Lessons 2, 3, 5 in particular)
- Allow the artifact to be completed across multiple sessions rather than in a single class period
- For students who need additional processing time during discussion, share discussion questions in advance

### Written-output accommodations

- Allow oral artifact production: the student records a verbal version of the AI Concept Map, Source Verification Log, Media Analysis, AI Use Disclosure, or Civic Issue Brief
- Provide partially completed templates with prompts that the student fills in (rather than blank templates)
- Allow scribed responses: the student dictates while a parent / aide / educator types

 

- Use voice-to-text software where available

### Reading accommodations

- Use audio versions of the Student Reading
- Use chunked reading (one section at a time with discussion between)
- Provide vocabulary cards in advance
- Pair with a peer reader for collaborative reading

### Attention / focus accommodations

- Break each lesson into shorter segments with breaks between
- Allow the student to work in a less-stimulating environment for the artifact-production phase
- Pre-teach the lesson structure so the student knows what to expect
- Use timers or visual cues for transitions

### Sensory accommodations

- **Visual:** ensure the Student Edition is available in larger font; the Markdown format reflows well; for students using screen readers, the standard Markdown format is screen-reader-compatible
- **Auditory:** during teacher demonstration (Activity 1 in most lessons), provide a written summary of what the demonstration showed; for students with hearing differences, the demonstration's substantive content can be conveyed through written walkthroughs
- **Color blindness:** the curriculum does not convey essential information through color alone

### Motor accommodations

- Allow keyboard / voice input instead of handwritten artifacts
- Use templates with checkboxes and short-response fields rather than open-ended prose
- For Concept Map and Media Analysis activities, provide pre-printed templates that the student annotates rather than constructs from scratch

---

## English Language Learner (ELL) differentiation

The Pilot Kit's vocabulary teaching helps ELL students build technical vocabulary in English. Additional supports:

- **Pre-teach lesson vocabulary in the student's home language** if a translator is available; many curriculum-relevant terms (AI, source, bias, agency, policy) have direct translations
- **Use cognate connections:** many curriculum vocabulary words have Latin / Greek / Spanish cognates; explicitly point these out
- **Pair with a bilingual peer or aide** for the artifact-production phase
- **Allow first-draft artifacts in the student's home language** with English version as a follow-up; the substance is the learning goal, not the language of expression
- **Use visual / diagrammatic artifact options** which are less language-dependent (Concept Map and Media Analysis adapt well to visual-heavy formats)

 

## Lesson-by-lesson differentiation notes

### Lesson 1 — What AI Is and Is Not

- **Concept Map alternatives:** drawing, sticky notes on a board, dictated audio, or a structured fill-in template
- **Demonstration alternatives:** if live AI access is unavailable, prepared example AI outputs in the Teacher Edition substitute fully
- **Reading alternatives:** chunked reading with vocabulary preview; audio support; partner reading

### Lesson 2 — Verifying AI Answers With Sources

- **Verification activity:** can be done with one source instead of two for students still building source-evaluation stamina; the rubric calibrates accordingly
- **Source-finding support:** for students who struggle with web search, the educator pre-curates 2–3 candidate sources for the student to choose among
- **Documentation alternative:** the Source Verification Log template can be completed orally with the educator scribing

### Lesson 3 — Media Bias, Claims, and Digital Persuasion

- **Source pre-selection:** for students who need scaffolding, the educator pre-selects the three sources rather than asking the student to find them
- **Six-question support:** provide a structured worksheet with the six questions and space for short responses, rather than an open template
- **Synthesis paragraph alternative:** can be a verbal explanation, a labeled diagram, or three sentences instead of a full paragraph

### Lesson 4 — Privacy, Ethics, and Academic Integrity

- **Scenario discussion:** for students who participate verbally with difficulty, allow written responses to the discussion scenarios
- **AI Use Disclosure alternative:** the disclosure can be a checklist with short responses rather than a narrative; the rubric calibrates to the student's writing-output accommodation

### Lesson 5 — Civic Tech Mini-Project

- **Issue selection support:** provide a curated list of 5–10 local / state issues for the student to choose from rather than asking for open-ended selection
- **Research scaffolding:** pre-identify the responsible agency for the chosen issue if agency identification is itself an obstacle
- **Artifact alternatives:** the Civic Issue Brief can be (a) a written brief, (b) a recorded oral presentation, (c) a visual artifact (poster, infographic, slide deck), (d) a letter to a public official; the rubric applies to whichever form the student chooses

 

- **Time accommodation:** Lesson 5 frequently needs more time even for students without accommodations; for students with processing-time accommodations, plan for the project to extend across two or three sessions

---

## Working with families on accommodations

For homeschool, microschool, and co-op contexts, the educator (often the parent) coordinates the student's accommodations directly with the family and any applicable plan, evaluator, or service provider. Where a formal IEP or 504 plan exists from a public-school placement or an outside evaluator, the educator follows that plan; where the family's setting does not include a formal plan but the student has documented needs, the educator works with the family and any relevant providers (private therapists, learning specialists) to apply consistent accommodations.

For classroom contexts where the educator and the case manager are different people:

- Share the Pilot Kit's Differentiation Notes and lesson summaries with the case manager before the pilot begins
- Identify in advance which accommodations from the student's IEP / 504 plan apply to which lessons
- Document the accommodations actually used during the pilot in the student's record
- The Pilot Kit's portfolio artifacts, evaluated with appropriately calibrated rubrics, may support documentation conversations or progress evidence when aligned to the student's plan and reviewed by the IEP / 504 team or service provider — the artifacts contribute to documentation, but progress determinations belong to the team

---

## When differentiation is not enough

If a student cannot meaningfully access the curriculum even with substantial differentiation, that is important information for the educator and the family. The Pilot Kit may not be the right fit for that student at that moment.

Possible alternative approaches:

- Run a single lesson (typically Lesson 1) in a longer, slower form, treating it as the entire unit
- Wait until the student is in a different grade or developmental stage and revisit
- Use the curriculum's foundation (the *Open Source Student* Foundation Edition) rather than Florida Pilot Kit, since the foundation has more pacing flexibility

These are not failures. They are honest acknowledgments that no single curriculum fits every student at every moment.

---

 

# Cross-Curricular Coordination Cards

**Teacher Edition appendix · Florida Pilot Kit**

Use these one-page cards when coordinating with another teacher, media specialist, or administrator. Copy the relevant card into an email or print it before the lesson.

---

## Card 1: Lesson 1 - What AI Is and Is Not

**This week I am teaching:** how AI tools generate language, what they are useful for, and why model limitations require verification.

**Natural partner subjects:** - ELA: vocabulary, informational text structure, explaining technical concepts - Science: models and limitations of models - Technology / CS: emerging technologies and AI concepts

**What I need from a partner teacher:** one example of a model in your subject that is useful but limited.

**Quick coordination prompt:** “Students are learning that AI is a model with limits. Do you have a model, diagram, simulation, or equation from your class that is useful but not the same as reality?”

---

## Card 2: Lesson 2 - Verifying AI With Sources

**This week I am teaching:** how to isolate a claim, choose reliable sources, compare evidence, and document a finding.

**Natural partner subjects:** - ELA: research and source documentation - Science: checking factual claims against scientific sources - Social Studies: primary and secondary sources

**What I need from a partner teacher:** one claim students often repeat without evidence, plus a source you would trust to check it.

**Quick coordination prompt:** “Students are practicing verification. Is there a claim from your class that would be useful for students to check against a textbook, official page, data table, or primary source?”

---

## Card 3: Lesson 3 - Media Bias, Claims, and Digital Persuasion

**This week I am teaching:** how to analyze claim, evidence, source, audience, missing context, and bias across AI, news, advocacy, government, and social media sources.

**Natural partner subjects:** - Civics: media, propaganda, bias, public opinion - ELA: rhetoric, argument, author’s purpose - Science: media coverage of scientific issues

 

**What I need from a partner teacher:** a public issue connected to your subject where sources frame the same topic differently.

**Quick coordination prompt:** “Students are comparing source framing. Do you have a current topic where a government page, news story, advocacy post, or social media post would show different audiences or biases?”

---

## Card 4: Lesson 4 - Privacy, Ethics, and Academic Integrity

**This week I am teaching:** privacy boundaries, appropriate AI use, academic integrity, disclosure, and the capability-vs-credential trap.

**Natural partner subjects:** - All subjects: AI use policy for assignments - ELA: authorship and plagiarism - Health / digital citizenship: privacy and safety

**What I need from a partner teacher:** your assignment rule for AI use, stated in one sentence students can understand.

**Quick coordination prompt:** “Students are learning to disclose AI use. For your class, what AI uses are clearly allowed, clearly not allowed, or gray enough that students should ask first?”

---

## Card 5: Lesson 5 - Civic Tech Mini-Project

**This week I am teaching:** a short civic research project in which students identify a local or state issue, find sources, identify a responsible agency, take a defensible position, and disclose AI use.

**Natural partner subjects:** - Civics / Social Studies: government agencies, public officials, civic participation - ELA: argument writing and research - Science: environmental or health issues - Math: data, budgets, statistics, charts

**What I need from a partner teacher:** one local or Florida-specific issue students could research in your subject area.

**Quick coordination prompt:** “Students need real civic issues. Do you have a local topic, public dataset, government decision, school-board question, or community issue that would make a good short research question?”

---

 

# Extension Options Guide

**Teacher Edition appendix · Florida Pilot Kit**

Use this guide when students finish early, need a deeper challenge, or are ready to connect the pilot to a longer project. Extensions are optional. They should deepen the same learning target rather than become unrelated extra work.

---

## Quick Selection Guide

| Student profile | Best extension type | Teacher move |
|---|---|---|
| Early finisher | Short product extension | Ask for a one-paragraph reflection or one additional source |
| Gifted / advanced | Complexity extension | Add source diversity, counterargument, or public-records research |
| Strong speaker | Presentation extension | Let student explain process orally or create a short slide |
| Strong writer | Argument extension | Ask for a stronger position / counterclaim paragraph |
| ELL student | Language-bridge extension | Allow bilingual source comparison or vocabulary teaching |
| Student with IEP / 504 | Mode extension | Preserve the thinking target; adjust output mode or length |

---

## Lesson-by-Lesson Extension Guidance

### Lesson 1: What AI Is and Is Not

**10 minutes:** Add two cross-links to the AI Concept Map explaining why hallucination happens.
**20 minutes:** Compare AI to another model students know, such as a weather model or map.
**Advanced:** Explain how a model can be useful even when it is not reality.

**Evaluate by:** conceptual accuracy and clarity, not artistic design.

### Lesson 2: Verifying AI With Sources

**10 minutes:** Add a third source to the Source Verification Log.
**20 minutes:** Test a new AI claim from science, civics, or ELA.
**Advanced:** Trace a claim back to the original source instead of relying on a summary.

**Evaluate by:** claim precision, source quality, comparison, and honest finding.

 

### Lesson 3: Media Bias, Claims, and Digital Persuasion

**10 minutes:** Add one missing-context question for each source.
**20 minutes:** Add a fourth source type, such as an official page or social media post.
**Advanced:** Compare two sources with different political or institutional perspectives and identify what both omit.

**Evaluate by:** specificity of bias and missing-context analysis.

### Lesson 4: Privacy, Ethics, and Academic Integrity

**10 minutes:** Write one additional capability-vs-credential scenario.
**20 minutes:** Draft a classroom AI disclosure rule in student-friendly language.
**Advanced:** Compare AI disclosure norms in journalism, college writing, or professional work.

**Evaluate by:** ethical reasoning, privacy awareness, and clarity of boundary.

### Lesson 5: Civic Tech Mini-Project

**10 minutes:** Add one more source or one named public official.
**20 minutes:** Strengthen the counterargument or uncertainty section.
**Advanced:** Draft a short letter to the responsible agency or create a mini presentation from the brief.

**Evaluate by:** evidence quality, agency accuracy, defensible position, and honest uncertainty.

---

## Grading Extensions

Extensions should not punish students who needed the full core time. Use one of these approaches:

1. **No grade:** enrichment only.
2. **Plus mark:** add a note such as “extension completed with strong source reasoning.”
3. **Rubric bump:** if the extension improves the core artifact, score the artifact accordingly.
4. **Separate enrichment score:** only if your gradebook requires it.

Do not require extensions for Proficient. Proficient means the student met the core target.

---

 

# Visual Asset Pack

**Teacher Edition appendix · Florida Pilot Kit**

This pack provides ready-to-project text mockups for no-install delivery. Use these when students cannot access live AI tools, when district policy requires screenshots only, or when a teacher wants a predictable demonstration.

These are not live AI screenshots. They are high-fidelity classroom mockups designed to show the exact reasoning move students need to practice. Teachers may paste each mockup into slides, print it, or display it directly.

---

## Slide 1: Lesson 1 - Confident But Wrong

**Prompt shown to students**

> Explain why dolphins are fish.

**Mock AI response**

> Dolphins are fish because they live in the ocean, swim with fins, and have streamlined bodies that help them move through water.

**Teacher display note**

Ask: “What makes this answer sound convincing? What would we need to check?” Then reveal: dolphins are mammals, not fish. This sets up hallucination and verification.

---

## Slide 2: Lesson 2 - Verification Log Demo

**Claim**

> Dolphins are fish because they live in water.

**Source check**

| Source | What it says | Result |
|---|---|---|
| NOAA dolphin page | Dolphins are marine mammals. They breathe air and nurse their young. | Claim contradicted |
| Aquarium education page | Fish use gills; dolphins use lungs. | Claim contradicted |

### Finding

The claim is false. Living in water does not make an animal a fish.

---

## Slide 3: Lesson 3 - Same Topic, Different Source Framing

### Topic

Phone restrictions in middle schools

| Source type | Claim | Missing context | Likely bias / perspective |
|---|---|---|---|
| AI overview | Phone rules can improve focus but create safety concerns. | No local policy or data | Smooths conflict; generalizes |
| District policy | Phones must be away during instructional time. | Why the policy was chosen | School-management perspective |
| Parent advocacy post | Students need phones for emergencies. | Classroom disruption and alternatives | Family-access perspective |

### Teacher prompt

Which source is “biased”? Expected answer: all of them, in different ways.

---

## Slide 4: Lesson 4 - Privacy Sorting

### Sort each item

OK to share / Use caution / Do not share

1. A public article link your teacher gave you
2. Your full name, school, and daily schedule
3. A paragraph you wrote for class
4. A private story a friend told you
5. A question about a vocabulary word

### Teacher key

1. OK to share, if the tool is approved
2. Do not share
3. Use caution
4. Do not share
5. OK to share, if the tool is approved

 

## Slide 5: Lesson 4 - Capability vs. Credential

**Student A**

Uses AI to write the essay, edits a few words, submits it, and gets a grade.

**Student B**

Uses AI to explain a confusing concept, rereads the source, writes their own answer, and discloses the help if required.

**Question**

Which student is building capability? Which student is only chasing the credential?

---

## Slide 6: Lesson 5 - Narrowing a Civic Issue

| Too broad | Better | Researchable today |
|---|---|---|
| Traffic | School traffic | Should the city review crosswalk safety near our school entrance? |
| Pollution | Park trash | Should the city add trash cans near the picnic area at a local park? |
| Education | Phone policy | Should the school board revise middle-school phone rules? |

**Teacher prompt**

What agency or public office might be connected to each researchable question?

---

## Slide 7: Lesson 5 - Civic Issue Brief Checklist

A complete brief includes:

- Specific real issue
- Researchable question
- Responsible agency or official
- At least three sources
- Verified facts
- Different perspectives
- Position or honest uncertainty
- AI Use Statement

---

 

# Student Reflection and Self-Check

**Student Edition · End-of-pilot reflection across all five lessons**

You've completed all five lessons of the Florida Pilot Kit. This document is your chance to look back at what you did, see how the lessons connect, and honestly assess what you learned.

This is not a graded assignment. It is a reflection. The point is to help you see your own learning and to identify what you want to do next.

---

## Look at your portfolio

By now you should have all five portfolio artifacts:

1. **AI Concept Map** (from Lesson 1)
2. **Source Verification Log** (from Lesson 2)
3. **Media Analysis** (from Lesson 3)
4. **AI Use Disclosure** (from Lesson 4)
5. **Civic Issue Brief** (from Lesson 5)

Lay them out where you can see them all at once — physically on a desk, or open in browser tabs / files.

Take a few minutes to look at them as a set. Notice:

- Which artifact are you most proud of? Why?
- Which artifact was hardest? Why?
- Looking at your AI Concept Map (the first thing you made) and your Civic Issue Brief (the last thing you made), what do you notice about how your thinking changed?

---

## Reflection questions — write a paragraph for each

These reflection questions ask you to think about the whole week, not just any one lesson. Write substantively — at least 4–6 sentences per question.

### 1. The skill that changed most for me this week

Of the major skills the Pilot Kit taught — explaining what AI is, verifying claims, analyzing sources for bias, using AI ethically, doing civic research — which skill changed most for you over the week? What did you understand at the start versus what you understand now?

### 2. The habit I want to keep

 

The Pilot Kit emphasized several habits: verification, source analysis, AI use disclosure, taking positions with evidence, acknowledging uncertainty. Which one of these do you most want to keep doing — not just for school assignments, but for your own life? Why that one?

### 3. The thing I'm still uncertain about

The lessons covered a lot of ground in five days. There are probably things you understand at a surface level but not deeply. Pick one specific thing you're still uncertain about and explain what you would want to understand better.

### 4. AI in my life going forward

After this week, how do you think you'll use AI differently than you did before? Name one specific thing you'll do differently. (If you're going to keep using AI the same way, that's also a valid answer — explain why.)

### 5. The civic issue I researched

The Civic Issue Brief was your chance to engage with a real local or state issue. Looking back at the issue you chose: do you still care about it the same way? More? Less? What surprised you about doing real civic research?

### 6. The hardest moment of the week

Identify one specific moment during the week when something was hard — a confusing concept, a verification that frustrated you, a discussion that didn't go well, an artifact you had to redo. What made it hard? What did you do? What did you learn?

### 7. What I would change

If you were redesigning the Pilot Kit for next year's students, what is one thing you would change? Be specific. Your educator will use this feedback to improve future versions of the curriculum.

---

## Self-check — what you should be able to do

Below is the curriculum's self-check across all five lessons. Honestly assess each item. There are no right answers — this is for you, not for a grade.

For each, mark one: - **Confident** — I can do this well and explain it to someone else - **Developing** — I can do this with effort or support; I'd want more practice - **Beginning** — I'm not yet sure I can do this on my own

### Lesson 1 — What AI Is and Is Not

- ☐ I can explain what an LLM is in my own words to someone who has never thought about it
- ☐ I can name three things AI is good at and three things AI struggles with
- ☐ I can explain why hallucination is a structural risk, not just a bug

 

### Lesson 2 — Verification

- [ ] I can take any factual claim and identify what would count as good evidence for it
- [ ] I can find at least two independent reliable sources on a topic
- [ ] I can document my verification process so someone else could check my work

### Lesson 3 — Media Bias and Critical Reading

- [ ] I can identify the claim, evidence, audience, missing context, and bias of any source I encounter
- [ ] I can recognize bias in sources I instinctively trust, not just sources I disagree with
- [ ] I can read across multiple sources and identify the pattern, not just one source's view

### Lesson 4 — Privacy and Ethics

- [ ] I know what kinds of information I should not type into commercial AI services
- [ ] I can explain the capability-vs-credential distinction in my own words
- [ ] I can produce an honest AI Use Disclosure for any school assignment that involved AI

### Lesson 5 — Civic Tech

- [ ] I can identify the responsible government agency or official for a given local or state issue
- [ ] I can take a defensible position on a real issue, using evidence from cited sources
- [ ] I can honestly acknowledge what I don't know about an issue I care about

---

## What to keep

These five artifacts together are your **portfolio for the Pilot Kit**. Keep them. They demonstrate what you can do.

Specifically, the portfolio supports:

- **Homeschool documentation** — for families documenting their child's education
- **Documentation support for families using scholarship programs** — the artifacts contribute to ESA / Family Empowerment Scholarship documentation; the actual reimbursement determination is made by the program reviewer, not by the artifacts
- **Your own record** — the proof you did the work, useful when you continue with related curriculum or apply skills elsewhere
- **Future learning** — looking back at this portfolio in a year will show you how much you grew

Store the artifacts somewhere you can find them. A folder on your computer. A physical binder. A shared family drive. Wherever your family or school keeps important academic records.

---

## What's next

The Pilot Kit is the introduction. If you want to continue:

 

- **The Open Source Student (Foundation Edition)** covers the technical side of local AI in much more depth — installation, custom assistants, advanced use
- **Future curriculum versions (Phase 2 nine-week module, Phase 3 full-year edition)** will expand the civic technology work into multi-week and full-year curricula
- **The skills you've built apply immediately** — in your school work, in your civic life, in any situation where you need to think clearly about information

You don't need to wait for more curriculum to use what you learned. Every time you encounter an AI claim, a news article, a social media post, a politician's statement, or a friend's confident assertion, you have a tool for thinking it through. That tool is yours now.

---

## A note from the curriculum team

You were part of a pilot. That means the curriculum is still being developed; your work — your artifacts, your feedback, your educator's notes — informs the version that comes next. You contributed to a curriculum that other students will use.

Thank you for participating. The skills you built this week are the kind of skills citizens need. We hope you use them.

---

 

# Cumulative Glossary

**Student Edition appendix · Florida Pilot Kit**

Use this glossary when a word from an earlier lesson comes back later in the Pilot Kit.

| Term | Lesson | Meaning |
|---|---|---|
| Academic integrity | 4 | Doing school work honestly and following the rules for what help is allowed. |
| Agency | 5 | A government office or public body responsible for a specific area of public work. |
| AI | 1 | Artificial intelligence: computer systems designed to do tasks that usually require human-like pattern recognition, language, prediction, or decision support. |
| AI Use Disclosure | 4 | A statement that explains what AI tool was used, what it helped with, what work is your own, and how you checked or revised the output. |
| Audience | 3 | The people a message is trying to reach or persuade. |
| Bias | 3 | A perspective or lean in how information is selected, framed, emphasized, or left out. |
| Capability | 4 | The actual skill or understanding you build by doing the work. |
| Citation | 2 | Information that helps someone else find the source you used. |
| Claim | 2, 3 | What a source wants the reader to believe or accept as true. |
| Credential | 4 | A grade, certificate, completion mark, or other proof that says you completed work. |
| Evidence | 2, 3 | Facts, examples, data, documents, expert statements, or reasoning used to support a claim. |
| Hallucination | 1, 2 | An AI answer that sounds confident but is false, unsupported, or made up. |
| Information integrity | 3 | The habit of checking claims, evidence, sources, context, and bias before trusting or sharing information. |
| Jurisdiction | 5 | The level or area of authority a public office has. City, county, state, and federal offices have different jurisdictions. |

 

| Term | Lesson | Meaning |
|---|---|---|
| Large language model / LLM | 1 | A type of AI system trained on large amounts of text to predict and generate language. |
| Missing context | 3 | Important information that is absent but needed to understand a claim fairly. |
| Model | 1 | A simplified computational representation that helps a system predict, classify, or generate output. |
| Personal information | 4 | Information that identifies you or someone else, such as full name, address, school schedule, medical information, passwords, or private stories. |
| Plagiarism | 4 | Presenting someone else's words, ideas, or work as your own without proper credit. |
| Policy | 5 | A rule, plan, or decision used by a school, government, organization, or public agency. |
| Primary source | 2 | A source close to the original information, such as an official document, law, data table, agency page, or firsthand record. |
| Prompt | 1 | The instruction or question a person gives to an AI tool. |
| Public official | 5 | A person who holds a government or public office, such as a mayor, school board member, agency director, or legislator. |
| Public records | 5 | Government records that citizens can usually inspect under public-records laws, subject to legal exceptions. |
| Source | 2, 3 | The person, organization, document, website, tool, or institution that produced information. |
| Verification | 2 | Checking a claim against reliable sources before trusting or using it. |

---

## Quick Reference: Six Questions for Any Source

1. What is the claim?
2. What evidence is offered?
3. What is the source?
4. Who is the audience?
5. What context is missing?
6. Where is the bias?

---

 

## Quick Reference: AI Privacy Test

If you would not want the information posted publicly with your name, do not put it into an AI tool.

---

 

# Supported Reading Versions

**Student Edition appendix · Florida Pilot Kit**

These supported readings restate the core reading from each lesson in simpler language for students who benefit from a lower reading load. They are designed for struggling readers, English Language Learners, students with reading accommodations, or classes where the teacher wants a read-aloud version.

Use without stigma. The learning targets are the same. Students using this appendix should still complete the same activities, with accommodations as needed.

---

## Lesson 1 Supported Reading: What AI Is and Is Not

AI means artificial intelligence. In this lesson, we are mostly talking about tools that can answer in language, such as chatbots.

A chatbot does not think like a person. It uses patterns from the text it was trained on. It predicts what words are likely to come next. That can be useful, but it can also be risky.

AI can help with:

- explaining a hard idea in simpler words
- brainstorming questions
- summarizing text you already have
- giving examples
- helping you revise your own writing

AI is not good at everything. It can be wrong. Sometimes it gives an answer that sounds confident but is false or unsupported. That is called a hallucination.

Base AI tools may not know current information unless they are connected to a search tool or another current-data tool. AI can also make mistakes in math unless it is using a calculator or code tool.

The most important habit is this: **use AI as a helper, not as the final authority.** If the answer matters, verify it.

---

## Lesson 2 Supported Reading: Verifying AI With Sources

AI can sound sure of itself even when it is wrong. That means you need a verification habit.

Verification means checking a claim with reliable sources.

First, find the claim. A claim is the part that can be checked. For example: “Dolphins are fish because they live in water.” The claim is not just “dolphins.” The claim is that dolphins are fish.

Next, choose good sources. A good source for a science claim might be a science textbook, a reputable aquarium, NOAA, a university, or an encyclopedia. A random comment is not enough.

Then compare the sources. Do they agree? Do they explain why? Do they give evidence?

Finally, write your finding. A good finding is honest. It might say:

- confirmed
- partly confirmed
- not confirmed
- false
- not enough information

Good researchers do not pretend to know what they do not know.

---

## Lesson 3 Supported Reading: Media Bias, Claims, and Digital Persuasion

Information comes from many places. The same topic might appear in an AI answer, a news article, a government page, an advocacy group post, and social media.

Each source has a point of view. That does not always mean the source is lying. It means the source makes choices about what to include, what to leave out, and what to emphasize.

Use these six questions with any source:

1. What is the claim?
2. What evidence is offered?
3. Who or what is the source?
4. Who is the audience?
5. What context is missing?
6. Where is the bias?

Bias means a lean or perspective. Every source has bias because every source is created by someone, for some purpose, for some audience.

Missing context is important information that is left out. A source might say something true but still leave out details that would change how you understand it.

Citizens need these skills. Public decisions are shaped by news, social media, advocacy, government statements, and AI. If you can analyze sources, you can participate more responsibly.

---

## Lesson 4 Supported Reading: Privacy, Ethics, and Academic Integrity

AI can help you learn, but you need boundaries.

Do not put private information into commercial AI tools. Private information includes:

- your full name with your school or schedule
- your address or phone number
- passwords
- student ID numbers
- medical information
- private family information
- private stories about friends

Use this test: **If you would not want it posted publicly with your name, do not type it into AI.**

Using AI honestly means using it to build your capability. Capability is the real skill you gain. A credential is the grade, certificate, or completed assignment that says you did the work.

The trap is getting the credential without building the capability. If AI writes the work and you submit it as yours, you may get completion, but you did not build the skill.

A good use of AI might be asking it to explain a confusing idea, then doing the assignment yourself. A bad use is copying AI answers and pretending they are yours.

Disclosure means saying how AI helped. Honest disclosure protects trust.

---

## Lesson 5 Supported Reading: Civic Tech Mini-Project

This lesson puts the week together. You will choose a real issue and research it.

A real civic issue is connected to your school, neighborhood, city, county, or state. It has real people affected by it. It also has a public office, agency, official, or school board connected to it.

Too broad: “traffic.”
Better: “Should the city review crosswalk safety near our school entrance?”

Your steps:

1. Choose a real issue.
2. Turn it into a specific question.
3. Identify the agency or official connected to it.
4. Find real sources.
5. Verify important claims.
6. Compare different perspectives.
7. State what you think should happen, or explain what you still do not know.
8. Include an AI Use Statement.

AI may help you brainstorm or organize questions, but it cannot be your source by itself. You still need real sources, such as a city page, school board agenda, state agency page, local news article, or public record.

Good civic work is specific, honest, and evidence-based.

---

 