

The Open Source Student — Florida Educator's Edition

External Partner Review Packet · Florida Pilot Kit v1.0 · May 2026

CivicOS Labs

Open Pilot Agreement

License and use limits for the Florida Pilot Kit

The Florida Pilot Kit is released so educators, families, microschools, libraries, and school leaders can review and use the pilot curriculum in real instructional settings before deciding whether to adopt a longer CivicOS curriculum product.

This agreement explains what the open pilot allows, what it does not allow, and when a separate institutional or commercial license is needed.

Short version

You may use, copy, print, share, and adapt the Florida Pilot Kit for noncommercial educational use, as long as you credit CivicOS Labs, LLC, keep the same Creative Commons license on adapted versions, and do not imply that CivicOS endorses your school, program, product, or modified version.

You may not sell the pilot, place it behind a paid course or membership as your own product, remove attribution, rebrand it as your curriculum, use it for commercial training, or distribute modified versions under a more restrictive license without a separate written agreement from CivicOS Labs, LLC.

License

Copyright (c) 2026 CivicOS Labs, LLC.

Published by CivicOS Labs, LLC.

The Florida Pilot Kit is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0).

License URL: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/>

This agreement is a plain-language explanation of the pilot use policy. The Creative Commons license controls the open-license permissions. A separate written agreement controls any paid institutional, commercial, white-label, LMS-packaged, SCORM-packaged, or district implementation use.

What this agreement allows

Under the open pilot license, you may:

- Use the Pilot Kit with students in a classroom, homeschool, microschool, library, after-school program, tutoring setting, or family learning setting.
- Copy and print the materials for your own students, household, class, pilot group, or noncommercial educational program.
- Share the original Pilot Kit files with other educators, parents, school leaders, or reviewers.
- Adapt the materials for local pacing, accessibility, grade-level support, student needs, or classroom logistics.
- Quote or excerpt limited portions of the materials in pilot reports, grant applications, ESA documentation, school board packets, parent communications, or curriculum-review documents, with attribution.
- Use the standards matrix, implementation packet, and pilot evidence documents to support internal review, adoption discussion, ESA review, or procurement planning.
- Collect student work, portfolio artifacts, and feedback generated during a pilot implementation.

These uses are allowed as long as they are noncommercial, properly attributed, and consistent with CC BY-NC-SA 4.0.

What this agreement does not allow

The open pilot license does not allow you to:

- Sell the Pilot Kit, lesson files, teacher edition, student edition, worksheets, standards matrix, or implementation packet as a standalone product.
- Sell access to the Pilot Kit through a paid course, paid membership, paid training, paid learning platform, or paid curriculum bundle unless you have a separate written commercial license.
- Rebrand the curriculum as your own work or remove CivicOS attribution.
- Present a modified version as an official CivicOS edition unless CivicOS has approved it in writing.
- Use CivicOS names, logos, marks, or institutional identity in a way that suggests sponsorship, endorsement, partnership, accreditation, approval, or official adoption where none exists.
- Apply digital rights management, platform restrictions, contract terms, or other technical/legal barriers that prevent recipients from exercising the rights granted by CC BY-NC-SA 4.0.
- Distribute adapted versions under a different or more restrictive license.
- White-label the curriculum for a school, company, vendor, consultant, learning platform, or institution without a separate written agreement.
- Convert the materials into SCORM, LMS packages, paid digital products, commercial professional development, or institutional training products without a separate written agreement.
- Use student data, pilot feedback, or student work in marketing, public case studies, or product claims without appropriate permissions and compliance review.

Institutional use

Schools, districts, libraries, homeschool co-ops, microschools, and nonprofit education programs may use the open pilot for noncommercial evaluation and pilot-period instruction.

The open pilot is appropriate for:

- A teacher trying the five lessons with one class.
- A library media specialist running a short pilot program.
- A homeschool parent using the pilot with their own child.
- A microschool or co-op testing the curriculum with a small group before adoption.
- A principal, curriculum director, or review committee evaluating the materials.

A separate institutional or commercial license is needed for:

- Full-year curriculum deployment.
- Paid professional development or train-the-trainer use.
- Commercial tutoring, enrichment, or microschool offerings that charge specifically for access to the CivicOS curriculum.
- District-wide or multi-school implementation beyond pilot review.
- LMS, SCORM, vendor-platform, or white-label packaging.
- Use by a company, consultant, or provider as part of a paid product or service.

When in doubt, treat the open pilot as evaluation and limited noncommercial pilot instruction. Treat scaled adoption, ongoing delivery, paid delivery, commercial packaging, or institutional deployment as requiring a written license.

Attribution requirements

When sharing, adapting, excerpting, or presenting these materials, include attribution substantially similar to:

The Open Source Student - Florida Educator's Edition: Florida Pilot Kit. Copyright (c) 2026 CivicOS Labs, LLC. Published by CivicOS Labs, LLC. Licensed under CC BY-NC-SA 4.0.

If you modify the materials, also state that changes were made. For example:

Adapted from The Open Source Student - Florida Educator's Edition: Florida Pilot Kit. Changes were made for local pacing and student support. Original copyright (c) 2026 CivicOS Labs, LLC. Licensed under CC BY-NC-SA 4.0.

Do not suggest that CivicOS Labs, LLC endorses your modified version, school, program, organization, or use unless that endorsement is separately granted in writing.

Student data and privacy

The open pilot license gives permission to use the curriculum materials. It does not give permission to collect, publish, sell, disclose, or reuse student data.

Schools, districts, programs, and families remain responsible for:

- Following applicable privacy laws and local policies.
- Obtaining any required parent/guardian permissions.
- Protecting student work and personally identifiable information.
- Using only AI tools, websites, accounts, or platforms permitted by their setting.
- Reviewing FERPA, COPPA, district policy, school policy, and scholarship-program requirements where applicable.

The Pilot Kit is designed to support no-install, screenshot-based, and district-approved-tool implementation paths. No commercial AI account is required for the core pilot.

No approval or reimbursement guarantee

The Pilot Kit includes standards alignment, implementation documents, and ESA-supporting templates, but CivicOS does not guarantee:

- Approval by a school, district, state agency, scholarship funding organization, or curriculum committee.
- ESA, scholarship, grant, procurement, or reimbursement eligibility.
- Alignment acceptance by every reviewer or institution.
- Suitability for every student, disability profile, device environment, or school policy.

Adoption, reimbursement, accessibility, privacy, procurement, and compliance decisions belong to the relevant school, district, program, family, agency, reviewer, or scholarship funding organization.

Feedback and pilot reporting

Educators and families are encouraged to share pilot feedback with CivicOS Labs, including what worked, what confused students, what needed adaptation, and what would make implementation easier.

Do not send student personally identifiable information, private student work, disability records, discipline records, grades, or other protected information unless there is a separate written agreement and a lawful basis for doing so.

Contact for institutional or commercial licensing

For full-year adoption, institutional deployment, paid training, LMS packaging, white-label use, commercial use, or other rights beyond the open pilot license, contact CivicOS Labs through civicoslabs.com.

- Principal & Superintendent Forward Packet
 - Page 1 — What this is and what it requires
 - One-paragraph summary
 - At a glance
 - What's verified (and what isn't)
 - What the pilot requires from the school
 - What the pilot does not require
 - Page 2 — Standards alignment and adoption logistics
 - Standards alignment (benchmark verification 2026-05-15; course-code hardening 2026-05-17; full per-benchmark detail in Standards Alignment Matrix v3.3)
 - Florida course code fit
 - What the curriculum produces
 - Privacy, FERPA, and accessibility
 - ESA / Florida scholarship reimbursement
 - Pricing and licensing
 - How to adopt the Pilot Kit (six steps, ~1–2 hours of administrative time total)
 - Contact
- Administrator Overview — The Open Source Student, Florida Pilot Kit
 - What it is
 - Why it matters
 - What the Pilot Kit contains
 - Standards alignment
 - Time and resource requirements
 - What you commit to in piloting
 - What CivicOS commits to
 - Concerns frequently raised by administrators (and our responses)
 - How to adopt the Pilot Kit
 - Contact
- Institutional Pricing Information
 - Product levels
 - Proposed Phase 2 pricing
 - Proposed Phase 3 pricing
 - What is included in a school license
 - Referral credit policy
 - Notes for ESA families
 - Market basis
- Florida Pilot Kit — Pacing Guide
 - What every pacing has in common
 - Pacing Option 1: One-Week Intensive (DEFAULT)
 - Pacing Option 2: Two-Week Relaxed
 - Pacing Option 3: Five-Week After-School Program
 - Pacing Option 4: Weekend Microschool Intensive
 - Pacing Option 5: Single-Day Intensive (NOT RECOMMENDED, but documented)
 - Choosing your pacing
 - What happens after the pilot
 - Time commitments at a glance
 - A note on "extra time"
- Florida Pilot Kit — Standards Alignment Matrix
 - Important format change since prior matrix versions
 - Honest caveats on substance-match limits
 - Florida course codes referenced in this matrix
 - How each lesson alignment is structured
 - Lesson 1: What AI Is and Is Not
 - Per-benchmark alignment (Lesson 1)
 - Pilot teacher's audit checklist for Lesson 1
 - Lesson 2: Verifying AI Answers With Sources
 - Per-benchmark alignment (Lesson 2)
 - Audit checklist for Lesson 2
 - Lesson 3: Media Bias, Claims, and Digital Persuasion
 - Per-benchmark alignment (Lesson 3)
 - Audit checklist for Lesson 3
 - Lesson 4: Privacy, Ethics, and Academic Integrity
 - Per-benchmark alignment (Lesson 4)
 - Audit checklist for Lesson 4
 - Lesson 5: Civic Tech Mini-Project
 - Per-benchmark alignment (Lesson 5)
 - Audit checklist for Lesson 5
 - Cross-Reference Summary Table
 - Course Lane Summary Table

- How to use this matrix for adoption documentation
 - Public sources used for verification (2026-05-15)
 - Open verification items
 - Adaptation to other states
- Teacher Quick Start
 - What this curriculum teaches in one sentence
 - What you need to know in five bullets
 - What you need to teach Lesson 1 on Monday
 - What students will produce across the week
 - What to do if something goes wrong
 - What this Pilot Kit asks of you
 - Where to read more
 - Contact and questions
- Google Classroom Upload Pack
 - What this pack is
 - Before setup
 - Recommended Classroom structure
 - Recommended posting sequence
 - 1. Add orientation materials
 - 2. Post each lesson as an assignment
 - 3. Use the pilot portfolio as the through-line
 - Suggested Drive folder structure
 - Google Classroom attachment settings
 - Rubric setup
 - Optional Google Form exit ticket
 - Optional IT/API setup
 - Public Google Classroom references
- Google Classroom Assignment Posts
 - Course orientation material
 - Lesson 1 assignment
 - Lesson 2 assignment
 - Lesson 3 assignment
 - Lesson 4 assignment
 - Lesson 5 assignment
 - Optional final portfolio assignment
 - Suggested short rubric for Classroom
- Google Classroom Upload Manifest
- IT Approval Checklist
 - Default delivery requirements
 - AI service access for teacher demonstration
 - Optional extension track (local AI installation)
 - Network and bandwidth requirements
 - Student data and privacy
 - Accessibility
 - IT approval checklist (for sign-off)
 - Approval recommendation
 - Questions and contact
- Parent / Guardian Letter — Template
 - TEMPLATE LETTER
 - What your student will learn
 - Why this matters
 - How AI is being used in the classroom
 - What you can do at home
 - Privacy and data
 - Academic integrity
 - If you have concerns
 - What happens at the end
 - ADAPTATION NOTES FOR EDUCATORS
- Student AI Use Agreement
 - STUDENT AI USE AGREEMENT — TEMPLATE
 - What I agree to do
 - What my school agrees to provide
 - What this agreement does not do
 - Consequences for violations
 - Signatures
 - ADAPTATION NOTES FOR EDUCATORS
 - A note on consequences
- Accessibility Statement
 - Design principles
 - Format and technology accessibility

- Support for IEP / 504 accommodation categories
 - Attention and executive function (ADHD, executive function challenges)
 - Reading and language (dyslexia, language processing)
 - Autism spectrum
 - Anxiety and emotional regulation
 - English Language Learner (ELL) support
 - Gifted and twice-exceptional support
 - Technology access variation
 - What the Pilot Kit does NOT yet have
 - Compliance posture
 - Contact for accessibility questions
- Data Privacy Statement
 - What the curriculum collects
 - What data exposure is possible during normal use
 - FERPA considerations
 - Florida student privacy considerations
 - Recommendations for educators
 - Recommendations for families using ESA / Family Empowerment Scholarship funds
 - What if you have privacy concerns we haven't addressed?
 - A brief note on the broader privacy argument
- ESA Documentation Guide
 - What this guide is not
 - What this guide is
 - Curriculum summary for ESA documentation
 - Standards alignment summary
 - Categories the curriculum may fit under
 - Implementation evidence
 - Common ESA reviewer questions, with suggested answers
 - Recommendations for the application process
 - If your ESA reimbursement application is denied or questioned
 - A note on Pilot Kit pricing
 - Verification reminder
- ESA Family Application Packet
 - Quick guide: which variant should I use?
 - Common information across both variants
 - Section A — FES-UA Application Language
 - Short-form (FES-UA)
 - Long-form (FES-UA)
 - Section B — Step Up For Students Portal Application Language
 - Short-form (SUFS portal)
 - Long-form (SUFS portal — for larger reimbursements or curriculum review)
 - Section C — FTC-PEP Application Language
 - Short-form (FTC-PEP)
 - Long-form (FTC-PEP)
 - Recommended attachments for any application
 - After submission: maintaining records
- Pre-Purchase Eligibility Letter — Template
 - How families request this letter
 - How CivicOS Labs issues this letter
 - Short-form variant
 - Long-form variant
 - Program-specific addenda
 - FES-UA addendum
 - Step Up For Students addendum
 - FTC-PEP addendum
 - Maintenance and reissue
- Reviewer Evidence Packet
 - Short-form variant — one-page reviewer summary
 - What this curriculum is
 - Standards alignment (summary)
 - Florida course code fit
 - Student outputs (portfolio artifacts)
 - Privacy and accessibility
 - Reviewer's quick verification path
 - Reviewer's quick determination questions
 - Long-form variant — full standards alignment evidence
 - Verification provenance
 - Detailed standards alignment by lesson
 - Cross-reference: standards coverage across lessons
 - Hours of instruction documentation

- Educational outputs documentation
 - Privacy and FERPA documentation
 - IEP and accessibility documentation
 - Reviewer's deeper verification path
 - Open verification item status
 - Determination support summary
 - Contact for verification or follow-up
- Lesson 1: What AI Is and Is Not
 - Lesson at a Glance
 - Background for the Teacher
 - Lesson Procedure
 - Bellringer / Warm-Up Options (choose one)
 - Opening (5 minutes)
 - Direct Instruction (15 minutes)
 - Activity 1: AI Demonstration (10 minutes)
 - Activity 2: AI Concept Map (15 minutes — most of the independent work time)
 - Closing (5 minutes)
 - Student Reading — Reproduced with Teacher Annotations
 - Vocabulary Teaching Strategies
 - Differentiation Notes
 - Below grade level readers
 - Above grade level readers
 - English Language Learners (ELL)
 - IEP / 504 — ADHD or Executive Function Support
 - IEP / 504 — Reading or Language Processing Support
 - IEP / 504 — Autism Spectrum
 - Anxiety or Emotional Regulation
 - Gifted students
 - Limited Technology Access (no personal device)
 - Assessment Rubric: AI Concept Map
 - Answer Key / Scoring Notes
 - Extension Options
 - No-Install Adaptation Notes
 - Common Misconceptions
 - Cross-Curricular Connections
 - Parent Communication Notes
 - Closing the lesson well
- Lesson 1: What AI Is and Is Not
 - What you will learn today
 - Bellringer / Warm-Up Options
 - Do not worry about being perfectly correct yet. This is your starting idea before we build a clearer explanation.
 - Vocabulary
 - Reading: What AI Actually Is
 - The Kind of AI This Lesson Is About
 - This Sounds Too Simple. How Does It Do So Much?
 - What AI Is Good At
 - What AI Is Not Good At (Important Limits to Know)
 - What This Means for How You Use AI
 - Is AI Really "Thinking"?
 - Activity 1: Watch the Demonstration
 - Activity 2: Build Your AI Concept Map (Portfolio Artifact)
 - Reflection Questions
 - Self-Check
 - Looking Ahead
- Lesson 2: Verifying AI Answers With Sources
 - Lesson at a Glance
 - Background for the Teacher
 - Lesson Procedure
 - Bellringer / Warm-Up Options (choose one)
 - Opening (5 minutes)
 - Direct Instruction (12 minutes)
 - Activity 1: Verification Demonstration (10 minutes)
 - Activity 2: Student Verification (independent work, 18+ minutes)
 - Closing (5 minutes)
 - Student Reading — Reproduced with Teacher Annotations
 - Vocabulary Teaching Strategies
 - Differentiation Notes
 - Below grade level readers
 - Above grade level readers
 - English Language Learners (ELL)

- IEP / 504 — ADHD / Executive Function
 - IEP / 504 — Reading or Language Processing
 - IEP / 504 — Autism Spectrum
 - Anxiety or Emotional Regulation
 - Limited Technology Access
 - Gifted students
- Assessment Rubric: Source Verification Log Entry
 - Answer Key / Scoring Notes
- Extension Options
- No-Install Adaptation Notes
 - Prepared AI claims for verification (Activity 2 source material)
 - Verification demonstration without live AI
- Common Misconceptions
- Cross-Curricular Connections
- Parent Communication Notes
- Closing the lesson well
- Lesson 2: Verifying AI Answers With Sources
 - What you will learn today
 - Bellringer / Warm-Up Options
 - The point is not just whether the claim is right or wrong. The point is how you would check.
 - Vocabulary
 - Reading: Why Verification Is the Habit That Matters Most
 - Why You Cannot Just Trust AI
 - The Verification Workflow
 - What Sources Are Worth Checking Against
 - Why This Matters for Civic Literacy
 - What “Reduces, Not Eliminates” Means
 - Activity 1: Watch the Verification Demonstration
 - Activity 2: Your Own Verification (Portfolio Artifact)
 - Source Verification Log Entry — Template
 - Reflection Questions
 - Self-Check
 - Looking Ahead
- Lesson 3: Media Bias, Claims, and Digital Persuasion
 - Lesson at a Glance
 - Background for the Teacher
 - Lesson Procedure
 - Bellringer / Warm-Up Options (choose one)
 - Opening (5 minutes)
 - Direct Instruction (15 minutes)
 - Activity 1: Class Demonstration (10 minutes)
 - Activity 2: Student Media Analysis (15 minutes core, plus independent work for completion)
 - Closing (5 minutes)
 - Student Reading — Reproduced with Teacher Annotations
 - Vocabulary Teaching Strategies
 - Differentiation Notes
 - Below grade level readers
 - Above grade level readers
 - English Language Learners
 - IEP / 504 — ADHD / Executive Function
 - IEP / 504 — Reading or Language Processing
 - IEP / 504 — Autism Spectrum
 - Anxiety or Emotional Regulation
 - Limited Technology Access
 - Gifted students
 - Assessment Rubric: Media Analysis
 - Answer Key / Scoring Notes
 - Sample Proficient Artifact (for educator reference)
 - Additional Scored Exemplars
 - Extension Options
 - No-Install Adaptation Notes
 - Sample topic and prepared source set: Sea level rise impacts in Florida
 - Common Misconceptions
 - Cross-Curricular Connections
 - Parent Communication Notes
 - Closing the lesson well
- Lesson 3: Media Bias, Claims, and Digital Persuasion
 - What you will learn today
 - Bellringer / Warm-Up Options
 - Be ready to share one thing you would need to know before trusting the sentence.

- Vocabulary
- Reading: Information Doesn't Travel Through One Pipe
 - Information Has Always Been Messy. AI Just Made It Faster.
 - What to Look For in Any Source
 - What This Has to Do With Civic Life
 - A Note on Bias
- Activity 1: Information Integrity Lab Mini (Demonstration)
- Activity 2: Your Own Media Analysis (Portfolio Artifact)
 - Media Analysis — Template
- Reflection Questions
- Self-Check
- Looking Ahead
- Lesson 4: Privacy, Ethics, and Academic Integrity
 - Lesson at a Glance
 - Background for the Teacher
 - Lesson Procedure
 - Bellringer / Warm-Up Options (choose one)
 - Opening (5 minutes)
 - Direct Instruction (15 minutes)
 - Activity 1: Discussion of AI Use Scenarios (10 minutes)
 - Activity 2: Student AI Use Disclosure (15 minutes core, plus completion as homework)
 - Closing (5 minutes)
 - Student Reading — Reproduced with Teacher Annotations
 - Vocabulary Teaching Strategies
 - Differentiation Notes
 - Below grade level readers
 - Above grade level readers
 - English Language Learners
 - IEP / 504 — ADHD / Executive Function
 - IEP / 504 — Reading / Language Processing
 - Autism Spectrum
 - Anxiety / Emotional Regulation
 - Limited Technology Access
 - Gifted Students
 - Assessment Rubric: AI Use Disclosure
 - Answer Key / Scoring Notes
 - Sample Proficient Artifact (for educator reference)
 - Additional Scored Exemplars
 - Extension Options
 - No-Install Adaptation Notes
 - Common Misconceptions
 - Cross-Curricular Connections
 - Parent Communication Notes
 - Closing the lesson well
- Lesson 4: Privacy, Ethics, and Academic Integrity
 - What you will learn today
 - Bellringer / Warm-Up Options
 - **Option C — Extended Launch (6-7 minutes):** Mark all five items. Then write one rule that could help a student decide what not to type into an AI tool.
 - Vocabulary
 - Reading: Using AI Without Becoming Hollow
 - Privacy: What Not to Share
 - When You Use Local AI, Privacy Works Differently
 - Ethics: Using AI Honestly in School Work
 - When AI Use Is Clearly Fine, Clearly Not Fine, and Gray
 - Disclosure: The Honest Move
 - What If You Made a Mistake?
 - Privacy and Ethics Are Civic Skills
 - Activity 1: Class Discussion of AI Use Scenarios
 - Activity 2: Your AI Use Disclosure (Portfolio Artifact)
 - AI Use Disclosure — Template
 - Reflection Questions
 - Self-Check
 - Looking Ahead
- Lesson 5: Civic Tech Mini-Project
 - Lesson at a Glance
 - Background for the Teacher
 - Lesson Procedure
 - Bellringer / Warm-Up Options (choose one)
 - Opening (5 minutes)
 - Direct Instruction (10 minutes)

- Activity 1: Issue Selection (10 minutes)
 - Florida Regional Topic Starters
 - Activity 2: The Mini-Project (35–45 minutes core; project completion may extend beyond)
 - Activity 3: Class Sharing (5–10 minutes if time allows)
 - Closing (5 minutes)
- Student Reading — Reproduced with Teacher Annotations
- Vocabulary Teaching Strategies
- Differentiation Notes
 - Below grade level readers
 - Above grade level readers
 - English Language Learners
 - IEP / 504 — ADHD / Executive Function
 - IEP / 504 — Reading or Language Processing
 - Autism Spectrum
 - Anxiety / Emotional Regulation
 - Limited Technology Access
 - Gifted Students
- Assessment Rubric: Civic Issue Brief
 - Answer Key / Scoring Notes
 - Sample Proficient Artifact (for educator reference)
 - Additional Scored Exemplars
- Extension Options
- No-Install Adaptation Notes
- Common Misconceptions
- Cross-Curricular Connections
- Parent Communication Notes
- Closing the lesson well — and the pilot
- Lesson 5: Civic Tech Mini-Project
 - What you will learn today
 - Bellringer / Warm-Up Options
 - This does not have to be your final project topic. It is a quick start for civic thinking.
 - Vocabulary
 - Reading: Putting It All Together
 - Why a Civic Project, Specifically?
 - What Counts as a “Real” Issue
 - How to Approach the Mini-Project
 - A Few Notes on Doing This Well
 - Activity 1: Issue Selection and Question Framing (10 minutes)
 - Activity 2: The Mini-Project (40+ minutes)
 - Civic Issue Brief — Template
 - Activity 3: Class Sharing (10 minutes if time allows)
 - Reflection Questions
 - Self-Check
 - What This Pilot Has Built
 - Your Portfolio at the End of the Pilot
 - Looking Ahead
- Pilot Assessment
 - Assessment philosophy
 - The five portfolio artifacts and their rubrics
 - Lesson 1 — AI Concept Map
 - Lesson 2 — Source Verification Log
 - Lesson 3 — Media Analysis
 - Lesson 4 — AI Use Disclosure
 - Lesson 5 — Civic Issue Brief (or approved equivalent: Letter to Public Official, Class Presentation)
 - Cumulative portfolio assessment
 - Pre/post assessment option
 - Answer key audit status
 - Reporting back to families and stakeholders
 - Adapting assessment for IEP / 504 / differentiated learners
 - After the Pilot — what assessment data tells you
- Pre/Post Assessment
 - Student Assessment
 - Answer Key
 - Scoring and Use
- Annotated Sample Portfolio
 - Portfolio Arc at a Glance
 - Artifact 1: AI Concept Map
 - Artifact 2: Source Verification Log
 - Artifact 3: Media Analysis
 - Artifact 4: AI Use Disclosure

- Artifact 5: Civic Issue Brief
 - What the Complete Portfolio Shows
 - Calibration Notes for Differentiated Portfolios
- Differentiation Notes
 - Differentiation principles
 - Reading-level differentiation
 - For students reading above grade level
 - For students reading at grade level
 - For students reading below grade level
 - IEP / 504 accommodation patterns
 - Processing-time accommodations
 - Written-output accommodations
 - Reading accommodations
 - Attention / focus accommodations
 - Sensory accommodations
 - Motor accommodations
 - English Language Learner (ELL) differentiation
 - Lesson-by-lesson differentiation notes
 - Lesson 1 — What AI Is and Is Not
 - Lesson 2 — Verifying AI Answers With Sources
 - Lesson 3 — Media Bias, Claims, and Digital Persuasion
 - Lesson 4 — Privacy, Ethics, and Academic Integrity
 - Lesson 5 — Civic Tech Mini-Project
 - Working with families on accommodations
 - When differentiation is not enough
- Cross-Curricular Coordination Cards
 - Card 1: Lesson 1 - What AI Is and Is Not
 - Card 2: Lesson 2 - Verifying AI With Sources
 - Card 3: Lesson 3 - Media Bias, Claims, and Digital Persuasion
 - Card 4: Lesson 4 - Privacy, Ethics, and Academic Integrity
 - Card 5: Lesson 5 - Civic Tech Mini-Project
- Extension Options Guide
 - Quick Selection Guide
 - Lesson-by-Lesson Extension Guidance
 - Lesson 1: What AI Is and Is Not
 - Lesson 2: Verifying AI With Sources
 - Lesson 3: Media Bias, Claims, and Digital Persuasion
 - Lesson 4: Privacy, Ethics, and Academic Integrity
 - Lesson 5: Civic Tech Mini-Project
 - Grading Extensions
- Visual Asset Pack
 - Slide 1: Lesson 1 - Confident But Wrong
 - Slide 2: Lesson 2 - Verification Log Demo
 - Slide 3: Lesson 3 - Same Topic, Different Source Framing
 - Slide 4: Lesson 4 - Privacy Sorting
 - Slide 5: Lesson 4 - Capability vs. Credential
 - Slide 6: Lesson 5 - Narrowing a Civic Issue
 - Slide 7: Lesson 5 - Civic Issue Brief Checklist
- Student Reflection and Self-Check
 - Look at your portfolio
 - Reflection questions — write a paragraph for each
 - 1. The skill that changed most for me this week
 - 2. The habit I want to keep
 - 3. The thing I'm still uncertain about
 - 4. AI in my life going forward
 - 5. The civic issue I researched
 - 6. The hardest moment of the week
 - 7. What I would change
 - Self-check — what you should be able to do
 - Lesson 1 — What AI Is and Is Not
 - Lesson 2 — Verification
 - Lesson 3 — Media Bias and Critical Reading
 - Lesson 4 — Privacy and Ethics
 - Lesson 5 — Civic Tech
 - What to keep
 - What's next
 - A note from the curriculum team
- Cumulative Glossary
 - Quick Reference: Six Questions for Any Source
 - Quick Reference: AI Privacy Test

- Supported Reading Versions
 - Lesson 1 Supported Reading: What AI Is and Is Not
 - Lesson 2 Supported Reading: Verifying AI With Sources
 - Lesson 3 Supported Reading: Media Bias, Claims, and Digital Persuasion
 - Lesson 4 Supported Reading: Privacy, Ethics, and Academic Integrity
 - Lesson 5 Supported Reading: Civic Tech Mini-Project
- Pilot Feedback Form
 - About you and your setting
 - About what you taught
 - What worked
 - What did not work
 - About the format and structure
 - About the institutional support materials
 - About student learning
 - About civics co-primary framing
 - About broader feedback
 - About the next phase
 - How to submit
 - Thank you

Principal & Superintendent Forward Packet

The Open Source Student — Florida Educator’s Edition · Florida Pilot Kit · v1.0 · May 2026

A concise executive summary for administrators and curriculum leaders. Page 1 presents decision-relevant facts. Page 2 summarizes standards alignment and adoption logistics.

Page 1 — What this is and what it requires

One-paragraph summary

The Open Source Student — Florida Educator’s Edition is a five-lesson, ~5-to-6-hour middle school civic technology curriculum from CivicOS Labs, LLC. It teaches Florida middle school students (primary audience: grades 6–8; grade 9 use is possible as early-high-school transition or enrichment, but grade-9 benchmark alignment is not claimed) to understand artificial intelligence, verify information, analyze sources for bias, use AI ethically, and apply technology to real civic problems. It is aligned to current Florida B.E.S.T. CS Standards (July 2024 revision), Florida Civics & Government Standards, and Florida B.E.S.T. ELA Standards at the middle school level. The Pilot Kit is **free during the pilot phase**, requires **no installations**, **collects no student data**, and **fits multiple existing M/J course lanes**.

At a glance

Item	Detail
Audience	Grades 6–9 (middle school + early high school transition)
Time	~5–6 hours of student-facing time (Lessons 1–4: ~45 min core each + ~20–25 min student work; Lesson 5 capstone: 60–75 min core + 30+ min project completion)
Format	5 paired Teacher/Student lessons + Implementation Readiness Packet, including Google Classroom upload support and ESA templates + Standards Alignment Matrix + Pacing Guide + Pilot Recruitment materials
Pacing options	One-week intensive · two-week relaxed · five-week after-school · weekend microschool
Devices	Any modern browser-capable device; no installations required for core delivery
Internet	Recommended for teacher demonstration; optional for students; full no-internet contingency documented
Cost	Free during pilot phase; proposed post-pilot launch anchors: Phase 2 from \$149 family / up to \$495 teacher / \$1,995 school site; Phase 3 from approximately \$349 family digital / up to \$895 teacher / \$39 student workbook-text / \$4,995 school site; district, LMS, SCORM, PD, printed-materials, and commercial-use pricing quoted separately
License	Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0
Publisher	CivicOS Labs · civicoslabs.com

What’s verified (and what isn’t)

- **All standards alignment is verified against public CPALMS / FDOE sources.** Per-benchmark, per-lesson alignment is documented in the curriculum’s Standards Alignment Matrix v3.3 (the Standards Alignment Matrix). Benchmark codes were verified on 2026-05-15; the M/J Language Arts 2/3, M/J Grade 6/7/8 Digital Discoveries, and current M/J Intensive Reading support course-code items were closed against official public sources on 2026-05-17. No codes are speculative.
- **Only one optional course-code refinement remains:** grade-specific M/J Intensive Reading 2/3 citations for schools that require reading-support course lanes beyond the current matrix defaults. This does not affect benchmark code accuracy or the primary adoption lanes.
- **ESA reimbursement is not guaranteed.** Eligibility under any specific Florida scholarship program (FES-UA, FTC-PEP, etc.) is determined by the program reviewer. The curriculum documents structural attributes that may support that determination; per FDOE guidance, the determination itself rests with the Scholarship Funding Organization.

What the pilot requires from the school

- **One educator** willing to teach the five lessons (CS teacher, civics teacher, ELA teacher, library media specialist, microschool facilitator, or homeschool parent — any of these can deliver the curriculum)
- **~15 minutes of preparation per lesson** for Lessons 1, 2, and 4 (Teacher Editions are complete; no separate planning materials required). **Lessons 3 and 5 need more preparation** — typically 30–60 minutes — for topic pre-selection, sample-source curation, or (in no-internet settings) building a printed Source Packet for Lesson 5
- **~10 minutes of feedback** at the end (Pilot Feedback Form supports the curriculum’s continued development)
- **Total administrative commitment:** approximately 1–2 hours including evaluation, parent communication, and feedback submission

What the pilot does not require

- ❌ Local AI software installation on student devices
- ❌ Student accounts on commercial AI platforms
- ❌ Network configuration changes

- **✗** Data sharing agreements with AI vendors (not required when using the prepared-output / no-live-AI path; any live commercial AI use during teacher demonstration remains subject to district vendor review)
- **✗** Specialized hardware
- **✗** District-approved AI tool (the curriculum supports prepared example AI outputs as a full substitute for live AI)

Page 2 — Standards alignment and adoption logistics

Standards alignment (benchmark verification 2026-05-15; course-code hardening 2026-05-17; full per-benchmark detail in Standards Alignment Matrix v3.3)

Florida B.E.S.T. Computer Science Standards (grades 6–8, July 2024 revision). Primary technical alignment across multiple strands. Confirmed benchmark anchors include:

- *Emerging Technologies* — SC.6.ET.2.1, SC.6.ET.2.2, SC.7.ET.2.1, SC.8.ET.2.1, SC.8.ET.2.2 (AI characteristics, benefits, applications, intelligent behavior)
- *Programming and Software Engineering* — SC.8.PE.3.3 ("Evaluate the benefits and limitations of the use of models" — anchors AI critical-evaluation content)
- *Personal Health and Safety* — SC.7.HS.1.4, SC.7.HS.1.6, SC.7.HS.1.7, SC.8.HS.1.2, SC.8.HS.3.2 (privacy, safety, digital media influence on behavior)
- *Cyber Security* — SC.7.CS.1.1, SC.7.CS.3.3, SC.8.CS.2.1, SC.8.CS.2.3 (data states, vulnerabilities, network privacy, data permanency)
- *Technological Impact* — SC.7.TI.1.3, SC.7.TI.2.1, SC.7.TI.2.2, SC.7.TI.2.4, SC.8.TI.2.2 (media influence, ethical/responsible technology use, civic engagement via government websites)
- *Computing Components* — SC.8.CO.3.1 ("Compare the benefits and limitations of desktop applications and their complimentary online subscription version" — anchors local-vs-cloud privacy framing)
- *Communication and Collaboration* — SC.7.CC.2.2 (research-informed digital artifact creation)

Florida Civics and Government Standards (grade 7 + grade 8 extensions).

- SS.7.CG.2.8 (impact of media, individuals, and interest groups on monitoring and influencing government)
- SS.7.CG.2.9 (analyzing media and political communications for bias, symbolism, propaganda)
- **SS.7.CG.2.10 — primary anchor for the Civic Tech Mini-Project** (process for citizens to address state or local problems by researching public policy alternatives, identifying responsible government agencies, and determining a course of action — the benchmark text reads almost as a description of the Lesson 5 capstone)
- Grade 8 extensions taught within M/J U.S. History (#2100010): SS.8.CG.2.2 (citizen responsibilities), SS.8.CG.2.3 (civic virtue), SS.8.CG.2.4 (civic-participation history), SS.8.CG.2.6 (expanded civic participation through constitutional amendments)

Florida B.E.S.T. ELA Standards (grades 6–8). Embedded throughout. Grade 7 anchors (parallels at grades 6 and 8):

- *Reading Informational Text* — ELA.7.R.2.1, R.2.4, R.3.3, R.3.4 (structure, argument, comparative reading, rhetoric)
- *Communication* — ELA.7.C.1.3 (argument), C.2.1 (oral), C.4.1 (research), C.5.1 (multimedia), C.5.2 (digital tools). **Note: B.E.S.T. ELA uses the "C" prefix for what other frameworks call "Writing."**
- *Vocabulary* — ELA.7.V.1.1, V.1.3
- *K-12 ELA Expectations* — ELA.K12.EE.4.1 (collaborative discussion), ELA.K12.EE.6.1 (voice and tone)

Florida course code fit

The curriculum supplements existing courses; it does not require a new course code. The codes below have been verified against CPALMS or the FDOE Course Code Directory; see footnote on the M/J Language Arts items.

- **M/J Navigating Technology: Digital Literacy and Digital Citizenship** (#0200024) — primary CTE fit
- **M/J Grade 6 / 7 / 8 Digital Discoveries** (#0200021 / #0200022 / #0200023)
- **M/J Civics** (#2106010); **M/J Civics, Advanced** (#2106020); **M/J Civics & Career Planning** (#2106016); **M/J Civics and Digital Technologies** (#2106029)
- **M/J Language Arts 1 / 2 / 3** (#1001010 / #1001040 / #1001070) — all three confirmed via CPALMS related-course listings and/or FDOE 2025–26 student database update records
- **M/J U.S. History** (#2100010 — embeds SS.8.CG benchmarks for grade 8)
- Also fits homeschool, microschool, and library after-school program contexts without a course code

What the curriculum produces

Five student portfolio artifacts, each with a defined rubric in the Teacher Edition: **AI Concept Map** (Lesson 1) · **Source Verification Log** (Lesson 2) · **Media Analysis** (Lesson 3) · **AI Use Disclosure** (Lesson 4) · **Civic Issue Brief** (Lesson 5). The artifacts may support ESA documentation, homeschool portfolio records, and IEP-related documentation where applicable — actual eligibility, progress, or compliance determinations rest with the appropriate program reviewer, IEP team, or homeschool authority, not with the curriculum publisher.

Privacy, FERPA, and accessibility

The curriculum collects no student data and operates no infrastructure that would create or store student records. Adoption requires no changes to existing FERPA-compliant student data practices. The curriculum is designed for accessibility (screen reader compatible, keyboard navigation, multi-modal access, no color-only information) with explicit IEP/504 differentiation guidance. Full documentation: the Data Privacy Statement, the Accessibility Statement, and Differentiation Notes.

ESA / Florida scholarship reimbursement

The curriculum's structural attributes — standards alignment, instructional materials format, student work artifacts, license terms — may support reimbursement under FES-UA (for students with an IEP or qualifying disability diagnosis), FTC-PEP (for students not enrolled full-time in a public or private school), and other Florida scholarship programs administered by Step Up For Students. Pre-filled application templates and a pre-purchase eligibility letter are included in the ESA templates. **Reimbursement determination rests with the Scholarship Funding Organization and program reviewer, not with the curriculum publisher.**

Pricing and licensing

The Pilot Kit is free during the pilot phase. Post-pilot pricing is designed as a school-friendly ladder: family licenses, single-teacher classroom licenses, microschool/co-op licenses, school site licenses, and district licenses. Proposed launch anchors are \$149 for the Phase 2 family license, up to \$495 for the Phase 2 single-teacher classroom license, \$1,995 for the Phase 2 school site license, approximately \$349 for the Phase 3 family digital license, up to \$895 for the Phase 3 single-teacher classroom license, \$39 per student workbook/text, and \$4,995 for the Phase 3 school site license. Final quotes depend on printed materials, LMS or SCORM packaging, professional development, term length, support needs, and district procurement requirements.

How to adopt the Pilot Kit (six steps, ~1–2 hours of administrative time total)

1. Identify the educator (CS / civics / ELA teacher, library media specialist, microschool facilitator, or homeschool parent)
2. Have them read the Teacher Quick Start
3. Choose a pacing option from the Pacing Guide
4. Distribute the Parent/Guardian Letter to families before the pilot begins
5. Run the five lessons
6. Submit the online Pilot Feedback Form created from the Google Forms setup pack, or use the Markdown form as an offline fallback

Contact

CivicOS Labs · civicoslabs.com · for pilot adoption questions, scheduling, institutional licensing, or curriculum verification.

Administrator Overview — The Open Source Student, Florida Pilot Kit

A 2–3 page summary for school administrators evaluating curriculum adoption.

What it is

The Open Source Student — Florida Educator's Edition is a civic technology curriculum developed by CivicOS Labs, LLC. It teaches middle school students to understand artificial intelligence, verify information against reliable sources, protect their privacy, use digital tools responsibly, and apply technology to civic problem-solving with evidence and public purpose.

This Pilot Kit is the introductory five-lesson package — designed to let your school evaluate the curriculum's format, pedagogy, and fit before committing to a longer module or full-year edition.

Why it matters

Three converging realities make AI literacy curriculum a practical necessity for Florida middle schools right now:

1. **Students are using AI already.** Whether through school-provided tools, free public platforms, or applications they discovered on their own, AI is part of how middle school students do homework, write essays, and learn. The question is no longer whether they will use AI; the question is whether they will use it well, with judgment, and with the verification and ethical habits that protect both their learning and their academic integrity.
 2. **Florida is leading on civic literacy.** The Civic Literacy Excellence Initiative, the Portrait of a Florida Graduate, and the civics graduation requirements all point to the same priority: Florida students should be informed, capable citizens who can evaluate information, engage with public life, and act with judgment. AI literacy and civic literacy are not separate subjects — they reinforce each other. A student who learns to verify AI claims is practicing the same skill they need to evaluate any source in civic life.
 3. **Florida schools and families need adoption-ready curriculum.** The current AI-in-education conversation is heavy on principles and light on practical, standards-aligned, classroom-ready material. This Pilot Kit fills that gap with a working curriculum that can be taught next week.
-

What the Pilot Kit contains

- **Five paired lessons** (Teacher Edition + Student Edition for each)
 - Lesson 1: What AI Is and Is Not
 - Lesson 2: Verifying AI Answers With Sources
 - Lesson 3: Media Bias, Claims, and Digital Persuasion
 - Lesson 4: Privacy, Ethics, and Academic Integrity
 - Lesson 5: Civic Tech Mini-Project
 - **Implementation Readiness Packet** — Teacher Quick Start, Google Classroom Upload Pack, IT Approval Checklist, Parent/Guardian Letter, Student AI Use Agreement, Accessibility Statement, Data Privacy Statement, Pilot Feedback Form, and ESA Documentation Guide
 - **Standards Alignment Matrix** — explicit per-lesson alignment to current Florida CS, Civics, and B.E.S.T. ELA standards
 - **Pacing Guide** — multiple pacing options including one-week intensive, two-week relaxed, five-week after-school program, and weekend microschool intensive
-

Standards alignment

The Pilot Kit aligns with current Florida Department of Education standards:

- **Florida B.E.S.T. Computer Science Standards (grades 6–8, July 2024 revision)** — Emerging Technologies (AI benchmarks SC.6/7/8.ET.2), Programming and Software Engineering (model limits via SC.8.PE.3.3), Communication and Collaboration, Personal Health and Safety, Computing Components (local-vs-cloud via SC.8.CO.3.1), Technological Impact, Cyber Security strands
- **Florida Civics and Government Standards (grades 7–8)** — SS.7.CG.2.8 (media/individuals/interest groups influencing government), SS.7.CG.2.9 (analyzing media for bias, symbolism, propaganda), SS.7.CG.2.10 (process for citizens to address state or local problems — primary anchor for the Civic Tech Mini-Project), plus grade 8 extensions (SS.8.CG.2.2 responsibilities, SS.8.CG.2.3 civic virtue, SS.8.CG.2.4 participation history, SS.8.CG.2.6 expanded participation)
- **Florida B.E.S.T. ELA Standards (grades 6–8)** — embedded throughout in reading informational text, communication (argument and research — B.E.S.T. uses C.1/C.4 prefixes), vocabulary acquisition, and K-12 ELA Expectations for collaborative discussion (EE.4.1 / EE.6.1)

The curriculum fits multiple Florida course lanes including M/J Navigating Technology (#0200024), M/J Grade 6/7/8 Digital Discoveries (#0200021 / #0200022 / #0200023), M/J Civics (#2106010), M/J Civics and Digital Technologies (#2106029), M/J Language Arts and ELA support, and middle-school CTE Information Technology pathway courses. Detailed per-lesson alignment is provided in the Standards Alignment Matrix.

Time and resource requirements

Time: Lessons 1–4 are approximately 45 minutes of core instruction each; Lesson 5 (the Civic Tech Mini-Project capstone) is 60–75 minutes of core instruction plus 30+ minutes of project completion. Per-lesson independent student work adds 20–30 minutes. Total student-facing time across the Pilot Kit is approximately 5–6 hours.

Devices: No installation required on student devices. The default delivery uses teacher demonstration, prepared example AI outputs, browser-safe AI access, and offline handouts. Compatible with locked-down school Chromebooks, shared lab stations, and limited-internet settings.

Educator preparation: Approximately 15 minutes of preparation per lesson for Lessons 1, 2, and 4. Lesson 3 (Media Analysis) and Lesson 5 (Civic Tech Mini-Project) typically need additional preparation — pre-selecting topics, sample sources, or (in no-internet settings) building the Source Packet of printed government documents and news articles. Plan for 30–60 minutes of preparation for those two lessons. The Teacher Edition includes complete lesson plans with timings, teaching notes, differentiation guidance, and answer keys. No prior AI expertise required; the Educator’s Edition is designed for educators who are learning alongside their students.

Cost: Pilot Kit is free during the pilot phase. Proposed 2026 post-pilot launch anchors are approximately \$149 for the Phase 2 family license, up to \$495 for the Phase 2 single-teacher classroom license, \$1,995 for the Phase 2 school site license, approximately \$349 for the Phase 3 family digital license, up to \$895 for the Phase 3 single-teacher classroom license, \$39 per student workbook/text, and \$4,995 for the Phase 3 school site license. Final pricing varies within the documented ranges. District, LMS, SCORM, printed-materials, professional-development, and commercial-use pricing are quoted separately. See Institutional Pricing Information for the full draft pricing menu and license notes.

What you commit to in piloting

If you adopt the Pilot Kit at your school, you commit to three things:

1. **Have an educator teach the five lessons** in a setting and pacing that fits your school
2. **Capture what happens** — informal notes from the educator on what worked, where students struggled, where the curriculum delivered or fell short
3. **Submit the Pilot Feedback Form** — about 10 minutes of structured feedback

That feedback shapes the next version of the curriculum. Pilot adopters are explicitly recognized as foundational contributors to the curriculum’s development.

What CivicOS commits to

- **Quality and integrity** — curriculum developed by experienced educators, current AI practitioners, and aligned to current Florida standards
 - **Responsiveness** — direct contact for pilot questions, clarifications, and support during your pilot run
 - **Recognition** — pilot adopters are credited in the Phase 2 (nine-week module) materials as foundational contributors
 - **Continued development** — the full curriculum (Phase 2 and Phase 3) is the planned next step after the Pilot Kit validates the format
-

Concerns frequently raised by administrators (and our responses)

“Is this asking us to install AI software on student devices?” No. The default delivery is no-install. Teacher demonstration, prepared example AI outputs, browser-safe AI access, and offline handouts are the standard. Local installation is an optional extension for students whose home setups support it; it is not part of the core lessons.

“How do we handle student privacy with AI tools?” The Data Privacy Statement documents the curriculum’s data practices. The curriculum does not require students to create accounts on commercial AI platforms. The Teacher Edition provides safe demonstration prompts and no-student-account alternatives (the prepared-example-output path); districts determine which AI platforms, account types, and use policies are permitted in instruction.

“What about academic integrity?” Lesson 4 directly addresses academic integrity in the AI era. Students learn what responsible AI use looks like, what disclosure means, and what the line between help and outsourcing is. The Student AI Use Agreement template supports school-wide policy implementation.

“How does this integrate with our existing tech curriculum?” The Pilot Kit is designed to supplement, not replace, existing technology curriculum. It can serve as a one-week unit within M/J Navigating Technology, M/J Grade 6/7/8 Digital Discoveries, M/J Civics and Digital Technologies, or M/J Civics; as a media literacy unit within M/J Language Arts; as enrichment in a library media center; or as standalone curriculum in homeschool and microschool settings.

“Can we use ESA / Family Empowerment Scholarship funds for this?” The ESA Documentation Guide provides families and schools with the documentation needed to support reimbursement applications. The Standards Alignment Matrix demonstrates the curriculum addresses standards-aligned learning across CS, Civics, and ELA frameworks at the middle school level. Verify current FES eligibility at <https://www.fldoe.org/schools/school-choice/k-12-scholarship-programs/fes/> before relying on this for purchasing decisions.

“What if our parents have concerns?” The Parent/Guardian Letter template proactively communicates what students are learning and why. Transparency about AI in the curriculum tends to defuse parental concern, especially when the curriculum’s framing emphasizes responsible use, verification, and ethics — which this curriculum’s central focus is. Where individual parents have additional concerns, the Data Privacy Statement and Student AI Use Agreement provide further documentation that supports those conversations.

How to adopt the Pilot Kit

1. Identify the educator who will teach the lessons (CS teacher, civics teacher, ELA teacher, library media specialist, or other)
2. Have them read the Teacher Quick Start
3. Choose a pacing from the Pacing Guide that fits your schedule
4. Distribute the Parent/Guardian Letter to families before the pilot begins
5. Run the five lessons
6. Submit the Pilot Feedback Form when complete

Total administrative time commitment: approximately 1–2 hours, including this evaluation, parent communication, and feedback submission.

Contact

CivicOS Labs · civicoslabs.com

For pilot adoption questions, scheduling, or institutional licensing inquiries: contact through the CivicOS Labs website.

Institutional Pricing Information

Proposed 2026 launch pricing for post-pilot curriculum products

The Florida Pilot Kit is free during the pilot period. Its purpose is to let educators, families, microschools, libraries, and school leaders evaluate the curriculum's format, standards alignment, implementation requirements, and classroom fit before adopting a longer paid curriculum product.

The prices below are proposed launch prices for the next CivicOS curriculum products. Final quotes may vary based on printed materials, LMS packaging, professional development, district requirements, term length, and support needs.

Product levels

Product	Scope	Status
Florida Pilot Kit	5 paired Teacher/Student lessons; approximately 5-6 hours of instruction; implementation packet; standards matrix; Google Classroom support	Free during pilot phase
Phase 2 nine-week module	Quarter-length module with expanded lessons, assessments, portfolio artifacts, and implementation support	Planned paid product
Phase 3 semester/full-year edition	Semester or full-year curriculum with full Teacher Edition, Student Edition/textbook, portfolio/workbook, assessments, rubrics, standards documentation, and implementation packet	Planned paid product

Proposed Phase 2 pricing

Buyer type	Proposed price
Family / homeschool digital license	\$149-\$249
Microschool / co-op license, up to 25 students	\$399-\$695/year
Single-teacher classroom license	\$299-\$495/year
School site license, up to 500 students	\$1,495-\$2,995/year
District license	\$4-\$8/student/year or \$5,000 annual minimum
LMS / Google Classroom implementation support add-on	\$500-\$1,500 one-time

Recommended launch anchors: **\$149 family, up to \$495 single-teacher classroom, \$1,995 school site**. These are post-pilot figures; the Florida Pilot Kit remains free during the pilot phase.

Proposed Phase 3 pricing

Buyer type	Proposed price
Family digital license	\$249-\$399/year
Family print + digital textbook bundle	\$349-\$499/year
Student textbook / workbook only	\$29-\$49 per student
Teacher Edition only	\$149-\$299
Single-teacher classroom digital license	\$695-\$950/year
Classroom print/digital pack for 30 students	\$1,250-\$1,950/year
School site license, up to 500 students	\$3,500-\$6,500/year
District license	\$6-\$12/student/year or \$7,500 annual minimum
SCORM / LMS package	\$2,500-\$7,500 setup plus annual license
White-label / commercial training use	quoted separately; typically \$10,000-\$25,000+ annually depending on scope

Recommended launch anchors: **approximately \$349 family digital, up to \$895 single-teacher classroom, \$39 per student workbook/text, \$4,995 school site**. These are post-pilot figures; final pricing may vary within the documented ranges based on format, support, term length, and implementation needs.

What is included in a school license

A standard school license should include:

- Teacher Edition
- Student Edition / student text
- student portfolio/workbook materials
- assessment package
- answer keys and rubrics
- standards alignment matrix
- Google Classroom upload package

- implementation readiness packet
- parent/guardian communication templates
- data privacy and accessibility documentation
- annual updates during the license term

Printed materials, professional development, custom LMS packaging, SCORM packaging, district-specific customization, and white-label rights are separate unless included in a written quote.

Referral credit policy

CivicOS may offer referral credits for introductions that lead to paid adoption. Referral credits must be disclosed, capped, and issued only where permitted by school, district, and state ethics rules.

Public employees should not personally accept referral compensation for purchases made by their school or district. Where a public-school referral is involved, any credit should go to the school, classroom, PTO, library/media center, or an approved scholarship/access fund rather than to the individual employee.

Suggested referral-credit structure:

Referral type	Suggested credit
Family or homeschool referral	10% account credit or \$25-\$50 curriculum credit
Microschool / co-op referral	10% first-year credit, capped at \$250
Private school referral	5%-10% first-year credit, capped at \$500
Public school / district referral	non-cash classroom/library credit or PD seat, never personal cash unless legal/ethics approval is documented
Consultant / channel partner	separate written partner agreement, typically 10%-20% commission depending on sales role

Notes for ESA families

The Pilot Kit is free during the pilot period, so reimbursement is not needed for the pilot materials themselves. Paid Phase 2 and Phase 3 products may support ESA review where the family's program rules allow curriculum purchases, but reimbursement eligibility is determined by the Scholarship Funding Organization or program reviewer, not by CivicOS Labs.

Families should keep:

- purchase receipt or invoice
- curriculum description
- standards alignment summary
- student portfolio artifacts
- lesson completion record
- any required program-specific documentation

Market basis

This pricing is based on a market scan of comparable public prices for digital literacy, AI literacy, civics, computer science, and standards-aligned curriculum products. Relevant public comparables include free sponsor-funded programs, teacher marketplace units, classroom coding plans around \$350/year, full course licenses around \$700-\$950/year, school licenses in the low thousands, and institutional computer science platforms above \$3,000 per teacher/year.

Florida Pilot Kit — Pacing Guide

One-week pilot in five paired lessons, with alternative paces for different educational settings.

This guide gives you four ways to run the Florida Pilot Kit: the default one-week intensive, a relaxed two-week version, a five-week after-school program, and a weekend microschool intensive. Pick the pacing that fits your setting and your students. The lessons themselves are the same across paces; only the time you spend on each varies.

What every pacing has in common

The Pilot Kit teaches five paired lessons:

1. **What AI Is and Is Not** — the basics: what artificial intelligence actually is, what it can and cannot do, and why the difference matters
2. **Verifying AI Answers With Sources** — the verification habit; how to check AI claims against real, reliable sources
3. **Media Bias, Claims, and Digital Persuasion** — how to think critically about information from any source — AI, news, advocacy, social media
4. **Privacy, Ethics, and Academic Integrity** — using AI responsibly in school work and personal life
5. **Civic Tech Mini-Project** — a short project applying everything from lessons 1–4 to a real local or state issue

Each lesson is roughly **45 minutes of core instruction**, plus **15–30 minutes of independent student work** (reading, writing, project work, reflection). The Pilot Kit assumes the teacher leads the core instruction; the independent work can happen during class, as homework, or in a flex block.

Each lesson includes:

- **Teacher Edition** — full lesson plan with timings, teaching notes, differentiation, assessment, and answer keys
- **Student Edition** — student-facing reading at grade level, activities, vocabulary, and reflection
- **No-install version** as the default — works on any device with a browser; no local AI installation required
- **Optional installation extension** — for students whose home setups support it; not required for the core lesson

Pacing Option 1: One-Week Intensive (DEFAULT)

The standard pilot pacing. Five lessons across five consecutive school days. Best fit for: classroom teachers running a full week’s curriculum block, library media specialists running a one-week summer or break program, microschools running a focused weekly theme.

Day	Lesson	Core Instruction	Independent Work
Monday	Lesson 1: What AI Is and Is Not	45 minutes	20 minutes (Student Reading + Self-Check)
Tuesday	Lesson 2: Verifying AI Answers With Sources	45 minutes	25 minutes (Verification Activity)
Wednesday	Lesson 3: Media Bias, Claims, and Digital Persuasion	45 minutes	25 minutes (Information Integrity Lab Mini)
Thursday	Lesson 4: Privacy, Ethics, and Academic Integrity	45 minutes	20 minutes (AI Use Reflection)
Friday	Lesson 5: Civic Tech Mini-Project	60 minutes	30 minutes (project completion + presentation prep)

Total contact time: approximately 4 hours of core instruction, plus 2 hours of independent student work over the week.

Recommended: Schedule the Friday lesson with extra time if possible (60–75 minutes for core instruction) so students can complete their mini-project and share back to the class.

Daily time note: Lessons 1–4 usually require about 65–75 minutes when core instruction and independent work are combined. Lesson 5 is longer; plan for approximately 90 minutes total, or split project completion/presentation into a follow-up block.

Pacing Option 2: Two-Week Relaxed

Same five lessons, spread across two weeks with built-in time for deeper discussion, slower pacing, and student support. Best fit for: homeschool families pacing for one student, ELL-heavy classrooms needing additional vocabulary support, classes with significant prior-knowledge variation.

Week 1: - Day 1: Lesson 1 introduction (30 min) + Student Reading - Day 2: Lesson 1 discussion and Self-Check (30 min) - Day 3: Lesson 2 introduction (30 min) + Student Reading - Day 4: Lesson 2 verification activity (45 min) - Day 5: Discussion and review (30 min); start Lesson 3 reading

Week 2: - Day 1: Lesson 3 introduction and Information Integrity Lab Mini (45 min) - Day 2: Lesson 3 discussion + start Lesson 4 reading (30 min) - Day 3: Lesson 4 main lesson and AI Use Reflection (45 min) - Day 4: Lesson 5 project introduction and start (60 min) - Day 5: Lesson 5 project completion and presentations (60 min)

Total contact time: approximately 6 hours of core instruction across 10 days.

Pacing Option 3: Five-Week After-School Program

One lesson per week, designed for after-school programs, library youth programs, or elective enrichment blocks that meet weekly. Best fit for: library media specialists running a five-week winter or spring program, after-school clubs, summer enrichment series.

Week	Lesson	Session Length	Notes
1	Lesson 1: What AI Is and Is Not	60 minutes	Add a 15-minute orientation at the start of the first session
2	Lesson 2: Verifying AI Answers With Sources	60 minutes	
3	Lesson 3: Media Bias, Claims, and Digital Persuasion	60 minutes	
4	Lesson 4: Privacy, Ethics, and Academic Integrity	60 minutes	
5	Lesson 5: Civic Tech Mini-Project	75 minutes	Allow extra time for student presentations and program closing

Total contact time: approximately 5 hours across five weekly sessions.

Recommendation: ask students to do a small amount of independent work between sessions (the Self-Check in the Student Edition for that lesson) so the next week’s session can build on it.

Pacing Option 4: Weekend Microschool Intensive

Full pilot completed across two weekend days. Best fit for: microschools or homeschool co-ops running periodic intensive blocks, family learning weekends, summer immersion programs.

Saturday: - Morning (9:00 AM – 12:00 PM): Lessons 1 and 2 with breaks - Lunch - Afternoon (1:00 PM – 4:00 PM): Lesson 3 and start of Lesson 4

Sunday: - Morning (9:00 AM – 12:00 PM): Complete Lesson 4 and start of Lesson 5 - Lunch - Afternoon (1:00 PM – 4:00 PM): Complete Lesson 5 mini-project, presentations, and closing

Total contact time: approximately 12 hours across two weekend days, with breaks built in.

Recommendation: include physical movement breaks every 45–60 minutes; this pacing is dense and students need them.

Pacing Option 5: Single-Day Intensive (NOT RECOMMENDED, but documented)

Some institutional contexts (a single PD day, a pre-camp day, a one-day workshop) ask for a single-day version. We document this pacing reluctantly — it sacrifices the depth that makes the curriculum work — but provide it for educators whose only option is a single day.

- 9:00 AM – 9:45 AM: Lesson 1
- 9:55 AM – 10:40 AM: Lesson 2
- 10:50 AM – 11:35 AM: Lesson 3
- 11:35 AM – 12:30 PM: Lunch
- 12:30 PM – 1:15 PM: Lesson 4
- 1:25 PM – 2:55 PM: Lesson 5 mini-project (compressed)
- 3:05 PM – 3:30 PM: Presentations and closing

Caveat: the verification practice, source evaluation habits, and project work all benefit substantially from time between lessons for reflection and consolidation. A single-day version delivers the content but loses the consolidation. Use only when no other pacing is available.

Choosing your pacing

Your setting	Recommended pacing
Florida public middle school, full weekly block	Option 1 (One-Week Intensive)
Florida public middle school, 30-min daily block	Option 2 (Two-Week Relaxed) or Option 3 (Five-Week)
Florida private or charter school, similar	Option 1 or Option 2
Homeschool family, one student	Option 2 (Two-Week Relaxed)
Homeschool co-op meeting weekly	Option 3 (Five-Week)
Microschool, daily	Option 1 or Option 2
Microschool, intensive blocks	Option 4 (Weekend Intensive)
Library media center, after-school program	Option 3 (Five-Week)
Library media center, summer/break program	Option 1 or Option 4
Camp or single-day workshop	Option 5 (last resort)

What happens after the pilot

When you finish all five lessons, your students should be able to:

- Explain in their own words what AI is and is not
- Demonstrate the verification habit by checking an AI claim against real sources
- Identify bias and missing context in information from multiple types of sources
- Articulate the ethics of using AI in their school work
- Apply all of the above to a real local or state issue through the Civic Tech Mini-Project

Their portfolio should include:

- An AI Concept Map (Lesson 1)
- A Source Verification Log entry (Lesson 2)
- A Media Analysis (Lesson 3)
- An AI Use Disclosure (Lesson 4)
- A Civic Issue Brief (Lesson 5)

You should be able to:

- Decide whether the curriculum is a fit for your setting
- Provide structured feedback to inform the full curriculum (Phase 2 and Phase 3)
- Make a more informed decision about adopting longer versions if and when they ship

The Pilot Feedback Form and the Pilot Adopter Feedback Form are both designed to capture what you learned. Five minutes of feedback after the pilot makes the next version of this curriculum significantly better.

Time commitments at a glance

Pacing	Total Days	Daily Time	Total Contact Hours
One-Week Intensive	5	60–80 min	~4–5 hours
Two-Week Relaxed	10	30–60 min	~6 hours
Five-Week After-School	5	60–75 min	~5 hours
Weekend Intensive	2	6 hours	~12 hours
Single-Day	1	6 hours	~6 hours

The four recommended paces (Options 1–4) all produce comparable learning outcomes. The single-day option (Option 5) is documented for completeness but produces meaningfully less consolidation.

A note on “extra time”

If your setting allows more time per lesson than paces above suggest, use the extra time for:

- Deeper student discussion (especially after Lessons 3 and 4 — both raise topics students often want to talk through)
- Optional extension activities listed in the Teacher Edition for each lesson
- Local-installation extension track for students whose home setups support it
- More substantial Civic Tech Mini-Project work in Lesson 5 (the project benefits significantly from additional research and presentation time)
- Cross-curricular connections (the Teacher Edition lists ELA, civics, science, and math integration points for each lesson)

The paces above are the minimum viable versions. The curriculum supports more time well; it does not support meaningfully less time.

Florida Pilot Kit — Standards Alignment Matrix

Per-lesson, benchmark-level alignment to current Florida standards across CS, Civics, and B.E.S.T. ELA frameworks.

This matrix is built to administrator and ESA-reviewer audit standards. Every alignment includes the specific benchmark code, the official benchmark text, the Florida course where the benchmark applies, the in-lesson evidence that exercises the benchmark, the student artifact that demonstrates the benchmark was met, and the public source URL where the code is verifiable.

Verification pass status: v3.3 — CPALMS / FDOE benchmark verification pass complete (2026-05-15), with course-code hardening completed (2026-05-17). Every benchmark code below has been resolved against an official public source (CPALMS individual standard pages, the July 2024 B.E.S.T. CS Standards PDF, the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards PDF, the FDOE 6-8 Civics Instructional Guide updated February 2026, the B.E.S.T. Social Studies Standards Book, and the FDOE Course Code Directory). The prior open course-code items for M/J Language Arts 2/3, M/J Digital Discoveries, and current intensive-reading support lanes are closed.

Important format change since prior matrix versions

Florida adopted **new B.E.S.T. Computer Science standards in July 2024 (effective December 2024)**. These replaced the earlier strand-based codes. The current format is:

- Single-grade prefixes** (SC.6.*, SC.7.*, SC.8.*) — not the legacy SC.68.CS-* format
- Strand abbreviations:** CC (Communication and Collaboration), HS (Personal Health and Safety), CO (Computing Components), PE (Programming and Software Engineering), TI (Technological Impact), ET (Emerging Technologies), CS (Cyber Security)
- There is **no "Digital Citizenship" strand by name** in B.E.S.T. CS; that content sits inside HS and TI
- B.E.S.T. ELA uses **C** (Communicating) as the prefix for what other frameworks call "Writing" — so research and argument benchmarks appear as ELA.7.C.1.3 (argument) and ELA.7.C.4.1 (research), not ELA.7.W.*
- B.E.S.T. ELA also has a **K-12 ELA Expectations (EE) strand** that carries discussion-skills, voice/tone, and other K-12-wide expectations as numbered codes (e.g., ELA.K12.EE.4.1, ELA.K12.EE.6.1) rather than grade-specific benchmarks

All codes below reflect the current B.E.S.T. format.

Honest caveats on substance-match limits

Two substance-match gaps deserve transparent disclosure rather than glossing:

- AI hallucination terminology.** B.E.S.T. CS does not use the term "hallucination." However, **SC.8.PE.3.3 ("Evaluate the benefits and limitations of the use of models")** in the Programming and Software Engineering strand directly covers the substance of "model limitations" that hallucination-discussion exercises. The matrix uses SC.8.PE.3.3 as the model-limits anchor, with the caveat that the curriculum's specific framing of hallucination and verification habits is enrichment beyond benchmark vocabulary.
- Citation conventions.** B.E.S.T. ELA has no standalone "documenting sources / citing" benchmark at grade 7. Citation lives in the Conventions Progression Chart appendix. Where the curriculum requires citation (Lessons 2, 3, 5), the matrix cites ELA.7.C.4.1 (research) as the closest numbered fit.

Discussion-skills coverage, previously flagged as a gap, is in fact addressed by the K-12 ELA Expectations strand: **ELA.K12.EE.4.1** ("Use appropriate collaborative techniques and active listening skills") and **ELA.K12.EE.6.1** ("Use appropriate voice and tone"). These codes are integrated into the lesson tables below where applicable.

Florida course codes referenced in this matrix

The Pilot Kit serves multiple Florida middle school courses. Course codes below have been verified against CPALMS preview pages and the FDOE Course Code Directory. The May 17, 2026 publication-hardening pass closed the prior M/J Language Arts 2/3 and Digital Discoveries verification items against official FDOE / CPALMS sources.

Course (FDOE / CPALMS official title)	Code	Verification	CPALMS / FDOE URL
M/J Navigating Technology: Digital Literacy and Digital Citizenship	0200024	Confirmed 2026-05-15 — listed as "2025 and beyond (current)" on CPALMS, associated with current CS benchmarks	https://www.cpalms.org/PreviewStandard/PrintStandard/119735
M/J Grade 6 Digital Discoveries	0200021	Confirmed 2026-05-17 — current 2025-26 FDOE Grades 6-8 Course Code Directory, Computer Science section	https://www.fldoe.org/core/fileparse.php/20833/urllt/10-3.pdf
M/J Grade 7 Digital Discoveries	0200022	Confirmed 2026-05-17 — current 2025-26 FDOE Grades 6-8 Course Code Directory, Computer Science section	https://www.fldoe.org/core/fileparse.php/20833/urllt/10-3.pdf
M/J Grade 8 Digital Discoveries	0200023	Confirmed 2026-05-17 — current 2025-26 FDOE Grades 6-8 Course Code Directory, Computer Science section	https://www.fldoe.org/core/fileparse.php/20833/urllt/10-3.pdf
M/J Civics (year-long, grade 7)	2106010	Confirmed 2026-05-15 — CPALMS lists current and 2026-and-beyond versions	https://www.cpalms.org/PreviewStandard/PrintStandard/3225
M/J Civics, Advanced	2106020	Confirmed 2026-05-15 (CPALMS)	https://www.cpalms.org/PreviewCourse/Preview/13315

Course (FDOE / CPALMS official title)	Code	Verification	CPALMS / FDOE URL
M/J Civics & Career Planning	2106016	Confirmed 2026-05-15 (CPALMS)	https://www.cpalms.org/PreviewStandard/PrintStandard/3225
M/J Civics and Digital Technologies	2106029	Confirmed 2026-05-15 — relevant adjacent course lane combining civics with digital technology coverage	(CPALMS preview, related-course listing)
M/J U.S. History (grade 8 — embeds SS.8.CG benchmarks)	2100010	Confirmed 2026-05-15	(CPALMS preview parallel)
M/J Language Arts 1 (grade 6)	1001010	Confirmed 2026-05-15 — CPALMS direct match; FDOE CCD: https://www.fldoe.org/policy/articulation/ccd/	https://www.cpalms.org/PreviewStandard/PrintStandard/6094
M/J Language Arts 2 (grade 7)	1001040	Confirmed 2026-05-17 — CPALMS related-course listing and FDOE 2025-26 student database update list it as current	https://www.cpalms.org/PreviewStandard/PrintStandard/5955
M/J Language Arts 3 (grade 8)	1001070	Confirmed 2026-05-17 — CPALMS related-course listing and FDOE 2025-26 student database update list it as current	https://www.cpalms.org/PreviewStandard/PrintStandard/6137
M/J Intensive Reading 1	1000010	Confirmed 2026-05-17 — CPALMS English certification/course listing; current intensive-reading support lane	https://www.cpalms.org/PreviewCertification/PrintCertification/144?IsPrintPreview=true
M/J Intensive Reading 2	1000012	Confirmed 2026-05-17 — CPALMS English certification/course listing; current intensive-reading support lane	https://www.cpalms.org/PreviewCertification/PrintCertification/144?IsPrintPreview=true
M/J Intensive Reading 3	1000014	Confirmed 2026-05-17 — CPALMS English certification/course listing; current intensive-reading support lane	https://www.cpalms.org/PreviewCertification/PrintCertification/144?IsPrintPreview=true
M/J Intensive Reading and Career Planning	1000020	Confirmed 2026-05-17 — CPALMS English certification/course listing; current intensive-reading support lane	https://www.cpalms.org/PreviewCertification/PrintCertification/144?IsPrintPreview=true
Legacy M/J Reading 1/2/3 sequence	1008010 / 1008040 / 1008070 — terminated	Confirmed 2026-05-17 — CPALMS related-course listings show the older M/J Reading 2/3 sequence as terminated after 2020-21; use current M/J Intensive Reading 1/2/3 codes above for reading-support citations	https://www.cpalms.org/PreviewStandard/PrintStandard/6096 ; https://www.cpalms.org/PreviewStandard/PrintStandard/6106

Naming note for ELA courses: FDOE's official course title is “M/J Language Arts 1/2/3” — there is no “Comprehensive” qualifier. Earlier matrix versions used “M/J Comprehensive Language Arts” informally. Codes are identical; only the title presentation has been corrected.

Naming note for Digital Discoveries: For 2025-26, FDOE's current Grades 6-8 Course Code Directory lists **M/J Grade 6 Digital Discoveries (#0200021)**, **M/J Grade 7 Digital Discoveries (#0200022)**, and **M/J Grade 8 Digital Discoveries (#0200023)** in the Computer Science section. FDOE's Summary of Changes lists the prior **M/J Computer Science Discoveries** courses (#0200000 / #0200010 / #0200020) as removed from the CCD starting with the 2025-26 school year, with 2024-25 the last year they could be offered.

How each lesson alignment is structured

For each of the five Pilot Kit lessons, the matrix below provides:

- Standard frameworks addressed** — overview of which Florida standards categories the lesson touches
- Per-benchmark alignment table** — for each specific benchmark addressed, the matrix shows: code, framework, official benchmark text, course where it applies, in-lesson evidence, student artifact, source URL, verification date
- Pilot teacher's audit checklist** — quick-reference summary suitable for forwarding to a curriculum reviewer or ESA program administrator

Lesson 1: What AI Is and Is Not

Standard frameworks addressed: - **Florida B.E.S.T. CS Standards (grades 6–8)** — Emerging Technologies (primary); Programming and Software Engineering (model limits — strong addition); Communication and Collaboration; Computing Components - **Florida Civics & Government** — SS.7.CG.2.9 (introduced through “AI as a source whose framing must be examined”; full development in Lessons 2–3) - **Florida B.E.S.T. ELA (grade 7 anchor; grade 6 and 8 parallels available)** — Reading Informational Text, Vocabulary Acquisition, Communication, K-12 Expectations (collaborative techniques)

Per-benchmark alignment (Lesson 1)

Code	Framework	Official Text	Course	In-Lesson Evidence	Student Artifact	Source URL
SC.6.ET.2.1	FL B.E.S.T. CS — Grade 6 Emerging Tech	"Identify the characteristics of Artificial Intelligence (AI)."	M/J Grade 6 Digital Discoveries (#0200021); M/J Navigating Tech (#0200024)	Reading "The Kind of AI This Lesson Is About" and "How an LLM Works"	AI Concept Map	https://cpalmsmediaproduct.blob.core.windows.net/uploads/docs/standards/best/cs/csstandards202407

Code	Framework	Official Text	Course	In-Lesson Evidence	Student Artifact	Source URL
SC.6.ET.2.2	FL B.E.S.T. CS — Grade 6 Emerging Tech	"Discuss the benefits associated with Artificial Intelligence (AI)."	M/J Grade 6 Digital Discoveries (#0200021); M/J Navigating Tech (#0200024)	"What AI Is Good At" reading	AI Concept Map ("what AI is good at" branch)	(B.E.S.T. CS PDF)
SC.7.ET.2.1	FL B.E.S.T. CS — Grade 7 Emerging Tech	"Explore future technologies and the role artificial intelligence (AI) may play."	M/J Grade 7 Digital Discoveries (#0200022)	Reading on AI in current and future use; teacher demo	AI Concept Map	(B.E.S.T. CS PDF)
SC.8.ET.2.1	FL B.E.S.T. CS — Grade 8 Emerging Tech	"Explore the use of an artificial intelligence (AI) device to accomplish a task."	M/J Grade 8 Digital Discoveries (#0200023)	Teacher demo of AI service generating response	AI Concept Map	(B.E.S.T. CS PDF)
SC.8.ET.2.2	FL B.E.S.T. CS — Grade 8 Emerging Tech	"Discuss the utilization of intelligent behavior in technology." (Clarification: instruction includes speech and language understanding and computer vision)	M/J Grade 8 Digital Discoveries (#0200023)	Reading on language-pattern prediction; "How an LLM Works"	AI Concept Map ("How AI works" branch)	(B.E.S.T. CS PDF)
SC.8.PE.3.3	FL B.E.S.T. CS — Grade 8 Programming and Software Engineering	"Evaluate the benefits and limitations of the use of models."	M/J Grade 8 Digital Discoveries (#0200023)	Strong primary fit for the model-limits substance — "What AI Is Not Good At" reading covers benefits and limits of LLMs as computational models	AI Concept Map ("what AI is not good at" branch)	(B.E.S.T. CS PDF)
SC.7.CC.2.2	FL B.E.S.T. CS — Grade 7 Communication & Collaboration	"Analyze one's own ideas with research-based information to create a unique digital artifact."	M/J Grade 7 Digital Discoveries (#0200022); M/J Navigating Tech (#0200024)	Concept Map construction integrates lesson reading with student's own analysis	AI Concept Map (the digital artifact)	(B.E.S.T. CS PDF)
SC.7.CO.2.2	FL B.E.S.T. CS — Grade 7 Computing Components	"Identify and describe the function of the main internal parts of a basic computing device." (Clarification: motherboard, hard drive, CPU, RAM, GPU)	M/J Grade 7 Digital Discoveries (#0200022); M/J Navigating Tech (#0200024)	Substrate context for "AI runs on computing systems" framing	Concept Map (background context)	(B.E.S.T. CS PDF)
SS.7.CG.2.9	FL Civics — Grade 7	"Analyze media and political communications and identify examples of bias, symbolism and propaganda."	M/J Civics #2106010	Hallucination + verification habit <i>introduced</i> (full development in Lesson 2 and 3)	Concept Map ("why we verify" branch)	https://www.fldoe.org/file/15223/CivicsGovInstructGuide-6-8.pdf
ELA.7.R.2.1	FL B.E.S.T. ELA — Grade 7 Reading (Structure)	"Explain how individual text sections and/or features convey a purpose in texts."	M/J Language Arts 2 (#1001040); grade 6 and 8 parallels at ELA.6.R.2.1 / ELA.8.R.2.1	Student Reading is grade-level informational text (~Lexile 1100L) with section structure	Concept Map reflects structural comprehension	https://www.fldoe.org/core/fileparse.php/18736/urlit/EnglishLanguageArts.pdf

Code	Framework	Official Text	Course	In-Lesson Evidence	Student Artifact	Source URL
ELA.7.V.1.1	FL B.E.S.T. ELA — Grade 7 Vocabulary	"Integrate academic vocabulary appropriate to grade level in speaking and writing."	M/J Language Arts 2 (#1001040)	Five technical terms introduced (AI, LLM, model, prompt, hallucinate) and used in context	Self-Check Q1; Concept Map vocabulary	(B.E.S.T. ELA PDF)
ELA.7.V.1.3	FL B.E.S.T. ELA — Grade 7 Vocabulary (Context & Connotation)	"Apply knowledge of context clues, figurative language, word relationships, reference materials, and/or background knowledge to determine the connotative and denotative meaning of words and phrases, appropriate to grade level."	M/J Language Arts 2 (#1001040)	Vocabulary section explicitly teaches context-based use	Concept Map; reflection use of vocabulary	(B.E.S.T. ELA PDF)
ELA.7.C.2.1	FL B.E.S.T. ELA — Grade 7 Communication (Oral)	"Present information orally, in a logical sequence, emphasizing key points that support the central idea."	M/J Language Arts 2 (#1001040)	Class discussion during Activity 1; partner share-out of Concept Maps	Discussion participation (formative)	(B.E.S.T. ELA PDF)
ELA.K12.EE.4.1	FL B.E.S.T. ELA — K-12 ELA Expectations	"Use appropriate collaborative techniques and active listening skills when engaging in discussions in a variety of situations."	M/J Language Arts 2 (#1001040) and all M/J Language Arts variants	Class discussion during Activity 1; partner discussion during Concept Map construction	Discussion participation	(B.E.S.T. ELA PDF)

Pilot teacher's audit checklist for Lesson 1

- ✓ Florida B.E.S.T. CS: Emerging Technologies (SC.6/7/8.ET.2.1+); **SC.8.PE.3.3 (model limits — strong fit)**; Communication & Collaboration; Computing Components — confirmed codes
- ✓ Florida Civics SS.7.CG.2.9: introduced (full development in Lessons 2–3)
- ✓ Florida B.E.S.T. ELA: Reading Informational Text (R.2.1), Vocabulary (V.1.1, V.1.3), Communication (C.2.1), K-12 Expectations (EE.4.1) — confirmed codes
- ✓ Course fit: M/J Navigating Technology #0200024; M/J Grade 6/7/8 Digital Discoveries 0200021/22/23; M/J Language Arts 1/2/3
- ✓ Student artifact: AI Concept Map (in portfolio)

Lesson 2: Verifying AI Answers With Sources

Standard frameworks addressed: - **Florida B.E.S.T. CS** — Emerging Technologies; Programming and Software Engineering (model limits, continued); Personal Health and Safety; Communication and Collaboration - **Florida Civics** — SS.7.CG.2.9 (primary, full development); SS.7.CG.2.8 (introduced) - **Florida B.E.S.T. ELA** — Reading Informational Text (Argument), Communication (Research), Vocabulary, K-12 Expectations

Per-benchmark alignment (Lesson 2)

Code	Framework	Official Text	Course	Evidence	Artifact	Source URL	Verified
SC.7.ET.2.1	FL B.E.S.T. CS — Grade 7 ET	"Explore future technologies and the role artificial intelligence (AI) may play."	M/J Grade 7 Digital Discoveries (#0200022); M/J Navigating Tech (#0200024)	Verification activity uses real AI output as source under examination	Source Verification Log	(B.E.S.T. CS PDF)	2026-05-15
SC.8.PE.3.3	FL B.E.S.T. CS — Grade 8 PE	"Evaluate the benefits and limitations of the use of models."	M/J Grade 8 Digital Discoveries (#0200023)	Primary substance fit — verification habit IS the model-limits evaluation practice	Source Verification Log	(B.E.S.T. CS PDF)	2026-05-15

Code	Framework	Official Text	Course	Evidence	Artifact	Source URL	Verified
SC.7.HS.1.4	FL B.E.S.T. CS — Grade 7 PHS	“Categorize potential dangers to an individual’s safety and security.”	M/J Grade 7 Digital Discoveries (#0200022); M/J Navigating Tech (#0200024)	Discussion of consequences of uncritical AI use (academic, personal, civic)	Source Verification Log + reflection	https://www.cpalms.org/PreviewStandard/PrintStandard/119735	2026-05-15
SC.7.HS.1.6	FL B.E.S.T. CS — Grade 7 PHS	“Compare the risks and benefits of accessing the Internet.”	M/J Grade 7 Digital Discoveries (#0200022)	Risks/benefits framing for AI as information source	Source Verification Log	(B.E.S.T. CS PDF)	2026-05-15
SC.7.CC.2.2	FL B.E.S.T. CS — Grade 7 CC	“Analyze one’s own ideas with research-based information to create a unique digital artifact.”	M/J Grade 7 Digital Discoveries (#0200022)	Verification = comparing AI output to research-based sources to produce documented log	Source Verification Log is the digital artifact	(B.E.S.T. CS PDF)	2026-05-15
SS.7.CG.2.9	FL Civics — Grade 7	“Analyze media and political communications and identify examples of bias, symbolism and propaganda.”	M/J Civics #2106010	Primary alignment — verification activity directly practices source-bias evaluation	Source Verification Log evaluates source credibility	https://www.fldoe.org/file/15223/CivicsGovInstructGuide-6-8.pdf	2026-05-15
SS.7.CG.2.8	FL Civics — Grade 7	“Examine the impact of media, individuals, and interest groups on monitoring and influencing government.”	M/J Civics #2106010	Comparison of AI as information source against established media/official sources	Discussion + reflection	https://www.fldoe.org/file/15223/CivicsGovInstructGuide-6-8.pdf	2026-05-15
ELA.7.R.2.4	FL B.E.S.T. ELA — Grade 7 Reading (Argument)	“Track the development of an argument, analyzing the types of reasoning used and their effectiveness.”	M/J Language Arts 2 (#1001040)	Verification = analyzing AI’s reasoning/claim against source evidence	Source Verification Log	(B.E.S.T. ELA PDF)	2026-05-15
ELA.7.C.4.1	FL B.E.S.T. ELA — Grade 7 Communication (Research)	“Conduct research to answer a question, drawing on multiple reliable and valid sources and generating additional questions for further research.”	M/J Language Arts 2 (#1001040)	Primary fit — verification activity is short structured research with documentation	Source Verification Log is the documented research artifact	(B.E.S.T. ELA PDF)	2026-05-15
ELA.7.V.1.1	FL B.E.S.T. ELA — Grade 7 Vocabulary	“Integrate academic vocabulary appropriate to grade level in speaking and writing.”	M/J Language Arts 2 (#1001040)	Six verification vocabulary terms (verification, source, credibility, primary source, secondary source, citation)	Source Verification Log uses vocabulary	(B.E.S.T. ELA PDF)	2026-05-15
ELA.K12.EE.4.1	FL B.E.S.T. ELA — K-12 ELA Expectations	“Use appropriate collaborative techniques and active listening skills when engaging in discussions in a variety of situations.”	M/J Language Arts 2 (#1001040)	Partner discussion of verification findings	Discussion participation	(B.E.S.T. ELA PDF)	2026-05-15

Audit checklist for Lesson 2

- ✔ Florida B.E.S.T. CS: SC.7.ET.2.1, **SC.8.PE.3.3 (primary substance fit)**, SC.7.HS.1.4, SC.7.HS.1.6, SC.7.CC.2.2 — confirmed
- ✔ Florida Civics SS.7.CG.2.9: primary alignment (full development)
- ✔ Florida Civics SS.7.CG.2.8: introduced
- ✔ Florida B.E.S.T. ELA: R.2.4, C.4.1 (primary), V.1.1, EE.4.1 — confirmed
- ✔ Student artifact: Source Verification Log (portfolio)

Lesson 3: Media Bias, Claims, and Digital Persuasion







Standard frameworks addressed: - **Florida B.E.S.T. CS** — Technological Impact (primary), Personal Health and Safety - **Florida Civics** — SS.7.CG.2.9 (primary, full development); SS.7.CG.2.8 (continued); SS.8.CG.2.2 / SS.8.CG.2.4 (grade 8 civic-participation extensions) - **Florida B.E.S.T. ELA** — Reading Informational Text (Argument, Comparative, Rhetoric), Communication (Argument), Vocabulary, K-12 Expectations

Per-benchmark alignment (Lesson 3)

Code	Framework	Official Text	Course	Evidence	Artifact	Source URL	Verified
SC.7.TI.1.3	FL B.E.S.T. CS — Grade 7 Technological Impact	"Identify how media is used to influence information."	M/J Grade 7 Digital Discoveries (#0200022); M/J Navigating Tech (#0200024)	Strong primary fit — Information Integrity Lab Mini directly exercises this benchmark	Media Analysis	(B.E.S.T. CS PDF)	2026-05-15
SC.8.HS.3.2	FL B.E.S.T. CS — Grade 8 Personal Health & Safety	"Analyze how digital media and communication influence behavior."	M/J Grade 8 Digital Discoveries (#0200023)	Discussion of digital persuasion mechanisms; how content shapes behavior	Media Analysis	(B.E.S.T. CS PDF)	2026-05-15
SC.7.HS.1.7	FL B.E.S.T. CS — Grade 7 PHS	"Examine safe practices for technology use."	M/J Grade 7 Digital Discoveries (#0200022)	Discussion of recognizing manipulation attempts; protective discernment	Media Analysis demonstrates discernment	(B.E.S.T. CS PDF)	2026-05-15
SS.7.CG.2.9	FL Civics — Grade 7	"Analyze media and political communications and identify examples of bias, symbolism and propaganda."	M/J Civics #2106010	Primary alignment — central focus of lesson	Media Analysis is the structured artifact	https://www.fldoe.org/file/15223/CivicsGovInstructGuide-6-8.pdf	2026-05-15
SS.7.CG.2.8	FL Civics — Grade 7	"Examine the impact of media, individuals, and interest groups on monitoring and influencing government."	M/J Civics #2106010	Examining how different sources/stakeholders shape public belief on chosen topic	Media Analysis	https://www.fldoe.org/file/15223/CivicsGovInstructGuide-6-8.pdf	2026-05-15
SS.8.CG.2.4	FL Civics — Grade 8 (taught within M/J U.S. History #2100010)	"Explain how forms of civic and political participation changed from the Colonial period through Reconstruction."	M/J U.S. History #2100010 (embedded civics)	Information Integrity Lab Mini connects historical media-and-democracy patterns to present	Reflection responses	(FDOE 6-8 Civics Instructional Guide)	2026-05-15
ELA.7.R.2.4	FL B.E.S.T. ELA — Grade 7 Reading (Argument)	"Track the development of an argument, analyzing the types of reasoning used and their effectiveness."	M/J Language Arts 2 (#1001040)	Six-question framework analyzes argument structure across sources	Media Analysis	(B.E.S.T. ELA PDF)	2026-05-15
ELA.7.R.3.3	FL B.E.S.T. ELA — Grade 7 Reading (Comparative)	"Compare and contrast how authors with differing perspectives address the same or related topics or themes."	M/J Language Arts 2 (#1001040)	Strong fit — reading across multiple sources on same topic is the lesson's core activity	Media Analysis "pattern across sources" paragraph	(B.E.S.T. ELA PDF)	2026-05-15
ELA.7.R.3.4	FL B.E.S.T. ELA — Grade 7 Reading (Rhetoric)	"Explain the meaning and/or significance of rhetorical devices in a text."	M/J Language Arts 2 (#1001040)	Identifying persuasion / framing / missing context across sources	Media Analysis	(B.E.S.T. ELA PDF)	2026-05-15
ELA.7.C.1.3	FL B.E.S.T. ELA — Grade 7 Communication (Argument)	"Write and support a claim using logical reasoning, relevant evidence from multiple sources, elaboration, a logical organizational structure with varied transitions, and acknowledging at least one counterclaim."	M/J Language Arts 2 (#1001040)	Pattern-across-sources paragraph requires written claim with multi-source evidence	Media Analysis	(B.E.S.T. ELA PDF)	2026-05-15
ELA.7.V.1.1	FL B.E.S.T. ELA — Grade 7 Vocabulary	"Integrate academic vocabulary appropriate to grade level in speaking and writing."	M/J Language Arts 2 (#1001040)	Seven analytical vocabulary terms (bias, claim, evidence, audience, missing context, persuasion, information integrity)	Media Analysis uses vocabulary	(B.E.S.T. ELA PDF)	2026-05-15

Code	Framework	Official Text	Course	Evidence	Artifact	Source URL	Verified
ELA.K12.EE.4.1	FL B.E.S.T. ELA — K-12 ELA Expectations	"Use appropriate collaborative techniques and active listening skills when engaging in discussions in a variety of situations."	M/J Language Arts 2 (#1001040)	Class demonstration discussion; partner analysis	Discussion participation	(B.E.S.T. ELA PDF)	2026-05-15
ELA.K12.EE.6.1	FL B.E.S.T. ELA — K-12 ELA Expectations	"Use appropriate voice and tone when speaking or writing."	M/J Language Arts 2 (#1001040)	Discussion protocol when engaging respectfully with disagreement	Discussion participation; reflection responses	(B.E.S.T. ELA PDF)	2026-05-15

Audit checklist for Lesson 3

-  Florida B.E.S.T. CS: SC.7.TI.1.3 (strong primary), SC.8.HS.3.2, SC.7.HS.1.7 — confirmed
-  Florida Civics SS.7.CG.2.9: primary, full development
-  Florida Civics SS.7.CG.2.8: continued
-  Florida Civics SS.8.CG.2.4: grade 8 civic-participation extension (taught within M/J U.S. History #2100010)
-  Florida B.E.S.T. ELA: R.2.4, R.3.3, R.3.4, C.1.3, V.1.1, EE.4.1, EE.6.1 — confirmed
-  Student artifact: Media Analysis (portfolio)

Lesson 4: Privacy, Ethics, and Academic Integrity

Standard frameworks addressed: - **Florida B.E.S.T. CS** — Personal Health and Safety (primary), Cyber Security, Technological Impact, **Computing Components (local-vs-cloud — strong addition)** - **Florida Civics** — SS.8.CG.2.2 / SS.8.CG.2.3 (grade 8 civic obligations and civic virtue) - **Florida B.E.S.T. ELA** — Communication (Argument), Vocabulary, K-12 Expectations

Per-benchmark alignment (Lesson 4)

Code	Framework	Official Text	Course	Evidence	Artifact	Source URL	Verified
SC.7.HS.1.4	FL B.E.S.T. CS — Grade 7 PHS	"Categorize potential dangers to an individual's safety and security."	M/J Grade 7 Digital Discoveries (#0200022); M/J Navigating Tech (#0200024)	"Privacy: What Not to Share" reading categorizes privacy and identity dangers	AI Use Disclosure	https://www.cpalms.org/PreviewStandard/PrintStandard/119735	2026-05-15
SC.7.HS.1.6	FL B.E.S.T. CS — Grade 7 PHS	"Compare the risks and benefits of accessing the Internet."	M/J Grade 7 Digital Discoveries (#0200022)	Risks/benefits framing for commercial AI services	AI Use Disclosure	(B.E.S.T. CS PDF)	2026-05-15
SC.7.HS.1.7	FL B.E.S.T. CS — Grade 7 PHS	"Examine safe practices for technology use."	M/J Grade 7 Digital Discoveries (#0200022)	Simple test ("would I be comfortable if this were posted publicly?"); safe practices for AI use	AI Use Disclosure	(B.E.S.T. CS PDF)	2026-05-15
SC.8.HS.1.2	FL B.E.S.T. CS — Grade 8 PHS	"Develop procedures to protect personal information while accessing the Internet." (Clarifications: software that does not protect against disclosure of personal information; theft of personal data including SSNs, banking information, identity)	M/J Grade 8 Digital Discoveries (#0200023); M/J Navigating Tech (#0200024)	Strong primary fit — explicit privacy procedures for AI service use	AI Use Disclosure	(B.E.S.T. CS PDF)	2026-05-15
SC.8.HS.3.2	FL B.E.S.T. CS — Grade 8 PHS	"Analyze how digital media and communication influence behavior."	M/J Grade 8 Digital Discoveries (#0200023)	"Privacy and Ethics Are Civic Skills" — how AI use shapes habits and behavior	AI Use Disclosure + reflection	(B.E.S.T. CS PDF)	2026-05-15
SC.7.CS.1.1	FL B.E.S.T. CS — Grade 7 Cyber Security	"Describe data in its three states and potential threats to each state."	M/J Grade 7 Digital Discoveries (#0200022)	Discussion of data submitted to AI in transit, at rest on company servers, and in use during inference	AI Use Disclosure	(B.E.S.T. CS PDF)	2026-05-15

Code	Framework	Official Text	Course	Evidence	Artifact	Source URL	Verified
SC.7.CS.3.3	FL B.E.S.T. CS — Grade 7 Cyber Security	"Identify data vulnerabilities." (Clarification: password strength, biometric access, two-factor authentication; encryption types)	M/J Grade 7 Digital Discoveries (#0200022)	Discussion of AI-service data-handling vulnerabilities	AI Use Disclosure	(B.E.S.T. CS PDF)	2026-05-15
SC.8.CS.2.1	FL B.E.S.T. CS — Grade 8 Cyber Security	"Evaluate security and privacy issues that relate to computer networks and Internet of Things (IoT) devices."	M/J Grade 8 Digital Discoveries (#0200023)	Cloud AI = networked service; analogous network/cloud privacy issues	AI Use Disclosure	(B.E.S.T. CS PDF)	2026-05-15
SC.8.CS.2.3	FL B.E.S.T. CS — Grade 8 Cyber Security	"Describe the permanency of data on the Internet, online identity and personal privacy." (Clarification: includes the "Right to be Forgotten")	M/J Grade 8 Digital Discoveries (#0200023)	"When You Use Local AI, Privacy Works Differently" — durability of submitted information	AI Use Disclosure	(B.E.S.T. CS PDF)	2026-05-15
SC.8.CO.3.1	FL B.E.S.T. CS — Grade 8 Computing Components	"Compare the benefits and limitations of desktop applications and their complimentary online subscription version."	M/J Grade 8 Digital Discoveries (#0200023)	Strong primary fit — local AI vs. cloud AI tradeoff is a direct application of this comparison framework	AI Use Disclosure (privacy-properties section)	(B.E.S.T. CS PDF)	2026-05-15
SC.7.TI.2.1	FL B.E.S.T. CS — Grade 7 Technological Impact	"Describe legal and ethical behaviors when using information and technology and describe the consequences of misuse."	M/J Grade 7 Digital Discoveries (#0200022)	Capability-vs-credential framing; consequences of misuse	AI Use Disclosure with reflection	(B.E.S.T. CS PDF)	2026-05-15
SC.7.TI.2.2	FL B.E.S.T. CS — Grade 7 TI	"Describe and model responsible use of modern communication media and devices."	M/J Grade 7 Digital Discoveries (#0200022)	Strong primary fit — entire lesson models responsible AI use	AI Use Disclosure	(B.E.S.T. CS PDF)	2026-05-15
SC.7.TI.2.4	FL B.E.S.T. CS — Grade 7 TI	"Explore the ethical use of collected data."	M/J Grade 7 Digital Discoveries (#0200022)	Ethics of how AI services collect and use user prompts	AI Use Disclosure	(B.E.S.T. CS PDF)	2026-05-15
SS.8.CG.2.2	FL Civics — Grade 8 (within M/J U.S. History #2100010)	"Compare the responsibilities of citizens at the local, state and national levels."	M/J U.S. History #2100010 (embedded civics)	Connection between personal integrity habits and citizen responsibilities at multiple levels	AI Use Disclosure + reflection	(FDOE 6-8 Civics Instructional Guide)	2026-05-15
SS.8.CG.2.3	FL Civics — Grade 8 (within M/J U.S. History #2100010)	"Analyze the role of civic virtue in the lives of citizens and leaders from the Colonial period through Reconstruction."	M/J U.S. History #2100010 (embedded civics)	"Privacy and Ethics Are Civic Skills" — explicit linkage of academic integrity habits to civic virtue	AI Use Disclosure + reflection	(FDOE 6-8 Civics Instructional Guide)	2026-05-15
ELA.7.C.1.3	FL B.E.S.T. ELA — Grade 7 Communication (Argument)	"Write and support a claim using logical reasoning, relevant evidence from multiple sources, elaboration, a logical organizational structure with varied transitions, and acknowledging at least one counterclaim."	M/J Language Arts 2 (#1001040)	Reflection writing articulates ethical position with reasoning	AI Use Disclosure + reflection	(B.E.S.T. ELA PDF)	2026-05-15

Code	Framework	Official Text	Course	Evidence	Artifact	Source URL	Verified
ELA.7.V.1.1	FL B.E.S.T. ELA — Grade 7 Vocabulary	"Integrate academic vocabulary appropriate to grade level in speaking and writing."	M/J Language Arts 2 (#1001040)	Six ethical vocabulary terms (privacy, personal information, disclosure, plagiarism, academic integrity, capability)	AI Use Disclosure	(B.E.S.T. ELA PDF)	2026-05-15
ELA.K12.EE.4.1	FL B.E.S.T. ELA — K-12 ELA Expectations	"Use appropriate collaborative techniques and active listening skills when engaging in discussions in a variety of situations."	M/J Language Arts 2 (#1001040)	Activity 2 ethics scenarios discussion; collaborative engagement with disagreement	Discussion participation	(B.E.S.T. ELA PDF)	2026-05-15
ELA.K12.EE.6.1	FL B.E.S.T. ELA — K-12 ELA Expectations	"Use appropriate voice and tone when speaking or writing."	M/J Language Arts 2 (#1001040)	Voice/tone discipline in disclosure-writing and ethical scenarios discussion	AI Use Disclosure; discussion participation	(B.E.S.T. ELA PDF)	2026-05-15

Audit checklist for Lesson 4

- ☒ Florida B.E.S.T. CS: SC.6/7/8.HS series (primary); SC.7.CS.1.1, SC.7.CS.3.3, SC.8.CS.2.1, SC.8.CS.2.3 (cyber); SC.7.TI.2.1, **SC.7.TI.2.2 (strong primary)**, **SC.7.TI.2.4** (ethics); **SC.8.CO.3.1 (local-vs-cloud — strong fit)** — confirmed
- ☒ Florida Civics SS.8.CG.2.2, SS.8.CG.2.3: civic responsibility + civic virtue extensions
- ☒ Florida B.E.S.T. ELA: C.1.3, V.1.1, EE.4.1, EE.6.1 — confirmed
- ☒ Student artifact: AI Use Disclosure (portfolio)

Lesson 5: Civic Tech Mini-Project

Standard frameworks addressed: - **Florida B.E.S.T. CS** — Technological Impact (engaging public officials — near-perfect match), Emerging Technologies, Communication and Collaboration - **Florida Civics** — SS.7.CG.2.10 (PRIMARY — direct, near-verbatim benchmark match), SS.7.CG.2.9 (continued), SS.7.CG.2.8 (continued); SS.8.CG.2.2 / SS.8.CG.2.6 (grade 8 active-participation extensions) - **Florida B.E.S.T. ELA** — Communication (Argument, Research, Oral, Tech-in-Communication), Reading (Comparative), Vocabulary, K-12 Expectations

Per-benchmark alignment (Lesson 5)

Code	Framework	Official Text	Course	Evidence	Artifact	Source URL	Verified
SS.7.CG.2.10	FL Civics — Grade 7	"Explain the process for citizens to address a state or local problem by researching public policy alternatives, identifying appropriate government agencies to address the issue and determining a course of action."	M/J Civics #2106010	PRIMARY — the mini-project IS this benchmark in practice. Five-step structure (frame question → identify responsible agency → find official sources → use AI as thinking partner → produce artifact) maps directly to the benchmark's components	Civic Issue Brief	https://www.fldoe.org/file/15223/CivicsGovInstructGuide-6-8.pdf	2026-05-15
SC.8.TI.2.2	FL B.E.S.T. CS — Grade 8 Technological Impact	"Use a local or federal government website to engage with a public official."	M/J Grade 8 Digital Discoveries (#0200023)	Near-perfect fit — mini-project Step 2 (identify responsible official) and Letter to a Public Official artifact option	Civic Issue Brief or Letter to Public Official	(B.E.S.T. CS PDF)	2026-05-15
SC.7.TI.2.2	FL B.E.S.T. CS — Grade 7 TI	"Describe and model responsible use of modern communication media and devices."	M/J Grade 7 Digital Discoveries (#0200022)	Mini-project produces a public-facing artifact using digital tools responsibly	Civic Issue Brief	(B.E.S.T. CS PDF)	2026-05-15
SC.7.ET.2.1	FL B.E.S.T. CS — Grade 7 Emerging Tech	"Explore future technologies and the role artificial intelligence (AI) may play."	M/J Grade 7 Digital Discoveries (#0200022)	Step 4 — using AI as thinking partner with verification	Civic Issue Brief AI Use Statement	(B.E.S.T. CS PDF)	2026-05-15

Code	Framework	Official Text	Course	Evidence	Artifact	Source URL	Verified
SC.7.TI.2.4	FL B.E.S.T. CS — Grade 7 TI	"Explore the ethical use of collected data."	M/J Grade 7 Digital Discoveries (#0200022)	Mini-project requires ethical use of AI and source data	AI Use Statement in Civic Issue Brief	(B.E.S.T. CS PDF)	2026-05-15
SC.7.CC.2.2	FL B.E.S.T. CS — Grade 7 Communication & Collaboration	"Analyze one's own ideas with research-based information to create a unique digital artifact."	M/J Grade 7 Digital Discoveries (#0200022); M/J Navigating Tech (#0200024)	Civic Issue Brief integrates student's own analysis with multi-source research	Civic Issue Brief	(B.E.S.T. CS PDF)	2026-05-15
SS.7.CG.2.9	FL Civics — Grade 7	"Analyze media and political communications and identify examples of bias, symbolism and propaganda."	M/J Civics #2106010	Mini-project considers how chosen issue is represented across media types	Civic Issue Brief "Different Perspectives" section	https://www.fldoe.org/file/15223/CivicsGovInstructGuide-6-8.pdf	2026-05-15
SS.7.CG.2.8	FL Civics — Grade 7	"Examine the impact of media, individuals, and interest groups on monitoring and influencing government."	M/J Civics #2106010	Mini-project examines stakeholder influence on chosen issue	Civic Issue Brief	https://www.fldoe.org/file/15223/CivicsGovInstructGuide-6-8.pdf	2026-05-15
SS.8.CG.2.2	FL Civics — Grade 8 (within M/J U.S. History #2100010)	"Compare the responsibilities of citizens at the local, state and national levels."	M/J U.S. History #2100010 (embedded civics)	Mini-project requires identifying the right level of government for the chosen issue	Civic Issue Brief "Responsible Agency or Official" section	(FDOE 6-8 Civics Instructional Guide)	2026-05-15
SS.8.CG.2.6	FL Civics — Grade 8 (within M/J U.S. History #2100010)	"Evaluate how amendments to the U.S. Constitution expanded opportunities for civic participation through Reconstruction."	M/J U.S. History #2100010 (embedded civics)	Lesson connects student-as-citizen to historical expansion of participatory rights	Civic Issue Brief reflects civic stance	(FDOE 6-8 Civics Instructional Guide)	2026-05-15
ELA.7.C.1.3	FL B.E.S.T. ELA — Grade 7 Communication (Argument)	(Claim with logical reasoning, multi-source evidence, counterclaim acknowledgment)	M/J Language Arts 2 (#1001040)	"What I Think Should Happen and Why" + "Different Perspectives" sections require argument with counterclaim	Civic Issue Brief	(B.E.S.T. ELA PDF)	2026-05-15
ELA.7.C.4.1	FL B.E.S.T. ELA — Grade 7 Communication (Research)	"Conduct research to answer a question, drawing on multiple reliable and valid sources and generating additional questions for further research."	M/J Language Arts 2 (#1001040)	Mini-project = sustained multi-source research; "What I Don't Know" section captures additional questions	Civic Issue Brief with cited sources	(B.E.S.T. ELA PDF)	2026-05-15
ELA.7.R.3.3	FL B.E.S.T. ELA — Grade 7 Reading (Comparative)	"Compare and contrast how authors with differing perspectives address the same or related topics or themes."	M/J Language Arts 2 (#1001040)	Mini-project requires reading across multiple stakeholder perspectives	Civic Issue Brief "Different Perspectives" section	(B.E.S.T. ELA PDF)	2026-05-15
ELA.7.C.2.1	FL B.E.S.T. ELA — Grade 7 Communication (Oral)	"Present information orally, in a logical sequence, emphasizing key points that support the central idea."	M/J Language Arts 2 (#1001040)	Activity 3: class sharing of mini-project findings	Presentation (formative)	(B.E.S.T. ELA PDF)	2026-05-15
ELA.7.C.5.1	FL B.E.S.T. ELA — Grade 7 Communication (Multimedia)	"Integrate diverse digital media to build cohesion in oral or written tasks."	M/J Language Arts 2 (#1001040)	Civic Issue Brief integrates multiple digital sources (gov't websites, news, advocacy materials)	Civic Issue Brief	(B.E.S.T. ELA PDF)	2026-05-15
ELA.7.C.5.2	FL B.E.S.T. ELA — Grade 7 Communication (Tech)	"Use digital tools to produce and share writing."	M/J Language Arts 2 (#1001040)	Mini-project produces a digital artifact	Civic Issue Brief	(B.E.S.T. ELA PDF)	2026-05-15

Code	Framework	Official Text	Course	Evidence	Artifact	Source URL	Verified
ELA.7.V.1.1	FL B.E.S.T. ELA — Grade 7 Vocabulary	"Integrate academic vocabulary appropriate to grade level in speaking and writing."	M/J Language Arts 2 (#1001040)	Five civic-process vocabulary terms (agency, jurisdiction, policy, public official, public records)	Civic Issue Brief uses vocabulary	(B.E.S.T. ELA PDF)	2026-05-15
ELA.K12.EE.4.1	FL B.E.S.T. ELA — K-12 ELA Expectations	"Use appropriate collaborative techniques and active listening skills when engaging in discussions in a variety of situations."	M/J Language Arts 2 (#1001040)	Activity 1 group discussion for issue selection; Activity 3 class sharing	Discussion participation	(B.E.S.T. ELA PDF)	2026-05-15

Headline alignment: SS.7.CG.2.10's official text reads almost as a description of the Civic Tech Mini-Project itself. Of all five lessons, Lesson 5 has the cleanest standard-to-activity match in the matrix.

Audit checklist for Lesson 5

- ✓ Florida Civics SS.7.CG.2.10: **PRIMARY — near-perfect benchmark match**
- ✓ Florida Civics SS.7.CG.2.9, SS.7.CG.2.8: continued
- ✓ Florida Civics SS.8.CG.2.2, SS.8.CG.2.6: grade 8 active-participation extensions
- ✓ Florida B.E.S.T. CS: SC.8.TI.2.2 (near-perfect), SC.7.TI.2.2, SC.7.ET.2.1, SC.7.TI.2.4, SC.7.CC.2.2 — confirmed
- ✓ Florida B.E.S.T. ELA: C.1.3, C.4.1, R.3.3, C.2.1, C.5.1, C.5.2, V.1.1, EE.4.1 — confirmed
- ✓ Student artifact: Civic Issue Brief (portfolio)

Cross-Reference Summary Table

Standard / Strand	L1	L2	L3	L4	L5
FL B.E.S.T. CS — ET (Emerging Technologies)	●	○	○	○	●
FL B.E.S.T. CS — PE (Programming & Software Engineering — model limits via SC.8.PE.3.3)	●	●	○	○	○
FL B.E.S.T. CS — CC (Communication & Collaboration)	●	●	○	○	●
FL B.E.S.T. CS — CO (Computing Components — incl. SC.8.CO.3.1 local-vs-cloud)	○	○	○	●	○
FL B.E.S.T. CS — HS (Personal Health & Safety)	○	●	●	●	○
FL B.E.S.T. CS — TI (Technological Impact)	○	○	●	●	●
FL B.E.S.T. CS — CS (Cyber Security)	○	○	○	●	○
FL Civics — SS.7.CG.2.8 (media/groups influencing govt.)	○	●	●	○	●
FL Civics — SS.7.CG.2.9 (bias/propaganda analysis)	●	●	●	○	●
FL Civics — SS.7.CG.2.10 (citizens addressing problems)	○	○	○	○	●
FL Civics — SS.8.CG.2.2 (citizen responsibilities, grade 8)	○	○	○	●	●
FL Civics — SS.8.CG.2.3 (civic virtue, grade 8)	○	○	○	●	○
FL Civics — SS.8.CG.2.4 (civic participation history, grade 8)	○	○	●	○	○
FL Civics — SS.8.CG.2.6 (expanded participation through amendments, grade 8)	○	○	○	○	●
FL B.E.S.T. ELA — R (Reading Informational Text)	●	●	●	○	●
FL B.E.S.T. ELA — C.1 (Communication: Argument)	○	○	●	●	●

Standard / Strand	L1	L2	L3	L4	L5
FL B.E.S.T. ELA — C.2 (Communication: Oral)	●	○	○	○	●
FL B.E.S.T. ELA — C.4 (Communication: Research)	○	●	○	○	●
FL B.E.S.T. ELA — C.5 (Communication: Multimedia/Tech)	○	○	○	○	●
FL B.E.S.T. ELA — V (Vocabulary)	●	●	●	●	●
FL B.E.S.T. ELA — K-12 EE (Collaborative Discussion / Voice & Tone)	●	●	●	●	●

Legend: ● = primary alignment; ○ = supporting alignment

Course Lane Summary Table

Course	Code	L1	L2	L3	L4	L5
M/J Navigating Technology	#0200024	●	●	●	●	●
M/J Grade 6 Digital Discoveries	#0200021	●	○	○	○	○
M/J Grade 7 Digital Discoveries	#0200022	●	●	●	●	●
M/J Grade 8 Digital Discoveries	#0200023	●	●	●	●	●
M/J Civics	#2106010	○	●	●	○	●
M/J Civics, Advanced	#2106020	○	●	●	○	●
M/J Civics & Career Planning	#2106016	○	○	○	●	●
M/J Civics and Digital Technologies	#2106029	●	●	●	●	●
M/J U.S. History (grade 8 — embeds SS.8.CG)	#2100010	○	○	●	●	●
M/J Language Arts 1/2/3	#1001010/1001040/1001070	●	●	●	●	●
M/J Intensive Reading 1	#1000010	○	●	●	○	●
M/J Intensive Reading and Career Planning	#1000020	○	●	●	○	●
Homeschool implementation	n/a	●	●	●	●	●
Microschool implementation	n/a	●	●	●	●	●
Library after-school program	n/a	●	●	●	●	●

How to use this matrix for adoption documentation

For a school principal or curriculum director: - Show the per-lesson alignment tables above; each row includes confirmed code, official benchmark text, and source URL - The matrix is benchmark-level, with substance-match caveats disclosed honestly - Lesson 5 (Civic Tech Mini-Project) demonstrates the cleanest alignment in the kit — SS.7.CG.2.10's text reads almost as a description of the mini-project itself - Lessons 1–2 anchor AI's structural-limits substance on **SC.8.PE.3.3** (model evaluation), Lesson 4's local-vs-cloud privacy framing on **SC.8.CO.3.1** (desktop vs. online subscription comparison), and Lesson 4's "responsible AI use" core on **SC.7.TI.2.2** (responsible use of communication media)

For a Florida ESA / Family Empowerment Scholarship application: - Submit the per-lesson alignment tables as supporting documentation - The matrix demonstrates benchmark-level alignment across CS, Civics, and ELA frameworks at the middle school level - Pair with the ESA Documentation Guide for application-specific framing

For a district CTE coordinator: - The M/J Navigating Technology #0200024 and M/J Grade 6/7/8 Digital Discoveries series (0200021/22/23) are the primary fits - M/J Civics and Digital Technologies #2106029 is a particularly strong adjacent lane, as it combines civics with digital technology coverage in a single course - All course codes in this matrix have been verified against public CPALMS or FDOE Course Code Directory sources

For audit by a curriculum reviewer: - Every benchmark code is sourced to a public CPALMS or FDOE URL with a verification date - Substance-match caveats are disclosed where benchmark text doesn't fully cover curriculum content (notably the absence of "hallucination" terminology in B.E.S.T. CS, even though SC.8.PE.3.3 covers the substance; and absence of standalone citation benchmarks in B.E.S.T. ELA) - There are no remaining open verification items for the Pilot Kit's standards, benchmark codes, or cited course lanes as of the v3.3 hardening pass

Public sources used for verification (2026-05-15)

- **Florida B.E.S.T. CS Standards (July 2024 revision)** — <https://cpalmsmediaproduct.blob.core.windows.net/uploads/docs/standards/best/cs/csstandards202407.pdf>
- **Florida B.E.S.T. ELA Standards** — <https://www.fldoe.org/core/fileparse.php/18736/urlt/EnglishLanguageArts.pdf>
- **Florida B.E.S.T. Social Studies Standards Book** — https://cpalmsmediaproduct.blob.core.windows.net/uploads/docs/standards/best/ss/ss_standardsbook_bc_240417_finalada.pdf
- **FDOE 6-8 Civics & Government Instructional Guide (Updated February 2026)** — <https://www.fldoe.org/file/15223/CivicsGovInstructGuide-6-8.pdf>
- **FDOE Course Code Directory** — <https://www.fldoe.org/policy/articulation/ccd/>
- **FDOE 2025-26 Grades 6-8 Course Code Directory, Section 3** — <https://www.fldoe.org/core/fileparse.php/20833/urlt/10-3.pdf>
- **FDOE 2025-26 Summary of Changes to CCD** — <https://www.fldoe.org/file/7746/SummaryofChanges2526.pdf>
- **FDOE 2025-26 Automated Student Information Database Updates** — <https://origin.fldoe.org/file/7574/2526stupdates.pdf>
- **CPALMS individual standard preview pages** — specific CPALMS source URLs are cited in the relevant benchmark rows above.
- **CPALMS course preview pages** — specific CPALMS source URLs are cited in the relevant course-code rows above.
- **FDOE Standards & Instructional Support** — <https://www.fldoe.org/academics/standards/>
- **FDOE Civics & Government Resources** — <https://www.fldoe.org/academics/standards/subject-areas/social-studies/civics-gov-res.stml>
- **Family Empowerment Scholarship** — <https://www.fldoe.org/schools/school-choice/k-12-scholarship-programs/fes/>
- **CPALMS (general)** — <https://www.cpalms.org>

CPALMS and the FDOE Course Code Directory are public resources — no subscription required. All verifications above were performed against the public sources listed.

Open verification items

None for the Pilot Kit’s standards, benchmark codes, or cited course lanes as of the 2026-05-17 hardening pass.

The prior open items for **M/J Language Arts 2/3**, **M/J Grade 6/7/8 Digital Discoveries**, and **grade-specific intensive-reading support lanes** are closed as of 2026-05-17. The older M/J Reading 1/2/3 sequence is documented as terminated and is not used as a current course lane in this matrix.

Adaptation to other states

The structure of this matrix is portable to other states. Future state editions will:

- Replace Florida B.E.S.T. CS strand references with the equivalent state CS standards
- Replace Florida Civics standards with the equivalent state social studies standards
- Replace Florida B.E.S.T. ELA references with the equivalent state ELA standards
- Replace Florida course codes with the equivalent state course codes
- Update the verification source URLs to that state’s standards publication

The underlying lesson content does not change. Only the alignment wrapper does.

States planned for future editions: Texas TEKS, California Common Core State Standards, generic Common Core implementation, and other states as adoption demand emerges.

All benchmark codes verified against public CPALMS / FDOE sources on 2026-05-15. M/J Language Arts 2/3, M/J Grade 6/7/8 Digital Discoveries, and current M/J Intensive Reading support course codes verified against public CPALMS / FDOE sources on 2026-05-17. Re-verification of any benchmark code listed here can be performed against the CPALMS individual standard preview pages or official FDOE publications cited in each row.

Teacher Quick Start

The fastest path from “I’m interested” to “I can teach this Monday morning.”

If you have 20 minutes to evaluate this Pilot Kit and decide whether to teach it next week, this document is what you need.

What this curriculum teaches in one sentence

Florida students learn to understand AI, verify information, protect privacy, use digital tools responsibly, and apply technology to civic problem-solving — through five paired lessons that work in any classroom, homeschool, microschool, or library setting in Florida.

What you need to know in five bullets

- **Five lessons, one week of teaching.** Each lesson is about 45 minutes of core instruction plus 20–30 minutes of independent student work. Alternative paces (two weeks, five weeks, weekend intensive) are documented in the [Pacing Guide](#) if a one-week run does not fit your setting.
 - **No installation required.** The default delivery works on any device with a browser, including locked-down school Chromebooks. Local AI installation is an optional extension for students whose home setups support it.
 - **Two paired editions.** Teacher Edition (everything you need to teach: lesson plans, timings, annotations, differentiation, assessment, answer keys) and Student Edition (what students read and work in). Per-lesson files match across editions.
 - **Florida standards-aligned.** Maps to current Florida B.E.S.T. Computer Science Standards (July 2024 revision — Emerging Technologies, Programming and Software Engineering, Communication and Collaboration, Personal Health and Safety, Technological Impact, Cyber Security, Computing Components), Florida Civics and Government Standards (SS.7.CG.2.8 media/groups influencing government, SS.7.CG.2.9 bias/propaganda analysis, SS.7.CG.2.10 citizens addressing state/local problems — primary anchor for the Civic Tech Mini-Project, plus grade 8 extensions SS.8.CG.2.2 / 2.3 / 2.4 / 2.6), and Florida B.E.S.T. ELA Standards for grades 6–8. Full matrix: [Standards Alignment Matrix](#).
 - **Pilot, not finished product.** This is a working draft you are evaluating. Your feedback shapes the full curriculum (Phase 2 nine-week module and Phase 3 full-year edition). Use the [Pilot Feedback Form](#) to tell us what worked and what did not.
-

What you need to teach Lesson 1 on Monday

Materials: - Teacher Edition: Lesson 1 Teacher Edition - Student Edition (printed or shared digitally): Lesson 1 Student Edition - A device with a browser and projection capability (your computer + class screen, or equivalent) - Optional: students’ own devices for follow-up activities; not required for the core lesson - A way for students to write (notebook, computer, paper)

Time: 45 minutes core instruction, plus 20 minutes of student independent work (which can be in-class or as homework).

Preparation (15 minutes the day before): 1. Read the Lesson 1 Teacher Edition end-to-end (about 12 minutes) 2. Print or queue up the Lesson 1 Student Edition for distribution 3. Decide which AI demonstration path your setting supports: (a) a district-approved AI tool, if your school has one; (b) prepared example AI outputs from the Teacher Edition’s No-Install Adaptation Notes (text descriptions ready to project directly or convert to screenshots — the lesson reaches all stated learning objectives this way, with no live AI access required); or (c) a browser-based commercial AI service, only if your school’s policy explicitly permits classroom demonstration. Florida district policies on classroom AI demonstration vary; do not assume permission. The [IT Approval Checklist](#) and [Administrator Overview](#) documents support that conversation if needed.

On Monday: 1. Open the Teacher Edition Lesson 1 file 2. Follow the Lesson Procedure section minute by minute 3. Have students follow along with the Student Edition 4. Use the Self-Check at the end of the Student Edition to confirm understanding before moving on

That is all you need for Lesson 1. Lessons 2–5 follow the same format.

What students will produce across the week

By the end of the five lessons, each student will have:

- An **AI Concept Map** showing their working understanding of what AI is and how it works (Lesson 1)
- A **Source Verification Log entry** documenting their practice of checking an AI claim against a real source (Lesson 2)
- A **Media Analysis** comparing how a single topic is treated across AI, news, advocacy, and social media (Lesson 3)
- An **AI Use Disclosure** demonstrating responsible documentation of AI assistance (Lesson 4)
- A **Civic Issue Brief** applying everything to a real local or state issue they researched (Lesson 5)

These accumulate as a portfolio. They support homeschool portfolio requirements, ESA documentation, and any institutional reporting on what students learned.

What to do if something goes wrong

Students get stuck on the reading. The Student Edition is calibrated to grade 7 (Lexile ~1100L). For students reading below grade level, the Teacher Edition's Differentiation Notes section for each lesson includes read-aloud guidance, vocabulary pre-teaching, and chunked reading approaches.

Use [Supported_Reading_Versions](#) when students need a lower reading load or when you want a read-aloud version. The supported readings preserve the same learning targets while reducing sentence density.

Students finish early. The Teacher Edition lists Extension Options for each lesson. Most are independent or partner activities that go deeper without requiring more direct instruction.

Use [Extension_Options_Guide](#) to choose extensions by student profile and available time. Extensions are enrichment; students do not need extensions to reach Proficient.

Your computer can't access an AI service. Every lesson includes the no-install default delivery using prepared example AI outputs (text descriptions in the Teacher Edition that can be projected as text or converted to screenshots) and offline activities. The lessons reach their learning objectives without requiring live AI access during class.

Use [Visual_Asset_Pack](#) when you need ready-to-project no-install mockups instead of live AI access.

A student asks a question you don't know the answer to. This is normal. AI is a fast-moving field. The Teacher Edition's Background for the Teacher section gives you what you need for each lesson; for deeper questions, *The Open Source Student* (Foundation Edition) is a much longer reference book your students or you can consult. You do not need to know everything about AI to teach this curriculum well; you need to know what each lesson teaches.

A parent has concerns. Use the [Parent/Guardian Letter](#) template to send proactively, or to respond when concerns arise. Most parents respond well to transparency about what students are learning and why.

What this Pilot Kit asks of you

Three things:

1. **Teach the five lessons** — in your setting, at your pacing
2. **Capture what happened** — informal notes on what worked, what didn't, where students struggled, what they got excited about
3. **Submit the Pilot Feedback Form** — the [Pilot Feedback Form](#), takes about 10 minutes

Your feedback shapes the next version. The full nine-week module (Phase 2) and the full-year curriculum (Phase 3) are designed based on what Pilot Kit educators actually report.

Where to read more

- [Project Orientation](#) at the project root — full project orientation
 - [the Pacing Guide](#) — alternative paces for your setting
 - [the Standards Alignment Matrix](#) — full standards alignment for administrators or ESA reviewers
 - [Pilot_Assessment](#) and [Pre_Post_Assessment](#) — portfolio rubrics and optional learning-gain measure
 - [Annotated_Sample_Portfolio](#) — one complete fictional student portfolio with teacher annotations
 - [Cumulative_Glossary](#) — student-facing vocabulary reference across all five lessons
 - [Lesson 1 Teacher Edition](#) — the first lesson, ready to teach
-

Contact and questions

CivicOS Labs · civicoslabs.com

For questions during your pilot, contact CivicOS Labs through the website. A formal FAQ for Teachers is planned for the full curriculum (Phase 2 nine-week module / Phase 3 full-year edition); during the Pilot Kit phase, direct contact is the right channel.

Google Classroom Upload Pack

CivicOS Florida Educator's Edition Pilot Kit

Purpose: Help a teacher, media specialist, microschool facilitator, or IT support person set up the five-lesson Pilot Kit in Google Classroom.

What this pack is

This is an upload-ready support pack for Google Classroom. It provides:

- A suggested Classwork structure
- Copy/paste assignment posts for all five pilot lessons
- Suggested attachment settings for readings, templates, and submitted artifacts
- A rubric structure that mirrors the Pilot Assessment
- A CSV manifest for teachers or IT staff who want a checklist-style upload plan

This is not an official Google Classroom add-on, plug-in, or one-click import file. It is designed for ordinary Google Classroom posting by a teacher, or for optional programmatic setup by a district technology team if district policy permits use of the Google Classroom API.

Before setup

Confirm these items before posting anything to students:

1. The teacher or facilitator has authority to use Google Classroom in the instructional setting.
 2. The school, district, microschool, or family has reviewed the Open Pilot Agreement.
 3. The teacher has selected the approved AI demonstration path for the setting:
 - district-approved AI tool,
 - prepared example AI outputs,
 - teacher demonstration only, or
 - commercial AI service only where policy explicitly permits.
 4. Student-facing materials are posted in a format students can access without creating unauthorized accounts.
 5. Any AI tool, website, Drive sharing setting, or student-submission workflow complies with local policy.
-

Recommended Classroom structure

Create one topic for orientation and one topic for each lesson.

1. Course Orientation
2. Lesson 1: What AI Is and Is Not
3. Lesson 2: Verify AI Answers
4. Lesson 3: Media Bias and Digital Persuasion
5. Lesson 4: Privacy, Ethics, and Academic Integrity
6. Lesson 5: Civic Tech Mini-Project

If the teacher prefers a simpler structure, use one topic only:

CivicOS Florida Pilot Kit

Recommended posting sequence

1. Add orientation materials

Post these as Classroom materials, not assignments:

- Open Pilot Agreement
- Parent/Guardian Letter, if used in the setting
- Student AI Use Agreement
- Pacing Guide
- Student Reflection and Self-Check reference

Suggested title:

Start Here: CivicOS Florida Pilot Kit

Suggested description:

This material introduces the CivicOS Florida Pilot Kit. Read the Student AI Use Agreement before beginning Lesson 1. Your teacher will explain which AI demonstration path is approved for this class.

2. Post each lesson as an assignment

Use the five assignment posts in the assignment-post section when creating Classroom assignments.

For each lesson:

- Attach the Student Edition lesson as view-only.
- Attach any student artifact template as "Make a copy for each student" if using Google Docs.
- Attach teacher-created prepared example AI outputs or approved demonstration materials as view-only.
- Set points according to the teacher's grading preference.
- Add the lesson topic.
- Add the rubric if the class uses Classroom rubrics.

3. Use the pilot portfolio as the through-line

Students should leave the pilot with five concrete artifacts:

1. AI concept map
2. Source verification log
3. Media claim and bias analysis
4. Responsible AI use and privacy reflection
5. Civic issue brief or civic technology mini-project artifact

Teachers can collect each artifact as a separate Classroom assignment, or collect all five in one final portfolio submission.

Suggested Drive folder structure

Create a teacher Drive folder for the class:

CivicOS Florida Pilot Kit

Inside it, create:

- Orientation Materials
- Student Edition Lessons
- Teacher Demonstration Materials
- Student Artifact Templates
- Rubrics and Assessment
- Pilot Feedback

Use view-only files for readings and agreement materials. Use student-copy files for worksheets, logs, and final-project templates.

Google Classroom attachment settings

Use these settings unless local policy says otherwise:

Material type	Recommended Classroom setting
Student lesson reading	Students can view file
Open Pilot Agreement	Students can view file
Parent/Guardian Letter	Students can view file
Student AI Use Agreement	Students can view file
Student worksheet or artifact template	Make a copy for each student
Screenshot packet	Students can view file
Final project template	Make a copy for each student
Teacher-only guide	Do not post to students

Do not post Teacher Edition files as student-facing materials unless the teacher intentionally wants students to see teacher notes, suggested answers, timing, and facilitation guidance.

Rubric setup

If the class uses Classroom rubrics, create a short rubric with five criteria:

1. AI concept accuracy

2. Source verification
3. Bias, claim, and persuasion analysis
4. Privacy, ethics, and responsible AI use
5. Civic problem-solving with evidence

Suggested levels:

Level	Points	Description
Strong	4	Work is accurate, evidence-based, specific, and independently reasoned.
Proficient	3	Work is mostly accurate and evidence-based, with minor gaps or generalities.
Developing	2	Work shows partial understanding but needs stronger evidence, clarity, or completion.
Beginning	1	Work is incomplete, unsupported, inaccurate, or too vague to assess confidently.

Teachers may use the full Pilot Assessment for more detailed scoring.

Optional Google Form exit ticket

For each lesson, a teacher can add a three-question Google Form exit ticket:

1. What is the most important idea from today’s lesson?
2. What is one question you still have?
3. What artifact did you add to your pilot portfolio today?

For Lesson 5, replace question 3 with:

What civic problem did your project address, and what evidence did you use?

Optional IT/API setup

A district technology team may use the upload manifest as a planning source for a Google Classroom API setup, if district policy permits. This pack does not provide credentials, API scripts, OAuth setup, student roster access, or automated posting code.

Programmatic setup should be reviewed by the district’s Google Workspace administrator and should follow local privacy, security, and data-governance requirements.

Public Google Classroom references

These official Google references were checked on 2026-05-16:

- [Google Classroom Help: Create an assignment](#)
- [Google Classroom Help: Add materials to the Classwork page](#)
- [Google Classroom Help: How attachments are shared in Classroom](#)
- [Google Classroom Help: Create or reuse a rubric for an assignment](#)
- [Google for Developers: Classroom CourseWork integration](#)

Google Classroom Assignment Posts

CivicOS Florida Educator's Edition Pilot Kit

Use: Copy/paste these posts into Google Classroom, then attach the appropriate student-facing files, templates, and approved demonstration materials.

Course orientation material

Post type: Material

Topic: Course Orientation

Title: Start Here: CivicOS Florida Pilot Kit

Description:

Welcome to the CivicOS Florida Pilot Kit. In this short unit, you will learn how to understand AI, verify information, protect privacy, use digital tools responsibly, and apply technology to civic problem-solving with evidence and judgment.

Before Lesson 1, read the Student AI Use Agreement and review your teacher's directions about how AI will be demonstrated in this class. Your teacher may use a district-approved tool, prepared example AI outputs from the Teacher Edition, or another demonstration path permitted by your school. You are not required to create an AI account unless your teacher, school, and parent/guardian have approved that path.

Attach:

- Open Pilot Agreement
- Student AI Use Agreement
- Parent/Guardian Letter, if used in the setting
- Student Reflection and Self-Check reference
- Student-facing pacing summary or selected schedule dates; attach the full Pacing Guide only if students need to see the full pilot schedule

Attachment settings:

- Use "Students can view file" for orientation materials.
 - Do not attach teacher-only guides to this post.
-

Lesson 1 assignment

Post type: Assignment

Topic: Lesson 1: What AI Is and Is Not

Title: Lesson 1: What AI Is and Is Not

Suggested points: 10

Suggested due date: End of Lesson 1 or next class meeting

Student instructions:

Today you will learn what AI is, what it is not, and why civic learners need to understand both its strengths and its limits. Your goal is not to treat AI as magic or as a villain. Your goal is to describe what it can do, what it cannot reliably do, and when a human has to verify the result.

Complete the Lesson 1 reading and class activities. Then submit your AI concept map and Lesson 1 reflection.

Bellringer / Warm-Up: Choose one self-contained option before the reading begins:

- Option A — Fast Start (3 minutes): Students name one AI tool or AI-powered feature they have used or seen. Examples: ChatGPT, Siri, Alexa, Gemini, Copilot, phone autocorrect, YouTube recommendations, translation apps, or game bots. They write what they think it is doing behind the screen.
- Option B — Standard Warm-Up (5 minutes): Students answer the Lesson 1 three-question warm-up: name an AI tool or feature, explain what they think it is doing behind the screen, and name one thing they would want to know before trusting its answer or recommendation.
- Option C — Extended Launch (6-7 minutes): Students answer the Option B questions and add whether it matters more to know what AI can do well or where AI fails, explaining their choice in 2-3 sentences.

For tight pacing, assign Option A as a short written response. For standard pacing, use Option B. For block schedules or discussion-heavy classes, use Option C.

Submit:

1. AI concept map
2. Lesson 1 reflection or self-check

Attach:

- Student Edition Lesson 1
- AI concept map template, if using one
- Teacher-approved prepared example AI output packet or demonstration file, if used

Attachment settings:

- Student reading: Students can view file
- Concept map template: Make a copy for each student
- Prepared example AI output packet: Students can view file

Rubric focus:

- AI concept accuracy
 - Strengths and limitations
 - Clear distinction between AI output and verified knowledge
-

Lesson 2 assignment

Post type: Assignment

Topic: Lesson 2: Verify AI Answers

Title: Lesson 2: Verifying AI Answers With Sources

Suggested points: 15

Suggested due date: End of Lesson 2 or next class meeting

Student instructions:

AI can produce useful answers, but an answer is not the same thing as verified information. Today you will practice checking AI output against reliable sources. You will identify claims, locate sources, compare evidence, and decide what can and cannot be trusted.

Complete the Lesson 2 reading and activities. Then submit your source verification log.

Bellringer / Warm-Up: Choose one self-contained option before the reading begins. Use this exact claim: “Dolphins are fish because they live in water.”

- Option A — Fast Start (3 minutes): Students identify the exact claim that needs checking. Expected claim: dolphins are fish because they live in water.
- Option B — Standard Warm-Up (5 minutes): Students answer: What exact claim needs checking? What source would verify it? What evidence would be enough? Suggested source examples: science textbook, reputable aquarium or marine biology website, encyclopedia, or government wildlife page.
- Option C — Extended Launch (6-7 minutes): Students answer the Option B questions and add: If two websites disagreed about this claim, what would you do next?

For tight pacing, assign Option A. For standard pacing, use Option B. For more discussion before source work, use Option C.

Submit:

1. Source verification log
2. Lesson 2 reflection or self-check

Attach:

- Student Edition Lesson 2
- Source verification log template
- Approved source list or teacher-selected links, if used
- Screenshot packet, if using no-install delivery

Attachment settings:

- Student reading: Students can view file
- Verification log template: Make a copy for each student
- Source list: Students can view file

Rubric focus:

- Identifying the claim being checked
 - Selecting appropriate sources
 - Comparing AI output against evidence
 - Explaining what changed after verification
-

Lesson 3 assignment

Post type: Assignment

Topic: Lesson 3: Media Bias and Digital Persuasion

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

Suggested points: 15

Suggested due date: End of Lesson 3 or next class meeting

Student instructions:

Today you will analyze how digital messages try to persuade an audience. You will look for claims, evidence, source choices, audience, missing context, emotional language, and bias. The goal is not to pretend any source is perfectly neutral. The goal is to read carefully and explain how a message works.

Complete the Lesson 3 reading and class activities. Then submit your media analysis artifact.

Bellringer / Warm-Up: Choose one self-contained option before the reading begins. Use this exact sentence: “This new school policy will solve the problem for everyone.”

- Option A — Fast Start (3 minutes): Students identify the claim being made. Expected claim: the new school policy will solve the problem for everyone.
- Option B — Standard Warm-Up (5 minutes): Students answer: What claim is being made? Who might be the audience? What important context is missing? Audience examples: students, parents, teachers, administrators, school board members, or voters. Missing-context examples: what the policy is, what problem it addresses, who benefits, who disagrees, or what evidence supports it.
- Option C — Extended Launch (6-7 minutes): Students answer the Option B questions and add: How could two people with different opinions use this sentence in different ways?

For tight pacing, assign Option A. For standard pacing, use Option B. For a longer launch into audience, framing, and persuasion, use Option C.

Submit:

1. Media claim and bias analysis
2. Lesson 3 reflection or self-check

Attach:

- Student Edition Lesson 3
- Media analysis template
- Teacher-selected media examples or links

Attachment settings:

- Student reading: Students can view file
- Media analysis template: Make a copy for each student
- Media examples: Students can view file, unless students are choosing their own examples

Rubric focus:

- Claim identification
- Evidence and missing context
- Audience and purpose
- Bias and persuasive technique analysis

Lesson 4 assignment

Post type: Assignment

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

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

Suggested points: 15

Suggested due date: End of Lesson 4 or next class meeting

Student instructions:

Today you will practice responsible AI use. You will think about privacy, personal information, data sharing, academic integrity, and disclosure. You will compare local and cloud-based AI use at a high level and decide what information should never be entered into an AI tool.

Complete the Lesson 4 reading and activities. Then submit your responsible AI use and privacy reflection.

Bellringer / Warm-Up: Choose one self-contained option before the reading begins. Rating system: OK to share = generally safe to type into an approved AI tool; Use caution = maybe safe only after removing personal details or asking the teacher; Do not share = too personal, private, or risky to type into an AI tool. Item list: (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.

- Option A — Fast Start (3 minutes): Students choose one item, mark it OK to share, Use caution, or Do not share, and explain why in one sentence.
- Option B — Standard Warm-Up (5 minutes): Students classify all five items using the rating system and write one sentence explaining their safest choice.
- Option C — Extended Launch (6-7 minutes): Students classify all five items and write one rule that could help a student decide what not to type into an AI tool.

For tight pacing, assign Option A. For standard pacing, use Option B. For a longer privacy-rule discussion, use Option C.

Submit:

1. Responsible AI use disclosure draft
2. Privacy and ethics reflection
3. Lesson 4 self-check

Attach:

- Student Edition Lesson 4
- Responsible AI use disclosure template
- Privacy reflection template
- Student AI Use Agreement, if not already posted

Attachment settings:

- Student reading: Students can view file
- Disclosure and reflection templates: Make a copy for each student
- Student AI Use Agreement: Students can view file

Rubric focus:

- Recognizing personal and sensitive information
- Explaining responsible AI use
- Distinguishing assistance from authorship
- Using clear disclosure language

Lesson 5 assignment

Post type: Assignment

Topic: Lesson 5: Civic Tech Mini-Project

Title: Lesson 5: Civic Tech Mini-Project

Suggested points: 25

Suggested due date: End of Lesson 5, end of week, or teacher-selected presentation date

Student instructions:

Today you will use the habits from the whole pilot to address a local or state civic issue. You will identify a real problem, verify information using sources, consider what public agency or civic process is relevant, and create a short civic artifact that explains the issue responsibly.

AI may be used only in the way your teacher permits. You are responsible for verifying facts, citing sources, and explaining any AI assistance you used.

Bellringer / Warm-Up: Choose one self-contained option before project work begins. A real civic issue means a problem or decision connected to the student's school, neighborhood, city, county, or state that people could research and try to improve. Examples: traffic near school, school phone policy, water quality, public park safety, bus routes, recycling, library hours, local flooding, or a proposed Florida law.

- Option A — Fast Start (3 minutes): Students write down one real civic issue people might disagree about or try to improve.
- Option B — Standard Warm-Up (5 minutes): Students write one real civic issue, who is affected, which public agency/official/school board/city/county/state office might connect to it, and what source they could check first. Source examples: school board agenda, city or county website, Florida agency page, local news article, or official meeting minutes.
- Option C — Extended Launch (6-7 minutes): Students answer the Option B questions and add what would make the issue too broad, too vague, or too hard to research today, then explain how to narrow it.

For tight pacing, assign Option A. For standard pacing, use Option B. For a block schedule or capstone workshop, use Option C to help students narrow topics before research.

Submit:

1. Civic issue brief or mini-project artifact
2. Source list
3. AI use disclosure, if AI was used
4. Final reflection or self-check

Attach:

- Student Edition Lesson 5
- Civic issue brief template
- Source list template
- AI use disclosure template
- Final reflection/self-check reference

Attachment settings:

- Student reading: Students can view file
- Project templates: Make a copy for each student
- Final reflection reference: Students can view file, or make a copy if students submit directly

Rubric focus:

- Civic problem definition
- Evidence and source quality
- Responsible use of technology
- Clear explanation of civic process or public agency relevance

- Honest uncertainty and disclosure

Optional final portfolio assignment

Post type: Assignment

Topic: Lesson 5: Civic Tech Mini-Project

Title: Final Pilot Portfolio Submission

Suggested points: 50

Suggested due date: After Lesson 5

Student instructions:

Submit your completed pilot portfolio. Your portfolio should show how your thinking developed across the five lessons.

Submit:

1. AI concept map
2. Source verification log
3. Media claim and bias analysis
4. Responsible AI use and privacy reflection
5. Civic issue brief or mini-project artifact
6. Final self-check

Rubric focus:

- Completeness
- Evidence and verification
- Responsible AI use
- Civic application
- Reflection and growth

Suggested short rubric for Classroom

Use this when a single Classroom rubric is preferred.

Criterion	4 - Strong	3 - Proficient	2 - Developing	1 - Beginning
Concept accuracy	Accurate, specific, and clearly explained	Mostly accurate with minor gaps	Partly accurate but unclear or incomplete	Inaccurate, unsupported, or missing
Evidence and verification	Sources are relevant, credible, and used to check claims	Sources are mostly relevant and connected to claims	Sources are present but weakly connected or incomplete	Evidence is missing, unreliable, or not used
Responsible AI use	AI use, privacy, and disclosure are handled thoughtfully	AI use and privacy are handled appropriately with minor gaps	Shows partial awareness but needs stronger judgment	Ignores privacy, disclosure, or responsible-use expectations
Civic application	Connects the work to a real civic issue, process, or public purpose	Civic connection is clear but could be more specific	Civic connection is present but vague	Civic purpose is missing or unsupported
Communication	Work is organized, readable, and precise	Work is mostly clear and organized	Work needs better organization or explanation	Work is hard to follow or incomplete

Google Classroom Upload Manifest

Seq.	Type	Topic	Title	Attachments	Notes
1	Material	Course Orientation	Start Here: CivicOS Florida Pilot Kit	Open Pilot Agreement; Student AI Use Agreement; Parent/Guardian Letter if used; Student Reflection and Self-Check reference; Cumulative Glossary; Supported Reading Versions if used; Pacing Guide if students will see the schedule	Post before Lesson 1. Do not attach Teacher Edition files to students.
2	Assignment	Lesson 1: What AI Is and Is Not	Lesson 1: What AI Is and Is Not	Student Edition Lesson 1; AI concept map template; approved prepared example AI output packet or demonstration file if used	No-install delivery works with prepared example AI outputs or teacher demonstration. Bellringer uses explicit AI examples: ChatGPT, Siri, autocorrect, YouTube recommendations, translation apps, and game bots.
3	Assignment	Lesson 2: Verify AI Answers	Lesson 2: Verifying AI Answers With Sources	Student Edition Lesson 2; source verification log template; approved source list or teacher-selected links; prepared example AI output packet if used	Primary artifact is the verification log. Bellringer claim: "Dolphins are fish because they live in water."
4	Assignment	Lesson 3: Media Bias and Digital Persuasion	Lesson 3: Media Bias, Claims, and Digital Persuasion	Student Edition Lesson 3; media analysis template; teacher-selected media examples or links	Use teacher-selected examples if local policy limits open web searching. Bellringer sentence: "This new school policy will solve the problem for everyone."
5	Assignment	Lesson 4: Privacy, Ethics, and Academic Integrity	Lesson 4: Privacy, Ethics, and Academic Integrity	Student Edition Lesson 4; responsible AI use disclosure template; privacy reflection template; Student AI Use Agreement if not already posted	Reinforces approved AI-use path and privacy guardrails. Bellringer classifies five explicit items: article link, full name/school/schedule, student paragraph, friend's private story, vocabulary question.
6	Assignment	Lesson 5: Civic Tech Mini-Project	Lesson 5: Civic Tech Mini-Project	Student Edition Lesson 5; civic issue brief template; source list template; AI use disclosure template; final reflection/self-check reference	Capstone artifact should include evidence, civic process/agency relevance, and any AI-use disclosure. Bellringer defines real civic issues and gives examples such as school policy, water quality, bus routes, library hours, local flooding, and proposed Florida law.
7	Assignment	Lesson 5: Civic Tech Mini-Project	Final Pilot Portfolio Submission	Portfolio checklist or final submission template	Optional. Use if the teacher wants one cumulative submission after the five lesson artifacts.

IT Approval Checklist

For school IT administrators evaluating whether the Florida Pilot Kit is compatible with institutional technology policies.

This checklist exists to make IT approval conversations short. It documents exactly what the curriculum requires, what it does not require, and how it handles common IT concerns. The curriculum's no-install default delivery is designed to require no infrastructure changes; whether your specific institutional setup needs any adjustments is a determination for your IT team to make against the items below.

Default delivery requirements

The Pilot Kit's default delivery requires:

- **A teacher device** with browser access (any modern computer running Chrome, Safari, Firefox, or Edge)
- **Class display** for teacher demonstration (projector, smart board, or large monitor)
- **Student devices** for some activities (Chromebooks, tablets, laptops; activities can also be completed on paper if devices are not available)
- **Browser-based AI access** on the teacher device for demonstrations (see "AI Service Access" below)
- **Internet connectivity** for the teacher device (most lessons benefit from connectivity but do not strictly require it; offline alternatives are documented in each lesson)

Not required:

- **✗** Local installation of any AI software on student or teacher devices
 - **✗** Administrative privileges on student devices
 - **✗** Student accounts on commercial AI platforms
 - **✗** Specialized hardware
 - **✗** Server-side software installation
 - **✗** Network configuration changes
 - **✗** Data sharing agreements with AI vendors (when using the no-install default)
 - **✗** Curriculum-side telemetry or data collection (the curriculum does not collect any student data)
-

AI service access for teacher demonstration

Several lessons benefit from teacher demonstration of an AI service for the class to observe. The curriculum's recommended default for the demonstration moment is, in priority order:

1. **An AI tool already approved for use by your district or school.** If your district has adopted, vetted, or licensed a specific AI service (whether a commercial platform, an educational AI service, or an institutional account with a major provider), use that. This is the most compliance-clean path.
2. **Pre-prepared example AI outputs from the Teacher Edition.** Each lesson includes pre-prepared materials specifically designed to substitute for live demonstration. The learning objectives are fully achievable using these materials with no live AI access at all. For schools without district-approved AI access or where AI demonstration is not permitted by current policy, this is the recommended path.
3. **Browser-based commercial AI services as illustrative examples only**, where institutional policy permits:
 - ChatGPT (OpenAI) — chat.openai.com
 - Claude (Anthropic) — claude.ai
 - Gemini (Google) — gemini.google.com
 - Copilot (Microsoft) — copilot.microsoft.com

Whether teacher demonstration of any specific commercial AI service is permitted in your school is a determination for your district's IT and curriculum policies, not an assumption the curriculum makes. Some districts permit broad teacher AI demonstration; others restrict it to specific approved tools; some prohibit it entirely. The curriculum is designed to work in any of these settings.

Considerations regardless of approach: - If your district has any approval process for AI tool use in instruction, follow it before the pilot begins - Teacher accounts on commercial AI services are subject to the platform's terms of service; institutional review for educational use compliance is your district's responsibility - Student observation of teacher demonstration does not require student accounts - If using the prepared-output path (text-described example AI responses, projected directly or converted to screenshots), the lessons reach all stated learning objectives; only the dynamism of live demonstration is lost

Optional extension track (local AI installation)

For schools or families that want to support deeper student learning, an optional extension track involves installing local AI software (Ollama) on student devices. This is **not part of the core curriculum** and is **not required** for any pilot lesson.

If your school chooses to support the extension track: - Installation requires administrative privileges on student devices - Disk space requirement: approximately 5–15 GB per device for AI model files - One-time download requirement: AI model files are 4–9 GB depending on which model is installed - After installation, no internet connection is required for AI use - See *The Open Source Student* (Foundation Edition) for full installation documentation

If your school cannot or does not want to support the extension track: the core curriculum delivers full learning objectives without it.

Network and bandwidth requirements

Default delivery (no-install path): - Teacher device: needs internet for AI service demonstration when used - Student devices: do not require live internet for the core lesson activities - Bandwidth: a single AI service browser tab uses minimal bandwidth (similar to any other web service) - No streaming video required (the curriculum does not use video as primary instructional medium)

Extension track (local installation): - One-time download of 4–9 GB per device for the AI model - After download, no internet required - Suggest scheduling extension-track installations during off-peak hours if doing many at once

No-internet contingency: - All core lessons can be completed using offline materials (printed Student Edition, prepared example AI outputs, paper activities).

Note for Lesson 5: the Civic Tech Mini-Project's source-finding step recommends live student internet for direct access to government websites; in a no-internet setting, the educator pre-curates a Source Packet (printed government documents, news articles, advocacy materials) for each candidate issue. The Source Packet path adds preparation time the day before but preserves the lesson's substantive learning objectives. - Offline alternatives are documented in each lesson's Teacher Edition under "No-install adaptation notes"

Student data and privacy

The curriculum is designed to minimize student data exposure:

- **No student accounts required** on commercial AI platforms in the core path
- **No curriculum-side data collection** — CivicOS does not collect any student data through the curriculum
- **No telemetry, analytics, or tracking** in the curriculum materials
- **Student work stays local** — student writing, projects, and reflections are produced in your school's normal academic environment (Google Classroom, Microsoft Teams, paper notebooks, whatever your school uses)
- **Parent communication template provided** — proactive transparency with families about what the curriculum involves

When teacher demonstration of an AI service is used: - Teacher's queries to the AI service are subject to that service's privacy policy - Student information should not be entered into the AI service during demonstration (the Teacher Edition specifies what queries to use) - The Data Privacy Statement provides full documentation

FERPA compliance: - The curriculum does not collect, store, or transmit student records - Schools can use the curriculum without altering existing FERPA-compliant student data practices - See the Data Privacy Statement for full documentation suitable for compliance reviews

Accessibility

The curriculum is designed for accessibility:

- **Screen reader compatible** — all curriculum materials are formatted as standard Markdown text, which works with major screen readers
- **No essential information conveyed only by color** — all visual elements have text equivalents
- **Keyboard navigation** — all activities can be completed with keyboard input
- **Multiple modalities** — most lessons offer auditory, visual, and kinesthetic options
- **IEP/504 accommodation support** — explicit differentiation guidance for common accommodation categories

See the Accessibility Statement for full documentation.

IT approval checklist (for sign-off)

If your IT review process requires checkbox sign-off, the items below summarize what the curriculum's default delivery requires and what it does not. The curriculum's structural design is documented; whether the implementation as a whole meets your institution's specific policies is a determination for your IT and compliance team in their context.

Default delivery — curriculum design summary (for IT review): - Teacher device with browser access required (curriculum-side: no further requirement) - Teacher access to an AI service for demonstration: optional and policy-dependent (curriculum supports operation without live AI access via prepared example AI outputs) - No student device installations required by the curriculum - No student accounts on commercial AI services required by the curriculum - No curriculum-side data collection (curriculum has no servers, no telemetry, no analytics) - No new network configuration changes required by the curriculum - Curriculum-side FERPA exposure: none (curriculum does not collect, store, or transmit student records)

Items requiring district determination: - Whether your district's existing AI use policies cover teacher demonstration of an AI service in this curriculum's context - Whether commercial AI services (if used during teacher demonstration) align with your district's vendor and data agreements - Whether the curriculum's implementation in your specific setting satisfies your district's compliance requirements as applied - Whether the optional installation extension track is acceptable under your district's device-management policies

Optional extension track — curriculum design summary (only if school is choosing to support student local installation): - Administrative privileges on participating student devices required for installation - Approximately 5–15 GB disk space required per participating device for AI model files - One-time bandwidth required for 4–9 GB download per device - Ollama (<https://ollama.com>) is the recommended local AI runtime for the extension track; whether it is acceptable for

your district is a separate determination

Approval recommendation

The default Pilot Kit delivery requires no curriculum-side installations, no student accounts, no curriculum-side data collection, and no network changes from the curriculum itself. For most Florida schools, this means IT review of the curriculum can be straightforward, with the substantive policy questions focused on which (if any) third-party AI services are used in connection with the curriculum.

The optional extension track requires more IT involvement and more district policy review. We recommend reviewing the default delivery first, running the pilot if approved, and revisiting the extension track only if there is interest after the pilot.

Questions and contact

For IT-specific questions during your review, contact CivicOS Labs through civicoslabs.com. Include your school name, the specific concern, and any relevant institutional policy text. Response time during business hours is typically within one business day.

Parent / Guardian Letter — Template

Adaptable letter for educators to send to families before beginning the Florida Pilot Kit.

This template is designed to communicate proactively with parents and guardians about what their student will be learning, why it matters, and how they can support the work at home. Most family concerns about AI in the classroom come from lack of information; transparent communication up front prevents most of those concerns from becoming problems.

Educators should adapt this letter to their setting (school, microschool, homeschool co-op, library program). Replace bracketed text with your specifics.

TEMPLATE LETTER

Dear Parents and Guardians,

Over the next [one week / two weeks / five weeks — pick your pacing], your student will participate in *The Open Source Student — Florida Educator’s Edition*, a five-lesson curriculum on artificial intelligence (AI), responsible technology use, and applying technology to civic problem-solving.

I am writing to let you know what your student will be learning and why, so you can support the work at home and ask questions if you have any.

What your student will learn

The five lessons cover:

1. **What AI Is and Is Not** — what artificial intelligence actually is, what it can do well, and where it makes mistakes
2. **Verifying AI Answers With Sources** — how to check whether what AI tells you is accurate, by comparing it to real, reliable sources
3. **Media Bias, Claims, and Digital Persuasion** — how to think critically about information from any source — AI, news, advocacy, social media
4. **Privacy, Ethics, and Academic Integrity** — using AI responsibly in school work and personal life; understanding what is and is not appropriate
5. **Civic Tech Mini-Project** — a short project where your student researches a real local or state issue using everything they have learned

By the end of the curriculum, your student should be able to explain what AI is in their own words, demonstrate the habit of verifying AI claims against real sources, identify bias and missing context in information, articulate the ethics of using AI in their school work, and apply all of this to a real civic issue.

Why this matters

Whether through school-provided tools, free public platforms, or applications they discovered on their own, your student is almost certainly already encountering AI. The question is not whether they will use AI; the question is whether they will use it well.

Students who understand AI — what it is, how it works, where it fails, and how to verify what it tells them — make better decisions about when to rely on it and when to think for themselves. Students who do not understand AI tend to either trust it too much (treating its output as authoritative when it is not) or avoid it entirely (missing legitimate uses for learning). This curriculum is designed to produce the first kind of student.

How AI is being used in the classroom

In most lessons, the teacher demonstrates AI on a single classroom screen while students observe and discuss. Students do not need their own AI accounts for the core lessons. When students do interact with AI directly during a lesson, it is for specific, purposeful activities (verifying a claim, analyzing an example, demonstrating responsible use), supervised, and within school policies.

The curriculum does **not** ask students to install AI software on their devices unless they choose to as an optional extension activity, and even then, only if your home setup supports it.

What you can do at home

You are welcome to read along with your student. The student materials are written primarily for grades 6 through 8. Grade 9 students may also use the materials as early-high-school transition or enrichment, but the Pilot Kit does not claim separate grade 9 benchmark alignment. If you would like to see what your student is reading, ask them to share their lesson materials with you.

You are also welcome to discuss AI with your student. Some questions worth asking:

- “What did you learn today about AI?”
- “Can you show me an example of AI being wrong about something?”
- “How would you check whether something AI told you is actually true?”
- “When do you think it is okay to use AI for school work, and when is it not?”

If your student is excited about a particular topic from the curriculum, follow that interest. If they have concerns or questions you cannot answer, those are exactly the kinds of things worth bringing to me.

Privacy and data

The curriculum does not collect any data from your student. Their writing, their projects, and their reflections stay in our normal classroom systems (the same systems we already use for any class). When the teacher demonstrates AI services in class, we do not enter your student’s personal information.

Academic integrity

Lesson 4 specifically addresses the question of when AI use is appropriate in school work and when it is not. Your student will learn that getting help understanding a concept is fine; having AI write an essay you submit as your own is not. They will also learn how to disclose AI use when they do legitimately use AI in their work, which is the responsible practice this curriculum models.

If you have specific concerns about how AI is being used in your student's other classes, those concerns are best addressed with those teachers; this curriculum addresses the principles broadly.

If you have concerns

I welcome your questions. Please reach out to me directly at [your email / phone / preferred contact].

If, after reviewing this information, you would prefer your student not participate in particular activities, please let me know and we can discuss accommodations. The curriculum is built to support a wide range of family preferences about AI exposure.

What happens at the end

When the pilot is complete, your student will have produced a portfolio of work including an AI Concept Map, a Source Verification Log entry, a Media Analysis, an AI Use Disclosure, and a Civic Issue Brief. These artifacts demonstrate what your student learned and can be shared with you. I will share the portfolio when the curriculum concludes.

Your student will also have practiced civic technology literacy — the ability to use technology in service of evidence-based, responsible engagement with public issues. This is a skill that serves them well beyond AI specifically, and it aligns with the broader civic literacy goals that Florida schools and families have prioritized.

Thank you for partnering with us on this. AI is changing what it means to be educated; helping students become capable, ethical users of these tools is some of the most important work we are doing right now.

Sincerely,

[Your name] [Your role / title] [Your contact information] [Your school / microschool / homeschool / program]

ADAPTATION NOTES FOR EDUCATORS

For homeschool families: the letter is essentially redundant if you are teaching your own children — but a similar communication may be useful when sharing the curriculum with co-op partner families or when documenting your educational program for portfolio review.

For microschool facilitators: customize the letter to reflect your microschool's specific structure, parent communication norms, and AI use policies.

For classroom teachers: consider sending this letter as part of your normal back-to-school or quarterly communication. If your school requires administrator review of communication about new curriculum, the letter has been written with administrator review in mind; adapt to your district's specific communication requirements and language conventions.

For library media specialists: adapt the letter for the library program context (you may not have ongoing relationship with families the way classroom teachers do); a shorter version focused on the program's structure may be more appropriate.

Optional add-ons: - Specific dates the curriculum will run - A QR code or link to the Pilot Kit's main README for parents who want more detail - A specific opportunity for parents to attend a brief overview session if your setting permits

Student AI Use Agreement

A short agreement clarifying responsible AI use expectations for students participating in the Florida Pilot Kit.

This document is designed to be signed by the student and a parent/guardian before the curriculum begins. It serves three purposes: it makes responsible-use expectations explicit; it gives students an opportunity to engage with the ethics framework before encountering it formally in Lesson 4; and it gives parents transparency about what the curriculum asks of their student.

Educators may use this agreement as written, modify it for their setting, or use their school's existing AI use policy if one is already in place.

STUDENT AI USE AGREEMENT — TEMPLATE

I am participating in *The Open Source Student — Florida Educator's Edition* curriculum. As part of this curriculum, I will learn about artificial intelligence (AI), how to use AI well, and how to be responsible when I use it.

This agreement explains what is expected of me when I use AI in this curriculum and in my school work generally.

What I agree to do

I will use AI to help me learn, not to replace my learning.

When I use AI for school work, my goal is to understand the material better, not to skip understanding it. If AI explains a concept, I make sure I can explain it back in my own words. If I cannot explain it, I have not actually learned it yet.

I will verify what AI tells me.

I understand that AI can be confidently wrong — it can produce plausible-sounding answers that are not accurate. When I rely on a fact AI gives me, I will check it against a real source (textbook, reliable article, expert, official document) before treating it as true.

I will be honest about how I used AI.

If I use AI to help me with school work in ways my teacher allows, I will disclose that use when expected to. I understand that using AI without disclosure when disclosure is required is academic dishonesty, the same as having someone else do my work for me.

I will follow my school's specific AI policies.

I understand that different teachers and different assignments may have different rules about AI use. When I am not sure, I will ask my teacher before using AI. If my school's policy is more restrictive than what this curriculum allows, I will follow my school's policy.

I will not use AI to do work I should be doing myself.

If a teacher assigns me to write an essay, I will write the essay. If a teacher assigns me to solve math problems, I will solve them. AI may help me understand or check my work, but the work itself is mine.

I will protect privacy — mine and others'.

I will not type personal information about myself (full name, address, school, family details, financial information, health information, account passwords) into AI services. I will not type personal information about other people (classmates, family members, teachers) into AI services. I understand that what I type into commercial AI services may be stored on company servers and is not private.

I will treat AI as a tool, not as an authority.

AI is good at language tasks but cannot tell when it is wrong. I will not rely on AI for medical advice, legal advice, mental health support, or other situations where being wrong could hurt me or someone else. For those situations, I will talk to a real person who knows me — a parent, doctor, counselor, or other trusted adult.

What my school agrees to provide

The school / educator agrees to:

- **Teach me what responsible AI use looks like** through the curriculum's lessons
 - **Be clear about when AI use is and is not permitted** for specific assignments and contexts
 - **Treat me fairly when I disclose AI use** that the school's policy allows; I will not be penalized for honest disclosure of permitted use
 - **Protect my privacy** by not entering my personal information into AI services on my behalf
 - **Help me when I am confused** about whether a particular use is appropriate
-

What this agreement does not do

This agreement is about responsible use of AI. It does not:

- Forbid me from using AI for homework when my teacher permits it
 - Suggest that AI is bad or that I should avoid it
 - Replace my school's existing technology use policies (those still apply)
 - Override my parents' or guardians' instructions about AI use at home
-

Consequences for violations

If I violate this agreement:

- **Honest mistake** (for example, forgetting to disclose AI use on a specific assignment): a conversation with my teacher about what I should have done. Specific consequences are determined by my school's academic integrity policy — but educators are encouraged to distinguish honest mistakes from patterns of misuse, and honest disclosure is consistently treated more constructively than concealment.
- **Pattern of misuse** (for example, repeatedly submitting AI-generated work as my own): my teacher will follow my school's standard academic integrity policy; consequences are the same as for any academic integrity violation
- **Privacy violation** (for example, entering classmates' personal information into an AI service): my teacher will address this directly per school policy; consequences may include a conversation with my parents and follow-up about what I have learned

The goal of this agreement is not punishment; it is helping me learn to use a powerful tool responsibly. If I make mistakes, I am expected to learn from them, the same way I would with any other learning.

Signatures

Student: I have read this agreement and understand what I am agreeing to. I will do my best to follow it.

Student name (printed): _____

Student signature: _____

Date: _____

Parent / Guardian: I have read this agreement and understand what my student is agreeing to. I support the curriculum's approach to teaching responsible AI use.

Parent / Guardian name (printed): _____

Parent / Guardian signature: _____

Date: _____

Educator: I have shared this agreement with the student and answered any questions they had.

Educator name (printed): _____

Educator signature: _____

Date: _____

ADAPTATION NOTES FOR EDUCATORS

Use as-is: for most settings, this agreement works without modification.

Modify for your setting: if your school has existing AI policies, integrate the relevant language. If your school uses a different academic integrity framework, adjust the consequences section accordingly.

Skip if you have an existing policy: if your school already has a comprehensive student AI use agreement that covers this ground, use yours instead. The point is that students engage with responsible-use expectations explicitly before the curriculum begins.

For homeschool settings: the agreement is still valuable as a way to make expectations explicit between parent and student, even though formal "agreement" structure may feel unusual in a family context. Adapt the formality to fit your family's normal practices.

For library or after-school program settings: the agreement may be too formal for a casual program. Consider extracting the key points into a one-page handout that students keep with their materials.

A note on consequences

The agreement's consequences section is deliberately graduated — honest mistakes get conversation, patterns of misuse get policy enforcement. This reflects the reality that students learning a new skill (responsible AI use is a new skill) will make mistakes, and that those mistakes are mostly learning opportunities. Treating every honest disclosure mistake as a major academic integrity violation discourages the disclosure habit the curriculum is trying to build.

If your school's academic integrity policy requires more punitive responses to certain violations, follow the school policy — but consider explicitly distinguishing between honest mistakes and patterns of misuse in how you communicate with students. A student who feels they will be punished for honesty will hide their AI use; a student who feels they will be helped by honesty will disclose. The second outcome is the one that supports actual learning.

Accessibility Statement

Documentation of how *The Open Source Student — Florida Educator's Edition* supports accessibility for diverse learners.

This statement is suitable for institutional review, ESA documentation, and IEP / 504 planning conversations. It documents the design choices that make the curriculum work for students across a range of accessibility needs.

Design principles

The curriculum is designed around three accessibility principles:

1. **Multiple modalities by default** — most lessons offer visual, auditory, and kinesthetic options so students can engage in the way that works best for them
2. **Differentiation is built in, not added on** — every lesson includes explicit support for common accommodation categories (ADHD, dyslexia, autism, ELL, anxiety) within the Teacher Edition
3. **No-install default delivery** — the curriculum works without specialized software or device configurations, removing one common barrier to access

These principles flow through every lesson in the Pilot Kit and will continue through the full curriculum.

Format and technology accessibility

Document format: All curriculum materials are formatted as standard Markdown text. This format: - Is fully compatible with major screen readers (JAWS, NVDA, VoiceOver, Narrator) - Renders cleanly in plain text, HTML, PDF, and other formats without loss of essential content - Has no proprietary dependencies - Can be re-formatted by users with specific accessibility needs (font size, contrast, line spacing, etc.) without losing meaning

Visual content: No essential information is conveyed only by color, image, or layout. Wherever the curriculum uses visual elements (tables, suggested screenshots, diagrams), the same information is also expressed in text.

Keyboard navigation: All curriculum activities can be completed using keyboard input alone. No activity requires mouse-only interaction or other input methods that would exclude users relying on keyboard, switch, or assistive technology.

Audio support: While the curriculum does not include native audio, all readings can be processed by text-to-speech tools (built into all major operating systems and web browsers, available free). The curriculum's straightforward text formatting works well with TTS engines.

Language: Curriculum text is written at Florida B.E.S.T. ELA grades 6–8 reading level (Lexile ~1100L), with technical vocabulary explained on first use. The Teacher Edition includes vocabulary pre-teaching strategies for students whose reading level varies.

Support for IEP / 504 accommodation categories

The Teacher Edition for each lesson includes Differentiation Notes covering the most common accommodation categories Florida educators encounter:

Attention and executive function (ADHD, executive function challenges)

- Lessons broken into shorter activity segments
- Clear, sequential instructions with checkboxes
- Built-in movement-break suggestions between segments
- Visual timers and pacing supports
- Reduced visual clutter on student handouts
- Extended time options for assessments built into the rubric

Reading and language (dyslexia, language processing)

- All curriculum materials screen-reader compatible
- Audio-friendly format (works with text-to-speech)
- Larger-font printable variants available on request
- Visual organizers (concept maps, flowcharts) as primary content delivery option for some lessons
- Alternative assessment formats (oral, demonstrative, project-based) available for written assessments
- Reduced reading load alternatives for newcomer or extreme-need students

Autism spectrum

- Predictable lesson structure (same components in the same order every lesson)
- Explicit social expectations for group work
- Clear transition signals between activities
- Sensory-friendly activity adaptations
- Special-interest connections (the AI subject matter itself is often a strong area of interest for many autistic students)

- Quiet alternative work options when group discussion is overwhelming

Anxiety and emotional regulation

- Low-stakes practice opportunities before formal assessments
 - Multiple ways to demonstrate understanding (oral, written, visual, project)
 - Privacy options for self-check work (students can complete privately rather than publicly)
 - Discussion participation alternatives (written response, partner sharing, small group, large group — student chooses)
 - No surprise assessments; all assessment timing is communicated in advance
-

English Language Learner (ELL) support

The curriculum is designed to be accessible to ELL students at multiple proficiency levels:

- Teacher Edition vocabulary notes flag English-Spanish cognates where useful for ELL students (educator-facing reference; cognates are not surfaced in the Student Edition by default)
- Visual representations of key concepts (diagrams, infographics, screenshots)
- Sentence frames and language scaffolds for written responses
- Discussion partner protocols (pair with bilingual peers when possible)
- Multilingual glossary appendix planned (full curriculum includes Spanish translations of key vocabulary; pilot includes Spanish cognate notes)
- Reduced reading load alternatives for newcomer ELL students
- Explicit guidance to teachers on supporting ELL students through each lesson

The curriculum's reading level (~1100L) is challenging for newcomer ELL students and may require additional scaffolding; the Teacher Edition documents specific scaffolding strategies for each lesson.

Gifted and twice-exceptional support

For students who need acceleration or additional challenge:

- Extension Options listed in every Teacher Edition lesson
 - Connections to *The Open Source Student* (Foundation Edition) for deeper independent reading
 - Optional installation extension track for hands-on technical work
 - Civic Tech Mini-Project (Lesson 5) supports independent project work at varying depths
 - Twice-exceptional students get the acceleration of the Extension Options combined with the accommodations from the Differentiation Notes — both supports apply simultaneously
-

Technology access variation

The curriculum is designed for the realities of varied home and school technology access:

- **Full home access (laptop + reliable internet):** standard pacing
- **Shared family device:** activities work in 30-minute blocks; one student at a time
- **Library-only or school-only access:** the Pacing Guide includes library/after-school options, including a five-week after-school pacing where each lesson fits a single 60-minute lab block
- **Limited or unreliable internet:** offline-capable activities for lessons that don't strictly require live AI access
- **No personal computer:** class-wide demonstration model; project work shifts to in-class lab time

No student is excluded from the curriculum by their technology access at home.

What the Pilot Kit does NOT yet have

Honest disclosure: the Pilot Kit is a working draft. Some accessibility features planned for the full curriculum are not yet present:

- **Native multilingual versions** — the Pilot Kit is in English; full Spanish translation planned for Phase 3
- **Native audio recordings** — the Pilot Kit relies on text-to-speech rather than including pre-recorded narration
- **ASL video versions** — not in the Pilot Kit; planned for Phase 3 if pilot adoption demonstrates need
- **Braille-formatted versions** — not in the Pilot Kit; can be produced from the Markdown source by Braille translation services as needed
- **Accessibility audit by certified specialists** — Pilot Kit accessibility design is best-effort; formal accessibility audit planned before Phase 3 publication

For pilot use, these limitations are usually acceptable. Educators with students who need specific accommodations not yet in the Pilot Kit are encouraged to share that need through the Pilot Feedback Form so it can be incorporated into the full curriculum.

Compliance posture

The curriculum is designed to support compliance with:

- **Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act** — accommodation support documented and built into curriculum design
- **IDEA (Individuals with Disabilities Education Act)** — IEP-relevant accommodations supported
- **ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act)** — accessibility design choices align with ADA principles for educational materials
- **Florida-specific accessibility requirements** for instructional materials (per FDOE guidelines for adopted curriculum)

Schools using this curriculum should follow their normal IEP / 504 / accommodation processes for individual students. The curriculum's Differentiation Notes provide specific guidance educators can integrate into student-specific accommodation plans.

Contact for accessibility questions

For accessibility questions during your pilot — including questions about specific accommodations not addressed above, requests for alternate formats, or feedback on accessibility limitations you encounter — contact CivicOS Labs at civicoslabs.com.

Pilot adopters are explicitly invited to flag accessibility gaps. Real classroom feedback is what makes accessibility design better; we want to hear what does not work.

Data Privacy Statement

Documentation of how *The Open Source Student — Florida Educator's Edition* handles student data and privacy.

This statement is suitable for institutional review, FERPA compliance documentation, and parent communication. It documents what data the curriculum collects (essentially nothing), what data exposure is possible during normal use, and how to minimize that exposure.

What the curriculum collects

The curriculum itself collects no student data. None.

CivicOS Labs, LLC does not collect, store, transmit, or process any student information through the Pilot Kit materials. There is no telemetry. There is no analytics. There are no tracking pixels. There are no cloud-side dashboards collecting how students interact with the materials.

The curriculum is published as standard text files (Markdown). Students read them, work in them, and produce written work — and all of that activity stays within whatever academic environment the school or family already uses (Google Classroom, Microsoft Teams, Schoology, paper notebooks, etc.). The curriculum has no infrastructure that talks to anyone.

This is not just a policy statement; it is a structural fact. The curriculum has no servers, no APIs, no backend. There is nothing the curriculum could collect even if we wanted to.

What data exposure is possible during normal use

While the curriculum itself collects no data, several lessons involve interaction with **commercial AI services** (ChatGPT, Claude, Gemini, Copilot, etc.) for teacher demonstration. Those services have their own data practices, which apply during the demonstration.

Teacher demonstration of AI services:

When the teacher demonstrates an AI service in class, the teacher's queries to that service are subject to the service's privacy policy. This is the same privacy exposure that applies whenever the teacher uses the service for any purpose. The lesson's design specifically minimizes any possibility of student information being entered into the AI service:

- The Teacher Edition specifies what queries to use during demonstration
- None of the demonstration queries require entering student names, school information, or any student-specific data
- Students observe the demonstration; they do not interact directly with the commercial AI service during the lesson

Student interaction with AI services:

Some optional activities allow students to interact with AI services directly. When this happens:

- It is at the school's discretion based on existing school policy about AI access
- Students should not enter personal information (their full name, address, school, family details, financial information, health information, account passwords) into AI services
- Students should not enter information about other people (classmates, family members, teachers) into AI services
- The Student AI Use Agreement (in this packet) makes these expectations explicit

If your school's policy prohibits student interaction with commercial AI services entirely, the Pilot Kit can still be taught fully — every lesson includes pre-prepared example AI outputs (described in detail in the Teacher Edition's No-Install Adaptation Notes, ready to be projected as text or converted to actual screenshots) that substitute for live AI interaction.

Optional installation extension:

If your school chooses to support the optional installation extension track, students install AI software (Ollama) on their own devices. When using local AI:

- Queries and responses stay on the student's own device
- No data is sent to any external service
- The privacy properties are essentially identical to using a word processor on your own computer

This is one of the curriculum's underlying arguments — local AI provides better privacy than cloud AI. The optional installation extension is the most privacy-protective option for students who can pursue it.

FERPA considerations

The curriculum's design supports FERPA review by school compliance teams. Specifically:

- The curriculum itself collects no student educational records and operates no infrastructure that would create or store such records
- The curriculum is a published text resource (functionally similar to a textbook or printed instructional material), not a software platform with its own data systems

- Student work produced through the curriculum (writing, reflections, projects, portfolio artifacts) is governed by your school's existing student-records policies, the same as any classwork
- Adoption of the curriculum does not require changes to your school's existing FERPA-compliant student data practices

FERPA compliance is ultimately determined by the school or district's compliance team based on how the curriculum is implemented in their specific context, including how any third-party AI services accessed during lessons are governed by district vendor agreements. The structural fact that the curriculum itself has no infrastructure to collect or store student data is the most relevant point for compliance review.

Florida student privacy considerations

The curriculum's design is consistent with Florida's general framework on student data privacy:

- The curriculum itself does not collect student data and does not function as a vendor with student-data access
- Florida laws governing how educational vendors collect and share student information do not impose new obligations on a curriculum that does not collect such information
- District-level student privacy policies remain the governing framework for any third-party services (commercial AI platforms, learning management systems, etc.) that may be used in connection with the curriculum

Because the curriculum collects no student data, alignment with Florida student privacy expectations is straightforward at the curriculum level. Compliance with specific Florida statutes and district policies as applied to your implementation is appropriately a matter for your school's compliance team and IT administrator to determine in their context.

Recommendations for educators

If you are running the Pilot Kit, these practices keep student privacy protected:

Before you begin: - Verify whether your school's existing AI use policies cover teacher demonstration of AI services in class. Florida district policies on this vary; do not assume coverage - If your school requires parent notification before AI is used in instruction, send the Parent / Guardian Letter (also) - Have students review and sign the Student AI Use Agreement (also)

During lessons: - Use the Teacher Edition's specified demonstration queries; they are designed to require no student information - If students interact with AI services directly during a lesson, supervise the interaction - Remind students of the AI Use Agreement's privacy expectations before any student AI interaction

After lessons: - Student work (their writing, their reflections, their projects) is part of your normal academic environment; it is not sent anywhere by the curriculum - If you publish or share student work (for celebration, portfolio review, etc.), follow your school's normal student work publication policies

Recommendations for families using ESA / Family Empowerment Scholarship funds

For families using state scholarship funds:

- The curriculum's no-data-collection design supports straightforward eligibility documentation (no third-party data sharing concerns)
- The Student AI Use Agreement provides documented evidence that the family has explicit conversations about responsible AI use as part of the curriculum
- The curriculum's privacy properties are part of what makes it suitable for ESA-funded educational use

See the ESA Documentation Guide (also) for application-specific guidance.

What if you have privacy concerns we haven't addressed?

Privacy in AI-adjacent education is an active conversation, and we welcome questions. If your school's compliance team, your IT administrator, or a concerned parent has a privacy question this statement does not answer, contact CivicOS Labs through civicoslabs.com with the specific concern.

Common questions we are happy to address: - Specific compliance reviews (your district's vendor approval process, etc.) - Specific institutional policies (whether the curriculum aligns with your school's specific AI use policy) - Parent concerns about specific lessons or activities - ESA program questions about data and privacy documentation

A brief note on the broader privacy argument

One of the curriculum's substantive arguments — explored most directly in Lessons 2 and 4 — is that students should think carefully about what information they share with commercial AI services. The curriculum models this in its own design: by collecting no data, by using teacher demonstration as the default delivery, by reserving direct student AI interaction for specific supervised activities, and by treating the optional local-installation extension as the most privacy-protective option.

The curriculum's privacy practices are part of the curriculum's content. Students learn responsible privacy practices in part by experiencing a curriculum that practices them.

ESA Documentation Guide

Guidance for Florida families using Education Scholarship Account (ESA) funds — including the Family Empowerment Scholarship (FES) — to purchase or document use of *The Open Source Student — Florida Educator’s Edition*.

This guide helps Florida families and educators document the curriculum’s educational value for ESA reimbursement applications and program compliance.

Verify current Family Empowerment Scholarship eligibility criteria, allowable expenses, and documentation requirements at <https://www.fldoe.org/schools/school-choice/k-12-scholarship-programs/fes/> before relying on this guide for purchasing decisions. Florida ESA programs evolve; specific rules change from year to year.

What this guide is not

- This is not legal or financial advice
- This is not an official statement from the Florida Department of Education
- This is not a guarantee of ESA reimbursement; eligibility decisions are made by program administrators
- This is documentation that supports a family’s reimbursement application; the application itself is the family’s responsibility

What this guide is

A documentation kit families can adapt for their specific ESA reimbursement application, including:

- Summary of the curriculum’s educational purpose
- Standards alignment documentation
- Implementation evidence templates
- Suggested categories the curriculum may fit under
- Common questions ESA reviewers ask, with documented answers

For paste-able application language and template letters, see the dedicated ESA templates collection:

- the Family Application Packet — pre-filled application language for FES-UA, the Step Up For Students portal, and FTC-PEP, in both short-form and long-form variants
- the Pre-Purchase Eligibility Letter — template letter a family can request from CivicOS Labs confirming the curriculum’s eligibility characteristics (in both short-form and long-form variants, with program-specific addenda)
- the Eligibility Letter Fulfillment Workflow — CivicOS operations workflow defining intake, signer authority, turnaround time, and recordkeeping for issued letters
- the Reviewer Evidence Packet — documentation aimed at the ESA program reviewer, designed for review efficiency (short-form and long-form variants)

This high-level orientation guide and the templates are designed to be used together: read this guide first for context, then go to the templates for the specific application language.

Curriculum summary for ESA documentation

When you describe *The Open Source Student — Florida Educator’s Edition* on an ESA application, this is the documented summary you can adapt:

The Open Source Student — Florida Educator’s Edition is a standards-aligned civic technology curriculum developed by CivicOS Labs, LLC. It teaches middle school students (primary audience: grades 6–8; grade 9 usable as early high school transition or enrichment but not separately standards-mapped) to understand artificial intelligence, verify information against reliable sources, protect privacy, use digital tools responsibly, and apply technology to civic problem-solving. The curriculum aligns with current Florida B.E.S.T. Computer Science Standards (July 2024 revision — Emerging Technologies including AI benchmarks SC.6/7/8.ET.2, Programming and Software Engineering including SC.8.PE.3.3 model limits, Communication and Collaboration, Personal Health and Safety, Technological Impact, Cyber Security, Computing Components including SC.8.CO.3.1 local-vs-cloud), Florida Civics and Government Standards (SS.7.CG.2.8 media/groups influencing government, SS.7.CG.2.9 bias/propaganda analysis, SS.7.CG.2.10 citizens addressing state/local problems — primary anchor for the Civic Tech Mini-Project, plus grade 8 extensions SS.8.CG.2.2 / 2.3 / 2.4 / 2.6), and Florida B.E.S.T. ELA Standards for grades 6–8. The Pilot Kit contains five paired Teacher/Student lessons designed for one-week intensive instruction, with alternative pacings for after-school programs, microschool blocks, or homeschool relaxed pacing. The full curriculum (Phase 2: nine-week module; Phase 3: full-year edition) is in development. Materials are licensed under Creative Commons BY-NC-SA 4.0 for educational use.

Standards alignment summary

The curriculum aligns with three Florida standards frameworks at the middle school level:

- **Florida B.E.S.T. Computer Science Standards (grades 6–8, July 2024 revision)** — primary technical alignment across Emerging Technologies, Programming and Software Engineering, Communication and Collaboration, Personal Health and Safety, Technological Impact, Cyber Security, and Computing Components strands
- **Florida Civics and Government Standards (grades 7–8)** — co-primary alignment with SS.7.CG.2.8 / 2.9 / 2.10 at grade 7 and SS.8.CG.2.2 / 2.3 / 2.4 / 2.6 extensions at grade 8
- **Florida B.E.S.T. ELA Standards (grades 6–8)** — embedded throughout reading informational text, communication (note: B.E.S.T. uses C-prefix for what other frameworks call Writing), vocabulary, and K-12 ELA Expectations for collaborative discussion

For specific per-lesson standards alignment, see the Standards Alignment Matrix. The detailed matrix is appropriate to attach to an ESA reimbursement application or to share with reviewers who need detailed alignment evidence.

Standards information current as of May 2026; verify against published FDOE/CPALMS documents before formal program submission.

Categories the curriculum may fit under

ESA programs typically allow reimbursement under various educational expense categories. The curriculum may fit under:

- **Curriculum and instructional materials** — primary category for most ESA programs; the curriculum is documented instructional material
- **Educational software and digital resources** — applicable framing if the program treats digital curriculum separately from print materials
- **Tutoring and instructional support** — applicable if a parent, microschool facilitator, or contracted educator delivers the curriculum to the student
- **Educational classes or programs** — applicable if the curriculum is delivered as part of a microschool, homeschool co-op, after-school program, or library program

The right category depends on your specific ESA program's structure and definitions. Consult your program's allowable expense list or program administrator for the right framing.

Implementation evidence

ESA programs often require documented evidence that purchased materials were used educationally. The Pilot Kit produces several evidence artifacts naturally:

Student work portfolio: By the end of the curriculum, each student has produced: - An AI Concept Map (Lesson 1) - A Source Verification Log entry (Lesson 2) - A Media Analysis (Lesson 3) - An AI Use Disclosure (Lesson 4) - A Civic Issue Brief (Lesson 5)

These are concrete artifacts that demonstrate educational use. Photograph or scan these and keep them in your student's homeschool portfolio.

Educator records: - Lessons taught (date, lesson number, time spent) - Notes on student engagement and learning - Pilot Feedback Form (also documented in the Pilot Feedback Form)

Standards alignment documentation: - Standards Alignment Matrix (the Standards Alignment Matrix) shows the specific Florida standards the curriculum addresses - Suitable to include as supporting documentation for ESA applications

Optional completion record: - The Pilot Kit does not include a pre-formatted Certificate of Completion artifact. Families who want one for their records may create a simple completion record themselves (date the pilot was completed, lessons taught, student name, educator name and signature). The full curriculum (Phase 2 nine-week module / Phase 3 full-year edition) is planned to include a formatted Student Portfolio System with a Certificate of Completion artifact.

Common ESA reviewer questions, with suggested answers

"Is this an approved curriculum?"

The Pilot Kit is published instructional material with documented standards alignment. ESA programs typically do not maintain pre-approved curriculum lists at the curriculum-by-curriculum level; instead, they evaluate whether purchased materials serve educational purposes for the student. The standards alignment documentation provides the evidence reviewers look for.

"What grade level is this for?"

Grades 6 through 9 (middle school plus early high school transition). Reading level calibrated to Florida B.E.S.T. ELA grades 6–8.

"Does the curriculum require specialized software or equipment?"

No. The default delivery requires only a browser-capable device. No installations are required for the core curriculum. An optional installation extension exists for students with capable home setups; it is not required.

"Does the curriculum collect or share student data?"

No. The curriculum collects no student data. See the Data Privacy Statement for full documentation.

"How is the curriculum aligned to Florida standards?"

Aligned to current Florida B.E.S.T. Computer Science Standards (July 2024 revision), Florida Civics and Government Standards (notably SS.7.CG.2.8 / 2.9 / 2.10 at grade 7, with grade 8 SS.8.CG extensions), and Florida B.E.S.T. ELA Standards at the middle school level. See the Standards Alignment Matrix for per-lesson alignment with confirmed benchmark codes and source URLs.

“What evidence will the family produce?”

Student work portfolio (AI Concept Map, Source Verification Log, Media Analysis, AI Use Disclosure, Civic Issue Brief) and educator records (lessons taught, dates, notes). Families may also create an informal completion record for their files; the curriculum does not include a pre-formatted Certificate of Completion in the Pilot Kit phase. All artifacts are produced through the normal course of the curriculum.

Recommendations for the application process

Before purchasing: 1. Read your ESA program’s current allowable expense list 2. If digital/software-format curriculum has specific requirements, verify the curriculum format meets them 3. If pre-approval is required for new curriculum items, submit the curriculum summary and standards alignment matrix for pre-approval 4. Save all relevant program documentation for your records

During implementation: 1. Keep dated records of lessons taught 2. Photograph or scan student work artifacts as they are produced 3. Have the student keep their own portfolio of completed work 4. Note any deviation from the standard curriculum (e.g., if you modify pacing or add supplementary materials)

After implementation: 1. Compile the student work portfolio 2. Prepare a brief written summary (1–2 pages) of what was taught and what was learned 3. If your records benefit from one, create an informal completion record (date, lessons taught, student name, educator signature) — the Pilot Kit does not include a pre-formatted Certificate of Completion 4. Submit the reimbursement application according to your ESA program’s instructions 5. Keep all documentation for the program’s required retention period

If your ESA reimbursement application is denied or questioned

If your application is denied or a reviewer requests additional documentation:

1. Read the specific reason for the denial or request carefully
2. The most common reason for denial is incomplete documentation; review the Standards Alignment Matrix, the student work portfolio, and the educator records to ensure all are included
3. If the question is about the curriculum’s nature or purpose, the curriculum summary and Standards Alignment Matrix are the primary supporting documents
4. If the question is about specific allowable expense categories, consult your program administrator directly
5. If you believe the denial is in error, your ESA program has an appeals process; consult the program documentation

For questions specifically about the curriculum that arise during your application: contact CivicOS Labs at civicoslabs.com with the specific question and reviewer feedback. We can provide additional documentation as needed.

A note on Pilot Kit pricing

The Florida Pilot Kit is currently free during the pilot phase. For families using ESA funds, the pilot phase represents an opportunity to evaluate the curriculum at no cost; reimbursement-eligible purchases would apply to the paid curriculum versions when those become available.

Proposed 2026 launch anchors for post-pilot products are:

- Phase 2 nine-week module: \$149 family license, \$495 single-teacher classroom license, \$1,995 school site license
- Phase 3 semester/full-year edition: \$349 family digital license, \$895 single-teacher classroom license, \$39 per student workbook/text, \$4,995 school site license
- District, LMS, SCORM, professional-development, printed-materials, and commercial-use pricing: quoted separately

See Institutional Pricing Information for the full draft pricing menu, referral-credit policy, and license notes. Final reimbursement determinations rest with the Scholarship Funding Organization or program reviewer, not with CivicOS Labs.

Verification reminder

This guide is based on Family Empowerment Scholarship and related Florida ESA program documentation as of May 2026. Florida ESA programs change. Verify current rules at:

- <https://www.fldoe.org/schools/school-choice/k-12-scholarship-programs/fes/>
- <https://www.stepupforstudents.org/> (program administrator for FES)
- Your specific scholarship program’s official documentation

If you discover the rules have changed in ways that affect this guide, please flag the change through the Pilot Feedback Form so we can update the documentation for future families.

This guide is informational and supports educational documentation; it is not legal or financial advice. Verify all program rules with official Florida sources before relying on this guide for purchasing or reimbursement decisions.

ESA Family Application Packet

Pre-filled application language a family can adapt for an ESA portal submission, plus supporting attachments.

This packet contains short-form and long-form variants of the application language for three Florida scholarship programs: **FES-UA, Step Up For Students** (which administers multiple Florida scholarships), and **FTC-PEP**. Choose the variant and program section that matches your family's situation; replace bracketed placeholders with your specifics; submit through your program's portal or paper application.

Quick guide: which variant should I use?

Use the short-form if...	Use the long-form if...
Your portal has character limits in description fields	The reviewer requested detailed standards alignment
Your reimbursement amount is small or routine	Your reimbursement amount is larger and warrants documentation
Your program has a streamlined approval flow	Your program requires curriculum review prior to purchase
You're attaching the Reviewer Evidence Packet	You're submitting standards alignment as part of the family application itself

When in doubt, submit the short-form first. If the reviewer asks for more, attach the long-form.

Common information across both variants

These items are required in nearly every ESA application; have them ready before you start:

- **Curriculum title:** *The Open Source Student — Florida Educator's Edition* (Florida Pilot Kit)
- **Publisher:** CivicOS Labs, LLC
- **Curriculum version:** v1.0 — Florida Pilot Kit (released May 2026)
- **License:** Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0); commercial license available separately if needed for your situation
- **Cost:** Pilot Kit free during pilot phase. Proposed 2026 post-pilot launch anchors for paid products: Phase 2 from \$149 family / up to \$495 single-teacher classroom / \$1,995 school site; Phase 3 from approximately \$349 family digital / up to \$895 single-teacher classroom / \$39 student workbook-text / \$4,995 school site. Final reimbursement determination rests with the Scholarship Funding Organization or program reviewer.
- **Grade levels served:** 6 through 9 (ages 11 through 15)
- **Hours of instruction:** Approximately 5–6 hours of student-facing time (Lessons 1–4 are ~45 minutes core each; Lesson 5 is 60–75 minutes core as a capstone project; per-lesson independent student work adds 20–30 minutes per lesson)
- **Standards alignment frameworks:** Florida B.E.S.T. Computer Science (July 2024 revision), Florida Civics and Government (grade 7 with grade 8 extensions), Florida B.E.S.T. ELA (grades 6–8)
- **Student artifacts produced (curriculum portfolio):** AI Concept Map, Source Verification Log, Media Analysis, AI Use Disclosure, Civic Issue Brief
- **Source for full standards alignment:** the Standards Alignment Matrix (v3.3; benchmark verification 2026-05-15; M/J Language Arts 2/3, Digital Discoveries, and current M/J Intensive Reading support course-code hardening 2026-05-17)

Section A — FES-UA Application Language

The Family Empowerment Scholarship for Students with Unique Abilities (FES-UA) is for Florida students who have an IEP or a qualifying disability diagnosis. **Per FDOE, a 504 plan alone is not sufficient for FES-UA eligibility.** FES-UA allows broad expense categories including curriculum, instructional materials, tutoring, and educational therapies. Step Up For Students and AAA Scholarship Foundation are the administering organizations.

Verify current FES-UA eligibility criteria, qualifying disability list, and expense rules at: <https://www.fldoe.org/schools/school-choice/k-12-scholarship-programs/fes/> (see FES-UA FAQs at <https://www.fldoe.org/core/fileparse.php/18766/urlt/FES-UA-FAQs.pdf>) and your administering organization's portal.

Short-form (FES-UA)

Use this in description fields with character limits, or for routine reimbursement requests under standard category amounts.

Item: *The Open Source Student — Florida Educator's Edition* (Florida Pilot Kit), v1.0 — May 2026

Category: Instructional materials and curriculum

Educational purpose: Standards-aligned middle school civic technology curriculum teaching artificial intelligence literacy, source verification, media analysis, privacy and ethics, and civic problem-solving. Aligned to Florida B.E.S.T. Computer Science Standards (July 2024 revision), Florida Civics and Government Standards SS.7.CG.2.8 / 2.9 / 2.10 plus grade 8 extensions, and Florida B.E.S.T. ELA Standards for grades 6–8. Five lessons (~5–6 hours total instruction) with student portfolio artifacts (AI Concept Map, Source Verification Log, Media Analysis, AI Use Disclosure, Civic Issue Brief).

Student name: [child's name]

Student grade level / IEP designation: [as applicable]

How materials will support the student's IEP goals: [specific to your child — example: “supports IEP goals related to reading comprehension of informational text, written communication, source evaluation, and digital citizenship”]

Long-form (FES-UA)

Use this when the reviewer requests detailed standards alignment, when reimbursement amounts warrant documentation, or for IEP-team curriculum review.

Curriculum: *The Open Source Student — Florida Educator's Edition* — Florida Pilot Kit v1.0 (May 2026) **Publisher:** CivicOS Labs, LLC **License:** Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0

Description. *The Open Source Student — Florida Educator's Edition* is a standards-aligned civic technology curriculum for middle school students (primary audience: grades 6–8; grade 9 usable as early high school transition or enrichment but not separately standards-mapped). It teaches students to understand artificial intelligence and its limitations, verify information against reliable sources, analyze media and identify bias, protect privacy and use AI ethically, and apply technology to civic problem-solving with evidence and public purpose. The curriculum's substantive design connects AI literacy with civic literacy: the same skills that protect students from misinformation also prepare them for informed civic participation.

Standards alignment. The curriculum aligns with three Florida standards frameworks at the middle school level:

- **Florida B.E.S.T. Computer Science Standards (grades 6–8, July 2024 revision)** — primary technical alignment across multiple strands. Confirmed benchmark anchors include: Emerging Technologies (SC.6.ET.2.1, SC.6.ET.2.2, SC.7.ET.2.1, SC.8.ET.2.1, SC.8.ET.2.2 — AI characteristics, benefits, applications, and intelligent behavior); Programming and Software Engineering (SC.8.PE.3.3 — “Evaluate the benefits and limitations of the use of models,” anchoring critical evaluation of AI as a model); Personal Health and Safety (SC.7.HS.1.4, SC.7.HS.1.6, SC.7.HS.1.7, SC.8.HS.1.2, SC.8.HS.3.2 — privacy, safety, digital media influence on behavior); Cyber Security (SC.7.CS.1.1, SC.7.CS.3.3, SC.8.CS.2.1, SC.8.CS.2.3 — data states, vulnerabilities, network privacy, data permanency); Technological Impact (SC.7.TI.1.3, SC.7.TI.2.1, SC.7.TI.2.2, SC.7.TI.2.4, SC.8.TI.2.2 — media influence, ethical/responsible technology use, civic engagement via government websites); Computing Components (SC.8.CO.3.1 — “Compare the benefits and limitations of desktop applications and their complimentary online subscription version,” anchoring the curriculum's local-vs-cloud privacy framing); Communication and Collaboration (SC.7.CC.2.2 — research-informed digital artifact creation).
- **Florida Civics and Government Standards (grade 7 with grade 8 extensions)** — co-primary alignment. Grade 7 anchors include SS.7.CG.2.8 (“Examine the impact of media, individuals, and interest groups on monitoring and influencing government”), SS.7.CG.2.9 (“Analyze media and political communications and identify examples of bias, symbolism and propaganda”), and SS.7.CG.2.10 (“Explain the process for citizens to address a state or local problem by researching public policy alternatives, identifying appropriate government agencies to address the issue and determining a course of action” — the primary anchor for the curriculum's Civic Tech Mini-Project capstone). Grade 8 extensions include SS.8.CG.2.2 (citizen responsibilities at local, state, national levels), SS.8.CG.2.3 (civic virtue), SS.8.CG.2.4 (civic and political participation history), and SS.8.CG.2.6 (expanded civic participation through constitutional amendments) — taught within M/J U.S. History (#2100010).
- **Florida B.E.S.T. ELA Standards (grades 6–8)** — embedded throughout. Grade 7 anchors include Reading Informational Text (ELA.7.R.2.1, R.2.4, R.3.3, R.3.4 — structure, argument, comparative reading, rhetoric); Communication (ELA.7.C.1.3 argument, ELA.7.C.2.1 oral, ELA.7.C.4.1 research, ELA.7.C.5.1 multimedia, ELA.7.C.5.2 technology in communication — note B.E.S.T. ELA uses C-prefix for what other frameworks call Writing); Vocabulary (ELA.7.V.1.1, V.1.3); K-12 ELA Expectations (ELA.K12.EE.4.1 collaborative discussion, ELA.K12.EE.6.1 voice and tone). Parallel codes exist at grades 6 and 8.

Per-benchmark, per-lesson alignment with confirmed public CPALMS / FDOE source URLs is documented in the Standards Alignment Matrix (v3.3). Benchmark codes were verified on 2026-05-15; the M/J Language Arts 2/3, M/J Grade 6/7/8 Digital Discoveries, and current M/J Intensive Reading support course-code items were closed on 2026-05-17. No codes are speculative.

Florida course code fit. The curriculum supplements multiple Florida middle school courses, including: M/J Navigating Technology: Digital Literacy and Digital Citizenship (#0200024), M/J Grade 6/7/8 Digital Discoveries (#0200021 / #0200022 / #0200023), M/J Civics (#2106010), M/J Civics and Digital Technologies (#2106029), M/J Language Arts 1/2/3 (#1001010 / #1001040 / #1001070), and M/J Civics & Career Planning (#2106016).

Instructional structure. Five paired lessons (Teacher Edition + Student Edition for each). Lessons 1–4 each provide ~45 minutes of core instruction plus ~20–25 minutes of independent student work; Lesson 5 (the Civic Tech Mini-Project capstone) is 60–75 minutes of core instruction plus 30+ minutes of project completion time. Combined student-facing time totals approximately 5–6 hours. Alternative paces (one-week intensive, two-week relaxed, five-week after-school program, weekend microschool intensive) are documented in the curriculum's pacing guide.

Student artifacts (portfolio). Five artifacts demonstrate student learning: AI Concept Map (Lesson 1), Source Verification Log (Lesson 2), Media Analysis (Lesson 3), AI Use Disclosure (Lesson 4), Civic Issue Brief (Lesson 5). Each artifact has a defined rubric in the Teacher Edition and serves as evidence of standards mastery.

IEP support. The curriculum's Differentiation Notes document explicit accommodations for common IEP categories including reading-level differentiation (Lexile range 1050L–1200L with grade-level scaffolding), processing-time accommodations, multi-modal access (visual, auditory, kinesthetic options), and assistive technology compatibility. Full accessibility documentation is in the Accessibility Statement.

Privacy. The curriculum collects no student data and operates no infrastructure that would create or store student records. Full privacy documentation is in the Data Privacy Statement.

How this curriculum supports my child's IEP goals: [family-specific narrative — example: “[Child's name]'s IEP includes goals related to reading grade-level informational text with comprehension, written communication with claim and evidence, source evaluation in research contexts, and digital citizenship. The five lessons of the Florida Pilot Kit directly exercise each of these areas through structured activities with student artifacts that demonstrate progress.”]

Section B — Step Up For Students Portal Application Language

Step Up For Students (SUFS) administers most Florida choice scholarships, including FES-EO, FES-UA, FTC, and FTC-PEP. The SUFS family portal has its own format conventions. The language below is structured for typical SUFS portal fields.

Verify current SUFS submission requirements at: <https://www.stepupforstudents.org>

Short-form (SUFS portal)

Provider / Vendor name: CivicOS Labs, LLC

Item description: *The Open Source Student — Florida Educator’s Edition — Florida Pilot Kit v1.0.* Five-lesson middle school civic technology curriculum teaching AI literacy, source verification, media analysis, privacy/ethics, and civic problem-solving. Aligned to Florida B.E.S.T. CS Standards (July 2024 revision), Florida Civics SS.7.CG.2.8 / 2.9 / 2.10, and Florida B.E.S.T. ELA grades 6–8. License: CC BY-NC-SA 4.0.

Expense category: Curriculum and instructional materials

Student grade and educational setting: [grade] / [homeschool / microschool / private school / other]

How this supports my student’s education: [brief — 1–2 sentences specific to your situation]

Long-form (SUFS portal — for larger reimbursements or curriculum review)

Same as the FES-UA long-form above, with these SUFS-specific notes added:

Curriculum source: Available directly from CivicOS Labs (<https://civicoslabs.com>). The Florida Pilot Kit is currently free during the pilot phase. Proposed post-pilot launch anchors are \$149 for the Phase 2 family license, up to \$495 for the Phase 2 single-teacher classroom license, \$1,995 for the Phase 2 school site license, approximately \$349 for the Phase 3 family digital license, up to \$895 for the Phase 3 single-teacher classroom license, \$39 per student workbook/text, and \$4,995 for the Phase 3 school site license. District, LMS, SCORM, printed-materials, professional-development, and commercial-use pricing are quoted separately.

Provider verification: A pre-purchase eligibility letter is available from CivicOS Labs on request — request the Pre-Purchase Eligibility Letter for vendor documentation. Detailed standards alignment evidence is available in the Reviewer Evidence Packet.

Submission attachments: Standards Alignment Matrix v3.3 (the Standards Alignment Matrix) — recommended attachment for any reimbursement request involving substantial curriculum review. Pre-Purchase Eligibility Letter — recommended for any program requiring vendor pre-approval.

Section C — FTC-PEP Application Language

The Florida Tax Credit Scholarship Personalized Education Program (FTC-PEP) is a newer scholarship (created 2023) designed for students who are not enrolled full-time in a public or private school and instead receive their education in a non-traditional setting (homeschool, microschool, hybrid programs). **Per FDOE and Step Up For Students, part-time private school enrollment is an eligible use category for PEP** — the program is structured around full-time non-enrollment, not total non-enrollment. FTC-PEP allows reimbursement for curriculum, instructional materials, tutoring, and similar educational expenses up to the per-student annual amount.

Verify current FTC-PEP eligibility and procedures at: <https://www.fldoe.org/schools/school-choice/k-12-scholarship-programs/ftc/pep-faqs.stml> and the Step Up For Students PEP page at <https://www.stepupforstudents.org/scholarships/personalized-education-program/>. Per-student annual amounts and eligible expense categories may change between funding years.

Short-form (FTC-PEP)

Curriculum: *The Open Source Student — Florida Educator’s Edition — Florida Pilot Kit v1.0* (May 2026)

Publisher: CivicOS Labs, LLC

Educational purpose: Standards-aligned middle school civic technology and AI literacy curriculum. Five lessons; approximately 5–6 hours of instruction. Aligned to Florida B.E.S.T. Computer Science Standards (July 2024 revision), Florida Civics and Government Standards SS.7.CG.2.8 / 2.9 / 2.10 plus grade 8 SS.8.CG extensions, and Florida B.E.S.T. ELA Standards (grades 6–8). Student artifacts: AI Concept Map, Source Verification Log, Media Analysis, AI Use Disclosure, Civic Issue Brief.

Educational setting: [homeschool / microschool / hybrid program / co-op]

License: Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0

Long-form (FTC-PEP)

Same as the FES-UA long-form above, with these FTC-PEP-specific notes added:

Setting suitability for FTC-PEP. The curriculum's design accommodates the non-school educational settings FTC-PEP students typically use:

- **Homeschool families** can run the Pilot Kit with a single educator (parent) and one student or sibling group; no specialized infrastructure required
- **Microschools and co-ops** can run the Pilot Kit with one facilitator and a small group; the lessons accommodate group sizes from 2 to ~25 students
- **Hybrid programs** can integrate the Pilot Kit as a one-week intensive unit, a five-week after-school sequence, or a weekend intensive

The curriculum includes specific implementation notes for non-classroom settings in the Teacher Quick Start and the Pacing Guide.

Documentation that supports FTC-PEP record-keeping. The five student portfolio artifacts produced by the curriculum (AI Concept Map, Source Verification Log, Media Analysis, AI Use Disclosure, Civic Issue Brief) provide concrete evidence of student work that **supports** FTC-PEP record-keeping for the curriculum-instruction component. **PEP has additional compliance obligations beyond curriculum artifacts** — notably the Student Learning Plan (SLP) and annual assessment requirements administered by Step Up For Students. The portfolio artifacts contribute to PEP documentation but do not, on their own, satisfy the program's full record/compliance expectations. The educator (parent / microschool facilitator) maintains a brief log of when each lesson was taught; the curriculum's Pilot Feedback Form template provides a structure for that log.

Recommended attachments for any application

Whichever program you apply through, these attachments strengthen the application:

1. **Standards Alignment Matrix** — the Standards Alignment Matrix. The v3.3 matrix includes benchmark verification from 2026-05-15 and course-code hardening from 2026-05-17; recommended for any submission.
2. **Pre-Purchase Eligibility Letter** — the Pre-Purchase Eligibility Letter (request the actual signed letter from CivicOS Labs via civicoslabs.com); recommended for programs that require vendor pre-approval.
3. **Reviewer Evidence Packet** — the Reviewer Evidence Packet; recommended for substantial reimbursement amounts or programs that conduct detailed curriculum review.
4. **Data Privacy Statement** — the Data Privacy Statement; recommended where the program reviewer asks about data practices.
5. **Accessibility Statement** — the Accessibility Statement; recommended for FES-UA applications and any submission where the student's IEP is relevant.

After submission: maintaining records

ESA programs typically require that families keep records demonstrating that purchased materials were actually used for the student's education. The curriculum makes this straightforward:

- **Lesson dates and duration:** Record when each of the five lessons was taught (a one-line entry per lesson is sufficient)
- **Student artifacts:** Keep the student's five portfolio artifacts (AI Concept Map, Source Verification Log, Media Analysis, AI Use Disclosure, Civic Issue Brief) — these are the work products the curriculum produces
- **Receipts:** Keep your CivicOS Labs receipt (or, during the pilot phase when the kit is free, a record of the pilot adopter agreement)
- **Educator log:** A brief educator log noting any adaptations made for your student is helpful for IEP-aligned reimbursements specifically

Standards information verified 2026-05-15. Verify current ESA program eligibility, expense categories, and submission procedures with your specific program before relying on this packet for purchasing decisions.

Pre-Purchase Eligibility Letter — Template

A template letter a family can request from CivicOS Labs documenting the curriculum’s structural attributes — standards alignment, instructional design, license terms — that may support review under a Florida scholarship program.

This letter is issued by CivicOS Labs on family request and may be attached to ESA portal submissions or filed with reimbursement requests where the program asks for curriculum documentation. The letter is **not a guarantee of reimbursement and not an eligibility determination**. Per FDOE guidance, Scholarship Funding Organizations (SFOs) and program reviewers determine purchase and reimbursement eligibility based on each program’s specific rules and the family’s specific situation. This letter is a structural attestation about what the curriculum is, what it teaches, and how it aligns to Florida standards — it documents curriculum-side attributes that may support the reviewer’s determination.

This file contains both:

- **Short-form variant** — one-page letter suitable for routine reimbursement attachments and for most ESA portal pre-approval submissions
- **Long-form variant** — two-to-three-page letter with full standards alignment evidence, suitable for substantial reimbursement amounts or for programs that conduct detailed curriculum review

CivicOS Labs issues the letter customized with date, family name, and student name (where the family wishes those included). Families request the letter via civicoslabs.com. CivicOS staff should follow the Eligibility Letter Fulfillment Workflow in this folder before issuing a customized letter.

How families request this letter

1. Visit civicoslabs.com and use the contact form (or email address listed there)
2. Specify which ESA program the letter is needed for (FES-UA / Step Up For Students / FTC-PEP / other)
3. Specify whether the letter should be addressed to the family generically, to the family by name, or to a specific reviewer or program contact
4. CivicOS Labs issues the letter using the standard turnaround in the Eligibility Letter Fulfillment Workflow: two business days after a complete request; one business day for accepted rush requests received before 12:00 p.m. Eastern Time; up to five business days when information is missing or program-specific review is needed
5. The letter is delivered as a PDF; families attach it to their ESA application or reimbursement request

How CivicOS Labs issues this letter

When responding to a family request, CivicOS Labs customizes the appropriate variant below by:

- Adding date of issue
- Adding family identifying information (name, student name, or both, as the family requested)
- Adding the program-specific addendum if the family identified a particular program
- Signing by an authorized CivicOS representative (Founder/Managing Member, Director of Curriculum, Director of Operations, or another written designee)
- Converting to PDF and delivering to the family

CivicOS Labs does not issue letters that make reimbursement guarantees (those are the program’s determination, not the publisher’s). The letter strictly attests to the curriculum’s structural attributes.

Short-form variant

[CivicOS Labs letterhead]

[Date of issue]

To Whom It May Concern,

This letter confirms that *The Open Source Student – Florida Educator's Edition* (Florida Pilot Kit, v1.0, May 2026) is a standards-aligned middle school civic technology curriculum published by CivicOS Labs and copyrighted by CivicOS Labs, LLC.

CURRICULUM ATTESTATION

Title:

The Open Source Student – Florida Educator's Edition (Florida Pilot Kit, v1.0)

Publisher:

CivicOS Labs

Copyright:

© 2026 CivicOS Labs, LLC

License:

Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0)

Audience:

Middle school students, grades 6 through 8; grade 9 usable as transition/enrichment without separate grade 9 benchmark alignment

Format:

Five paired lessons (Teacher Edition + Student Edition for each),

with implementation readiness packet
Hours: Approximately 5 to 6 hours of contact instruction (5 lessons × ~45 minutes core + ~25 minutes student independent work per lesson)

STANDARDS ALIGNMENT

The curriculum is aligned to current Florida standards in three frameworks:

1. Florida B.E.S.T. Computer Science Standards (grades 6–8, July 2024 revision)
2. Florida Civics and Government Standards (grade 7 with grade 8 extensions)
3. Florida B.E.S.T. ELA Standards (grades 6–8)

All benchmark codes were verified against public CPALMS and FDOE sources on 2026-05-15. Per-lesson, per-benchmark alignment with confirmed source URLs is documented in the curriculum's Standards Alignment Matrix.

EDUCATIONAL OUTPUTS

The curriculum produces five student portfolio artifacts that demonstrate student work and standards mastery:

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)

These artifacts may support ESA program record-keeping, IEP progress documentation conversations (when used together with the student's plan and provider/educator records), and homeschool portfolio submission. Eligibility and progress determinations rest with the relevant program reviewer, IEP team, or homeschool evaluator – not with this letter or with the artifacts alone.

EXPENSE CATEGORY FIT

The curriculum is designed as instructional materials and curriculum, suitable for the typical "curriculum and instructional materials" or equivalent expense category in Florida ESA programs (FES-UA, FTC-PEP, and similar).

Whether this curriculum qualifies for reimbursement under a specific ESA program in a specific family's situation is determined by the program administrator, not by this letter. This letter attests only to the curriculum's structural attributes.

Sincerely,

[Signed]
CivicOS Labs
Published by CivicOS Labs · © 2026 CivicOS Labs, LLC
civicoslabs.com

For questions about this letter, contact CivicOS Labs through the website.

Long-form variant

[CivicOS Labs letterhead]

[Date of issue]

To Whom It May Concern,

This letter confirms that *The Open Source Student – Florida Educator's Edition* (Florida Pilot Kit, v1.0, May 2026) is a standards-aligned middle school civic technology curriculum published by CivicOS Labs and copyrighted by CivicOS Labs, LLC. This letter is provided in support of an ESA reimbursement application, vendor pre-approval submission, or institutional adoption review.

CURRICULUM ATTESTATION

Title: The Open Source Student – Florida Educator's Edition (Florida Pilot Kit, v1.0)
Publisher: CivicOS Labs
Copyright: © 2026 CivicOS Labs, LLC
License: Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0)
Audience: Middle school students, grades 6 through 8; grade 9 usable as transition/enrichment without separate grade 9 benchmark alignment
Reading Level: Calibrated for Florida B.E.S.T. ELA grades 6–8 (Lexile range

approximately 1050L to 1200L)

Format: Five paired lessons (Teacher Edition + Student Edition for each), with comprehensive implementation readiness packet (Teacher Quick Start, Administrator Overview, Principal & Superintendent Forward Packet, IT Approval Checklist, Parent/Guardian Letter, Student AI Use Agreement, Accessibility Statement, Data Privacy Statement, Pilot Feedback Form, ESA Documentation Guide, and ESA Templates subdirectory)

Hours: Approximately 5 to 6 hours of contact instruction

Pacing: Multiple options – one-week intensive, two-week relaxed, five-week after-school program, weekend microschool intensive

CURRICULUM SUBSTANCE

The curriculum teaches middle school students to:

1. Understand artificial intelligence – what it actually is, what it can do, where it fails (Lesson 1)
2. Verify AI claims and other information against reliable sources (Lesson 2)
3. Read across multiple media sources critically and identify bias (Lesson 3)
4. Use AI ethically, protect privacy, maintain academic integrity (Lesson 4)
5. Apply all of the above to a real local or state civic issue (Lesson 5)

The substantive design connects AI literacy with civic literacy: the same skills that protect students from misinformation also prepare them for informed civic participation.

DETAILED STANDARDS ALIGNMENT

The curriculum is aligned to current Florida standards in three frameworks. All benchmark codes below have been verified against public CPALMS and FDOE sources as of 2026-05-15. Per-lesson, per-benchmark alignment with confirmed source URLs is documented in the curriculum's Standards Alignment Matrix v3.3.

1. FLORIDA B.E.S.T. COMPUTER SCIENCE STANDARDS (grades 6–8, July 2024 revision). Confirmed benchmark anchors include:
 - Emerging Technologies: SC.6.ET.2.1, SC.6.ET.2.2, SC.7.ET.2.1, SC.8.ET.2.1, SC.8.ET.2.2 (AI characteristics, benefits, applications, intelligent behavior)
 - Programming and Software Engineering: SC.8.PE.3.3 ("Evaluate the benefits and limitations of the use of models")
 - Personal Health and Safety: SC.7.HS.1.4, SC.7.HS.1.6, SC.7.HS.1.7, SC.8.HS.1.2, SC.8.HS.3.2 (privacy, safety, digital media influence)
 - Cyber Security: SC.7.CS.1.1, SC.7.CS.3.3, SC.8.CS.2.1, SC.8.CS.2.3 (data states, vulnerabilities, network privacy, data permanency)
 - Technological Impact: SC.7.TI.1.3, SC.7.TI.2.1, SC.7.TI.2.2, SC.7.TI.2.4, SC.8.TI.2.2 (media influence, ethical/responsible use, civic engagement via government websites)
 - Computing Components: SC.8.CO.3.1 (desktop applications vs. complementary online subscription version – anchoring local-vs-cloud privacy framing)
 - Communication and Collaboration: SC.7.CC.2.2 (research-informed digital artifact creation)
2. FLORIDA CIVICS AND GOVERNMENT STANDARDS (grade 7 with grade 8 extensions). Grade 7 anchors:
 - SS.7.CG.2.8: "Examine the impact of media, individuals, and interest groups on monitoring and influencing government"
 - SS.7.CG.2.9: "Analyze media and political communications and identify examples of bias, symbolism and propaganda"
 - SS.7.CG.2.10: "Explain the process for citizens to address a state or local problem by researching public policy alternatives, identifying appropriate government agencies to address the issue and determining a course of action" (primary anchor for the Civic Tech Mini-Project)

Grade 8 extensions (taught within M/J U.S. History #2100010):

 - SS.8.CG.2.2 (citizen responsibilities at local, state, national levels)
 - SS.8.CG.2.3 (civic virtue)
 - SS.8.CG.2.4 (civic and political participation history)
 - SS.8.CG.2.6 (expanded civic participation through constitutional amendments)
3. FLORIDA B.E.S.T. ELA STANDARDS (grades 6–8). Grade 7 anchors (parallels at grades 6 and 8):
 - Reading Informational Text: ELA.7.R.2.1, R.2.4, R.3.3, R.3.4 (structure, argument, comparative, rhetoric)
 - Communication: ELA.7.C.1.3 (argument), C.2.1 (oral), C.4.1 (research), C.5.1 (multimedia), C.5.2 (digital tools) – note B.E.S.T. ELA uses C-prefix for what other frameworks call Writing

- Vocabulary: ELA.7.V.1.1, V.1.3
- K-12 ELA Expectations: ELA.K12.EE.4.1 (collaborative discussion), ELA.K12.EE.6.1 (voice and tone)

FLORIDA COURSE CODE FIT

The curriculum supplements multiple Florida middle school courses, including:

- M/J Navigating Technology: Digital Literacy and Digital Citizenship (#0200024)
- M/J Grade 6 Digital Discoveries (#0200021), M/J Grade 7 Digital Discoveries (#0200022), M/J Grade 8 Digital Discoveries (#0200023)
- M/J Civics (#2106010); M/J Civics, Advanced (#2106020)
- M/J Civics & Career Planning (#2106016)
- M/J Civics and Digital Technologies (#2106029)
- M/J Language Arts 1 (#1001010), M/J Language Arts 2 (#1001040), M/J Language Arts 3 (#1001070)
- M/J U.S. History (#2100010, embeds SS.8.CG benchmarks)

EDUCATIONAL OUTPUTS (PORTFOLIO)

The curriculum produces five student portfolio artifacts that demonstrate student work and standards mastery, suitable for ESA program record-keeping, IEP progress documentation, and homeschool portfolio submission:

1. AI Concept Map (Lesson 1) – visual demonstration of conceptual understanding of AI and its limits
2. Source Verification Log (Lesson 2) – documented verification of an AI claim against multiple real sources
3. Media Analysis (Lesson 3) – structured analysis of multiple sources on a topic, identifying claim, evidence, audience, missing context, bias
4. AI Use Disclosure (Lesson 4) – honest documentation of student's own AI use practices
5. Civic Issue Brief (Lesson 5) – capstone research project on a real local or state issue, demonstrating verification, source analysis, ethical AI use, and evidence-based civic engagement

PRIVACY AND DATA PRACTICES

The curriculum collects no student data and operates no infrastructure that would create or store student records. It is published as standard text files (Markdown) that students read and work in; all student work stays within the academic environment the school or family already uses. Full privacy documentation, including FERPA review notes and Florida student data privacy considerations, is in the curriculum's Data Privacy Statement.

ACCESSIBILITY

The curriculum is designed for accessibility, including: screen reader compatibility (standard Markdown text); no essential information conveyed only by color; keyboard navigation for all activities; multiple modalities (visual, auditory, kinesthetic options); explicit IEP/504 differentiation guidance. Full accessibility documentation is in the curriculum's Accessibility Statement.

EXPENSE CATEGORY FIT

The curriculum is designed as instructional materials and curriculum, suitable for the typical "curriculum and instructional materials" expense category in Florida ESA programs (FES-UA, FTC-PEP, and similar). It may also fit under "educational software and digital resources" or "tutoring and instructional support" depending on how the family delivers the curriculum and how the ESA program structures its categories.

LIMITATIONS OF THIS LETTER

This letter does not guarantee ESA reimbursement. Reimbursement determinations are made by the ESA program administrator based on the program's specific rules, the family's specific situation, and (in some programs) the student's IEP or educational plan. This letter attests only to the curriculum's structural attributes.

This letter is issued in May 2026 and reflects benchmark information verified on 2026-05-15 and course-code hardening verified on 2026-05-17. Florida standards and course codes undergo periodic revision; for formal adoption submissions or for reimbursement requests in subsequent funding years, families and reviewers should confirm the most current standards alignment status.

CONTACT FOR VERIFICATION

For verification of this letter or for follow-up questions about the curriculum's structural attributes:

CivicOS Labs
civicoslabs.com

The complete curriculum, including the Standards Alignment Matrix v3.3 with per-benchmark public CPALMS / FDOE source URLs, is available through the same channel.

Sincerely,

[Signed]

CivicOS Labs

Published by CivicOS Labs · © 2026 CivicOS Labs, LLC
civicoslabs.com

Program-specific addenda

When CivicOS Labs issues a letter for a specific program, one of the following addenda may be added at the end of the letter (before the signature). The family identifies the program in their request.

FES-UA addendum

ADDENDUM: FES-UA RELEVANCE

This curriculum's structural attributes may support review under the Family Empowerment Scholarship for Students with Unique Abilities (FES-UA). Per FDOE, FES-UA eligibility requires an IEP or qualifying disability diagnosis; a 504 plan alone is not sufficient. Reimbursement eligibility is determined by the SFO / program reviewer, not by this letter. Specific FES-UA-relevant curriculum attributes:

- The curriculum's Differentiation Notes document accommodations for common IEP categories including reading-level differentiation, processing-time accommodations, multi-modal access, and assistive technology compatibility
- Five student portfolio artifacts demonstrate progress on goals related to informational text comprehension, written communication, source evaluation, digital citizenship, and civic engagement
- The curriculum's accessibility design (screen reader compatibility, no color-only information, keyboard navigation, multiple modalities) supports students with a range of access needs
- The curriculum operates in any educational setting (homeschool, microschool, private school, public school) and adapts to the family's specific delivery arrangement

Step Up For Students addendum

ADDENDUM: STEP UP FOR STUDENTS PORTAL FILING

This letter is suitable for attachment in the Step Up For Students family portal as supporting documentation for a curriculum reimbursement request or provider pre-approval submission. The accompanying Standards Alignment Matrix is recommended as an additional attachment for substantive reimbursement amounts or for any submission requiring detailed curriculum review.

FTC-PEP addendum

ADDENDUM: FTC-PEP RELEVANCE

This curriculum's structural attributes may support review under the Florida Tax Credit Scholarship Personalized Education Program (FTC-PEP). Per FDOE and Step Up For Students, PEP is for students not enrolled full-time in a public or private school; part-time private enrollment is an eligible use category. PEP also imposes Student Learning Plan (SLP) and annual assessment obligations beyond curriculum-instruction documentation. Reimbursement eligibility is determined by the SFO / program reviewer, not by this letter. Specific FTC-PEP-relevant curriculum attributes:

- Designed for non-school educational settings (homeschool, microschool, hybrid programs, co-ops) – adapts to the family's chosen delivery
- Pacing options accommodate one-week intensive, multi-week relaxed, after-school program, and weekend microschool formats
- Five student portfolio artifacts provide concrete evidence of student work suitable for FTC-PEP record-keeping and progress documentation
- The educator (parent / facilitator / contracted instructor) maintains a brief lesson log; the curriculum's templates support that documentation

Maintenance and reissue

This template is current as of **2026-05-15**. CivicOS Labs reviews and updates the template when:

- Florida standards or course codes are revised by FDOE
- Florida ESA program rules or expense categories change materially
- The curriculum version changes (Phase 2 nine-week module, Phase 3 full-year edition)

Families who received an earlier version of this letter and need a current version may request reissue through civicoslabs.com.

Standards information verified 2026-05-15. CivicOS Labs issues customized letters on family request via civicoslabs.com.

Reviewer Evidence Packet

Documentation aimed at the ESA program reviewer evaluating an application or reimbursement request involving this curriculum.

This packet is intended for ESA program staff (Step Up For Students reviewers, FES-UA case managers, FTC-PEP reviewers, AAA Scholarship Foundation reviewers, and similar). It distills the curriculum's standards alignment, instructional structure, student outputs, and verification provenance into a form designed for review efficiency.

The packet contains both:

- **Short-form variant** — one-to-two-page summary suitable for rapid review and routine reimbursement determinations
- **Long-form variant** — full standards-alignment evidence with confirmed public CPALMS / FDOE source URLs, suitable for detailed review of substantial reimbursement amounts or for programs that conduct curriculum-level evaluation prior to approval

Either variant can stand alone, or both can be submitted together with the short-form serving as an executive summary atop the long-form.

Short-form variant — one-page reviewer summary

What this curriculum is

The Open Source Student — Florida Educator's Edition is a five-lesson middle school civic technology curriculum published by CivicOS Labs, LLC, released May 2026. It teaches students grades 6–8 (primary audience; grade 9 usable as early high school transition or enrichment but not separately standards-mapped) to understand artificial intelligence, verify information against reliable sources, analyze media critically, use AI ethically and protect privacy, and apply technology to civic problem-solving. Approximately 5–6 hours of student-facing time. Licensed under Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0.

Standards alignment (summary)

Aligned to three current Florida standards frameworks at the middle school level. All benchmark codes verified against public CPALMS / FDOE sources on **2026-05-15**:

- **Florida B.E.S.T. Computer Science Standards (grades 6–8, July 2024 revision)** — primary technical alignment across Emerging Technologies (incl. AI benchmarks SC.6/7/8.ET.2), Programming and Software Engineering (SC.8.PE.3.3 model limits), Personal Health and Safety, Cyber Security, Technological Impact, Computing Components (SC.8.CO.3.1 desktop-vs-cloud), Communication and Collaboration
- **Florida Civics and Government Standards** — grade 7 anchors SS.7.CG.2.8, SS.7.CG.2.9, SS.7.CG.2.10 (with SS.7.CG.2.10 the primary anchor for the Civic Tech Mini-Project capstone); grade 8 extensions SS.8.CG.2.2 / 2.3 / 2.4 / 2.6 (taught within M/J U.S. History #2100010)
- **Florida B.E.S.T. ELA Standards (grades 6–8)** — embedded throughout reading informational text, communication (B.E.S.T. uses C-prefix for argument and research), vocabulary, and K-12 ELA Expectations for collaborative discussion

Per-benchmark, per-lesson alignment with confirmed public CPALMS / FDOE source URLs is documented in the curriculum's Standards Alignment Matrix v3.3 (the Standards Alignment Matrix).

Florida course code fit

Supplements multiple Florida middle school courses, including: M/J Navigating Technology (#0200024); M/J Grade 6/7/8 Digital Discoveries (#0200021 / #0200022 / #0200023); M/J Civics (#2106010); M/J Civics, Advanced (#2106020); M/J Civics & Career Planning (#2106016); M/J Civics and Digital Technologies (#2106029); M/J Language Arts 1/2/3 (#1001010 / #1001040 / #1001070); M/J U.S. History (#2100010, embeds SS.8.CG benchmarks).

Student outputs (portfolio artifacts)

Five distinct student work products, each with a defined rubric in the Teacher Edition:

1. **AI Concept Map** (Lesson 1) — visual evidence of conceptual understanding
2. **Source Verification Log** (Lesson 2) — documented verification of an AI claim against multiple real sources
3. **Media Analysis** (Lesson 3) — structured analysis of multiple sources on a topic
4. **AI Use Disclosure** (Lesson 4) — honest documentation of student's AI use practices
5. **Civic Issue Brief** (Lesson 5) — capstone research project on a real local or state issue

These artifacts serve as evidence of standards mastery suitable for ESA record-keeping, IEP progress documentation, and homeschool portfolio submission.

Privacy and accessibility

The curriculum collects no student data and operates no infrastructure that would create or store student records (full documentation: the Data Privacy Statement). Designed for accessibility including screen reader compatibility, no color-only information, keyboard navigation, multiple modalities, and explicit IEP/504 differentiation guidance (the Accessibility Statement).

Reviewer's quick verification path

If you want to verify any claim in this summary against the public source:

- **Standards alignment:** open the Standards Alignment Matrix v3.3; each benchmark row links to a public CPALMS or FDOE source
- **Course codes:** verify course codes in the relevant CPALMS course preview pages or in the FDOE 2025–26 Course Code Directory at <https://www.fldoe.org/policy/articulation/ccd/>
- **License terms:** Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0, full text at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/>
- **Publisher:** CivicOS Labs, LLC; contact via civicoslabs.com

Reviewer’s quick determination questions

- Does the program reimburse “curriculum and instructional materials”? → Yes is the typical fit
- Does the program require Florida standards alignment? → The Standards Alignment Matrix v3.3 documents per-benchmark alignment with public CPALMS / FDOE source URLs
- Does the program require evidence of student work? → Five portfolio artifacts are the structural output
- Does the program have IEP-specific requirements? → Differentiation Notes and Accessibility Statement document accommodations
- Does the program have data privacy concerns? → The curriculum collects no student data; Data Privacy Statement provides full documentation

Long-form variant — full standards alignment evidence

Verification provenance

All standards information is sourced from the curriculum’s Standards Alignment Matrix v3.3 (the Standards Alignment Matrix). Benchmark verification was completed on **2026-05-15** against public CPALMS and FDOE sources; M/J Language Arts 2/3, M/J Grade 6/7/8 Digital Discoveries, and current M/J Intensive Reading support course-code hardening was completed on **2026-05-17** against official public FDOE / CPALMS sources. The verification pass included:

- Confirmation of every benchmark code against either the official Florida B.E.S.T. CS Standards PDF, the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards PDF, the B.E.S.T. Social Studies Standards Book, the FDOE 6-8 Civics Instructional Guide (Updated February 2026), or the relevant CPALMS individual standard preview page
- Confirmation of every primary course code against either the FDOE 2025–26 Course Code Directory, the FDOE 2025–26 student database update list, or CPALMS public related-course listings
- Honest disclosure of substance-match limits (specifically: Florida B.E.S.T. CS does not use the term “hallucination” but covers the substance under SC.8.PE.3.3; B.E.S.T. ELA underspecifies citation conventions by placing them in the Conventions Progression Chart appendix rather than in numbered benchmarks)
- Closure of the prior course-code caveats for M/J Language Arts 2/3, M/J Grade 6/7/8 Digital Discoveries, and current M/J Intensive Reading support lanes. The older M/J Reading 1/2/3 sequence is documented as terminated and is not used as a current adoption lane.

CPALMS and the FDOE Course Code Directory are public resources — no subscription required. Reviewer verification of any code can be performed against the URLs documented in the matrix.

Detailed standards alignment by lesson

The curriculum has five lessons, each with multiple confirmed benchmark anchors. Below is the per-lesson alignment with the primary anchors highlighted; the full per-benchmark table with official benchmark text and source URLs is in the Standards Alignment Matrix v3.3.

Lesson 1: What AI Is and Is Not

Standards anchored: Florida B.E.S.T. CS (Emerging Technologies — SC.6.ET.2.1, SC.6.ET.2.2, SC.7.ET.2.1, SC.8.ET.2.1, SC.8.ET.2.2 for AI characteristics, benefits, applications, and intelligent behavior; **Programming and Software Engineering — SC.8.PE.3.3 “Evaluate the benefits and limitations of the use of models” as the primary substance fit for the lesson’s “what AI is not good at” content**; Communication and Collaboration — SC.7.CC.2.2; Computing Components — SC.7.CO.2.2). Florida Civics **SS.7.CG.2.9 primary** (introduced through hallucination + verification framing). Florida B.E.S.T. ELA (Reading Informational Text — ELA.7.R.2.1; Vocabulary — ELA.7.V.1.1, V.1.3; Communication — ELA.7.C.2.1; K-12 ELA Expectations — ELA.K12.EE.4.1).

Student artifact: AI Concept Map demonstrating conceptual understanding.

Lesson 2: Verifying AI Answers With Sources

Standards anchored: Florida B.E.S.T. CS (Emerging Technologies — SC.7.ET.2.1; **Programming and Software Engineering — SC.8.PE.3.3 as primary substance fit because verification IS the model-limits evaluation practice**; Personal Health and Safety — SC.7.HS.1.4, SC.7.HS.1.6; Communication and Collaboration — SC.7.CC.2.2). Florida Civics **SS.7.CG.2.9 primary** (analyzing media for bias, symbolism, propaganda); SS.7.CG.2.8 introduced. Florida B.E.S.T. ELA (Reading — ELA.7.R.2.4; **Communication — ELA.7.C.4.1 primary** “conduct research drawing on multiple reliable and valid sources”; Vocabulary — ELA.7.V.1.1; K-12 EE — ELA.K12.EE.4.1).

Student artifact: Source Verification Log documenting verification of an AI claim against multiple real sources.

Lesson 3: Media Bias, Claims, and Digital Persuasion

Standards anchored: Florida B.E.S.T. CS (**Technological Impact — SC.7.TI.1.3 “Identify how media is used to influence information” as strong primary fit**; Personal Health and Safety — SC.7.HS.1.7, SC.8.HS.3.2). Florida Civics **SS.7.CG.2.9 primary**; SS.7.CG.2.8 continued; SS.8.CG.2.4 grade 8 extension (taught within M/J U.S. History). Florida B.E.S.T. ELA (Reading — ELA.7.R.2.4 argument, R.3.3 comparative, R.3.4 rhetoric; Communication — ELA.7.C.1.3 argument; Vocabulary — ELA.7.V.1.1; K-12 EE — ELA.K12.EE.4.1, EE.6.1).

Student artifact: Media Analysis applying a six-question framework across multiple sources on a topic.

Lesson 4: Privacy, Ethics, and Academic Integrity

Standards anchored: Florida B.E.S.T. CS (Personal Health and Safety — SC.7.HS.1.4, SC.7.HS.1.6, SC.7.HS.1.7, **SC.8.HS.1.2 strong primary** “Develop procedures to protect personal information while accessing the Internet”; Cyber Security — SC.7.CS.1.1 data states, SC.7.CS.3.3 vulnerabilities, SC.8.CS.2.1 network privacy, SC.8.CS.2.3 data permanency including “Right to be Forgotten”; Technological Impact — SC.7.TI.2.1, **SC.7.TI.2.2 strong primary** “Describe and model responsible use of modern communication media and devices”, SC.7.TI.2.4 ethical use of collected data; **Computing Components — SC.8.CO.3.1 strong primary** “Compare the benefits and limitations of desktop applications and their complimentary online subscription version” anchoring the local-AI-vs-cloud-AI privacy framing). Florida Civics SS.8.CG.2.2 responsibilities, SS.8.CG.2.3 civic virtue (taught within M/J U.S. History). Florida B.E.S.T. ELA (Communication — ELA.7.C.1.3; Vocabulary — ELA.7.V.1.1; K-12 EE — ELA.K12.EE.4.1, EE.6.1).

Student artifact: AI Use Disclosure documenting the student’s own AI use practices honestly.

Lesson 5: Civic Tech Mini-Project (capstone)

Standards anchored: Florida Civics **SS.7.CG.2.10 PRIMARY — near-verbatim benchmark match:** the benchmark text reads “*Explain the process for citizens to address a state or local problem by researching public policy alternatives, identifying appropriate government agencies to address the issue and determining a course of action,*” which is essentially a description of the Civic Tech Mini-Project’s five-step structure. Also: SS.7.CG.2.9 continued, SS.7.CG.2.8 continued, SS.8.CG.2.2 + SS.8.CG.2.6 (grade 8 extensions). Florida B.E.S.T. CS (**Technological Impact — SC.8.TI.2.2 “Use a local or federal government website to engage with a public official” as near-perfect fit**, SC.7.TI.2.2 responsible communication-media use; Emerging Technologies — SC.7.ET.2.1; Communication and Collaboration — SC.7.CC.2.2). Florida B.E.S.T. ELA (Communication — ELA.7.C.1.3 argument, C.4.1 research, C.2.1 oral, C.5.1 multimedia, C.5.2 digital tools; Reading — ELA.7.R.3.3 comparative; Vocabulary — ELA.7.V.1.1; K-12 EE — ELA.K12.EE.4.1).

Student artifact: Civic Issue Brief — capstone research project on a real local or state civic issue, demonstrating verification, source analysis, ethical AI use, and evidence-based civic engagement.

Cross-reference: standards coverage across lessons

The curriculum exercises Florida B.E.S.T. ELA Vocabulary (V.1.1) and K-12 ELA Expectations (EE.4.1) in **all five lessons**. Florida B.E.S.T. CS Emerging Technologies and Programming/Software Engineering anchors appear in Lessons 1 and 2. Florida B.E.S.T. CS Personal Health and Safety, Technological Impact, and Cyber Security anchors cluster in Lessons 2, 3, and 4. Florida Civics SS.7.CG.2.8, 2.9, 2.10 distribute across Lessons 2, 3, and 5 with SS.7.CG.2.10 primary in Lesson 5. Grade 8 SS.8.CG extensions appear in Lessons 3, 4, and 5.

The full cross-reference table is in the Standards Alignment Matrix v3.3.

Hours of instruction documentation

The curriculum delivers approximately **5 to 6 hours of contact instruction** total:

- Lessons 1–4: ~45 minutes core instruction each (180 minutes total)
- Lesson 5 (Civic Tech Mini-Project capstone): 60–75 minutes core instruction (the project nature warrants the longer in-class time)
- Combined core: ~4 hours
- 5 lessons × 25 minutes student independent work = 125 minutes (~2 hours)
- Lesson 5 Civic Tech Mini-Project includes additional project completion time, frequently 30+ minutes beyond the standard pacing

Pacing options documented in the Pacing Guide include:

- **One-week intensive** — five consecutive school days; standard pacing
- **Two-week relaxed** — five lessons over two weeks with extended discussion / project time
- **Five-week after-school program** — one lesson per week
- **Weekend microschool intensive** — five lessons over one or two weekends

For ESA programs that document hours-of-instruction explicitly, the per-lesson timing breakdown above can be reproduced in family record-keeping logs.

Educational outputs documentation

Each of the five student portfolio artifacts has a defined rubric in the Teacher Edition. Rubric criteria are calibrated for grades 6–8 work quality (parallel codes for grades 6 and 8 documented in the matrix). The artifacts together demonstrate:

- **Conceptual understanding** (AI Concept Map — Lesson 1)
- **Information evaluation methodology** (Source Verification Log — Lesson 2)
- **Cross-source critical analysis** (Media Analysis — Lesson 3)
- **Ethical reasoning and self-disclosure** (AI Use Disclosure — Lesson 4)
- **Integrated civic application of all prior skills** (Civic Issue Brief — Lesson 5)

Reviewers evaluating IEP-aligned reimbursements may find the Civic Issue Brief especially useful as evidence of grade-level mastery in writing with claim and evidence (ELA.7.C.1.3), research with multiple sources (ELA.7.C.4.1), and reading across perspectives (ELA.7.R.3.3).

Privacy and FERPA documentation

The curriculum has no infrastructure that creates or stores student data:

- No telemetry, analytics, or tracking
- No accounts on commercial AI platforms required in the core delivery path
- No data sharing agreements required (the curriculum does not collect data)
- All student work stays within the educational environment the family or school already uses

Adoption of the curriculum does not require changes to the family's or school's existing FERPA-compliant student data practices. The full Data Privacy Statement (the Data Privacy Statement) covers practical privacy considerations for both the no-install default delivery and the optional local-installation extension track (which is more privacy-protective, not less, because no data leaves the student's device).

IEP and accessibility documentation

For FES-UA reviewers and other reviewers handling IEP-relevant submissions:

- **Reading-level differentiation:** lessons calibrated for Lexile 1050L–1200L with explicit scaffolding for students reading above or below grade level
- **Processing-time accommodations:** all activities support extended timing without changes to the lesson structure
- **Multi-modal access:** most lessons offer auditory, visual, and kinesthetic options
- **Assistive technology compatibility:** standard Markdown text format works with major screen readers; no essential information conveyed only by color; keyboard navigation throughout
- **IEP/504 differentiation guidance:** explicit notes for common accommodation categories in Differentiation Notes

The Accessibility Statement (the Accessibility Statement) provides full documentation suitable for compliance review.

Reviewer’s deeper verification path

If you need to verify the curriculum's substantive claims beyond the surface attestations:

1. **Open the curriculum directly.** *The Open Source Student — Florida Educator’s Edition* publishes its full content (Teacher Editions, Student Editions, Implementation Readiness Packet, Standards Alignment Matrix) as standard Markdown text files. Available through CivicOS Labs (civicoslabs.com).
2. **Verify standards alignment.** Use the Standards Alignment Matrix v3.3; each benchmark row links to a public CPALMS or FDOE source. Spot-check any row.
3. **Verify course codes.** Each course code in the matrix’s Course Codes Section links to its CPALMS PreviewCourse page or to the relevant FDOE Course Code Directory section.
4. **Inspect student artifacts.** Each Student Edition lesson concludes with a templated artifact form. Reviewers can see exactly what student work the curriculum produces.
5. **Inspect rubrics.** Each Teacher Edition lesson includes the rubric the educator uses to evaluate the artifact. Reviewers evaluating mastery claims can review the rubric structure.

This level of transparency is structural to the curriculum's design. The materials are published openly under Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0; reviewer verification is a first-class use case.

Open verification item status

There are **no open verification items** for the Pilot Kit’s standards, benchmark codes, or cited course lanes as of the v3.3 hardening pass. Prior caveats for M/J Language Arts 2/3, M/J Grade 6/7/8 Digital Discoveries, and current intensive-reading support lanes have been closed. The legacy M/J Reading 1/2/3 sequence is documented as terminated and is not cited as a current course lane.

Determination support summary

For a reviewer making an approval determination, the structurally relevant facts are:

- The curriculum is **standards-aligned** to current Florida B.E.S.T. CS (July 2024 revision), Florida Civics, and Florida B.E.S.T. ELA at the middle school level, with per-benchmark alignment documented and verified
- The curriculum **fits multiple Florida course lanes** including M/J Navigating Technology #0200024, M/J Civics #2106010, and M/J Civics and Digital Technologies #2106029, each of which is a confirmed FDOE course code
- The curriculum **produces concrete student work** in the form of five portfolio artifacts that demonstrate mastery of standards
- The curriculum **collects no student data** and operates no infrastructure that would create student records
- The curriculum is **accessibility-designed** for IEP/504 compatibility and multiple modalities
- The curriculum is **transparent and verifiable** — every standards claim links to a public source

Whether these structural facts satisfy a specific program’s reimbursement rules in a specific family's situation is the reviewer’s determination.

Contact for verification or follow-up

For verification of any claim, follow-up questions about the curriculum, or requests for additional documentation:

CivicOS Labs · civicoslabs.com

CivicOS Labs typically responds to reviewer-initiated verification requests within one business day during normal business hours.

All benchmark information verified against public CPALMS / FDOE sources on 2026-05-15. M/J Language Arts 2/3, M/J Grade 6/7/8 Digital Discoveries, and current M/J Intensive Reading support course-code hardening verified against public CPALMS / FDOE sources on 2026-05-17. The Standards Alignment Matrix v3.3 (the Standards Alignment Matrix) is the authoritative source for per-benchmark alignment with confirmed public source URLs.

Lesson 1: What AI Is and Is Not

Teacher Edition

Lesson at a Glance

Lesson length: 45 minutes core instruction + 20 minutes student independent work (in-class or homework)

Learning objectives. By the end of this lesson, students will be able to: 1. Explain in their own words what a Large Language Model (LLM) is and how it works at a basic level 2. Identify three things AI is good at and three things AI is not good at 3. Define and apply the term “hallucination” to an AI context 4. Articulate why verification of AI answers matters 5. Produce an AI Concept Map that demonstrates conceptual understanding

Florida standards addressed: - **FL B.E.S.T. CS (grades 6–8):** Emerging Technologies — AI benchmarks (SC.6.ET.2.1, SC.6.ET.2.2, SC.7.ET.2.1, SC.8.ET.2.1, SC.8.ET.2.2, primary); **Programming and Software Engineering — model limits (SC.8.PE.3.3, primary substance fit for “what AI is not good at”);** Communication and Collaboration (SC.7.CC.2.2); Computing Components (SC.7.CO.2.2) - **Civics:** SS.7.CG.2.9 (analyzing media for bias, symbolism, and propaganda) — *introduced* through hallucination + verification framing; full development in Lessons 2 and 3 - **B.E.S.T. ELA (grades 6–8):** Reading Informational Text — Structure (ELA.7.R.2.1), Vocabulary Acquisition (ELA.7.V.1.1, ELA.7.V.1.3), Communication — Oral (ELA.7.C.2.1), K-12 ELA Expectations — Collaborative Discussion (ELA.K12.EE.4.1)

(See the Standards Alignment Matrix for full alignment detail.)

Materials needed: - Teacher device with browser access for AI demonstration - Class display (projector, smart board, or large monitor) - Student copies of the Lesson 1 Student Edition (printed or digital) - Concept map worksheet or blank paper for AI Concept Map activity - Optional: students' own devices for follow-up activities

Google Classroom quick access: [Google Classroom Upload Pack](#) — setup guide, copy/paste assignment posts, upload manifest, and Bellringer / Warm-Up pacing options.

Prerequisites: None. This is the entry-point lesson.

Vocabulary introduced: AI (Artificial Intelligence), LLM (Large Language Model), Model, Prompt, Hallucinate

Portfolio artifact produced: AI Concept Map (Lesson 1 contribution to the curriculum portfolio)

Assessment: Self-Check questions at end of Student Edition + AI Concept Map evaluated with the rubric in this Teacher Edition

Background for the Teacher

This is the foundational lesson. Everything in subsequent lessons builds on what students grasp here. Two pieces are most important to get across:

First, the working model of how an LLM works. Students should leave understanding that an LLM is, at its base, a “predict the next word” engine — and that this seemingly simple mechanism, applied at huge scale, is what makes AI capable of doing so much. This is not just a fact to memorize; it is the conceptual handle that makes everything else in the curriculum make sense. When students later encounter AI hallucination, AI's inability to do math, AI's lack of current information — all of those make sense as consequences of “predict the next word” rather than as separate mysteries.

Second, hallucination as a structural property. This is the most important thing students will learn in the entire curriculum. AI does not occasionally make small mistakes. It produces confidently wrong answers as a routine output of how it works. Students who internalize this — who develop the verification habit early — use AI well throughout their education. Students who do not internalize it tend to get burned at some point, often badly. The lesson treats hallucination seriously and gives students the language to recognize and respond to it.

A common pitfall when teaching this lesson is being either too dismissive (“AI is just statistics; it doesn't really do anything”) or too reverent (“AI is amazing and can do almost anything”). Both framings produce worse outcomes than curriculum's framing, which is something like: AI is a powerful tool with specific strengths and specific structural limitations; using it well requires understanding both.

You do not need deep AI expertise to teach this lesson well. You need the working model in this Background section and the lesson plan that follows. Your job is to deliver the conceptual framework and facilitate students' engagement with it; you do not need to be able to answer every advanced AI question that comes up.

If a student asks something you genuinely do not know: model what you want them to do. “I don't know — let me check.” Look it up with them. The verification habit you are teaching applies to you too.

Lesson Procedure

Total time: 45 minutes core instruction. Independent work afterward: 20 minutes.

Timing note for first delivery: Times are targets, not requirements. First-time delivery often runs 5–10 minutes long because students ask clarifying questions about what counts as AI. If pacing gets tight, use Bellringer Option A, shorten share-outs, and keep the Concept Map as independent completion work.

Bellringer / Warm-Up Options (choose one)

Use one option at the start of class. If pacing is tight, use Option A and treat it as the first three minutes of the Opening rather than an added activity. Post or read the exact prompt; do not assume students know which tools count as AI.

Option A — Fast Start (3 minutes): Post: “Name one AI tool or AI-powered feature you have used or seen. Examples: ChatGPT, Siri, Alexa, Gemini, Copilot, phone autocorrect, YouTube recommendations, translation apps, or game bots. What do you think it is doing behind the screen?” Students answer in one sentence. Ask for one quick share-out.

Option B — Standard Warm-Up (5 minutes): Post: “1. Name one AI tool or AI-powered feature you have used or seen. Examples: ChatGPT, Siri, Alexa, Gemini, Copilot, phone autocorrect, YouTube recommendations, translation apps, or game bots. 2. What do you think that tool is doing behind the screen to produce its answer, suggestion, or action? 3. What is one thing you would want to know before trusting its answer or recommendation?” Students answer, then pair-share one answer. Use one response to transition into: “Can someone explain what AI actually is?”

Option C — Extended Launch (6-7 minutes): Post: “1. Name one AI tool or AI-powered feature you have used or seen. 2. What do you think that tool is doing behind the screen? 3. What is one thing you would want to know before trusting its answer or recommendation? 4. Which matters more when using AI: knowing what it can do well, or knowing where it fails? Explain your choice in 2-3 sentences.” Let two students take different positions, then frame the lesson as learning both.

Opening (5 minutes)

Begin with a question to the class: “How many of you have used AI before — ChatGPT, Claude, Siri, Alexa, anything similar?” Get a show of hands. Most will have.

Then ask: “Can someone explain what AI actually is?” Let two or three students try. Most explanations will be vague or incomplete; that is the point. Acknowledge: “This is normal. Almost everyone uses AI without being able to explain what it actually is. We’re going to fix that today.”

State the lesson goal: “By the end of class, you should be able to explain what AI is to someone who has never thought about it — a parent, a younger sibling, a friend. You should also know where AI is reliable and where it isn’t, which matters for how you use it.”

Direct Instruction (15 minutes)

Have students follow along in their Student Edition (printed or digital). Walk through the reading section by section. Read the first paragraph or two aloud yourself; this models the expected attention level and gives students who read more slowly time to catch up.

The key sections to emphasize:

“The Kind of AI This Lesson Is About” — make sure students understand that “AI” in this curriculum specifically means LLMs. Other kinds of AI exist (image recognition, speech recognition, game-playing AI), but this curriculum is about the kind they are most likely to encounter for school work.

“What an LLM does” — this is the conceptual core. The “predict the next word” framing is what students must internalize. Use the analogy in the reading (someone who has read every book ever) and add a personal example. Try: “Imagine I asked you ‘The capital of France is...’ What word comes next? Right — Paris. You did the same kind of pattern-matching the AI does. The AI is just doing it on a much bigger scale, with way more text in its memory.”

“What AI is good at” and “What AI is not good at” — read these together. Pause after the four limitations and check for understanding: “Why might base LLMs not have current information?” “Why is base AI not reliable for math?” Most students will already understand intuitively that base AI does not know last week’s news; the math limitation often surprises them. Take the time to explain — base LLMs generate digits the same way they generate words, by pattern, not by actually computing. Note that some modern systems connect to tools (web search, calculators, code execution) that improve these limits substantially; the lesson framing acknowledges this rather than asserting absolute incapability.

Hallucination — this is the most important paragraph in the entire lesson. Read it slowly. Pause after. Ask: “What’s the difference between AI being wrong sometimes and AI hallucinating?” The answer: AI usually does not *know* it is wrong when it hallucinates. It produces wrong information with the same confident voice as right information. This is what makes hallucination dangerous; the AI cannot reliably warn you. Modern AI systems can reduce hallucination through grounding techniques, but they cannot eliminate it — that is the framing the curriculum uses, and it is the responsible level of claim.

Activity 1: AI Demonstration (10 minutes)

Now demonstrate AI in real time on the class display. Choose a topic that interests your students — sports, history, science, current pop culture (within the AI’s knowledge cutoff). Type a prompt and let the class watch the response appear.

Suggested prompts (use one): - “Explain photosynthesis to a 7th grader.” - “Tell me three interesting things about the Roman Republic.” - “Explain how the body fights off a virus.”

As the response generates, point out: - “Notice how it streams the words one at a time? That’s the AI predicting word after word, in real time.” - “Notice how confident it sounds? That’s how AI always sounds — confident, whether it’s right or wrong.”

When the response is complete, ask: - “Did anything in there sound surprising or new to you?” - “If we wanted to check whether the AI got everything right, what would we do?”

The goal is to make hallucination concrete. Even if the AI’s response was actually accurate, the question “how would we check?” sets up the verification habit that becomes the focus of Lesson 2.

If you cannot do live AI demonstration, use the prepared example AI outputs from the No-Install Adaptation Notes section below.

Activity 2: AI Concept Map (15 minutes — most of the independent work time)

Direct students to the Activity 2 instructions in their Student Edition. Walk through the structure: - Center: AI or LLM - Four branches: what AI is good at, what AI is not good at, how AI works (basic), why we verify - Sub-branches with specific examples - One thing they found surprising

Give students 12–15 minutes to work. Circulate and prompt: “Can you add a specific example?” “What’s a more concrete way to say that?” “What’s missing from this branch?”

The Concept Map is the portfolio artifact for Lesson 1. It does not need to be polished or visually impressive; it needs to demonstrate that the student understands the lesson’s conceptual content.

Closing (5 minutes)

Bring the class back together. Have two or three students share one thing from their concept maps — what they put on a particular branch, what surprised them.

Preview Lesson 2: “Tomorrow we’re going to take this idea about hallucination seriously. We’re going to take an actual AI answer and check it against real sources, then document what we find. The goal is to start building the verification habit that will protect you from the most common way students get into trouble with AI.”

Direct students to the Reflection Questions in their Student Edition (5 minutes after class or as homework) and the Self-Check (also after class).

Student Reading — Reproduced with Teacher Annotations

The full Student Edition reading appears below with margin annotations for educators. The annotations flag important points, predictable confusion, and discussion opportunities.

You have probably used AI before. [TEACHER NOTE: Most students will recognize at least one of the AI examples that follow. Ask early in this paragraph for a show of hands; gets students engaged.] **Maybe you asked ChatGPT to help with homework. Maybe you talked to Siri or Alexa. Maybe you got a movie recommendation from Netflix that figured out what you liked. All of those use artificial intelligence.**

But here is something interesting. Most people who use AI every day cannot actually explain what it is. [TEACHER NOTE: This framing is intentional. Students often think their parents or older siblings “understand AI.” Most adults don’t either. The lesson positions students as gaining understanding most adults lack — a small motivation boost.]

When most people say “AI” today, they are usually talking about a specific kind of program called a Large Language Model — an LLM. [TEACHER NOTE: First introduction of the LLM term. Make sure students hear “Large Language Model” once. Use the abbreviation LLM consistently after that.]

Imagine reading every book ever written. Plus most of the internet. Plus millions of articles and conversations. [TEACHER NOTE: This is the analogy that does most of the conceptual work. Spend time here. Have a student estimate how long it would take a human to read every book ever written. The answer is “many lifetimes.” This is what makes the scale meaningful.]

That is the whole job. The AI predicts what word should come next. [TEACHER NOTE: The most important sentence in the lesson. Pause after reading it aloud. Some students will be surprised; some will be skeptical. The skepticism is healthy — it leads naturally into the next section.]

You might be thinking: that does not sound powerful enough to do everything AI can do. [TEACHER NOTE: This paragraph addresses the natural skepticism. The “predict what comes after ‘Here is a summary:’” example is the key. Students often have an “oh, I see” moment here.]

First, base LLMs do not have current information unless they’re connected to other tools. [TEACHER NOTE: This limitation is intuitive for most students. The “unless they’re connected to other tools” clause matters — students may have used ChatGPT or similar with web search enabled and gotten current information; the lesson honors that without overstating the base LLM’s capabilities. If a student says “but ChatGPT told me about something that happened yesterday,” that’s a tool-augmented system at work; the underlying model still doesn’t know last week’s news on its own.]

Second, AI is not reliable for math unless it’s using a calculator or code tool. [TEACHER NOTE: This one usually surprises students. They’ve seen AI write equations and assume it’s actually computing. The key clarification: base LLMs generate digits as patterns, not as computed values. Some modern AI systems do call out to calculators or code execution tools — when that happens, math reliability improves substantially. The lesson’s framing is honest about both: base AI is unreliable for math; tool-augmented AI can be reliable. This is also a natural cross-curricular tie to math: “your calculator does math; a base AI predicts what math should look like.”]

Third — and this is the most important one — AI hallucinates. [TEACHER NOTE: THE most important paragraph in the lesson. Read slowly. Pause. The structural point — that hallucination is a persistent risk that can be reduced but not eliminated — must land. Students who internalize this become careful AI users; students who miss this get burned later. The lesson’s framing acknowledges that modern systems reduce hallucination through grounding, retrieval augmentation, and tool use; it does not assert that engineering will never improve. What it asserts is that hallucination will not disappear and treating AI as if it never hallucinates is risky.]

Fourth, AI only knows what you tell it. [TEACHER NOTE: This sets up the prompting work in Lesson 4 of the Foundation Edition (and in lessons throughout this curriculum). For now, students just need to know that vague questions get vague answers.]

The single most important habit when using AI is verification. [TEACHER NOTE: This is the bridge to Lesson 2, where verification becomes a practiced skill. Set this up with intent: “We’re going to actually practice this tomorrow.”]

People argue about whether AI is really thinking or really understanding. [TEACHER NOTE: This is the philosophical question students will probably bring up if you don’t address it. The reading addresses it briefly. If a student wants to go deeper, the Extension Options below include this discussion. For most classes, the brief treatment in the reading is enough.]

Vocabulary Teaching Strategies

The five vocabulary terms (AI, LLM, Model, Prompt, Hallucinate) appear throughout the curriculum. Investing in teaching them well in Lesson 1 pays off across all subsequent lessons.

Quick check at start of class: Ask the class which of the five terms they have heard before. Most will have heard “AI” and “ChatGPT” but few will have heard “LLM,” “prompt” (in the AI sense), or “hallucinate” (in the AI sense).

Pre-teach “hallucinate”: Before the reading, ask students what “hallucinate” means in everyday English. The usual answer: seeing or hearing things that aren’t really there. Then preview: “We’re going to learn that AI does something kind of like that. AI makes up information that isn’t there but acts like it is. We use the same word.”

Cognate flagging for ELL students: “Modelo” (model) and “prompt” (less direct cognate but learnable) help Spanish-speaking ELL students. “Inteligencia Artificial” maps directly to AI. Reinforce these orally for ELL students before the reading.

Vocabulary check during the lesson: After the reading, before Activity 1, do a quick verbal check. “What does LLM stand for? What’s a model? What’s a prompt? What does hallucinate mean in our AI context?” Sixty seconds. This consolidates before students move to active work.

Differentiation Notes

The Differentiation Notes for Lesson 1 cover the most common needs. Adapt to your specific students.

Below grade level readers

The Student Reading is calibrated to ~Lexile 1100L. Students reading meaningfully below grade level may need:

- **Read-aloud:** read the reading aloud while students follow along. Slows the pace but ensures comprehension.
- **Vocabulary pre-teaching:** introduce all five vocabulary words before the reading begins, with student-friendly definitions on the board
- **Chunked reading:** stop after each major section, ask one comprehension question, then continue
- **Visual organizer:** for the AI Concept Map activity, provide a pre-formatted template with the four branches already drawn; students just fill in the sub-branches

Above grade level readers

For students reading well above grade level:

- **Independent reading first:** let them read silently while the rest of the class reads with the teacher; then pull them into the discussion
- **Extension reading:** Foundation Edition (*The Open Source Student* v1.4) Chapter 1 is the deeper version of this lesson; share it with students who want to go further
- **Mentor role:** ask them to help explain concepts to peers during the Concept Map activity

English Language Learners (ELL)

For ELL students at intermediate proficiency:

- **Pre-teach vocabulary** orally before the reading begins
- **Provide a Spanish-cognate flag list:** AI = Inteligencia Artificial, model = modelo, etc.
- **Pair ELL students with bilingual peers** during discussion when possible
- **Offer the Concept Map in graphic form** rather than text-heavy

For newcomer ELL students: – **Reduce the reading load** to the section headers and the most important paragraph (the hallucination paragraph) – **Allow the Concept Map to be drawn or annotated in the student’s strongest language**, with key terms in English

IEP / 504 — ADHD or Executive Function Support

- Break the 45-minute lesson into shorter visible segments with timers
- Use the lesson’s natural sections (Opening, Reading, Activity 1, Activity 2, Closing) as movement-break opportunities
- Provide the Concept Map template pre-formatted to reduce executive function load
- Use a visual progress tracker on the board so students see where they are in the lesson

IEP / 504 — Reading or Language Processing Support

- Provide audio of the Student Reading (built-in TTS or your own recording)
- Allow student to demonstrate understanding through speech rather than written response on the Concept Map
- Provide larger font printable version

IEP / 504 — Autism Spectrum

- Preview the lesson structure visually before starting (the lesson follows the predictable lesson structure: Opening / Reading / Activity 1 / Activity 2 / Closing)
- For the demonstration in Activity 1, give an explicit advance signal: “I’m about to type into the AI; the response will appear on the screen; we’ll discuss after”
- The AI subject matter itself may be an area of strong interest; channel that interest into the Extension Options if needed

Anxiety or Emotional Regulation

- Self-Check questions at the end of the Student Edition can be done privately; students do not need to share answers
- The Concept Map is graded on thinking, not artistic quality; reassure students about this directly
- Discussion participation is invited but not required; students can write reflections instead

Gifted students

- Extension Option 1 (the philosophical question) is a good fit
- Extension Option 2 (designing a prompt to reveal hallucination) suits students who want to engage technically
- Cross-Curricular Connection to writing/literature (how is AI’s pattern-matching different from how human writers use patterns?) suits literature-strong students

Limited Technology Access (no personal device)

- The whole lesson works on the teacher’s single device with class projection; no student device is needed
- Concept Map can be on paper instead of digital
- Self-Check can be answered on paper

Assessment Rubric: AI Concept Map

The AI Concept Map is the portfolio artifact for Lesson 1. Evaluate based on conceptual understanding, not artistic merit.

Criterion	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
Center concept (AI/LLM) clearly identified	AI mentioned but not centered	AI/LLM clearly central	AI/LLM central with brief definition or analogy
Four required branches present	Two or three branches	All four branches present	All four branches present, clearly labeled, well-organized
Specific examples on each branch	One or two examples; mostly general	At least three specific examples per branch	Multiple specific examples; some examples connect to student’s life
“How AI works” branch shows real understanding	Vague reference (e.g., “computers do it”)	“Predicts next word” or equivalent	“Predicts next word” framing with the scale element (“on huge amounts of text”)
“Why we verify” branch shows understanding of hallucination	Verification mentioned but not connected to hallucination	Connection made: AI can be wrong, verification protects against it	Hallucination explained as structural; verification framed as a habit, not a one-time check
One personal “surprised by” element	Missing or generic	One specific thing the student found surprising	Surprised-by element shows real engagement with the concept
Overall coherence	Map is hard to follow	Map is organized; reader can trace the logic	Map shows the student’s own thinking, not just transcription of the lesson

Sample Proficient artifact (for educator reference):

A concept map with “LLM (Large Language Model)” centered, defined briefly as “AI that works with language.” Four branches: “Good at” (with sub-branches: explaining concepts, summarizing, brainstorming, helping with writing); “Not good at” (with sub-branches: current news — does not know, math — pretends but is wrong, made-up facts — hallucination); “How it works” (with sub-branches: trained on huge text, predicts next word, generates one word at a time); “Why verify”

(with sub-branches: AI can sound confident but be wrong, checking against real sources catches errors, this is a habit not a one-time thing). Surprised by: “I did not know AI was actually predicting the next word — I thought it was ‘thinking’ more like a person.”

Sample Exemplary artifact: the same content but with cross-connections drawn (e.g., a line from “predicts next word” to “makes up facts” with a note: “this is why hallucination happens”), and a personal application (“I’m going to verify the science homework AI helps with from now on”).

Answer Key / Scoring Notes

Use these notes when reviewing the warm-up, discussion responses, Concept Map, reflection, and Self-Check. Do not require student wording to match exactly; require the core idea.

Bellringer / Warm-Up expected responses: – Acceptable AI examples include ChatGPT, Siri, Alexa, Gemini, Copilot, phone autocorrect, recommendation systems, translation apps, grammar suggestions, game bots, or other AI-powered features. – A proficient response says the tool is using patterns in data to produce an answer, suggestion, recommendation, or action. – A developing response may say “it searches” or “it knows things.” Use that as a teaching moment: search engines retrieve pages; LLMs generate language from patterns unless connected to retrieval tools.

Activity 1 demonstration expected observations: – Students should notice that the AI response appears confident and fluent. – Stronger responses also notice that confidence is not the same as accuracy. – If students ask how to check the response, expected verification sources include a textbook, teacher-approved source, official source, reputable educational website, or expert source relevant to the topic.

Concept Map required content: – Center: AI or LLM. – Four branches: what AI is good at; what AI is not good at; how AI works; why we verify. – “How AI works” branch should include “predicts next word” or equivalent. – “Not good at” branch should include at least two of: current information without tools, exact math without calculator/code tools, fabricated quotes/facts, hallucination, privacy-sensitive judgment, or unverified claims. – “Why verify” branch should connect verification to hallucination, confident wrong answers, or protecting school/civic work from false information.

Self-Check answer key: 1. LLM stands for **Large Language Model**. 2. Strong answers name one language task AI can often support, such as explaining, summarizing, brainstorming, drafting, translating, or reorganizing text; and one limitation, such as current information without tools, exact math without tools, privacy judgment, or hallucination. 3. AI “hallucinates” when it produces information that sounds plausible but is false, invented, or unsupported, usually without reliably warning the user. 4. Verification matters because AI can sound confident while being wrong; real sources help confirm, correct, or reject the claim. 5. Do not trust a famous-person quote just because AI gives it. Verify it against a reliable quote archive, primary source, official collection, reputable biography, or another source that identifies where the quote originally appeared.

Reflection scoring notes: – Grade reflections for specificity and honesty, not for agreeing with a particular view of AI. – A proficient reflection names a concrete change in understanding and a specific responsible or irresponsible use. – An exemplary reflection connects the lesson to future behavior, for example: “I can use AI to brainstorm, but I should verify facts and not paste private information.”

Extension Options

For students who finish the Concept Map quickly or want to go deeper:

Extension 1: The Philosophical Question. Have the student write a short response (1 page) to the question “Is AI really thinking?” Should reference the patterns/understanding distinction from the reading. Particularly suitable for verbally strong students or those interested in philosophy.

Extension 2: Design a Hallucination Test. Have the student design a prompt that they think might cause AI to hallucinate. Predict what the AI will get wrong, then test it (with teacher demonstration or browser-safe AI). Document what happened. This is a hands-on entry point to Lesson 2’s verification work.

Extension 3: Compare AI Tools. If you have access to two different AI services (e.g., ChatGPT and Claude, or two different open-source models), have the student ask the same question of both and compare the responses. What’s the same? What’s different? What does this tell us about AI?

Extension 4: Foundation Edition Reading. Direct interested students to *The Open Source Student* (Foundation Edition) Chapter 1 for the longer, deeper treatment of the same content. Suitable for students reading at high school level or above.

No-Install Adaptation Notes

The default Lesson 1 design assumes you can demonstrate AI live during Activity 1 using a browser-based commercial AI service. If your setting does not permit live AI access, here is the no-install version of Activity 1.

Pre-prepared example AI outputs (text descriptions in this Teacher Edition; project as text or convert to screenshots if useful):

For the demonstration moment in Activity 1, use these prepared examples instead of live AI generation. (In the published curriculum, screenshots will be embedded; for the Pilot Kit Markdown source, descriptions are provided that can be turned into screenshots or projected text.)

Example 1: AI explains photosynthesis (typical good response)

Prompt: “Explain photosynthesis to a 7th grader.”

Response (typical AI output, summarized for your demonstration): “Photosynthesis is how plants make their own food using sunlight. Plants take in carbon dioxide from the air through tiny holes in their leaves called stomata. They take in water from the soil through their roots. Using energy from sunlight (captured by chlorophyll, the green pigment in leaves), they combine water and carbon dioxide to make sugar (glucose) for food. They release oxygen as a waste product, which is what we breathe. The simple equation is: water + carbon dioxide + sunlight → sugar + oxygen.”

Discussion prompts: - “Did anything in here surprise you?” - “If we wanted to check whether the AI got the facts right, where would we look?” (Expected answer: textbook, science website, teacher.)

Example 2: AI hallucinates a quote (illustration of the hallucination problem)

Prompt: “Give me a quote by Albert Einstein about education.”

Response (commonly hallucinated AI output — this is a real type of hallucination): “Einstein said, ‘Education is what remains after one has forgotten what one has learned in school.’”

Reality: this quote is widely misattributed to Einstein. There is no reliable source confirming he said it. The quote actually comes from a different source (often attributed to B.F. Skinner, though even that is uncertain).

Discussion prompts: - “If I needed this quote for an essay, what should I do before using it?” - “Notice how confident the AI was. Did it warn us that this might be wrong?” (Answer: no.) - “This is what we mean by hallucination.”

This is one of the most powerful demonstrations available and works without any live AI access — it shows hallucination concretely with a real example.

Common Misconceptions

Students often arrive at this lesson with one or more of the following misconceptions. Address them when they surface; do not assume the lesson alone catches all of them.

“AI knows everything.” The lesson directly addresses this with the four limitations. Reinforce: AI is bounded by its training data; it does not have current information; it cannot reliably do math; it can be wrong about anything.

“AI is just like a search engine.” AI does not search for information when you ask; it generates a response from patterns. A search engine looks up real pages; AI predicts what an answer might look like. This is why AI can confidently produce wrong answers — it isn’t actually retrieving anything.

“AI is going to take my job / my parent’s job.” This concern surfaces sometimes, especially with older students. The honest answer: AI changes what jobs look like; some jobs change a lot; some go away; new ones emerge. The students best positioned for what comes next are the ones who understand AI well enough to use it as a tool, not those who fear it or those who treat it as magic. This curriculum is designed to produce that first kind of student.

“AI is alive / AI is conscious.” Some students treat AI as having feelings or awareness. The reading addresses the philosophical question briefly. The practical answer: AI is software running on a computer. It does not have feelings. Treating it as if it does does not help the student use it well.

“My parents told me not to use AI.” Some parents are skeptical; some are forbidding. Validate the parent’s concern (they’re trying to protect the student) without endorsing avoidance. The curriculum’s stance: use AI well, with verification, ethics, and judgment. That stance is what most parents actually want, even if “don’t use AI” was their first reaction. The Parent / Guardian Letter in the Implementation Readiness Packet is designed to bridge this conversation.

Cross-Curricular Connections

This lesson connects to the following Florida middle school subject areas:

ELA (Reading Informational Text): the Student Reading is informational text written at grade level. Students practice identifying main ideas, supporting details, and the author’s purpose throughout. Vocabulary acquisition is explicit.

ELA (Communication and K-12 Expectations): the discussion in Activity 1 and the Reflection Questions exercise B.E.S.T. ELA’s K-12 Expectations for collaborative discussion (ELA.K12.EE.4.1 — collaborative techniques and active listening) and the grade-7 oral-presentation benchmark (ELA.7.C.2.1).

Mathematics: the AI’s inability to reliably do math is a concrete connection point. Discuss with math teacher: what makes AI different from a calculator? What kinds of math does AI struggle with? Why?

Science: the AI demonstration prompt about photosynthesis (in the No-Install version) connects directly to middle school life science. Coordinate with science teacher for terminology consistency.

Social Studies / Civics: the verification habit is the same skill students use in evaluating historical and contemporary sources. Coordinate with social studies teacher to reinforce that “check against real sources” is a habit they apply across subjects.

Parent Communication Notes

Most families will not need parent communication beyond the standard Parent / Guardian Letter sent before the curriculum begins. Specific situations that warrant additional communication:

A student becomes uncomfortable with the AI demonstration. Some students have anxiety about AI from media coverage. After class, send a brief note to the parent: “[Student] participated in our first AI literacy lesson today. They seemed [uncertain/uncomfortable] during the AI demonstration. The curriculum’s approach is calm and grounded — we focus on understanding AI as a tool, not on AI as something to fear. Happy to discuss if you’d like.”

A student is excited and wants to do more at home. Send the Foundation Edition reference (*The Open Source Student* v1.4 Chapter 1) and a brief note: “[Student] showed strong engagement today and is interested in going deeper. The Foundation Edition of the curriculum (which is suitable for adult or high-school readers) covers similar material in more depth. They may enjoy reading Chapter 1.”

A parent asks specifically what AI tools were used in class. Be specific. “We demonstrated [tool name] on my classroom screen. Students did not interact with the AI directly. The Data Privacy Statement in the curriculum’s Implementation Readiness Packet documents how AI is used in the curriculum.”

Closing the lesson well

The transition from Lesson 1 to Lesson 2 is critical. End Lesson 1 with intentional setup for what comes next.

The setup language to use: “Today we learned that AI hallucinates — it makes up information that sounds true but isn’t. Tomorrow we’re going to take that seriously. We’re going to take an actual AI answer and check it against real sources. By the end of tomorrow’s lesson, you’ll have a habit that protects you from the most common way students get into trouble with AI.”

This frames Lesson 2 as the practical follow-through to Lesson 1’s most important content. Students who are now thinking “okay, AI hallucinates — but what do I actually do about that?” are ready for Lesson 2.

Lesson 1: What AI Is and Is Not

Student Edition

What you will learn today

By the end of this lesson, you should be able to explain in your own words what AI actually is, what it can do well, where it fails, and why that matters for how you use it.

You should also be able to explain it to someone who has never thought about it before — a parent, a younger sibling, a friend.

Bellringer / Warm-Up Options

Your teacher will choose one option.

Option A — Fast Start (3 minutes): Answer in one sentence:

Name one AI tool or AI-powered feature you have used or seen. Examples: ChatGPT, Siri, Alexa, Gemini, Copilot, a phone autocorrect suggestion, a YouTube recommendation, a translation app, or a game bot. What do you think it is doing “behind the screen”?

Option B — Standard Warm-Up (5 minutes): Answer these three questions:

1. Name one AI tool or AI-powered feature you have used or seen. Examples: ChatGPT, Siri, Alexa, Gemini, Copilot, a phone autocorrect suggestion, a YouTube recommendation, a translation app, or a game bot.
2. What do you think that tool is doing “behind the screen” to produce its answer, suggestion, or action?
3. What is one thing you would want to know before trusting its answer or recommendation?

Option C — Extended Launch (6-7 minutes): Answer all four questions:

1. Name one AI tool or AI-powered feature you have used or seen.
2. What do you think that tool is doing “behind the screen”?
3. What is one thing you would want to know before trusting its answer or recommendation?
4. Which matters more when using AI: knowing what it can do well, or knowing where it fails? Explain your choice in 2-3 sentences.

Do not worry about being perfectly correct yet. This is your starting idea before we build a clearer explanation.

Vocabulary

These five words show up over and over in any conversation about AI. Learn them now and the rest of the lesson is much easier.

AI (Artificial Intelligence). Programs that can do tasks people used to think only humans could do — understanding language, recognizing pictures, having a conversation, writing.

LLM (Large Language Model). The kind of AI behind tools like ChatGPT, Claude, Gemini, and Copilot. “Large” because it learned from huge amounts of text. “Language Model” because what it does is work with language.

Model. The actual AI program. Different models are trained on different data, in different ways, at different sizes.

Prompt. What you type to an AI — your question, instruction, or text. Everything an AI generates is a response to a prompt.

Hallucinate. When an AI makes something up that sounds completely true but is wrong. AI hallucinates a lot more than people realize.

Reading: What AI Actually Is

You have probably used AI before. Maybe you asked ChatGPT to help with homework. Maybe you talked to Siri or Alexa. Maybe you got a movie recommendation from Netflix that figured out what you liked. All of those use artificial intelligence.

But here is something interesting. Most people who use AI every day cannot actually explain what it is. They know it works. They do not know how. And when you do not know how something works, you sometimes trust it when you should not, or avoid it when it would actually help.

This lesson is about learning what AI actually is.

The Kind of AI This Lesson Is About

When most people say “AI” today, they are usually talking about a specific kind of program called a **Large Language Model** — an LLM. That includes ChatGPT, Claude, Gemini, Copilot, and most of the AI tools you might use for schoolwork.

Here is the simple version of how an LLM works.

Imagine reading every book ever written. Plus most of the internet. Plus millions of articles and conversations. After all that reading, you would notice patterns. Certain words tend to follow other words. Certain kinds of sentences appear in certain kinds of writing. Certain topics come with certain vocabulary.

That is basically what an LLM does. It is “trained” by reading a huge amount of text. Through that training, it learns the patterns of how humans use language.

When you type something to an LLM — your prompt — the AI uses what it learned to figure out what words probably come next. It generates its response by predicting one word at a time, based on patterns from all the text it learned from.

That is the whole job. The AI predicts what word should come next.

This Sounds Too Simple. How Does It Do So Much?

You might be thinking: that does not sound powerful enough to do everything AI can do. How can predicting the next word write essays, explain science, or help with math?

Here is the surprising part. When you can predict the next word really well, on a huge scale, you can do almost anything that involves language.

Want a summary of an article? The AI predicts what comes after the words “Here is a summary:”. Want an explanation of how plants make food? It predicts what comes after “Here is an explanation of photosynthesis for a 7th grader:”. Want a poem about your dog? It predicts what comes after “Here is a poem about a dog:”.

By treating any task as “predict what comes next,” one trained AI can handle a huge variety of things.

This surprised the researchers who built the first LLMs. They did not expect their AI to do all of this. The AI just got good enough at predicting words that lots of useful stuff fell out as a side effect.

What AI Is Good At

LLMs are good at almost anything that involves language.

They can explain concepts in different ways or at different reading levels. They can summarize long articles or book chapters. They can brainstorm ideas with you. They can help with writing by drafting, revising, or finding better phrasing. They can answer questions about topics that were well-covered in their training data. They can help with code — explaining it, fixing bugs, writing it from a description.

If your task is mostly about words, AI can probably help.

What AI Is Not Good At (Important Limits to Know)

The same way it works creates real limits. Four of them matter for students.

First, base LLMs do not have current information unless they're connected to other tools. An AI model was trained at a specific point in time. The base model does not know about anything that happened after that training cutoff. Some commercial AI systems add web search or other tools that let them pull in current information — but the underlying model itself does not know what is happening today. If you ask an AI about something that happened last week, you may get “I don't know” (good response), a real current answer (only if a search tool is connected), or a confidently invented answer (when the AI guesses without telling you it is guessing).

Second, AI is not reliable for math unless it's using a calculator or code tool. A base LLM writes equations the same way it writes everything else — by predicting what should come next, not by actually computing. Sometimes the prediction matches the real answer. Sometimes it does not. Some modern AI systems can call out to calculators or run code to get accurate math; if your AI does that, math becomes more reliable. If you cannot tell whether your AI is doing real computation or just predicting digits, treat its math as unverified — use a calculator yourself for any answer that matters.

Third — and this is the most important one — AI hallucinates. This means AI sometimes makes up information that sounds completely true but is wrong. Not “occasionally a small mistake.” Actually invented facts. Fake quotes from real people. Fake historical events. Fake details about real things. The AI usually cannot tell when it is hallucinating. It produces wrong answers in the same confident voice it uses for right answers.

This is not just a bug that engineers will eventually patch out. It is a persistent structural risk built into how LLMs work — they predict what comes next based on patterns, and when the patterns produce a plausible-sounding wrong answer, you get a plausible-sounding wrong answer. Modern AI systems reduce hallucination through better training, source-grounding, and tool use, and they will keep getting better at it. But hallucination is not going to disappear, and treating AI as if it never hallucinates is the most common way students get into trouble.

Fourth, AI only knows what you tell it. It does not know who you are, what class you are in, or what your assignment is unless you say so. If you give vague questions, you get vague answers.

What This Means for How You Use AI

Here is the practical takeaway. AI is a powerful tool for things that involve language. It is a bad tool for things that need current information, exact math, or claims you cannot verify.

The single most important habit when using AI is **verification**. Anywhere a fact actually matters — for a homework assignment, a paper, a project, a decision you are about to make — you should check the AI's answer against a real source. A textbook. A reliable article. A trusted website. A teacher. A real source you can trust.

Students who form this habit early use AI well throughout their education. Students who do not form it tend to get burned at some point — by a fake citation that did not exist, by a confidently wrong fact that ended up in a graded paper, by a misunderstanding the AI never told them about.

This is not about avoiding AI. It is about using AI well.

Is AI Really “Thinking”?

People argue about whether AI is really thinking or really understanding. Some people say yes — look at everything it can do; that has to be some kind of real intelligence. Other people say no — it is just pattern matching with no real understanding behind it.

The honest answer is that AI is doing something genuinely new, and we do not yet have good words for what it is. It is not exactly thinking the way you think. It is also not just dumb pattern matching like a calculator. It is something in between, and the people who study this are still figuring out what to call it.

For using AI well, the question matters less than it might sound. What matters in practice is that AI sometimes produces correct answers and sometimes produces wrong ones, and AI itself cannot tell the difference. That is the operating reality.

Treat AI as a tool that can be very helpful but cannot be fully trusted. That stance gets you most of what AI can offer, while protecting you from the most common ways AI use goes wrong.

Activity 1: Watch the Demonstration

Your teacher will use AI to explain a topic. As you watch, pay attention to:

- How does the AI start its response?
- Is the explanation clear? Easy to follow?
- Does the AI sound confident? Should it?
- What is one question you would ask to check whether the AI got something right?

You will discuss what you noticed after the demonstration ends.

Activity 2: Build Your AI Concept Map (Portfolio Artifact)

A concept map shows how ideas connect to each other. You will build a concept map of what AI is, based on what you learned today. This goes into your portfolio for the curriculum.

Step 1. In the middle of your page (or canvas if you are working digitally), write **AI** or **LLM**.

Step 2. Draw four branches off the center, labeled: – What AI is good at – What AI is not good at – How AI works (the basic idea) – Why we need to verify AI answers

Step 3. Off each branch, add at least three sub-branches with specific examples or details from today’s lesson. For instance, off “What AI is not good at,” you might add “current information,” “math,” and “hallucination.”

Step 4. Somewhere on your map, add one thing about AI that surprised you today.

Step 5. Sign and date your map. Put it in your portfolio.

You will refer back to this map at the end of the curriculum to see how your understanding grew.

Reflection Questions

Take 5 minutes to write a short response to each. Write enough to show your thinking; complete sentences are fine.

1. Before this lesson, what did you think AI was?
 2. What is one thing you learned today that surprised you?
 3. Describe a way you might use AI for school that you would feel okay about. Then describe a way you would not feel okay about.
 4. What is one question about AI that you still have?
-

Self-Check

Before you move on, check whether you can answer these. If you can, you are ready for Lesson 2. If you cannot, go back and re-read.

1. What does the abbreviation **LLM** stand for?
2. Name one thing AI is good at and one thing AI is not good at.
3. What does it mean to say AI **hallucinates**?

4. Why is it important to verify AI answers against real sources?

5. If AI tells you that a famous person said a specific quote, should you trust the quote? Why or why not?

Looking Ahead

In the next lesson, you will practice the verification habit directly. You will take a real AI answer and check it against real sources, document what you find, and start building a habit that protects you from the most common way students get into trouble with AI.

Lesson 2: Verifying AI Answers With Sources

Teacher Edition

Lesson at a Glance

Lesson length: 45 minutes core instruction + 25 minutes student independent work (Activity 2 is the major artifact-producing work)

Learning objectives. By the end of this lesson, students will be able to: 1. Explain why verification matters when using AI 2. Apply a five-step verification workflow to a real AI claim 3. Distinguish between primary, secondary, and other source types and judge appropriateness for verification purposes 4. Produce a documented Source Verification Log entry that demonstrates verification practice 5. Connect the AI verification habit to the broader civic skill of source evaluation

Florida standards addressed: - **FL B.E.S.T. CS (grades 6–8):** Emerging Technologies (SC.7.ET.2.1), **Programming and Software Engineering — model limits (SC.8.PE.3.3, primary substance fit)**, Personal Health and Safety (SC.7.HS.1.4, SC.7.HS.1.6), Communication and Collaboration (SC.7.CC.2.2) - **Florida Civics:** SS.7.CG.2.9 (primary, full development — analyzing media for bias, symbolism, propaganda); SS.7.CG.2.8 (introduced — media/individuals/interest groups influencing government) - **B.E.S.T. ELA (grades 6–8):** Reading Informational Text — Argument (ELA.7.R.2.4), Communication — Research (ELA.7.C.4.1, primary fit), Vocabulary (ELA.7.V.1.1), K-12 ELA Expectations — Collaborative Discussion (ELA.K12.EE.4.1)

(See the Standards Alignment Matrix for benchmark-level alignment.)

Materials needed: - Teacher device with browser access (for AI demonstration in Activity 1, OR for displaying prepared example AI outputs) - Class display - Student copies of Lesson 2 Student Edition (printed or digital) - Source Verification Log Template (in Student Edition; can also be reproduced as separate worksheet) - Internet access for student devices during Activity 2 (for source-finding); paper alternative possible if a single shared computer is the only option - A pre-selected AI claim per student or per small group for Activity 2 (educator prepares 5–10 AI claims in advance to choose from)

Google Classroom quick access: [Google Classroom Upload Pack](#) — setup guide, copy/paste assignment posts, upload manifest, and Bellringer / Warm-Up pacing options.

Prerequisites: Lesson 1 (What AI Is and Is Not). The hallucination concept from Lesson 1 is essential context for this lesson.

Vocabulary introduced: Verification, Source, Credibility, Primary source, Secondary source, Citation

Portfolio artifact produced: Source Verification Log entry (Lesson 2 contribution to curriculum portfolio)

Assessment: Source Verification Log entry, evaluated with rubric below

Background for the Teacher

Lesson 2 is where the curriculum's verification habit becomes a practiced skill. Lesson 1 established that AI hallucinates; Lesson 2 gives students the workflow to do something about it.

The lesson's core move is structural: students learn that verification is not "I asked a teacher and they said it was fine" — it is a workflow with steps, sources, and documentation. The Source Verification Log artifact exists in part because the structure of "log it" is what makes the habit stick. Students who casually verify in their heads tend to drift away from the habit; students who produce documented log entries tend to keep doing it.

A few important framings:

Verification is a civic skill, not just an AI skill. This is the lesson where the curriculum's two pillars (AI literacy + civic technology literacy) most visibly converge. The same skill that protects students from AI hallucination protects them from misinformation, propaganda, and manipulation in any source type. The Florida civic standards that center on analyzing source bias and media influence (SS.7.CG.2.9 most directly, with SS.7.CG.2.8 supporting) are the same standards this lesson exercises. Note: SS.7.CG.2.10, often loosely described as the "source evaluation" benchmark, is in fact about the *process for citizens to address state or local problems* — that benchmark anchors Lesson 5, not Lesson 2.

Sources have a hierarchy. Students often need explicit teaching about why some sources are more reliable than others. The hierarchy in the reading (primary > reputable secondary > official > general reference > less reliable > almost never) is intentionally simplified for grade-level accessibility. Use the hierarchy as a discussion starter rather than as dogma; real source evaluation involves judgment, not just type-matching.

Two independent sources is the threshold. A single source can be wrong; multiple sources that all trace back to the same original could all be wrong together. Two independent sources — each with its own basis for the claim — substantially increases confidence. This is a real research methodology principle that students will use throughout their education.

Modern AI improvements are real but do not eliminate the need to verify. The lesson explicitly acknowledges that some AI systems use grounding, retrieval, and tool integration to reduce hallucination. This honesty matters — students who use modern AI tools have probably noticed that AI is better than it was. The lesson's response is "yes, AI is improving, and verification still matters." This is the calibrated position.

The lesson's structural goal is that by the end, every student has produced one Source Verification Log entry that demonstrates they can do verification. The habit only forms through practice; this lesson is the first practice.

Lesson Procedure

Total time: 45 minutes core instruction. Independent work afterward: 25 minutes (most of it spent on the Source Verification Log artifact).

Timing note for first delivery: Times are targets, not requirements. First-time delivery often runs 5–10 minutes long because students need help distinguishing a claim from evidence and choosing verification sources. If pacing gets tight, model one source together and assign the second source check as independent work.

Bellringer / Warm-Up Options (choose one)

Use one option at the start of class. If pacing is tight, use Option A and treat it as the first three minutes of the Opening rather than an added activity. Display this exact warm-up claim for all options: “Dolphins are fish because they live in water.”

Option A — Fast Start (3 minutes): Post: “Dolphins are fish because they live in water.” Students identify the exact claim that needs checking. Expected claim: dolphins are fish because they live in water. Use one response to introduce the word “verification.”

Option B — Standard Warm-Up (5 minutes): Post: “Dolphins are fish because they live in water. 1. What exact claim would you need to check? 2. What kind of source would you use to verify it? Examples: science textbook, reputable aquarium or marine biology website, encyclopedia, or government wildlife page. 3. What would count as enough evidence to trust your answer?” Have students compare sources they would use, then transition: “Today we are going to make that checking process systematic.”

Option C — Extended Launch (6-7 minutes): Post: “Dolphins are fish because they live in water. 1. What exact claim would you need to check? 2. What kind of source would you use to verify it? 3. What would count as enough evidence to trust your answer? 4. If two websites disagreed about this claim, what would you do next?” Use this to introduce independent sources and why one search result is not enough.

Opening (5 minutes)

Recap from Lesson 1: “Yesterday we learned that AI hallucinates. Who can explain in their own words what that means?” Get one or two student responses.

Reinforce: AI sometimes produces wrong information in the same confident voice as right information; AI usually cannot tell the difference; this is built into how LLMs work and is a persistent risk that modern improvements reduce but do not eliminate.

Bridge: “Today we are doing something about it. We are learning a workflow called verification — checking AI claims against real sources. By the end of class, every one of you will have produced one Source Verification Log entry. This is a habit you will use for the rest of your life.”

State the lesson goal: “By the end of class, you will be able to take an AI answer that contains a factual claim, find real sources to check whether the claim is accurate, and document what you learned. You will also see how this same skill applies to anything else that comes at you as fact — news, social media, things people tell you.”

Direct Instruction (12 minutes)

Walk students through the Student Reading. Read aloud or have students read silently while you walk; choose based on your class’s reading patterns.

Key sections to emphasize:

“Why You Cannot Just Trust AI” — the Lincoln-quote example is concrete and memorable. Pause after this paragraph and ask: “Has anyone here had something like this happen — used an AI claim and later found out it was wrong?” If anyone has, briefly hear it. If not, that is fine; the example does the work.

“The Verification Workflow” — read all five steps. After each step, briefly explain the rationale. The five steps will be the structure of Activity 2; getting them clear here saves time later.

“What Sources Are Worth Checking Against” — the source hierarchy is the most important reference content in the lesson. Pause and discuss: “Why is a primary source more reliable than a secondary source?” “Why might a Wikipedia article be useful but not the final stop?” Make sure students understand that this is judgment, not a strict ranking.

“Why This Matters for Civic Literacy” — this paragraph makes the curriculum’s two-pillar framing visible. Read it aloud. Pause: “What other kinds of information besides AI do you encounter where this same skill would help?” Get 2–3 student responses. The point is that verification transfers beyond AI.

“What ‘Reduces, Not Eliminates’ Means” — for tech-savvy students who will say “but ChatGPT has search now,” this paragraph honors that observation while preserving the verification habit. Reinforce: AI has gotten better; verification still matters.

Activity 1: Verification Demonstration (10 minutes)

Demonstrate the verification workflow on a real AI response. The class watches. There are two paths depending on whether you have live AI access:

Path A — Live AI access available: - Type a query that will produce a response with verifiable claims. Suggested queries: - “Tell me three interesting facts about [a famous historical figure]” - “Explain a recent discovery in [a scientific field]” - “Give me a quote by [a real public figure] about [a topic]” - Project the response to the class - Walk through the five steps live: identify the specific claim, plan verification, find sources, compare, document

Path B — Prepared example outputs (no live AI): - Use the prepared example AI response from the No-Install Adaptation Notes section below - Display on class screen - Walk through the five steps using the prepared materials

In either path, do at least one verification where the AI is correct AND one where the AI is incorrect (the Einstein quote example from Lesson 1’s No-Install section is a reliable hallucination demonstration). Showing both outcomes is essential — students should not leave with the impression that verification always finds AI wrong (which would discourage AI use) or always finds AI right (which would devalue verification).

After the demonstration, ask: “What did you notice? What surprised you? How would you do this for your own AI claim?”

Activity 2: Student Verification (independent work, 18+ minutes)

This is the artifact-producing core of the lesson. Each student (or pair, depending on your setting) produces one Source Verification Log entry on an AI claim.

Setup (3 minutes): - Distribute the Source Verification Log Template (in the Student Edition) - Distribute or assign AI claims for verification — see “AI claims for verification” in the No-Install Adaptation Notes for prepared examples; alternatively, generate fresh ones during Activity 1 from your live AI access - Ensure each student has internet access for source-finding (or arrange paper alternative — see Differentiation Notes)

Student work (15 minutes): Students work independently or in pairs. Circulate. Specific things to look for:

- Are students writing the AI claim down exactly, or paraphrasing? (They should write it exactly; paraphrasing during transcription hides what was actually claimed.)
- Are students checking against truly independent sources, or two pages that obviously copy from each other? (Push toward independent sources.)
- Are students documenting honestly when the AI was right? (Some students try to make the AI look bad; gently correct: “Document what you found, not what you wished you found.”)
- Are students stopping at one source? (Push for two; explain why.)

Wrap-up (closing 2 minutes of activity time): - Two or three students share what they found - Acknowledge: this is a real habit, you have just done it once, you will do it many more times across this curriculum and beyond

Closing (5 minutes)

Bring class back together. Highlight one specific student finding (with permission) — particularly powerful if a student found a hallucination during their verification.

Preview Lesson 3: “Tomorrow we take this verification skill and expand it. Instead of checking one AI claim against sources, we will look at how the same topic gets covered across many different kinds of sources — AI, news, advocacy organizations, social media. We will look for bias, missing context, and the patterns of how information actually moves through the world.”

Direct students to Reflection Questions and Self-Check (in Student Edition) to complete after class or as homework.

Student Reading — Reproduced with Teacher Annotations

In Lesson 1, you learned that AI hallucinates [TEACHER NOTE: Direct callback to Lesson 1’s most important concept. If a student needs the recap, this is the moment.] — **that it sometimes produces wrong information in the same confident voice it uses for right information, and that it usually cannot tell the difference. Today’s lesson is about what to do about that.**

The answer is short: verify. [TEACHER NOTE: The lesson’s central claim. Underline. Emphasize.]

Here is a concrete example. Imagine you ask an AI for a quote by Abraham Lincoln. [TEACHER NOTE: This example is concrete and memorable. Most students will quickly grasp how the failure mode works. The Lincoln example also generalizes — AI invents quotes from many real historical figures.]

Verification is a workflow, not a single check. [TEACHER NOTE: The “workflow” framing matters. Students who think of verification as “I’ll just glance at one search result” do not really verify. The five-step structure is what makes verification reliable.]

Step 1: Identify the specific claim. [TEACHER NOTE: Underrated step. Students often try to “verify a paragraph” rather than identifying the specific claims within it. Demonstrate explicitly: “There are 3 claims in this AI response. Which one are we checking?”]

Step 2: Decide what counts as verification. [TEACHER NOTE: Different claims need different evidence. A historical date needs a historical source. A scientific claim needs a scientific source. A quote needs a confirmed primary source. Use Activity 1 to model this judgment.]

Step 3: Find at least two independent sources. [TEACHER NOTE: The “two independent” rule is research methodology. One source could be wrong. Two sources that obviously copy from each other are effectively one source. Two independent sources, each with their own basis for the claim, gives much higher confidence.]

Step 4: Compare the AI claim to the sources. [TEACHER NOTE: Students often want a binary “AI was right / wrong.” The reality is messier — fully correct,

mostly correct (small errors), partly correct (some pieces match), mostly wrong, fully invented. The Source Verification Log template provides this gradient.]

Step 5: Document what you found. [TEACHER NOTE: Documentation is what makes verification stick. Without it, students “verify” in their heads and forget. The Source Verification Log artifact exists for this reason. Treat the documentation as part of the workflow, not as a separate task.]

Not all sources are equally reliable. [TEACHER NOTE: The source hierarchy paragraph. Spend time here. The hierarchy is judgment-based, not strict. Wikipedia is genuinely useful — but as a starting point for finding citations, not as the citation itself.]

The verification habit is not just about AI. [TEACHER NOTE: This paragraph is the bridge to civic literacy. The same skill protects students from any kind of misinformation — news, social media, advocacy claims, things friends repeat. This is why source-bias evaluation appears in Florida civics standards (SS.7.CG.2.9 — analyzing media for bias/symbolism/propaganda, primary; SS.7.CG.2.8 — media/individuals/interest groups influencing government, supporting) and in B.E.S.T. ELA research standards (ELA.7.C.4.1 — research drawing on multiple reliable and valid sources). Note: SS.7.CG.2.10 is sometimes loosely cited here, but its actual text is about citizens addressing state or local problems — that benchmark anchors Lesson 5.]

Modern AI systems try to reduce hallucination. [TEACHER NOTE: Honest acknowledgment that AI is improving. Tech-savvy students will appreciate this honesty. The point: AI improvement is real, the verification habit is still necessary.]

Vocabulary Teaching Strategies

Six terms today (verification, source, credibility, primary source, secondary source, citation). Most students have heard these in social studies; the lesson sharpens their meaning in an information-evaluation context.

Pre-teach during opening: ask the class “what does it mean to verify something?” Get a definition or two. Refine if needed: “Verifying means checking whether something is actually true by comparing it against a source you can trust.”

Primary vs. secondary distinction: this is the trickiest pair for middle school students. Use a concrete example: “If we want to know what Abraham Lincoln actually said, the primary source is a written record of him saying it — a letter, a speech transcript, a contemporary newspaper account. A textbook talking about Lincoln’s quotes is a secondary source — useful, but if the textbook quotes Lincoln, you might want to find the primary source it cites to be sure.” Most students grasp this with one or two examples.

For ELL students: “verificación” is a direct cognate. “Source” maps to “fuente.” “Credibility” maps to “credibilidad.” Most of today’s vocabulary has Spanish cognates, which is helpful.

Vocabulary in use during Activity 2: the Source Verification Log template uses all six terms. By the end of the lesson, every student should have used the vocabulary in their own writing.

Differentiation Notes

Below grade level readers

- Read the verification workflow aloud while students follow along
- Provide a one-sentence version of each step on the board
- For Activity 2, pair below-level readers with on-level partners
- Allow oral verification (student finds the source and explains aloud what it says, rather than writing the comparison)

Above grade level readers

- Extension reading: Foundation Edition Chapter 2 (the longer treatment of why verification matters)
- Have advanced students do their verification on a more complex AI claim (a multi-paragraph response with multiple verifiable claims)
- Have advanced students serve as verification helpers for classmates struggling with the workflow

English Language Learners (ELL)

- Most vocabulary has Spanish cognates; flag them for ELL students
- Allow Spanish-language sources where appropriate (Spanish Wikipedia, Spanish-language news, etc.)
- Provide sentence frames for the Source Verification Log entry: “The AI claimed _____. Source 1 says _____. Source 2 says _____. So the AI was _____ because _____.”
- For newcomer ELL students, focus on a simpler verification (e.g., a single date claim) rather than a complex one

IEP / 504 — ADHD / Executive Function

- Use the five-step workflow as an explicit checklist; check off each step as completed
- Break the 18-minute Activity 2 into shorter visible segments (5 min identify claim, 5 min find sources, 5 min compare, 3 min document)
- Provide pre-formatted Source Verification Log template with sections clearly demarcated

IEP / 504 — Reading or Language Processing

- Audio of the Student Reading (TTS or recorded)
- Allow oral or recorded Source Verification Log entry instead of written
- Larger-font printable template

IEP / 504 — Autism Spectrum

- Provide the lesson structure visually before starting (the same five-component lesson structure students saw in Lesson 1)
- For Activity 2, the systematic five-step workflow may be a strength — autistic students often handle structured procedures well; explicitly acknowledge this if helpful
- If group work in Activity 1 demonstration is overwhelming, allow private observation with later check-in

Anxiety or Emotional Regulation

- Reassure: there is no “right” outcome to verification. Both “the AI was correct” and “the AI was wrong” are legitimate findings.
- The Source Verification Log is graded on process (did the student do the workflow), not outcome (what they found)
- Reflection Questions can be answered privately

Limited Technology Access

- For Activity 2, students without internet can verify against printed sources (textbook, encyclopedia, library books)
- Provide a small set of pre-printed source materials educators can hand out for verification (a textbook excerpt, an encyclopedia entry, a printed government document)
- The Source Verification Log can be completed on paper

Gifted students

- Have them verify a claim where the answer is genuinely unclear or contested — “what is the average global temperature change since 1900?” requires nuanced source evaluation
- Have them research the verification methodologies that journalists use (fact-checking organizations like PolitiFact, FactCheck.org)
- Connect to Foundation Edition Appendix D (AI Agent Platforms) — modern retrieval-augmented systems try to automate verification; what would it take to make that reliable?

Assessment Rubric: Source Verification Log Entry

The Source Verification Log entry is the portfolio artifact for Lesson 2. Evaluate primarily on whether the verification workflow was followed, not on whether the AI was right or wrong.

Criterion	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
Specific claim identified	Vague claim or paraphrase	Specific claim quoted exactly from AI	Specific claim plus brief explanation of why this claim matters
Verification plan stated	No plan; jumped to searching	Plan stated: what kind of source needed, where to look	Plan stated and reasoning given (e.g., “this is a historical claim, so I want a primary source from the Lincoln Presidential Library”)
Two sources found and documented	One source only, or sources not documented	Two sources with type and reference noted	Two independent sources of clearly different types (e.g., one primary, one reputable secondary)
Comparison shows real engagement	Vague “the AI was right/wrong”	Specific comparison: which parts match, which don’t	Nuanced comparison: identifies “mostly correct but with a small error” or “partly true with missing context”
Documentation completeness	Missing key fields	All template fields completed	All fields completed plus reflection on the process
Honesty about findings	Findings may be exaggerated either toward “AI right” or “AI wrong”	Honest report of what sources said	Honest report includes uncertainty: “I am not sure whether this counts as the AI being wrong or just incomplete”
What was learned	Generic (“I learned to verify”)	Specific takeaway from this verification (“I learned that AI quotes from real people are often invented”)	Specific takeaway connected to broader habit (“I am going to verify quotes specifically from now on, because this is the second time I’ve seen AI invent one”)

Sample Proficient artifact (for educator reference):

Date: May 14, 2026
Student: M.S.

AI Response Source: Classroom demonstration, ChatGPT

The Claim Being Verified: "Abraham Lincoln said, 'In the end, it's not the years in your life that count. It's the life in your years.'"

Why This Claim Matters: I want to use this quote in my essay about Lincoln, so I need to know if he actually said it.

Verification Plan: I want to find a primary source – a real Lincoln document or the Lincoln Presidential Library website – or a reputable Lincoln biography that quotes the actual source.

Source 1:

- Type: official source
- Reference: Lincoln Presidential Library website (<https://...>)
- What this source says: I searched for the quote on the Lincoln Presidential Library site. The quote does not appear in any of their collections.

Source 2:

- Type: reputable secondary source / fact-check
- Reference: QuoteInvestigator.com article on this exact quote
- What this source says: This quote is widely misattributed to Lincoln. The actual origin is uncertain but appears to be from a 1947 magazine, decades after Lincoln died. Lincoln did not say it.

Comparison: Fully invented – AI claim is not supported by any reliable source

What I Found: The AI confidently attributed this quote to Lincoln. Lincoln did not say it. The quote comes from a 20th-century source and has been misattributed to many famous people, not just Lincoln.

What I Learned About AI From This Verification: AI seems to be especially likely to invent quotes from famous historical figures. I'm going to verify any quote I plan to use, regardless of who it's attributed to.

This sample would receive Proficient or Exemplary marks depending on the depth of the “what I learned” reflection.

Answer Key / Scoring Notes

Use these notes to calibrate student verification work. The lesson is graded on process quality, not on whether the AI claim turned out true or false.

Bellringer / Warm-Up answer key: – Exact claim: **“Dolphins are fish because they live in water.”** – Correct verification outcome: dolphins are **mammals**, not fish. Living in water is not enough to classify an animal as a fish. – Reliable verification sources include a science textbook, aquarium or marine biology organization, encyclopedia, NOAA or other government wildlife page, or teacher-approved science source. – Evidence that is enough: a source explaining that dolphins breathe air, nurse young, are warm-blooded mammals, and belong to marine mammal groups.

Activity 1 demonstration expected outcomes: – Students should identify one specific factual claim from the AI response before searching. – They should say what kind of source would verify that claim. – They should compare the AI wording to the source wording, not merely announce “right” or “wrong.” – If the AI is partly correct, students should record the nuance. “Mostly correct but missing context” is a valid outcome.

Source Verification Log minimum proficient standard: – Exact claim copied or quoted. – A verification plan that matches the claim type. – Two independent sources documented with source type and reference. – A comparison that identifies what matches and what does not. – A final statement of what the student learned about the claim and about AI reliability.

Self-Check answer key: 1. Verification matters because AI can produce confident but false or unsupported claims; verification protects student work and civic judgment. 2. A primary source comes directly from the original event, person, organization, record, or data source. A secondary source explains, interprets, summarizes, or reports on primary sources. 3. Two independent sources reduce the chance that one source is mistaken, copied, biased, or incomplete. Two pages repeating the same source do not count as truly independent. 4. Usually reliable source types include official government pages, primary documents, textbooks, academic or expert sources, reputable news reporting, and established encyclopedias used as starting points. Usually weaker sources include unsourced social media posts, anonymous blogs, copied quote pages, AI output by itself, and advocacy claims with no evidence. 5. Verification is not only for AI. It also applies to news stories, social media, advocacy claims, rumors, friend-to-friend claims, and civic information.

Common grading mistakes to avoid: – Do not give a high score for finding a correct answer if the student did not document the workflow. – Do not penalize a student for finding that AI was correct; correct AI output is common and worth documenting. – Do not accept “I Googled it” as documentation. The student must name the source used and what it said.

Extension Options

For students who finish early or want to go deeper:

Extension 1: Verify a multi-claim response. Take an AI response with several factual claims and verify each one separately. Document which were correct, which had errors, which were invented.

Extension 2: Compare verification across AI services. Take the same factual question, ask two different AI services, and verify both responses. Were they the same? Different? What does this tell us about AI reliability?

Extension 3: Investigate hallucination patterns. Look up published research or journalism on AI hallucination types. What kinds of hallucinations are most common? What categories of claim is AI most likely to get wrong?

Extension 4: Research professional verification. What do professional journalists do for verification? Look up the methodology of one or two fact-checking organizations (PolitiFact, FactCheck.org, Snopes). How does their process compare to what we did today?

No-Install Adaptation Notes

If you do not have live AI access for Activity 1, use the prepared materials below.

Prepared AI claims for verification (Activity 2 source material)

These are pre-prepared AI claims for student verification practice. Mix verifiable-correct, verifiable-incorrect, and verifiable-invented claims so students experience the full range of outcomes.

Claim Set A (likely true; verification confirms): 1. "The Roman Republic ended in 27 BCE when Augustus became the first Emperor." 2. "Photosynthesis converts carbon dioxide and water into glucose using energy from sunlight." 3. "Florida became a U.S. state in 1845, the 27th state to join the Union."

Claim Set B (likely incorrect with subtle error; verification reveals the error): 1. "The Roman Republic ended in 31 BCE." [Correct year: 27 BCE; 31 BCE was the Battle of Actium] 2. "Photosynthesis happens in the cell's mitochondria." [Wrong organelle; happens in chloroplasts] 3. "Florida became a U.S. state in 1845, the 28th state to join the Union." [27th, not 28th]

Claim Set C (likely invented; verification reveals fabrication): 1. "Mark Twain wrote, 'The two most important days in your life are the day you are born and the day you find out why.'" [Widely misattributed; not Twain] 2. "Eleanor Roosevelt said, 'No one can make you feel inferior without your consent.'" [Widely attributed to her but not actually a documented quote of hers] 3. "Albert Einstein said, 'Education is what remains after one has forgotten what one has learned in school.'" [Misattribution; actually from a different source]

Distribute one claim per student, varying across the three sets so the class collectively experiences different outcomes.

Verification demonstration without live AI

Use Claim B-1 or C-1 as your demonstration claim. Walk through the five-step workflow:

1. Identify the claim (read it aloud, write it on the board)
2. Plan verification (where would we look? — historical source for B-1; primary source documenting Twain's actual writings for C-1)
3. Find sources — model the search; for the prepared demonstration, you can have a printed reference page ready
4. Compare — show the AI claim and the source side by side
5. Document — fill in a Source Verification Log template on the board as you go

The demonstration takes about 8 minutes and reaches the same learning objective as live AI demonstration.

Common Misconceptions

"If I can't find it on Google, it must be made up." Not necessarily. Some real sources are not indexed by general search engines, are paywalled, or require library access. For some claims, "I can't easily verify" means the verification process needs to escalate (ask a librarian, use academic databases) rather than concluding the AI is wrong.

"If the first source I found agrees with the AI, the AI must be right." Not necessarily. The first source may itself be wrong, may be parroting the AI's same misinformation, or may be incomplete. The two-source rule exists for this reason.

"Verification is too much work for normal use." It can feel that way at first. With practice, the workflow gets faster — most verifications take 2–5 minutes, not 30. The lesson's framing: do verification when the fact actually matters; for casual exploration, you may not need formal verification.

"AI got it right this time, so it's fine." AI being right one time tells you nothing about whether it will be right next time. The verification habit is about the kind of work you are doing (work where being wrong matters), not about the AI's track record. Even AI that is usually right occasionally hallucinates.

"Wikipedia is always wrong / Wikipedia is always right." Both are wrong. Wikipedia is a useful starting point — its citations point to real sources you can then verify. Wikipedia articles vary in quality; well-developed articles on widely-edited topics are usually accurate, while obscure topics or recent events may be less reliable. Use Wikipedia to find sources, then verify those sources directly.

Cross-Curricular Connections

Social Studies (Civics): SS.7.CG.2.9 (analyzing media and political communications for bias, symbolism, and propaganda) is the most direct grade-7 alignment, with SS.7.CG.2.8 (media/individuals/interest groups influencing government) as supporting context. Note: SS.7.CG.2.10 — sometimes loosely described as "source evaluation" — is in fact the *citizens addressing state or local problems* benchmark and anchors Lesson 5 rather than this lesson. Coordinate with the social studies teacher: today's lesson is the same source-bias evaluation work students will do on historical sources in U.S. History or on political communications in civics.

ELA (Research): B.E.S.T. ELA Communication standards (ELA.7.C.4.1) emphasize research and inquiry, including locating multiple sources, evaluating credibility, and documenting sources. Today's lesson is the foundational research methodology those Communication-strand standards assume. (Note: B.E.S.T. ELA uses "C" for Communicating rather than "W" for Writing, which is the strand prefix in some other state frameworks.)

Science: scientific evidence relies on primary sources (peer-reviewed research) verified across multiple studies. The two-source rule and primary-source preference apply directly to scientific reasoning. Coordinate with the science teacher to reinforce.

Mathematics: for AI claims about statistics or numerical relationships, students may need to evaluate the math underlying the claim, not just whether sources agree. Coordinate with the math teacher about how to evaluate quantitative claims.

Parent Communication Notes

Most parents will appreciate this lesson without specific communication. The verification habit is a clearly responsible practice that aligns with what most parents already want from school — students who think critically rather than accept claims at face value.

Specific situations that warrant additional communication:

A student finds something genuinely surprising during verification (e.g., that a quote they had heard for years is misattributed). This is a teachable moment worth sharing: "[Student] verified an AI claim today and discovered that a quote often attributed to [person] is misattributed. They asked great questions about how widespread misinformation can be. You may enjoy continuing the conversation at home."

A student becomes worried about how much misinformation is "out there." Normalize: this is how many adults feel when they first develop the verification habit. Reassure: the verification habit is the response. They are now better equipped to handle the information environment than most adults are.

A parent asks for the verification framework to use at home. Share the five-step workflow from the lesson. It applies to any source, not just AI.

Closing the lesson well

Lesson 2 establishes the verification habit. Lesson 3 expands it to a wider information landscape. The transition matters.

End-of-lesson language: "Today you practiced verification on one AI claim. Tomorrow we are going to take this same skill and apply it to something bigger — looking at how information moves through different sources, where bias appears, what gets left out. The verification habit you started today becomes the foundation for everything we do for the rest of this curriculum, and for the kind of citizen you grow up to be."

This frames Lesson 3 as the natural extension and the curriculum's broader civic purpose as the larger arc.

Lesson 2: Verifying AI Answers With Sources

Student Edition

What you will learn today

By the end of this lesson, you should be able to take an AI answer that contains a factual claim, find real sources to check whether the claim is accurate, and document what you learned. You should also know why this habit — verification — protects you from the most common way students get into trouble with AI.

This is the most important habit you will build in this whole curriculum. You will use it every time you use AI, for the rest of your life.

Bellringer / Warm-Up Options

Your teacher will choose one option.

Use this warm-up claim for all three options:

“Dolphins are fish because they live in water.”

Option A — Fast Start (3 minutes): For the claim “Dolphins are fish because they live in water,” write the exact claim you would need to check. Do not answer whether it is true yet; just identify the claim.

Option B — Standard Warm-Up (5 minutes): Answer these three questions about the claim “Dolphins are fish because they live in water”:

1. What exact claim would you need to check?
2. What kind of source would you use to verify it? Examples: a science textbook, a reputable aquarium or marine biology website, an encyclopedia, or a government wildlife page.
3. What would count as enough evidence to trust your answer?

Option C — Extended Launch (6-7 minutes): Answer these four questions about the claim “Dolphins are fish because they live in water”:

1. What exact claim would you need to check?
2. What kind of source would you use to verify it?
3. What would count as enough evidence to trust your answer?
4. If two websites disagreed about the claim, what would you do next?

The point is not just whether the claim is right or wrong. The point is how you would check.

Vocabulary

Six words for today's lesson.

Verification. The process of checking whether something is actually true by comparing it against a source you can trust.

Source. Where information comes from. A source can be reliable (a textbook, a peer-reviewed article, an official government website) or unreliable (a random social media post, an AI without verification, a stranger making claims).

Credibility. How trustworthy a source is. A source has high credibility when it is produced by people with relevant expertise, has accountability for accuracy, and can be checked.

Primary source. A first-hand record of something — original documents, eyewitness accounts, official records, the actual study a finding came from.

Secondary source. A second-hand discussion of something — a textbook explaining a study, a journalist reporting on an event, an article summarizing other sources. Useful, but you may need to trace back to the primary source for the most reliable information.

Citation. A documented reference to where you got information. Citations make it possible for others (and your future self) to check whether a claim is accurate.

Reading: Why Verification Is the Habit That Matters Most

In Lesson 1, you learned that AI hallucinates — that it sometimes produces wrong information in the same confident voice it uses for right information, and that it usually cannot tell the difference. Today's lesson is about what to do about that.

The answer is short: **verify**. Anywhere a fact actually matters, check the AI's answer against a real source before relying on it. Get into the habit early, do it often, and use AI from a position of strength instead of from a position of trust you have not earned.

This sounds simple. In practice, it is the single move that separates students who use AI well from students who get burned.

Why You Cannot Just Trust AI

Here is a concrete example. Imagine you ask an AI for a quote by Abraham Lincoln. The AI gives you a quote that sounds Lincoln-like — thoughtful, a bit folksy, on a topic you would expect Lincoln to address. You use it in an essay.

Three weeks later, your teacher writes “Lincoln never said this — please cite a source” on your paper.

This happens. A lot. AI is particularly prone to inventing quotes from real historical figures because the patterns of how those figures spoke are well-represented in its training data, but the specific quote it produces may be invented. The AI is not trying to deceive you. It just generated text that fits the pattern of “Lincoln-style quote about X” without retrieving an actual quote.

If you had verified the quote against a real source — a Lincoln biography, the Lincoln Presidential Library website, a primary-source archive — you would have caught the problem before it reached your paper.

The Verification Workflow

Verification is a workflow, not a single check. Here is the basic version, which you will practice today.

Step 1: Identify the specific claim. AI responses often contain many claims. Pick the ones that matter most for your work — the facts, dates, names, statistics, quotes you might actually use.

Step 2: Decide what counts as verification. Different claims need different evidence. A factual claim about history needs a historical source. A claim about science needs a scientific source. A claim about current events needs a current source. A quote from a real person needs a confirmed primary source where the person actually said it.

Step 3: Find at least two independent sources. One source is not enough — you might find a source that simply repeats the same wrong information. Two independent sources, each tracing back to credible original information, gives you much better confidence.

Step 4: Compare the AI claim to the sources. Does the AI claim match what the sources say? Is it close but not exactly right (a paraphrase rather than a real quote)? Is it partly true but missing important context? Is it just wrong?

Step 5: Document what you found. Write down the AI claim, the sources you checked, and what you learned. This documentation is the artifact that proves verification happened. If you ever need to defend the use of AI in your work to a teacher, this documentation is your evidence.

What Sources Are Worth Checking Against

Not all sources are equally reliable. Here is a rough hierarchy, from most to least reliable for verification purposes:

Primary sources. Original documents. The actual study, the actual speech, the actual government record, the actual eyewitness account. These are the most reliable because everything else is built on top of them.

Reputable secondary sources. Textbooks, peer-reviewed articles, established encyclopedias, well-edited journalism. These are reliable when the publisher has a track record of accuracy and accountability for errors.

Official sources. Government websites for government information, university websites for academic information, professional organizations for professional information. These are reliable for the kinds of information they are responsible for.

General reference websites. Wikipedia is often a useful starting point — but a Wikipedia article is only as good as the citations it links to. Use Wikipedia to find primary and secondary sources; do not stop at Wikipedia.

Less reliable sources. Random websites, blog posts without citations, social media posts, AI without verification (so: not the original AI claim you are trying to verify), opinion pieces that do not cite their evidence.

Almost never reliable for verification. AI claims you have not checked, anonymous online sources, sites known for producing misinformation, sources that disagree with the well-established consensus without good reason.

Why This Matters for Civic Literacy

The verification habit is not just about AI. It is the same habit you need to think clearly about anything that gets presented to you as fact — news stories, social media posts, advocacy claims, claims by public officials, things your friends tell you. The skill you build today is broader than AI.

This is a major reason civics standards in Florida and elsewhere include source evaluation. Citizens who cannot evaluate sources cannot reliably tell true from false in public life. They cannot evaluate competing policy claims. They cannot identify when they are being manipulated. They cannot defend their own positions with evidence.

You are not just learning to verify AI today. You are practicing a skill you will use as a citizen for the rest of your life.

What “Reduces, Not Eliminates” Means

Modern AI systems try to reduce hallucination. Some connect to web search and pull in real sources. Some use techniques like “retrieval-augmented generation” that ground responses in real documents. Some are getting better at saying “I do not know” instead of inventing answers.

These improvements are real. They will continue. But none of them eliminate the underlying issue. AI still produces wrong information sometimes, even with all the modern improvements applied. Your verification habit protects you regardless of which AI you are using or how advanced it is.

The habit is not about distrust. It is about not putting more weight on a source than source can carry. AI can carry a lot of weight on language tasks. It cannot carry the weight of “I am sure this is true” — only verification can.

Activity 1: Watch the Verification Demonstration

Your teacher will demonstrate the verification workflow on a real AI response. You will watch them:

1. Get an AI response to a question that contains factual claims
2. Identify the specific claims worth checking
3. Look up real sources to compare the AI claim against
4. Document what they found

As you watch, pay attention to:

- What does the teacher do when the AI claim turns out to be correct?
- What does the teacher do when the AI claim turns out to be wrong?
- How long does verification actually take?
- What sources does the teacher use?

You will discuss after the demonstration.

Activity 2: Your Own Verification (Portfolio Artifact)

Now you will do your own verification. Your teacher will give you (or help you find) an AI response that contains at least one specific factual claim — a date, a quote, a statistic, a historical event detail, a scientific claim, something concrete you can check.

Step 1. Identify the specific claim from the AI response. Write it down exactly as the AI stated it.

Step 2. Plan your verification. What kind of source do you need? Where would you look? Write down your plan before you start searching.

Step 3. Find at least two real sources. Note the URLs, page numbers, or other reference information for each.

Step 4. Compare the AI claim against your sources. Did the AI get it right? Wrong? Partly right? Use specific evidence from the sources.

Step 5. Write your finding. One short paragraph: what was the claim, what did you check it against, what did you find.

Step 6. Add this to your portfolio as your **Source Verification Log entry**.

This is the portfolio artifact for Lesson 2. Use the template below.

Source Verification Log Entry — Template

SOURCE VERIFICATION LOG

Date: _____

Student: _____

AI Response Source: (e.g., ChatGPT, prepared example, classroom demo)

The Claim Being Verified:

[Write the exact AI claim, in quotes if possible]

Why This Claim Matters:

[1–2 sentences on why this is worth verifying]

Verification Plan:

What kind of source do I need? Where am I going to look?

Source 1:

- Type: (primary / reputable secondary / official / general reference)
- Reference: (title, URL, page, etc.)
- What this source says about the claim:

Source 2:

- Type:
- Reference:
- What this source says about the claim:

Comparison:

Did the AI claim match the sources? Choose one:

[] Fully correct – AI claim matches sources
[] Mostly correct – AI claim matches in substance but with small errors
[] Partly correct – important pieces match, important pieces do not
[] Mostly wrong – AI claim contradicts the sources on important points
[] Fully invented – AI claim is not supported by any reliable source

What I Found (one short paragraph):

What I Learned About AI From This Verification:

Reflection Questions

5 minutes. Write enough to show your thinking.

1. What is one thing you noticed during verification that surprised you?
2. If you found that the AI was wrong, how did you feel? If the AI was right, how did you feel? Why?
3. How long did verification take? Was it worth the time?
4. When in your school work would you actually use the verification workflow? When would you skip it?
5. How is verifying an AI claim similar to (or different from) verifying any other source — a news story, a social media post, something a friend told you?

Self-Check

Before moving on, check whether you can answer these.

1. Why is verifying AI claims important?
2. What is the difference between a primary source and a secondary source?
3. Why do you need at least two independent sources for verification, not just one?
4. Name two kinds of sources that are usually reliable and one kind that is usually not.
5. Is verification just for AI, or for other kinds of information too? Explain.

Looking Ahead

Tomorrow's lesson takes the verification skill you practiced today and applies it to a wider problem: identifying bias and missing context across information sources of all kinds — AI, news, advocacy organizations, social media. The Information Integrity Lab format you will learn in Lesson 3 builds directly on what you did today.

Lesson 3: Media Bias, Claims, and Digital Persuasion

Teacher Edition

Lesson at a Glance

Lesson length: 45 minutes core instruction + 25 minutes student independent work

Learning objectives. By the end of this lesson, students will be able to: 1. Apply the six-question framework (claim, evidence, source, audience, missing context, bias) to any information source 2. Compare how the same topic is treated across multiple source types (AI, news, advocacy, social media) 3. Identify bias in sources, including sources they instinctively trust 4. Recognize missing context and explain how it shapes meaning 5. Produce a documented Media Analysis demonstrating cross-source critical reading 6. Articulate the connection between source-evaluation skills and civic literacy

Florida standards addressed: - **FL B.E.S.T. CS (grades 6–8):** Technological Impact — SC.7.TI.1.3 (“Identify how media is used to influence information,” strong primary fit); Personal Health and Safety — SC.7.HS.1.7, SC.8.HS.3.2 (“Analyze how digital media and communication influence behavior”); Communication and Collaboration - **Florida Civics:** SS.7.CG.2.9 (primary, full development — analyzing media for bias, symbolism, propaganda); SS.7.CG.2.8 (continued — media/individuals/interest groups influencing government); SS.8.CG.2.4 (grade 8 civic-participation history extension, taught within M/J U.S. History #2100010) - **B.E.S.T. ELA:** Reading Informational Text — Argument (ELA.7.R.2.4), Comparative (ELA.7.R.3.3), Rhetoric (ELA.7.R.3.4); Communication — Argument (ELA.7.C.1.3 — note B.E.S.T. uses C.1 prefix, not W.1); Vocabulary (ELA.7.V.1.1); K-12 ELA Expectations (ELA.K12.EE.4.1 collaborative discussion, ELA.K12.EE.6.1 voice and tone)

(See the Standards Alignment Matrix for benchmark-level alignment.)

Materials needed: - Teacher device with browser access (for AI access during demonstration; live AI optional with prepared example AI outputs as substitute) - Class display - Pre-selected topic for class demonstration of the Information Integrity Lab Mini - Pre-prepared sample sources for demonstration (see No-Install Adaptation Notes) - Student copies of Lesson 3 Student Edition - Internet access for student devices during Activity 2 (or printed source packets if devices unavailable) - Media Analysis Template (in Student Edition)

Google Classroom quick access: [Google Classroom Upload Pack](#) — setup guide, copy/paste assignment posts, upload manifest, and Bellringer / Warm-Up pacing options.

Prerequisites: Lessons 1 and 2 complete. The verification habit from Lesson 2 underlies today’s analysis work.

Vocabulary introduced: Bias, Claim, Evidence, Audience, Missing context, Persuasion, Information Integrity

Portfolio artifact produced: Media Analysis (Lesson 3 contribution)

Assessment: Media Analysis evaluated with rubric below

Background for the Teacher

Lesson 3 is the curriculum’s most ambitious lesson conceptually. It asks students to do something hard: read multiple sources critically at the same time, identify patterns and gaps across them, and recognize bias in sources they trust as well as sources they don’t. This is the work of civic literacy at the middle-school level.

Three framings are important to get right:

Bias is universal. Students sometimes arrive at this lesson with a “bias means lying” association — and a sense that “my side” is unbiased while “the other side” is. The lesson reframes: every source has perspective; the question is what the perspective is and how it shapes what is said. This applies to sources the student likes, sources their parents like, sources the school assigns, and sources nobody likes. Frame this as intellectual honesty, not as cynicism.

Missing context is harder to see than direct misinformation. Direct misinformation is easier to call out — the source said something that is wrong. Missing context is sneakier — the source said something that is technically true but leaves out the surrounding information that would change the reader’s interpretation. Most modern misinformation works through missing context, not outright lies. Teaching students to look for what is left out is one of the highest-leverage skills in this lesson.

The lesson is the bridge to civic literacy. Florida civics standards SS.7.CG.2.9 (analyzing media and political communications for bias, symbolism, and propaganda — primary), SS.7.CG.2.8 (impact of media, individuals, and interest groups on monitoring and influencing government — supporting), and SS.8.CG.2.4 (grade 8 civic-participation history extension, taught within M/J U.S. History #2100010) ask students to evaluate sources on public issues and the media-and-democracy patterns those sources sit inside. This lesson is the methodology that makes those standards practical. A student who can do the Information Integrity Lab Mini on a topic can do it on any civic question they encounter.

The lesson is intentionally non-partisan in its examples and topics. The skill is the goal; specific political conclusions are not. When students discover bias in sources that match their own views, that is a successful learning outcome — not a problem to manage.

Lesson Procedure

Total: 45 minutes core instruction + 25 minutes student independent work.

Timing note for first delivery: Times are targets, not requirements. First-time delivery often runs 5–10 minutes long because the six-question framework is new and students need practice naming missing context. If pacing gets tight, reduce the class demonstration to three sources and let students finish the synthesis paragraph independently.

Bellringer / Warm-Up Options (choose one)

Use one option at the start of class. If pacing is tight, use Option A and treat it as the first three minutes of the Opening rather than an added activity. Display this exact warm-up sentence for all options: “This new school policy will solve the problem for everyone.”

Option A — Fast Start (3 minutes): Post: “This new school policy will solve the problem for everyone.” Students identify the claim being made. Expected claim: the new school policy will solve the problem for everyone. Ask one student to read their claim statement aloud.

Option B — Standard Warm-Up (5 minutes): Post: “This new school policy will solve the problem for everyone. 1. What claim is being made? 2. Who might be the audience? Examples: students, parents, teachers, administrators, school board members, or voters. 3. What important context is missing? Examples: what the policy is, what problem it addresses, who benefits, who disagrees, or what evidence supports it.” Have students share what context is missing. Use that to introduce the six-question framework.

Option C — Extended Launch (6-7 minutes): Post: “This new school policy will solve the problem for everyone. 1. What claim is being made? 2. Who might be the audience? 3. What important context is missing? 4. How could two people with different opinions use this sentence in different ways?” Use this to introduce audience, framing, and persuasion.

Opening (5 minutes)

Recap from Lesson 2: “Yesterday you verified an AI claim against real sources. You learned the verification workflow. Today we expand it. Instead of one AI claim against sources, we are going to look at one topic across many sources — AI, news, advocacy, social media — and see what each one is doing.”

Bridge: “By the end of class, you will be able to look at any information you encounter and ask six questions about it. This is one of the most important skills any citizen has.”

State the lesson goal as written in the Student Edition.

Direct Instruction (15 minutes)

Walk students through the Student Reading. The reading is longer and conceptually denser than Lessons 1 and 2; pace accordingly.

Key sections to emphasize:

“Information Doesn’t Travel Through One Pipe” — set up the lesson’s premise. The same topic gets discussed in many places by many actors with many purposes. No single source is “the truth”; all are interpretations.

“Information Has Always Been Messy. AI Just Made It Faster.” — important framing. Students sometimes blame AI for misinformation. The honest answer: people have always shaped information; AI accelerated the speed and scale, which is a real problem, but the underlying skills (verification, source evaluation, critical reading) are timeless.

“What to Look For in Any Source” — the six questions framework. This is the lesson’s most important content. Spend time here. Walk through each question with a concrete example. Use a familiar source type (e.g., a recent news headline students have seen) to demonstrate the framework before applying it formally in Activity 1.

“What This Has to Do With Civic Life” — the bridge to civic literacy. The Florida civics standards reason for this lesson. Make the connection explicit so students understand why this is in their curriculum.

“A Note on Bias” — read this paragraph carefully. The reframing — every source has bias; the question is what kind, where, how it shapes the message — is one students need to hear directly. Some students will resist; let them work through the resistance during Activity 2.

Activity 1: Class Demonstration (10 minutes)

Pick a topic and lead the class through the six-question framework on three or four sources covering it. Topic recommendations (choose one):

- **Sea level rise impacts in Florida** (concrete, local relevance, plenty of source diversity)
- **Use of phones in middle schools** (immediately relevant to students’ lives)
- **Endangered species protection in your county** (local civic relevance)

For the chosen topic, gather (in advance): - An AI response on the topic - A news article from a recognized news outlet - An advocacy organization’s framing of the topic - (Optional) a social media post discussing the topic

For each source, lead the class through the six questions on the board: - What is the claim? - What evidence is offered? - What is the source? - Who is the audience? - What context is missing? - Where is the bias?

The demonstration takes about 8 minutes if you keep it disciplined. After analyzing 3–4 sources, do the synthesis question: “What does the pattern across these sources tell us? What does any single source leave out? What would a careful citizen need that no single source provides?”

Activity 2: Student Media Analysis (15 minutes core, plus independent work for completion)

Direct students to Activity 2 in the Student Edition. They will produce their own Media Analysis on a topic.

Topic selection: offer the suggested topics in the Student Edition or assign topics if appropriate. For Florida pilot adopters, topics with local relevance produce the most engaged work.

Source gathering (5 minutes): - AI response: assist students in obtaining one (live AI if available, prepared examples otherwise) - News article: students search a recognized news site (or you provide pre-selected articles from a Florida news source) - Advocacy or government source: students find one (or you provide) - Optional social media post: only if appropriate for your setting

Analysis (10+ minutes): - Students apply the six questions to each source - They write the synthesis paragraph - They complete the Media Analysis template
If students do not finish in class, they complete as homework.

During work, circulate and look for: - Are students naming bias in sources they instinctively trust? (Push them to do this — it is the hardest and most important part.) - Are students noticing missing context? (Often the most overlooked question; prompt: “What’s NOT in this source that should be?”) - Are students producing real synthesis or just listing sources? (The pattern paragraph is what makes the artifact analytical rather than descriptive.)

Closing (5 minutes)

Bring class back. Ask 2–3 students to share one thing they noticed during their analysis — particularly bias in a source they expected to be neutral.

Acknowledge: “This work is genuinely hard. You will not get perfect at it in one lesson. The framework is now in your head; over time, you will use it without thinking.”

Preview Lesson 4: “Tomorrow we shift from analyzing other people’s information to thinking about how YOU use AI — privacy, ethics, academic integrity. The skills you have built so far (verification, source analysis) are about evaluating information from outside. Tomorrow is about how you use information well in your own work.”

Student Reading — Reproduced with Teacher Annotations

In Lesson 2, you practiced verifying a single AI claim against real sources. [TEACHER NOTE: Direct callback to Lesson 2. The verification skill underlies today’s broader analysis.]

A typical topic in the modern world might be discussed: by an AI service... in news articles... by advocacy organizations... across thousands of social media posts... [TEACHER NOTE: This list is the lesson’s core insight. Students often think information comes from one place; the list makes the multi-source reality concrete.]

It is tempting to think that misinformation, bias, and persuasion are new problems caused by AI. They are not. [TEACHER NOTE: This framing matters. Students who blame AI for misinformation will neither use AI well nor handle non-AI sources critically. The honest framing — older problems made faster by AI — produces better student outcomes.]

What to look for in any source. [TEACHER NOTE: The six-question framework. The most important content in the lesson. Students should leave able to recite these six questions.]

1. What is the claim? [TEACHER NOTE: Students often try to “evaluate” without first identifying what is being claimed. Force this step. Many sources hide their actual claim behind framing or rhetoric; naming the claim is half the work.]

2. What evidence is offered? [TEACHER NOTE: Strong sources cite verifiable evidence. Weak sources offer vague references (“studies show”), emotional appeal, or unsupported assertion.]

3. What is the source? [TEACHER NOTE: Connect to Lesson 2 source-evaluation work. Who produced this? What’s their incentive? Is this a credentialed expert with no obvious stake, or an organization that benefits if the claim is true?]

4. Who is the audience? [TEACHER NOTE: Underrated question. Sources frame claims for their audiences. Understanding audience is key to understanding why a source emphasizes what it does.]

5. What context is missing? [TEACHER NOTE: One of the highest-leverage questions. Most modern misinformation works through missing context, not outright lies. Push students to ask: what's NOT here?]

6. Where is the bias? [TEACHER NOTE: The "A Note on Bias" paragraph addresses this in depth. Students may need encouragement to name bias in sources they trust — this is the hardest version of the question.]

The reason source evaluation appears in Florida civics standards [TEACHER NOTE: The bridge to civic literacy. Make this connection explicit during direct instruction.]

A note on bias. [TEACHER NOTE: Read this paragraph carefully during direct instruction. The "every source has bias" framing is the lesson's intellectual move. Students who resist this framing benefit from working through the resistance during Activity 2.]

Vocabulary Teaching Strategies

Seven terms today (more than previous lessons because the lesson is conceptually richer).

Pre-teach during opening: ask "what does bias mean?" Get definitions. Refine: "Bias is a systematic lean in how something is presented. It's not always bad — everyone has perspectives — but unrecognized bias can shape what we believe without us knowing."

Most important pair to distinguish: claim vs. evidence. Students often conflate these. A claim is what is asserted; evidence is what supports the claim. A source can have a strong claim with weak evidence, or a weak claim with strong evidence. The framework asks both questions for a reason.

Most subtle term: missing context. Many students have not thought of "what is left out" as a thing to evaluate. Use a concrete example: "If a source says 'crime is up 20% this year,' missing context might include: compared to what year? In what category? In what location? With what definition of crime?"

For ELL students: "bias" maps roughly to "sesgo" or "parcialidad." "Claim" maps to "afirmación." "Evidence" maps to "evidencia." "Audience" maps to "audiencia." Most cognates work; flag for ELL students.

Differentiation Notes

Below grade level readers

- Walk through the reading section by section, with check-ins
- Provide a simplified version of the six-question framework on a single visual card students can keep
- For Activity 2, simplify by reducing source count to 2 instead of 3

Above grade level readers

- Extension: have them analyze 4 or 5 sources instead of 3
- Extension: have them propose what would make each source's coverage more complete
- Extension reading: Foundation Edition Chapter 14 covers ethics adjacent to bias; relevant for tomorrow's lesson

English Language Learners

- Most vocabulary has Spanish cognates; flag them
- Pair with bilingual peers during analysis
- Allow Spanish-language sources for the Media Analysis (Spanish news, Spanish advocacy organizations); cross-language analysis is a particular strength for ELL students
- Provide sentence frames for the analysis: "The claim is _____. The evidence is _____. The source is _____."

IEP / 504 — ADHD / Executive Function

- Use the six-question framework as an explicit checklist
- Break the analysis work into 4–5 minute segments per source
- Provide pre-formatted Media Analysis template with sections clearly demarcated

IEP / 504 — Reading or Language Processing

- Audio of Student Reading
- Allow oral analysis (student explains their reading of each source aloud rather than writing each section)
- Pair with on-grade peer for source reading

IEP / 504 — Autism Spectrum

- The systematic six-question framework may be a strength for many autistic students
- Allow private work during Activity 2 if group dynamics are overwhelming
- Provide explicit social expectations for the closing share-out

Anxiety or Emotional Regulation

- The bias content can feel charged; reassure that there is no “right” finding
- Make explicit: students will not be graded on what bias they find; they will be graded on whether they did the analysis honestly
- Allow students to choose a low-charge topic for their Media Analysis if a high-charge topic would be difficult

Limited Technology Access

- Provide pre-printed source packets (one packet per topic, 3–4 sources each) for students who cannot search online
- The Media Analysis can be completed entirely on paper

Gifted students

- Have them analyze a topic with genuinely contested expert disagreement (climate adaptation strategies, education policy options) rather than one with clear-cut sourcing
- Have them research how professional fact-checkers and media analysts approach this work
- Have them produce a comparison of how two different news outlets cover the same story

Assessment Rubric: Media Analysis

Criterion	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
Topic specificity	Topic too broad to analyze	Topic specific enough for meaningful comparison	Topic specific to a real local or current issue
Number and variety of sources	Fewer than 3 sources, or all the same type	3 sources of at least 2 different types	3 or more sources spanning AI, news, advocacy/government, and (optionally) social media
Six-question framework applied to each source	Some questions skipped or answered superficially	All six questions answered for each source with substance	Six questions answered with specific evidence cited from each source
Bias identification	Bias named only in “obvious” sources	Bias identified in all sources, including ones the student may agree with	Bias identification is nuanced — distinguishes degree, type, and effect of bias
Missing context identification	“Missing context” answered vaguely or skipped	Specific missing context noted for each source	Missing context analysis includes “what would a citizen need that this leaves out?”
Synthesis paragraph	List of sources without pattern recognition	Pattern across sources articulated; agreement and disagreement named	Synthesis identifies what no single source provides; offers analytical insight beyond any individual source
Honest engagement with discomfort	Student avoids naming bias in trusted sources	Student names bias in trusted sources where it exists	Student reflects in writing on what was hardest about the analysis

Answer Key / Scoring Notes

Lesson 3 has no single answer key because students may analyze different topics and sources. The teacher-facing key is the **six-question framework** plus the quality indicators below.

Six-question framework key: 1. **Claim:** what the source wants the reader/viewer to believe. 2. **Evidence:** facts, examples, data, expert statements, documents, images, personal experience, or reasoning offered to support the claim. 3. **Source:** who produced the message and what role, expertise, incentive, or stake they have. 4. **Audience:** who the message is trying to reach or persuade. 5. **Missing context:** what a careful reader still needs to know before deciding what to believe. 6. **Bias:** the perspective, lean, selection pattern, emotional framing, incentive, or omission shaping how the information is presented.

Self-Check answer key: 1. Bias is a systematic lean or perspective in how information is selected, framed, emphasized, or omitted. It is not always dishonest, but it must be recognized. 2. The six questions are: claim, evidence, source, audience, missing context, and bias. 3. Every source has bias because every source is created by a person, organization, tool, or institution with a perspective, purpose, audience, limits, and choices about what to include or leave out. 4. Missing context means important information needed to understand the claim is absent. Example: “Crime is up 20%” is missing location, time period, crime category, data source, and comparison baseline. 5. These are civic-literacy skills because citizens need to evaluate public claims, media messages, advocacy arguments, official statements, and AI-generated information before forming opinions or acting in public life.

Common grading mistakes to avoid: - Do not require students to label one source “good” and another “bad.” The goal is to analyze how each source works. - Do not accept “this source is biased” as a complete answer. Students should say what kind of bias and how it shapes the message. - Do not treat government or trusted news sources as bias-free. They may be more accountable or evidence-based, but they still make choices about framing and emphasis.

Sample Proficient Artifact (for educator reference)

INFORMATION INTEGRITY LAB MINI — MEDIA ANALYSIS

Date: May 14, 2026
Student: J.R.

Topic: Cell phone restrictions in middle schools

Source 1: AI response (type: AI)

- Claim: Schools should limit phones during class because phones distract students, but students may still need phones for safety and communication.
- Evidence: The response mentions distraction, learning focus, and family contact, but does not cite any specific study or school policy.
- Source: AI system used in class; it summarizes common arguments but is not a primary source.
- Audience: A general student or teacher audience.
- Missing context: No local school policy, no data from our district, no student survey, and no research citation.
- Bias: Balanced-sounding, but it may smooth out conflict and make the issue seem simpler than it is.

Source 2: Local news article (type: news)

- Claim: More schools are restricting phone use because teachers report distraction and administrators want more focused classrooms.
- Evidence: Quotes from a principal and two teachers; mentions discipline referrals decreasing after one school changed its policy.
- Source: Local news reporter covering education.
- Audience: Parents and community members.
- Missing context: Few student voices; no full data table; little attention to students who use phones for medical or family reasons.
- Bias: Emphasizes adult and school-administration perspectives.

Source 3: Parent advocacy post (type: advocacy)

- Claim: Students should be allowed to keep phones because families need direct contact during emergencies.
- Evidence: Uses a parent story about not reaching a child quickly after an incident, but does not compare multiple schools or policies.
- Source: Parent group advocating against strict bans.
- Audience: Other parents and school board members.
- Missing context: Does not address classroom distraction or how many emergencies actually require direct student phone access.
- Bias: Strongly favors family access and safety concerns.

The Pattern Across Sources:

All three sources agree that phones create a real school decision, not just a student preference. They disagree about what problem matters most. The AI gives a balanced overview but no evidence. The news article emphasizes classroom focus and adult management. The parent advocacy post emphasizes safety and family contact. No single source gives a complete answer. A careful citizen would need the actual school policy, student and parent input, teacher experience, discipline or learning data, and exceptions for medical or safety needs.

This sample is **Proficient** because it applies all six questions to three source types and includes a real synthesis paragraph. It becomes **Exemplary** if the student cites the exact article/post, uses more specific evidence, and identifies what data would resolve the disagreement.

Additional Scored Exemplars

Use these shorter calibration examples when scoring varied student work. They are intentionally not perfect; they show how to score real classroom artifacts.

Exemplar A — Exemplary / advanced student

Topic: whether the county should expand bus service near a middle school.

The student analyzes: an AI overview, a county transit webpage, a local news article quoting parents, and a business association statement. For each source, the student identifies the claim, evidence, source, audience, missing context, and bias. The synthesis states: "The county page proves service changes are being studied, but it does not show student-specific safety data. The news article shows parent concern, but mostly interviews families who want expansion. The business group focuses on traffic delay, not student access. The AI answer helped me identify search terms but was not evidence."

Score: Exemplary. The student uses four source types, distinguishes evidence from advocacy, names bias in every source, and explains what no single source provides. Award Exemplary even if the writing has minor grammar errors.

Exemplar B — ELL-adapted Proficient

Topic: plastic waste at a local park.

The student uses sentence frames: "The claim is..." "The source wants..." "The missing context is..." The student analyzes an AI response, a city parks page, and an environmental group page. Some sentences are short: "The city page says cleanup days happen. It does not say how much trash is found. Bias: city wants people to think they are working on it." The synthesis says the city and advocacy source agree litter is real but disagree on urgency.

Score: Proficient. The artifact meets the analytical target even with simplified language. Do not lower the score for sentence-frame use, accent marks, or grammar that does not block meaning.

Exemplar C — IEP-modified Developing moving toward Proficient

Topic: phones in school.

The student completes a two-source version using a teacher-provided template. The AI source and a school policy excerpt are analyzed. Four of the six questions are answered for both sources; missing context is answered only once. The synthesis says: "The AI is general. The school policy is official but does not explain why the rule exists."

Score: Developing, or Proficient if the student's IEP modification reduced the required source count and the missing-context answer was orally explained. Record the accommodation. The key scoring distinction is whether the student performed the six-question reasoning, not whether the artifact matches the full template length.

Extension Options

Extension 1: Compare across time. Have students take a single topic and analyze how a single news outlet has covered it over time. Has the framing shifted? What has been added or dropped from the coverage?

Extension 2: Investigative source-tracing. Take an AI claim or social media post; trace its assertions back through the chain of sources to the original. How many hops does it take? Where does the claim get distorted along the way?

Extension 3: Read across the political spectrum. Have students analyze the same topic across one left-leaning, one right-leaning, and one center-positioned news source. What do all three agree on? What does each emphasize that the others ignore? Particularly suitable for advanced civics students.

Extension 4: Foundation Edition Chapter 8 reading. The research methodology in Chapter 8 of *The Open Source Student* (Foundation Edition) extends today's analytical work into formal research practice.

No-Install Adaptation Notes

If you do not have live AI access for the demonstration, use prepared materials.

Sample topic and prepared source set: Sea level rise impacts in Florida

For the Activity 1 demonstration, you can use this prepared source set on the topic of sea level rise impacts in Florida. The sources illustrate the six-question framework cleanly.

Source 1 — AI response (prepared): *"Sea level rise is a major concern for Florida. Scientists project that sea levels along Florida's coast will rise by approximately 1 to 4 feet by 2100, with significant impacts on coastal communities, infrastructure, and ecosystems. Cities like Miami and Tampa face particular vulnerability due to their low elevation and porous limestone bedrock. Adaptation efforts include seawalls, elevated infrastructure, and managed retreat from the most vulnerable areas."*

Six-question demonstration: - Claim: sea level will rise 1-4 feet by 2100; specific FL cities are vulnerable; specific adaptation strategies exist - Evidence: vague "scientists project"; no specific study cited - Source: AI; we don't know which scientific projections it drew on - Audience: general reader, no specific group - Missing context: range of projections (1-4 feet is wide); time scale (this century is long); regional variation; political context of adaptation funding - Bias: framed as factual / neutral; AI may reflect mainstream scientific consensus, which is itself a kind of position

Source 2 — news article excerpt (prepared): *"South Florida is increasingly experiencing 'sunny day flooding' — flooding during high tides that occurs without rainfall. The phenomenon, driven by sea level rise, is now occurring on more than 60 days per year in some Miami-Dade neighborhoods, up from fewer than 10 days per year a generation ago. Local officials are debating funding for elevated streets, raised sea walls, and other infrastructure adaptations."* [Source attribution: a Florida-based news outlet]

Six-question demonstration: - Claim: sunny day flooding has increased substantially; specific number (60+ days vs. <10); local officials debating funding - Evidence: specific numbers given; "a generation ago" is vague but quantitative claim is stronger than Source 1 - Source: news outlet (named); reporter accountability for accuracy - Audience: South Florida residents and policy followers - Missing context: which specific data source for the 60-day claim; how funding debates are progressing; alternative perspectives on solutions - Bias: implicit assumption that sea level rise is the driver (which scientific consensus supports but isn't argued in the excerpt); no skeptical perspective offered

Source 3 — advocacy organization position (prepared): *"Florida coastal residents face an existential threat from accelerating sea level rise. Without immediate, large-scale federal investment in adaptation infrastructure, hundreds of thousands of homes will become uninsurable within two decades, triggering a coastal real estate collapse. We call on Florida's congressional delegation to support legislation funding \$50 billion in adaptation investments."* [Source attribution: a hypothetical environmental advocacy organization]

Six-question demonstration: - Claim: existential threat; large federal investment needed; specific consequence (uninsurable homes) and timeline (two decades) - Evidence: claims not specifically sourced in the excerpt; would need to follow up - Source: advocacy organization; clear stake in the outcome (federal funding for adaptation) - Audience: congressional members and Florida voters who could pressure them - Missing context: alternative views on adaptation strategy; cost-benefit analysis of federal vs. state vs. local funding; uncertainty in projections - Bias: clearly advocating a specific policy position; not pretending to be neutral; this is honest framing of a clear stake

Source 4 — social media post (prepared): *"My neighbor's house in Miami flooded again last week. Third time this year. The water level is just getting higher. People keep building new condos like nothing's wrong. We need to wake up."* [Source attribution: a hypothetical local resident's social media post]

Six-question demonstration: - Claim: personal experience of repeated flooding; broader assertion that development continues despite the problem; call for action - Evidence: personal observation only; not verifiable from the post - Source: individual; emotional / experiential perspective - Audience: the poster's followers; broader public if shared - Missing context: exact location; whether flooding events are connected to sea level rise vs. drainage issues vs. specific weather; broader

development context – Bias: clear personal frustration; legitimate experience but limited to one observer’s view

Synthesis demonstration: Across these four sources, the agreement: sea level rise is happening and affecting Florida. The disagreements: how urgent it is, what to do about it, who should pay, and how confident the projections are. What no single source provides: a complete picture combining the personal lived experience (Source 4), the local empirical data (Source 2), the policy debate (Source 3), and the scientific projection (Source 1) into a coherent civic understanding. A careful citizen would need all four perspectives to form a defensible view of the issue.

Common Misconceptions

“Mainstream sources are unbiased; alternative sources are biased.” All sources are biased. Mainstream sources have establishment bias; alternative sources have anti-establishment bias. The skill is identifying bias regardless of where it sits.

“If I disagree with a source, it’s biased; if I agree with it, it’s true.” This is the most important misconception to surface. Apply the framework to sources the student likes; bias is often most visible there.

“Identifying bias means I’m being political.” No — identifying bias is intellectual honesty. Refusing to identify bias in sources you trust is the political move.

“All sources are equally biased; we can’t trust anything.” No — bias varies in degree, transparency, and impact. A clearly-labeled opinion column is different from a news article presenting opinion as fact. The skill is calibrated reading, not blanket skepticism.

“Missing context means the source lied.” Not necessarily. Sources have to leave things out — they can’t include everything. The question is whether the missing context distorts the meaning. Some omissions matter; others don’t. Judgment is required.

Cross-Curricular Connections

Social Studies (Civics): SS.7.CG.2.9 (analyzing media for bias, symbolism, propaganda — primary), SS.7.CG.2.8 (media/individuals/interest groups influencing government — supporting), and grade 8 civic-participation extensions (SS.8.CG.2.4) are the closest fits. The Information Integrity Lab Mini is essentially the methodology for the bias-and-influence analysis civics standards expect at grade 7.

ELA (Reading and Communication): the analytical reading work directly serves B.E.S.T. ELA Reading Informational Text standards (ELA.7.R.2.4 Argument, ELA.7.R.3.3 Comparative, ELA.7.R.3.4 Rhetoric). The synthesis paragraph serves Communication — Argument (ELA.7.C.1.3) standards. Note: B.E.S.T. ELA uses “C” (Communicating) as the strand prefix for what other frameworks call “Writing”; the substance is the same.

Social Studies (History): the same six-question framework applies to historical sources. Coordinate with the social studies teacher to reinforce.

Science: scientific claims (especially in policy contexts) require this kind of analysis to navigate well. Coordinate with the science teacher about how to evaluate scientific claims in news coverage.

Parent Communication Notes

Most parents will value this lesson but it can occasionally surface concerns:

A parent worries the lesson is “teaching kids to distrust the news.” Honest response: the lesson teaches calibrated reading, not blanket distrust. Students who can evaluate sources are better positioned to identify reliable journalism than students who can’t. Reading critically is not the same as cynicism.

A parent worries the lesson is “political.” Honest response: the lesson is non-partisan in its examples and topics. The skill is the goal; specific political conclusions are not. The framework applies to sources across the political spectrum.

A student becomes upset when finding bias in a source they trust. This is a learning opportunity. Acknowledge that this is the hardest part of the work. The student is doing it correctly.

Closing the lesson well

Lesson 3 is the curriculum’s most ambitious analytical lesson. Lesson 4 shifts focus to the personal — privacy, ethics, academic integrity. The transition matters.

End-of-lesson language: “You have just done some of the hardest work in this curriculum. You looked at multiple sources critically, named bias including in places it was uncomfortable to name, and started building the analytical habits that distinguish a thoughtful citizen from a passive consumer of information. Tomorrow we turn the analysis inward. We look at how YOU use AI — privacy, ethics, integrity — and what it means to be the kind of person who uses these tools well.”

Lesson 3: Media Bias, Claims, and Digital Persuasion

Student Edition

What you will learn today

By the end of this lesson, you should be able to look at the same topic across several different kinds of sources — AI, news, advocacy organizations, social media — and identify what each source is claiming, what evidence it offers, who its audience is, what important context it leaves out, and where bias appears. You should also be able to use this skill on any topic that comes up in your civic and personal life, not just AI.

This is the lesson where the AI verification habit you built in Lesson 2 becomes a broader skill: critical analysis of information from any source.

Bellringer / Warm-Up Options

Your teacher will choose one option.

Use this warm-up sentence for all three options:

"This new school policy will solve the problem for everyone."

Option A — Fast Start (3 minutes): For the sentence "This new school policy will solve the problem for everyone," write the claim being made. A claim is the idea the sentence is asking you to believe.

Option B — Standard Warm-Up (5 minutes): Answer these three questions about the sentence "This new school policy will solve the problem for everyone":

1. What claim is being made?
2. Who might be the audience for this message? Examples: students, parents, teachers, administrators, school board members, or voters.
3. What important context is missing? Examples: what the policy is, what problem it addresses, who benefits, who disagrees, or what evidence supports it.

Option C — Extended Launch (6-7 minutes): Answer these four questions about the sentence "This new school policy will solve the problem for everyone":

1. What claim is being made?
2. Who might be the audience for this message?
3. What important context is missing?
4. How could two people with different opinions use this sentence in different ways?

Be ready to share one thing you would need to know before trusting the sentence.

Vocabulary

Seven terms today.

Bias. A systematic lean in how something is presented — toward a particular view, group, or interpretation. Bias is not always bad (everyone has perspectives), but unrecognized bias is dangerous because it shapes what we believe without us knowing.

Claim. A statement asserting something to be true. Every source is making claims, even when they don't say "I am claiming."

Evidence. What a source offers to support its claims — data, quotes, references, observations. Strong evidence is verifiable; weak or missing evidence should make you skeptical.

Audience. The people a source is trying to reach. Different audiences get different information, framing, and emphasis. Understanding audience helps you understand why a source says what it says.

Missing context. Information that is left out of a source — sometimes accidentally, sometimes deliberately. What is left out can change the meaning of what is included.

Persuasion. The use of language, framing, evidence, and emotion to move an audience toward a particular view or action. Persuasion is not lying; it is the craft of making a case.

Information Integrity. The degree to which a piece of information is accurate, complete, properly contextualized, and clearly sourced. High-integrity information is honest about what it knows and what it doesn't.

Reading: Information Doesn't Travel Through One Pipe

In Lesson 2, you practiced verifying a single AI claim against real sources. Today's lesson zooms out. Instead of one claim from one source, you will look at the same topic across many different sources — and you will discover that information rarely travels through just one pipe.

A typical topic in the modern world might be discussed: - By an AI service when someone asks about it - In news articles from multiple outlets, each with their own angle - By advocacy organizations on either side of any debate - Across thousands of social media posts, each with limited context - In official government statements from agencies or elected officials - By experts and researchers in technical or academic publications

Each of these sources says something. Each is making claims. Each has its own audience, its own purposes, and its own choices about what to emphasize and what to leave out. None of them is simply "the truth" — they are all interpretations and selections of what could be said about the topic.

The skill you build today is reading across all of those sources at once and seeing the patterns. Where do they agree? Where do they disagree? What does each one emphasize? What does each one leave out? Whose interests are served by each presentation? What would a careful citizen need to know that no single source is telling them?

Information Has Always Been Messy. AI Just Made It Faster.

It is tempting to think that misinformation, bias, and persuasion are new problems caused by AI. They are not. People have always shaped how information is presented to serve their purposes — in newspapers, in pamphlets, in speeches, in books. Bias, framing, and missing context are as old as communication.

What is new is the speed and scale. Information moves around the world in seconds now. AI can produce convincing-sounding content faster than anyone can verify it. Social media spreads claims before they can be evaluated. The ratio of information to verification has gotten worse.

This is not a reason for despair. It is a reason for the verification and analysis skills you are building right now. Citizens who know how to read across sources, identify bias, recognize missing context, and resist persuasion will navigate this environment well. Citizens who do not have these skills get pushed around by whatever information arrives in their feed.

What to Look For in Any Source

When you encounter any piece of information — an AI response, a news article, a social media post, a flyer, a video — six questions help you read it well:

- 1. What is the claim?** Strip away the rhetoric and identify what the source is actually asserting. Sometimes the claim is explicit ("Policy X will cause Y"). Sometimes it is implicit ("Look at this scary photo from a place where Policy X is in effect"). Either way, name the claim before evaluating it.
- 2. What evidence is offered?** Strong sources back up their claims with verifiable evidence — data, citations, quotes from named experts, original documents. Weak sources offer assertion without evidence, vague references ("studies show"), or emotional appeal without backing.
- 3. What is the source?** Who produced this information? What is their track record? What are their incentives? A source from a credentialed expert with no obvious stake is different from a source from an organization that benefits from the claim being true. Both can be useful, but you read them differently.
- 4. Who is the audience?** Whom is this source trying to reach? People who already agree? Skeptics? Decision-makers? The general public? Audience shapes how a source frames its claims, which changes how you should read those claims.
- 5. What context is missing?** What would a careful reader need to know that this source does not tell them? Statistics without comparison? Quotes without context? Events without history? Claims without counter-claims? Missing context is one of the most common ways sources mislead without technically lying.
- 6. Where is the bias?** Every source has a perspective. Sometimes the perspective is upfront and labeled (an opinion column). Sometimes it is hidden behind a neutral-sounding voice. Bias is not always bad — but unrecognized bias is always dangerous.

These six questions are the framework for the **Information Integrity Lab Mini** activity you will do today. Over the rest of this curriculum (and over the years to come), this framework becomes second nature.

What This Has to Do With Civic Life

The reason source evaluation appears in Florida civics standards (and in civics standards across most states and countries) is that being a citizen requires evaluating claims. Voting requires evaluating claims about candidates and issues. Forming opinions on policy requires evaluating claims about consequences. Engaging in public discourse requires distinguishing strong claims from weak ones, your own honest reasoning from your own bias.

Citizens who cannot evaluate sources are citizens who can be pushed around. Citizens who can evaluate sources have agency — they can defend their own positions, challenge claims they doubt, and contribute to public conversation from a position of integrity.

The skill you build today serves you as a student. It also serves you as a citizen, for the rest of your life.

A Note on Bias

It is sometimes uncomfortable to talk about bias in a school setting. Bias has political associations; people get defensive about claims of bias against "their side."

Here is the framing this curriculum uses: every source has bias. Every news outlet, every advocacy organization, every person, every AI service, every government communication, every social media account. The question is not "is this source biased?" — the answer is always yes. The question is "what is the bias, where does it appear, and how does it shape what is being said?"

This question can be asked of sources you agree with and sources you disagree with. The most important place to apply the question is to sources you instinctively trust — because trusted sources can shape your beliefs in ways you may not notice.

This is not about pretending to be neutral. It is about being honest about how every source is positioned, including the ones you like.

Activity 1: Information Integrity Lab Mini (Demonstration)

Your teacher will lead a class demonstration of the Information Integrity Lab Mini using a real topic. As a class, you will look at the same topic across:

- An AI response
- A news article
- An advocacy organization's framing
- A social media post

For each source, the class will work through the six questions: claim, evidence, source, audience, missing context, bias.

Watch how the same topic looks completely different depending on which source you read. That difference is the point.

Activity 2: Your Own Media Analysis (Portfolio Artifact)

Now you will do your own Information Integrity Lab Mini on a topic of your choice (or a topic your teacher assigns). This becomes your **Media Analysis** for the portfolio.

Step 1. Pick (or receive) a topic. Suggested topics for Florida middle schoolers: - Climate impacts in Florida (sea level, hurricanes, water) - Use of phones / social media / AI in schools - Protections for endangered species in your county - Local water quality in your area - A current local zoning or development decision in your community

Step 2. Find at least three sources discussing the topic. Aim for a mix: - One AI response (your teacher will help you get this) - One news article from a recognized news outlet - One advocacy or government source - (Optional) one social media post or community forum discussion

Step 3. For each source, work through the six questions: - What is the claim? - What evidence is offered? - What is the source (who produced this)? - Who is the audience? - What context is missing? - Where is the bias?

Step 4. After analyzing each source separately, write one paragraph (4–6 sentences) on **the pattern across sources**. Where do they agree? Where do they disagree? What does each one emphasize that others leave out? What would a careful citizen need to know that no single source tells them?

Step 5. Add this Media Analysis to your portfolio.

Use the template below.

Media Analysis — Template

INFORMATION INTEGRITY LAB MINI – MEDIA ANALYSIS

Date: _____
Student: _____

Topic: _____

Source 1: _____ (type: AI / news / advocacy / social media / official)

- Claim:
- Evidence:
- Source (who produced):
- Audience:
- Missing context:
- Bias:

Source 2: _____ (type: _____)

- Claim:
- Evidence:
- Source:
- Audience:
- Missing context:
- Bias:

Source 3: _____ (type: _____)

- Claim:
- Evidence:
- Source:
- Audience:
- Missing context:
- Bias:

(Optional) Source 4: _____ (type: _____)

- (Same six questions)

The Pattern Across Sources (one paragraph, 4–6 sentences):
Where do these sources agree? Where do they disagree? What does each emphasize?

What context is missing from all of them? What would a careful citizen need to know that no single source tells them?

Reflection Questions

Take 5 minutes.

1. Which source did you find most surprising? Why?
 2. Did any source's bias surprise you? (Including a source you instinctively trusted?)
 3. How does this analysis change how you will read information in the future?
 4. What is one source on your topic that you wish you could analyze but did not have time to find?
 5. How does the verification habit from Lesson 2 connect to the Information Integrity Lab from today's lesson?
-

Self-Check

1. Define "bias" in your own words.
 2. What are the six questions you ask of any source?
 3. Why does every source have bias?
 4. What does "missing context" mean? Give an example.
 5. Why are these skills part of civic literacy, not just AI literacy?
-

Looking Ahead

Tomorrow's lesson focuses on the personal side of using AI: privacy, ethics, and academic integrity. You will learn how to use AI in ways that protect you and others, and how to be honest about your AI use in your school work. Together with today's lesson on bias and analysis, this gives you the full ethical foundation for using AI well.

Lesson 4: Privacy, Ethics, and Academic Integrity

Teacher Edition

Lesson at a Glance

Lesson length: 45 minutes core instruction + 20 minutes student independent work

Learning objectives. By the end of this lesson, students will be able to: 1. Identify categories of personal information that should not be entered into commercial AI services 2. Distinguish appropriate from inappropriate AI use in school work 3. Articulate the capability-vs-credential trap and explain why it matters 4. Produce an AI Use Disclosure that demonstrates honest documentation of AI use 5. Connect personal ethics around AI to broader civic responsibility

Florida standards addressed: - **FL B.E.S.T. CS (grades 6–8):** Personal Health and Safety — SC.7.HS.1.4 (categorize potential dangers), SC.7.HS.1.6 (risks/benefits of Internet access), SC.7.HS.1.7 (safe practices), SC.8.HS.1.2 (procedures to protect personal information, primary), SC.8.HS.3.2 (digital media influence on behavior); Cyber Security — SC.7.CS.1.1 (data in three states), SC.7.CS.3.3 (data vulnerabilities), SC.8.CS.2.1 (network/IoT privacy), SC.8.CS.2.3 (data permanency); Technological Impact — SC.7.TI.2.1 (legal/ethical behaviors), **SC.7.TI.2.2 (responsible use of communication media — strong primary fit)**, SC.7.TI.2.4 (ethical use of collected data); **Computing Components — SC.8.CO.3.1 (desktop applications vs. complementary online subscription version — strong primary fit for local-AI vs. cloud-AI privacy framing)** - **Florida Civics:** SS.8.CG.2.2 (responsibilities of citizens at local/state/national levels) and SS.8.CG.2.3 (civic virtue) — grade 8 extensions taught within M/J U.S. History #2100010 - **B.E.S.T. ELA:** Communication — Argument (ELA.7.C.1.3 — note B.E.S.T. uses C.1 prefix, not W.1); Vocabulary (ELA.7.V.1.1); K-12 ELA Expectations — Collaborative Discussion (ELA.K12.EE.4.1) and Voice & Tone (ELA.K12.EE.6.1)

(See the Standards Alignment Matrix for benchmark-level alignment.)

Materials needed: - Teacher device with browser/projection - Pre-prepared scenarios for Activity 1 discussion (provided in this Teacher Edition) - Student copies of Lesson 4 Student Edition - AI Use Disclosure template (in Student Edition) - Optional: copies of school's existing AI use policy or academic integrity policy

Google Classroom quick access: [Google Classroom Upload Pack](#) — setup guide, copy/paste assignment posts, upload manifest, and Bellringer / Warm-Up pacing options.

Prerequisites: Lessons 1, 2, and 3 complete. The verification (Lesson 2) and analysis (Lesson 3) work informs the ethical reasoning in this lesson.

Vocabulary introduced: Privacy, Personal information, Disclosure, Plagiarism, Academic integrity, Capability

Portfolio artifact produced: AI Use Disclosure (Lesson 4 contribution)

Assessment: AI Use Disclosure evaluated with rubric below

Background for the Teacher

This is the curriculum's most important lesson for protecting students from the most common ways AI use damages them — both in the immediate term (privacy violations, academic integrity violations) and in the long term (the capability-vs-credential trap that hollows out their actual learning).

Three framings carry the lesson:

Privacy is structural. The lesson is not about telling students “don’t trust AI companies” — it’s about recognizing that commercial AI services are not designed to keep their user data private and adapting your behavior accordingly. The simple test (“would I be comfortable if this were posted publicly with my name?”) is the working heuristic students can apply in real time without needing to read every privacy policy.

The capability-vs-credential trap is the deepest argument in the curriculum. Students who internalize this concept use AI well throughout their education and beyond. Students who don’t internalize it use AI to skip the cognitive work that school is supposed to develop, and pay the price years later when capability gaps surface. The lesson treats this with care — not moralizing, just honest about consequences.

Disclosure is the move that keeps students safe. Hidden AI use is high-risk academically; honest disclosure of permitted use is low-risk. The disclosure habit, built early, is what makes ongoing AI use in school work sustainable. This is also the practice that builds character — students who learn to handle their methods honestly become adults who handle their methods honestly.

The lesson is intentionally non-judgmental about students who have used AI inappropriately in the past. Most students will have. The goal is to build the habit going forward, not to punish past mistakes. The “what if you made a mistake” section in the student reading exists for this reason.

Lesson Procedure

Total: 45 minutes core instruction + 20 minutes student independent work.

Timing note for first delivery: Times are targets, not requirements. First-time delivery often runs 5–10 minutes long because students want to discuss edge cases around academic integrity. If pacing gets tight, use three scenarios instead of five and assign the disclosure reflection as independent completion work.

Bellringer / Warm-Up Options (choose one)

Use one option at the start of class. If pacing is tight, use Option A and treat it as the first three minutes of the Opening rather than an added activity. Use this rating system: OK to share = generally safe to type into an approved AI tool; Use caution = maybe safe only after removing personal details or asking your teacher; Do not share = too personal, private, or risky to type into an AI tool. Use this item list: (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, and (5) a question about a vocabulary word.

Option A — Fast Start (3 minutes): Post the rating system and item list above. Students choose one item, mark it OK to share, Use caution, or Do not share, then explain why in one sentence.

Option B — Standard Warm-Up (5 minutes): Post the rating system and all five items above. Students classify every item as OK to share, Use caution, or Do not share. Ask for quick share-outs that include one safe item and one unsafe item.

Option C — Extended Launch (6-7 minutes): Post the rating system and all five items above. Students classify every item, then write one rule that could help a student decide what not to type into an AI tool. Use their rules to introduce the lesson's privacy heuristic: if you would not want it posted publicly with your name, do not put it into an AI tool.

Opening (5 minutes)

Recap from Lessons 1–3: "You've learned that AI hallucinates, that you should verify, and that you should read all sources critically. Today we turn the focus inward: how do YOU use AI in ways that make you stronger, not weaker?"

Bridge: "By the end of class, you'll have produced an AI Use Disclosure — a documented record of how you've been using AI in your school work. This is the practice that makes your AI use honest and sustainable."

State lesson goal as written in Student Edition.

Direct Instruction (15 minutes)

Walk students through the Student Reading. Pace carefully — the content is dense and consequential.

Key sections to emphasize:

"Privacy: What Not to Share" — read the categories aloud. Pause: "Has anyone here typed something into AI that, looking back, you wish you hadn't?" Don't require sharing; the question itself is the teaching moment. The simple test ("would I be comfortable if this were posted publicly with my name?") is the heuristic students should leave with.

"When You Use Local AI, Privacy Works Differently" — short paragraph, important distinction. Local AI has different (better) privacy properties than commercial AI. This explains why the curriculum's Foundation Edition emphasizes local AI installation.

"Ethics: Using AI Honestly in School Work" — the central content of the lesson. Read the two-students example carefully. Pause and ask: "Which student is in better shape five years from now? Why?" The answer should be Student B, but get students to articulate why — because Student B has both credential and capability, while Student A has only credential.

"The capability-vs-credential trap" — the most important conceptual content in the lesson. Pause after reading. Ask: "Have you seen this happen to anyone you know? Have you done it yourself, even a little?" This is the moment many students will privately recognize themselves; the recognition is part of the learning.

"When AI Use Is Clearly Fine, Clearly Not Fine, and Gray" — read the lists. Acknowledge the gray areas honestly. The "ask the teacher" guidance is critical; students who don't know the answer should ask, not guess.

"Disclosure: The Honest Move" — read the disclosure example. This is the format students will use in Activity 2.

"What If You Made a Mistake?" — important paragraph for any student who has used AI inappropriately in the past. The honest move is to come forward; the consequences of disclosure are almost always smaller than consequences of being discovered.

Activity 1: Discussion of AI Use Scenarios (10 minutes)

Present 4–5 scenarios for class discussion. For each: was this use appropriate? Why or why not? If gray, what would make it clearly appropriate or not?

Scenario 1: A student has trouble understanding a chapter on cell biology. They ask AI to explain the chapter's main concepts in simpler terms. They then re-read the chapter and feel they understand it. They write their own summary for class.

[Discussion prompts for educator: This is a clearly appropriate use. AI was used for understanding, not for producing the submission. The student did the cognitive work. No disclosure required for most assignments because the use was support for understanding, not production.]

Scenario 2: A student has an essay due tomorrow. They give the prompt to AI, take the AI's response, change a few sentences to sound like their voice, and submit it.

[Discussion prompts: Clearly inappropriate. The submitted work is essentially AI's, not the student's. The "change a few sentences" doesn't make it the student's work. This is the textbook capability-vs-credential failure. If the student had disclosed honestly, they would still be in trouble; the violation is the substitution itself, not just the failure to disclose.]

Scenario 3: A student is brainstorming a research topic. They ask AI for 10 possible angles on the broad topic. They pick one of the suggested angles, then go research and write the paper themselves.

[Discussion prompts: Generally appropriate, especially with disclosure. Brainstorming with AI is comparable to brainstorming with a friend or sibling — the ideas don't make the paper any less the student's work. Disclosure is the responsible move when the chosen angle came from AI suggestion.]

Scenario 4: A student is working on a math problem set. They paste the problems into AI to get the answers. They then write the answers on the homework worksheet without working through the problems themselves.

[Discussion prompts: Clearly inappropriate. The cognitive work the homework was supposed to develop has been skipped entirely. The student has the credential of completed homework and zero capability gain.]

Scenario 5: A student is writing a short story for English class. They use AI to help generate names for their characters and descriptions of fictional places. They write the story themselves.

[Discussion prompts: Generally fine, especially with disclosure. Creative-task assistance is comparable to using a baby names website or a thesaurus. The student is doing the storytelling; AI helped with peripheral details. Disclosure is courteous.]

Scenario 6: A student is confused by a math procedure. They ask AI to explain the first step in simpler language, close the AI tool, then solve the assigned problems by showing their own work.

[Discussion prompts: Appropriate if teacher policy allows AI explanation support. This builds capability because the student still practices the target skill. The same scenario becomes inappropriate if the student copies AI's worked answers without doing the reasoning.]

Scenario 7: A student asks AI to generate an essay outline, then fills in each paragraph with AI-generated topic sentences and lightly changes the wording before submitting.

[Discussion prompts: Usually inappropriate unless the assignment explicitly allows that level of AI drafting. The student may be doing some surface editing, but AI is controlling the structure and much of the substance. This is a credential risk because the submitted work may overstate the student's actual writing and planning capability.]

Scenario 8: A student uses AI to create practice questions before a civics quiz, answers the practice questions without AI, checks the textbook when unsure, and studies the mistakes.

[Discussion prompts: Appropriate and strongly capability-building. AI generated practice, but the student did the retrieval, checking, and learning work.]

The discussion takes about 10 minutes if you keep moving. Some scenarios will produce immediate consensus; others will produce real debate. The debate is the teaching moment.

Activity 2: Student AI Use Disclosure (15 minutes core, plus completion as homework)

Direct students to Activity 2. Each student produces their own AI Use Disclosure based on their actual AI use across this curriculum (and other school work where they've used AI).

Setup (3 minutes): Distribute (or direct to) the AI Use Disclosure template. Walk through the template structure.

Student work (10 minutes): - Students reflect honestly on their AI use - They complete the template - They write the short reflection

Honesty norms during Activity 2: - Be clear with students about how honest disclosure will be handled in your specific setting. Disclosure should be evaluated according to your school's academic integrity policy — not under a classroom-level amnesty unless the school has explicitly approved one. The lesson's substantive point (honest disclosure is the right move and produces better long-term outcomes than concealment) does not require promising any specific consequence outcome - The grading criterion for the disclosure activity itself is honesty of process, not whether students used AI a lot or a little - Students may keep their disclosure private if they prefer (submit to teacher only) or share with the class

Wrap-up (2 minutes): - One or two students share what was hardest about writing their disclosure - Acknowledge: this is the kind of practice that builds real trust between students and teachers

Closing (5 minutes)

Bring class back. Acknowledge that today's content was emotionally heavier than other lessons — privacy, ethics, integrity, the capability trap. These are real stakes and students felt that.

Final framing: "You now have the foundation: you know what AI is and isn't, you know how to verify, you know how to read across sources, and you know how to use AI ethically. Tomorrow we put it all together in a project. You'll pick a real issue in your community or state, research it using the skills you've built, and produce something that demonstrates everything you've learned. This is the capstone of the pilot."

Direct students to Reflection Questions and Self-Check.

Student Reading — Reproduced with Teacher Annotations

This lesson is about using AI in ways that strengthen you rather than hollow you out. [TEACHER NOTE: The lesson's central framing. Underline.]

Don't share information that identifies you specifically. [TEACHER NOTE: The most concrete privacy guidance. Read the categories aloud. Many students have already typed personal info into AI without thinking; this is the moment they may realize the implications.]

The simple test: [TEACHER NOTE: The heuristic students should remember. Repeat it during direct instruction.]

The ethics question for AI use in school is not "should I use AI?" [TEACHER NOTE: This reframing matters. The question is "how do I use it well?"]

This is the capability vs. credential trap. [TEACHER NOTE: The single most important conceptual content in the lesson. If students remember nothing else, they should remember this trap and how to avoid it.]

When AI Use Is Clearly Fine, Clearly Not Fine, and Gray [TEACHER NOTE: The lists are pragmatic. The "ask the teacher" guidance for gray areas is the most important: when in doubt, ask.]

Disclosure is the move that keeps you on the right side of academic integrity rules. [TEACHER NOTE: This is the practice that makes ongoing AI use sustainable. Hidden use is high-risk; honest disclosure is low-risk.]

What If You Made a Mistake? [TEACHER NOTE: This paragraph exists for students who recognize themselves in the inappropriate-use scenarios. The honest move is to come forward. Most teachers respond much better to disclosure than to discovery.]

Vocabulary Teaching Strategies

Most terms in today's lesson will be familiar from social studies or general usage. The two terms requiring focused teaching:

"Capability vs. credential" — the conceptual heart of the lesson. Use the two-students example. Make sure students can distinguish: a credential is documentation that you completed something; capability is the actual skill the documentation was supposed to represent. They are not the same thing; AI use can produce one without the other.

"Disclosure" — students may know the word in other contexts (legal disclosure, financial disclosure). In the AI use context, it means clearly explaining where AI helped with your work. The disclosure example in the reading is the format.

For ELL students: "privacidad," "información personal," "divulgación," "plagio," "integridad académica" all map cleanly. "Capability" maps to "capacidad."

Differentiation Notes

Below grade level readers

- Read aloud the privacy categories
- Use the two-students story as an oral discussion before students read it themselves
- Simplify the AI Use Disclosure to a checkbox version

Above grade level readers

- Foundation Edition Chapter 14 is the deeper version of today's content
- Extension: have them write a longer reflection on a time they (or someone they know) faced the capability-vs-credential trap and what they would do differently

English Language Learners

- All vocabulary has cognates; flag for ELL students
- Pair for the discussion activity
- Allow the AI Use Disclosure to be completed in the student's stronger language with key terms in English

IEP / 504 — ADHD / Executive Function

- Use the lists in the reading as visible checklists
- Break Activity 2 into smaller segments

IEP / 504 — Reading / Language Processing

- Audio of reading
- Allow oral disclosure

Autism Spectrum

- The systematic ethical framework may be a strength
- Allow private completion of disclosure if discussion is overwhelming

Anxiety / Emotional Regulation

- Be clear with students about how honest disclosure will be handled in your specific school setting (per your school's academic integrity policy); reduce anxiety by surfacing the actual policy rather than improvising a classroom-level promise the school has not approved
- Disclosure can be private (to teacher only) if student prefers

Limited Technology Access

- The lesson works without any AI access
- AI Use Disclosure can be on paper

Gifted Students

- Have them research how journalism organizations or publishing houses handle AI disclosure
- Have them propose an institutional AI use policy for their school or microschool

Assessment Rubric: AI Use Disclosure

Evaluate primarily on honesty and completeness, not on whether the student used AI a lot or a little.

Criterion	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
Identifies AI services used	Vague or absent	Names specific AI services used	Names services and notes when each was used
Documents specific uses	Generic "I used AI for help"	Specific tasks for which AI was used	Specific tasks with description of how AI's output was used (verbatim, as starting point, for feedback only)
Confirms own work	Confirmation is rote or unclear	Clear confirmation that substantive work is the student's own	Confirmation distinguishes between AI-supported and AI-substituted work; honest about boundary
Reflection: where AI helped learning	Generic ("It helped me")	Specific example of AI supporting learning	Specific example with reflection on why this use built capability rather than substituted for it
Reflection: where student avoided AI	Missing or generic	Specific example of choosing not to use AI to develop the skill	Reflection includes why this choice was worth making
Reflection: what student would do differently	Vague or absent	Specific change the student plans to make	Change is grounded in the capability-vs-credential framework
Honesty	Disclosure feels rehearsed or sanitized	Disclosure reads as genuine	Student includes uncertainty or past mistakes; demonstrates real reflection

Answer Key / Scoring Notes

Lesson 4 is graded on judgment, honesty, and disclosure quality. Students do not need to have used AI heavily to complete the artifact well.

Warm-Up classification key: - Public article link from teacher: **OK to share** with an approved AI tool, assuming the article is public and the teacher allows AI use. - Full name, school, and daily schedule: **Do not share**. It identifies the student and creates safety/privacy risk. - Paragraph the student wrote for class: **Use caution**. It may be okay if assignment policy allows it and personal information is removed; it should not be used to outsource the work. - Private story a friend told the student: **Do not share**. It is someone else's private information. - Question about a vocabulary word: **OK to share** with an approved AI tool; this is a learning-support use.

Activity 1 scenario key: 1. Cell biology explanation: **appropriate**. AI supports understanding; student still does the reading and writes their own summary. 2. Essay generated by AI and lightly reworded: **inappropriate**. AI substitutes for the student's work; rephrasing does not fix authorship. 3. Brainstorming research angles: **generally appropriate with disclosure** if the student researches and writes independently. 4. Math answers copied from AI: **inappropriate**. The assignment's purpose is the student's mathematical practice. 5. Character names and fictional place descriptions: **generally appropriate with disclosure** if the student writes the story and uses AI for peripheral support.

Self-Check answer key: 1. Personal information not to type into commercial AI includes full name, address, phone number, school schedule, student ID, passwords, private family information, medical information, financial information, private stories about friends, photos of private people, or anything the student would not want posted publicly with their name. 2. A credential is proof or appearance of completing work; capability is the actual skill or understanding the work is supposed to build. 3. Simple test: if you would not be comfortable with the information posted publicly with your name, do not put it into an AI tool. 4. An AI Use Disclosure names the AI tool used, what it was used for, what parts of the work are the student's own, how the student verified or revised the output, and what boundaries were followed. 5. The right move is honest disclosure to the teacher or appropriate adult, following the school's academic integrity policy. The student should explain what happened, what AI did, what the student did, and what they will do differently.

Sample Proficient Artifact (for educator reference)

AI USE DISCLOSURE

Student: A.T.
Assignment / Project: Civic Tech Mini-Project planning notes
Date: May 14, 2026

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

What I used AI for:
I asked AI to help me list possible local issues connected to water quality and school transportation. I also asked it to explain the difference between a city department and a county department.

What I did not use AI for:
I did not ask AI to write my final paragraph or make my position for me. I did not paste my full name, school schedule, address, or private information into AI.

How I checked the AI output:
The AI suggested checking my county environmental services page. I verified the agency name on the county website. One AI suggestion about a state office was too general, so I did not use it in my brief.

What part is my own work:
The source choices, notes, final position, and writing are mine. AI helped me brainstorm and understand terms, but I made the decisions and wrote the final artifact.

What I learned:
AI is helpful when I am stuck at the beginning, but it can make things sound more certain than they are. Next time I will ask AI for questions to investigate, not for answers to copy.

This sample is **Proficient** because it names the service, describes specific uses, confirms student authorship, and explains verification. It becomes **Exemplary** if the student names exact prompts or timestamps, includes a clearer privacy boundary, and connects the reflection explicitly to the capability-vs-credential trap.

Additional Scored Exemplars

Use these examples to calibrate disclosures that are honest but vary in detail, language level, or accommodation level.

Exemplar A — Exemplary

The student names the tool, date, purpose, and boundary: "I used Gemini on May 13 to ask for three possible questions about school bus routes. I copied none of its wording. I used one suggestion to search the county transportation page. I did not enter my name, school schedule, address, or my friend's story about missing the bus. The final question and paragraph are mine." The reflection says AI helped with "starting questions" but not with "the thinking that proves I understand the issue."

Score: Exemplary. Specific tool/date/purpose, clear privacy boundary, clear authorship boundary, and explicit capability-vs-credential reflection.

Exemplar B — ELL-adapted Proficient

The student writes: "I used AI for vocabulary words: agency and jurisdiction. I asked in English and Spanish. I did not put my full name or address. I wrote my own answer. AI helped me understand, but I did the project." The student adds a short oral explanation to the teacher: "I did not use AI to write my position."

Score: Proficient. The disclosure is short but complete. Accept bilingual wording or oral clarification when the student demonstrates the authorship and privacy distinction.

Exemplar C — IEP-modified Developing moving toward Proficient

The student completes a checkbox disclosure: - AI used: yes - Used for: understand words / brainstorm questions - Did not use for: final answer - Private information shared: no - My own work: final paragraph and source choices

The written reflection is one sentence: "Next time I will ask before using AI."

Score: Developing on the standard rubric because reflection is thin; Proficient may be appropriate if the student's accommodation permits reduced written output and the teacher records an oral reflection explaining why AI support did not replace the student's work.

Exemplar D — Beginning / needs reteach

The student writes only: "I used AI but I changed it so it is mine."

Score: Beginning. This does not identify the tool, task, boundary, verification, or authorship distinction. Reteach the capability-vs-credential trap and require a revised disclosure.

Extension Options

Extension 1: Have students review their school's existing academic integrity policy and draft a paragraph that would update it for the AI era.

Extension 2: Have students write a short letter to a younger student who is just starting to use AI, advising them on privacy and ethics.

Extension 3: Foundation Edition Chapter 14 reading. Significantly more depth on the same content.

Extension 4: Research how professional fields handle AI disclosure (journalism, academic publishing, legal practice). Compare their norms to what students should do in school work.

No-Install Adaptation Notes

This lesson does not require live AI access for any activity. The discussion scenarios in Activity 1 are pre-prepared. The AI Use Disclosure in Activity 2 is reflective writing.

The only AI-related need is that students should have actually used AI at some point in their school work to have something to disclose. If a class includes students who have not yet used AI, those students can complete the disclosure for the AI use within this curriculum (the AI demonstrations they observed, any AI interactions during Lessons 1–3 activities) and reflect on how they would handle disclosure if they began using AI more.

Common Misconceptions

“Privacy doesn’t matter because I don’t have anything to hide.” This framing misunderstands privacy. Privacy isn’t about hiding wrongdoing; it’s about controlling what information about you is available to whom. Even people with nothing to hide have legitimate reasons to keep their information out of databases they don’t control.

“If I rephrase what AI gave me, it’s my work.” Rephrasing doesn’t transform AI’s work into your work. The thinking and the substance remain AI’s. The capability-vs-credential trap operates regardless of how you transform the surface text.

“Using AI is cheating.” Not necessarily. The lesson distinguishes between AI use that builds capability (legitimate) and AI use that substitutes for capability (cheating). Using AI to understand a concept is fine; using AI to skip the writing is not.

“My teacher won’t notice if I don’t disclose.” Teachers are increasingly able to detect AI-generated work, and they are also able to test whether students can defend their submitted work. The “won’t notice” assumption is increasingly wrong; honest disclosure remains the safer practice regardless.

“If AI is okay sometimes, it’s okay all the time.” No — appropriateness varies by assignment, context, and what the assignment is meant to develop. The “ask the teacher” guidance for gray areas is essential.

Cross-Curricular Connections

ELA (Writing): academic integrity in writing is foundational across all subjects. The AI disclosure practice transfers to any writing assignment.

Social Studies (Civics): civic responsibility and personal integrity are linked. The lesson’s broader framing — that personal ethics around AI shape civic responsibility — connects directly to civics standards.

Health: privacy and digital wellness are part of middle school health curriculum. The lesson’s privacy content reinforces health curriculum themes.

All academic subjects: the capability-vs-credential framing applies to every subject. Coordinate with teachers across subjects to reinforce the framework.

Parent Communication Notes

This lesson can produce parent questions about AI use at home and at school.

A parent asks for the lesson’s framework so they can apply it at home. Share the categories of personal information not to share with AI, the simple test, and the capability-vs-credential framing. Most parents value all three.

A parent expresses concern about academic integrity. Direct them to today’s lesson content and the Student AI Use Agreement. The curriculum’s framework is conservative and aligned with traditional academic integrity principles.

A parent worries their student has used AI inappropriately. Reinforce the “what if you made a mistake” framing — honest disclosure is the path forward. Acknowledge that most students will have used AI in some inappropriate way at some point; the goal is the habit going forward, not punishment for past mistakes.

Closing the lesson well

End-of-lesson language: “Today’s content was heavier than rest of the week. Privacy, ethics, integrity — these are real stakes for who you are becoming. The students who handle these well in school become adults who can be trusted with much more. The students who don’t tend to limit their own future possibilities. This is up to you, every time you sit down to use AI. Tomorrow we put everything together in the Civic Tech Mini-Project — your chance to use these skills for something that matters in your community.”

Lesson 4: Privacy, Ethics, and Academic Integrity

Student Edition

What you will learn today

By the end of this lesson, you should be able to use AI in ways that protect your privacy and the privacy of people in your life, explain when AI use is and is not appropriate in your school work, and produce a clear AI Use Disclosure that demonstrates you can be honest about how you used AI. You should also understand the difference between getting credentials (grades, completed assignments) and building real capability — and why that difference matters more than it sounds.

Bellringer / Warm-Up Options

Your teacher will choose one option.

Use this rating system:

- **OK to share** = generally safe to type into an approved AI tool.
- **Use caution** = maybe safe only after removing personal details or asking your teacher.
- **Do not share** = too personal, private, or risky to type into an AI tool.

Use this item list:

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

Option A — Fast Start (3 minutes): Choose one item from the list. Mark it **OK to share**, **Use caution**, or **Do not share**. Explain your choice in one sentence.

Option B — Standard Warm-Up (5 minutes): Mark all five items **OK to share**, **Use caution**, or **Do not share**. Then write one sentence explaining your safest choice.

Option C — Extended Launch (6-7 minutes): Mark all five items. Then write one rule that could help a student decide what not to type into an AI tool.

Vocabulary

Six terms today.

Privacy. The state of having information about yourself protected from being shared without your knowledge or consent.

Personal information. Specific details that identify you (or someone else) — full name, address, school, family members' names, financial information, health information, account passwords, photos, location. The kind of information that could let someone find or impersonate you.

Disclosure. Telling people honestly what you did and how you did it. In an academic context, AI use disclosure means clearly explaining where AI helped with your work.

Plagiarism. Presenting someone else's work — or AI-generated work — as your own. A form of academic dishonesty.

Academic integrity. Doing your school work honestly. Following the rules of the assignment. Being truthful about what you produced and how.

Capability. The actual ability to do something well — solve problems, write clearly, understand material, do the work. Different from credentials, which are the documentation that you completed something (grade, certificate, transcript line).

Reading: Using AI Without Becoming Hollow

This lesson is about using AI in ways that strengthen you rather than hollow you out.

Two big ideas matter here. The first is **privacy** — protecting your information and other people's. The second is **integrity** — being honest about your work and not letting AI do the parts of school you are supposed to be doing yourself.

Both ideas are personal. Nobody else can guarantee them for you. They are choices you make every time you sit down to use AI.

Privacy: What Not to Share

When you type into a commercial AI service like ChatGPT, Claude, Gemini, or Copilot, your text usually gets sent to the company's servers. Some companies promise they won't use your data to train their AI; some companies use it for training; the policies vary and change over time. The important fact is that what you type to commercial AI is not private the way a notebook on your desk is private.

This means there are categories of information you should not type into commercial AI services unless you have a specific reason and have thought carefully about it.

Don't share information that identifies you specifically. Your full name, your home address, your phone number, your school, your family's names, your financial information, photos of yourself, your location, your account passwords. None of this needs to be in your AI prompts for the AI to help you with most things. A prompt that says "explain photosynthesis to a 7th grader" works just as well as a prompt that says "explain photosynthesis to a 7th grader named Maria Garcia who attends Lincoln Middle School in Miami."

Don't share information about other people. Your classmates, your teachers, your family members, your friends. They have not given you permission to share their information with a commercial AI service. If you're getting AI help with a story or essay, refer to people generically ("my classmate," "a friend," "a person I know") rather than by name.

Don't share information about anyone's medical, financial, or legal situation. This includes you, your family, and others. AI is not a doctor, lawyer, or financial advisor — and these categories of information are sensitive enough that you don't want them sitting on commercial servers.

Be careful with school-related information. If your school has confidential information (test materials, assessment data, things teachers have shared with you that aren't public), don't type that into AI either.

The simple test: before typing something into AI, ask yourself "would I be comfortable if this text were posted on a public website with my name attached to it?" If yes, you're probably fine. If no, don't type it.

When You Use Local AI, Privacy Works Differently

If you use local AI (the kind installed on your own computer using something like Ollama), the privacy properties are very different. The AI runs on your machine. Nothing you type leaves your computer. The conversation is essentially as private as any document on your computer is private.

This is one reason the *Open Source Student* curriculum is built around local AI as the primary path. It's not just about cost or independence; it's about being able to think and explore without that thinking being collected and stored on someone else's server.

If you're using the optional installation extension for this curriculum, the privacy properties are the strongest available. If you're using browser-based commercial AI, the privacy expectations are different and more limited — and the rules above about what not to share apply.

Ethics: Using AI Honestly in School Work

The ethics question for AI use in school is not "should I use AI?" Many students will use AI in some form, and schools have a wide range of policies — some allow AI use for specific purposes, some restrict it, some prohibit it. Find out what your school's policy actually says. Then the real question becomes: **how do I use AI in ways that build my capability rather than hollow it out, within the policy that applies to me?**

Here is the central distinction. Imagine two students working on the same essay assignment.

Student A asks AI to write the essay. The AI produces fluent prose. Student A reads it, makes a few small changes, and submits it as their own work. They get a grade. From outside, this looks like a successful assignment.

Student B writes the essay themselves. They use AI for specific support: getting an explanation of a concept they didn't fully understand, brainstorming possible thesis statements before choosing one, getting feedback on whether their argument was clear. The writing is theirs. The thinking is theirs. The decisions about what to argue and how to argue it are theirs. They get a grade — comparable to Student A's grade.

In the moment, the difference between these two students is almost invisible. They both have an essay turned in. They both have a grade.

In the medium and long term, the difference is enormous. Student A has the credential of having completed the assignment but did not actually develop the writing capability the assignment was supposed to develop. Student B has both the credential and the capability. The next assignment, which builds on this one, will be much harder for Student A than for Student B. The test that requires writing skill will reveal the gap. The job that requires the ability to think and write clearly will reveal it more.

This is the **capability vs. credential trap**. Using AI to skip the parts of school that are supposed to develop you produces credentials without capability. The credentials look the same on a transcript; the actual ability they were supposed to represent isn't there.

The escape from the trap is simple: use AI in ways that build you up rather than substitute for you. Use it for understanding, feedback, brainstorming, support — all the things AI is genuinely good for. Don't use it to skip the cognitive work that the assignment exists to develop.

When AI Use Is Clearly Fine, Clearly Not Fine, and Gray

Some uses of AI are clearly fine in any reasonable academic culture:

- Asking AI to explain a concept you don't understand
- Getting AI feedback on your draft writing
- Using AI to generate practice problems for self-study
- Asking AI to help you brainstorm
- Getting AI to check your reasoning on a problem you're working through

Some uses are clearly not fine:

- Having AI write your essay and submitting it as yours
- Using AI to solve problems on a test
- Copying AI answers without understanding them
- Using AI in ways your teacher specifically prohibited

A lot of cases are gray. Asking AI to outline an essay you'll then write — is that brainstorming or outsourcing? Asking AI to “improve” a paragraph you wrote — is that getting feedback or having AI rewrite for you? Using AI to summarize a reading you should have read — is that legitimate help or skipping the work?

The honest answer in gray cases: ask. Your teacher knows what the assignment is supposed to develop. They can tell you whether a specific use is okay for that specific assignment. Asking is always cheaper than guessing wrong.

Disclosure: The Honest Move

When you use AI in your school work in a way that is permitted, you should disclose how. This is not just an ethical preference; it is the practice that makes AI use trustworthy.

A simple AI Use Disclosure looks something like this:

AI Use Statement: I used [AI service] to help me brainstorm thesis ideas (generated 5 options, chose option 3). I used AI to evaluate the logic in paragraphs 2 and 4 (revised based on feedback). I used AI to generate practice problems for self-study before this assignment. All writing and analysis is my own work.

This does several things at once. It tells your teacher exactly how AI helped, so there's no ambiguity. It distinguishes between AI assistance (legitimate) and AI authorship (not your work). It builds the kind of trust that makes ongoing AI use in your school work sustainable.

Hiding AI use that you would have been allowed to disclose is a much bigger violation than original use was. Disclosure is the move that keeps you on the right side of academic integrity rules.

What If You Made a Mistake?

If you used AI in a way you now realize wasn't appropriate — copied something without understanding it, didn't disclose use that should have been disclosed, used AI for something that was prohibited — the right move is to talk to your teacher honestly before they discover it.

This is hard. It feels like getting in trouble for being honest. In practice, teachers respond much better to honest disclosure than to discovery. The student who comes forward and says “I used AI in a way I shouldn't have; I want to fix it” usually faces much smaller consequences than student who hides AI use that gets discovered later.

This is also the practice that builds character. Students who learn to handle their own mistakes honestly become adults who handle their mistakes honestly. The opposite habit — hiding things and hoping they don't get caught — is a character trait that follows students well past their academic years.

Privacy and Ethics Are Civic Skills

This lesson is personal, but its skills are civic. Citizens who protect their privacy understand the broader stakes of data privacy in society. Citizens who use information honestly contribute to a culture of trust. Citizens who can disclose their methods can be trusted in their public claims.

The habits you build in your personal AI use are the habits you bring to your civic life — voting, public discourse, professional work, community participation. The student who learns to use AI ethically becomes the adult who can be trusted with more.

Activity 1: Class Discussion of AI Use Scenarios

Your teacher will present several scenarios of student AI use. As a class, you'll discuss each:

- Was this use appropriate?
- Why or why not?
- If it's a gray area, what would make it clearly appropriate or clearly not?
- How should the student have handled it?

Examples might include: a student who used AI to outline a paper, a student who pasted a homework problem into AI to solve, a student who used AI to translate a passage from a language they're learning, a student who got AI feedback on a draft and then revised heavily.

There are not always single right answers. The point is the discussion, not arriving at a verdict.

Activity 2: Your AI Use Disclosure (Portfolio Artifact)

Now you'll produce your own AI Use Disclosure. This is the portfolio artifact for Lesson 4.

Step 1. Think about the AI use across your work in this curriculum so far — and across your school work generally if you've used AI for that.

Step 2. Write a disclosure that documents: - What AI services you've used - For which kinds of tasks - How you used the AI's output (did you use it directly? as a starting point? for feedback only?) - Confirmation that the substantive work in your assignments is your own

Step 3. Write a short reflection (3–5 sentences) on: - Where AI helped your learning - Where you avoided AI to make sure you developed the skill yourself - One thing you'd do differently next time

Use the template below.

AI Use Disclosure — Template

AI USE DISCLOSURE

Student: _____

Date: _____

AI services used during this curriculum (and for what):

- [AI service]: [purposes – e.g., generating practice problems, brainstorming, getting feedback on drafts]

For each major piece of school work where I used AI, the specific use:

- [Assignment]: [how AI was used]

- [Assignment]: [how AI was used]

Confirmation: All substantive work in my assignments is my own. Where AI helped, I used AI assistance as described above and did the writing, analysis, and reasoning myself. I did not submit AI-generated text as my own writing.

Reflection (3–5 sentences):

Where did AI help my learning?

Where did I avoid AI to make sure I developed the skill myself?

What would I do differently with AI next time?

Reflection Questions

1. What is the most uncomfortable boundary in this lesson — the place where you weren't sure what was okay?
2. The capability-vs-credential trap: have you seen it happen to anyone (or to yourself)? What was the consequence?
3. What's one specific way you'll change how you use AI in school based on today's lesson?
4. The reading says "the habits you build in your personal AI use are the habits you bring to your civic life." Do you agree? Why or why not?
5. What's a question about AI ethics you wish you could discuss more?

Self-Check

1. Name three categories of personal information you should not type into commercial AI.
2. What is the difference between credential and capability?
3. What is the simple test for whether something is okay to type into AI?
4. What does an AI Use Disclosure include?
5. If you used AI inappropriately on a past assignment, what is the right move?

Looking Ahead

Tomorrow's lesson is the Civic Tech Mini-Project. You'll apply everything you've learned in Lessons 1–4 to a real local or state issue. The verification, source analysis, and ethical AI use you've practiced this week all come together in one project. Pick an issue in advance if you can — something local that you actually care about.

Lesson 5: Civic Tech Mini-Project

Teacher Edition

Lesson at a Glance

Lesson length: 60–75 minutes core instruction recommended (longer than other lessons because it includes a project) + 30+ minutes student independent work for project completion

Learning objectives. By the end of this lesson, students will be able to: 1. Identify a real local or state civic issue suitable for short-form research 2. Frame an issue as a specific researchable question 3. Identify the responsible government agency or official for a chosen issue 4. Apply verification, source analysis, and ethical AI use practices to a real research project 5. Produce a Civic Issue Brief that demonstrates evidence-based civic engagement 6. Disclose AI use honestly within a substantive piece of work

Florida standards addressed (capstone — touches all major frameworks): - **FL B.E.S.T. CS (grades 6–8):** Technological Impact — engaging public officials (SC.8.TI.2.2, near-perfect fit) and responsible communication-media use (SC.7.TI.2.2); Emerging Technologies (SC.7.ET.2.1 — AI as research/drafting partner); Communication and Collaboration (SC.7.CC.2.2 — analyze own ideas with research-based information to create unique digital artifact) - **Florida Civics: SS.7.CG.2.10 (PRIMARY — near-verbatim benchmark match: “process for citizens to address state or local problems by researching public policy alternatives, identifying appropriate government agencies, and determining a course of action”),** SS.7.CG.2.9 (continued — analyzing media for bias), SS.7.CG.2.8 (continued — media/groups influencing government), SS.8.CG.2.2 / SS.8.CG.2.6 (grade 8 active-participation extensions) - **B.E.S.T. ELA:** Communication — Argument (ELA.7.C.1.3), Research (ELA.7.C.4.1), Oral (ELA.7.C.2.1), Multimedia (ELA.7.C.5.1), Tech in Communication (ELA.7.C.5.2); Reading Informational Text — Comparative (ELA.7.R.3.3); Vocabulary (ELA.7.V.1.1); K-12 ELA Expectations — Collaborative Discussion (ELA.K12.EE.4.1)

(See the Standards Alignment Matrix for benchmark-level alignment.)

Materials needed: - Teacher device with browser/projection - Class display - Internet access for student devices (recommended for live source-finding; **for no-internet settings, the educator pre-curates a Source Packet** — a small folder of printed government documents, news articles, and advocacy materials for each candidate issue, prepared the day before. The Source Packet path is the documented offline alternative for Lesson 5 and supports the kit's no-internet contingency claim) - Student copies of Lesson 5 Student Edition - Civic Issue Brief template (in Student Edition; can also be reproduced as worksheet) - Pre-prepared list of suggested local/state issues for students who need topic suggestions - For pilots in specific Florida counties: pre-research a handful of local issues that students might engage with (links to local government pages, current local news topics, etc.)

Google Classroom quick access: [Google Classroom Upload Pack](#) — setup guide, copy/paste assignment posts, upload manifest, and Bellringer / Warm-Up pacing options.

Prerequisites: Lessons 1, 2, 3, 4 complete. This is the capstone; all four prior lessons' skills are exercised here.

Vocabulary introduced: Agency, Jurisdiction, Policy, Public official, Public records

Portfolio artifact produced: Civic Issue Brief (Lesson 5 contribution and culminating artifact for the curriculum)

Assessment: Civic Issue Brief evaluated with rubric below

Background for the Teacher

Lesson 5 is the curriculum's most ambitious lesson logistically and pedagogically. It is also the lesson that demonstrates whether the previous four lessons actually built durable capability — students either can or cannot apply verification, source analysis, ethical AI use, and civic engagement skills to a real issue.

Three framings carry the lesson:

Real issues, not hypothetical ones. The lesson is built around real local and state issues because the work of civic literacy is meaningless if it is only practiced on hypotheticals. Students who research a real local zoning question, a real Florida bill, or a real environmental issue produce work that connects to civic life directly. The “real issue” requirement is binding, not advisory.

Short-form, not comprehensive. The mini-project is bounded — one lesson period, plus completion time. Students will not produce comprehensive policy analyses; they will produce defensible issue briefs that demonstrate they can do the work. The bounded scope is a feature, not a limitation. The full nine-week module (Phase 2) and full-year edition (Phase 3) will support more substantial civic technology projects.

Position-taking with evidence. The Civic Issue Brief includes a section where students state their position on what should happen. This is intentional. Civic literacy includes the capacity to take a defensible position, not just to neutrally report. The grading criterion is whether the position is defensible from the student's sources, not what the position is. This is important to establish explicitly with students who may worry that their teacher will grade them on agreement with a particular view.

The lesson also exercises the curriculum's two pillars (AI literacy and civic technology literacy) most explicitly. AI is genuinely useful as a research and drafting assistant for civic work; the lesson models this use while requiring verification, source citation, and disclosure. Students leave with a concrete example of what responsible AI-assisted civic work looks like.

The lesson is logistically heavier than others — more student-led work, more variation in what each student produces, more time required overall. Plan accordingly. If the standard one-week pacing has Friday for Lesson 5, schedule extra time if possible (60–75 minutes for core instruction instead of 45) so the project can be completed in class. If the project must extend into homework, that is workable but reduces the in-class collaborative element.

Lesson Procedure

Total: 60–75 minutes core instruction recommended + 30+ minutes student independent work.

Timing note for first delivery: Times are targets, not requirements. First-time delivery often runs 10–15 minutes long because issue selection and agency identification are unfamiliar. If pacing gets tight, provide a pre-curated issue list and source packets, then evaluate a compact but complete Civic Issue Brief rather than a longer project.

Bellringer / Warm-Up Options (choose one)

Use one option at the start of class. If pacing is tight, use Option A and treat it as the first three minutes of the Opening rather than an added activity. For this warm-up, a real civic issue means a problem or decision connected to the student's school, neighborhood, city, county, or state that people could research and try to improve. Examples: traffic near school, school phone policy, water quality, public park safety, bus routes, recycling, library hours, local flooding, or a proposed Florida law.

Option A — Fast Start (3 minutes): Post the definition and examples above. Students name one real civic issue people might disagree about or try to improve. Scan responses quickly to identify students who may need topic support.

Option B — Standard Warm-Up (5 minutes): Post the definition and examples above, then ask: “1. What real civic issue might people disagree about or try to improve? 2. Who is affected by this issue? 3. What public agency, public official, school board, city, county, or state office might be connected to it? 4. What source could you check first to learn more? Examples: a school board agenda, city or county website, Florida agency page, local news article, or official meeting minutes.” Ask two students to share the public agency or official they think might connect to their issue.

Option C — Extended Launch (6-7 minutes): Post the definition and examples above, then ask: “1. What real civic issue might people disagree about or try to improve? 2. Who is affected by this issue? 3. What public agency, public official, school board, city, county, or state office might be connected to it? 4. What source could you check first to learn more? 5. What would make this issue too broad, too vague, or too hard to research today? How could you narrow it?” Use one broad example and one narrowed example to model the difference between a topic that is too big and a question students can actually research today.

Opening (5 minutes)

Recap the week: “You’ve built a set of skills this week — understanding what AI is, verification, source analysis, ethical use. Today we put it all together. You’re going to take a real issue in your community or state and do real research on it, using everything you’ve learned. By the end of class, you’ll have produced a Civic Issue Brief that documents what you found and what you think should happen.”

Bridge: “This is the lesson where the curriculum’s purpose becomes concrete. The skills you’ve built are not just academic exercises. They are what citizens do when they engage seriously with public life.”

State the lesson goal as written in Student Edition.

Direct Instruction (10 minutes)

Walk students through the Student Reading. Lighter touch than previous lessons because students are about to do a substantial project; the reading is more orienting than instructional.

Key sections to highlight:

“Why a Civic Project, Specifically” — connect to civics standards explicitly. This is why Florida has the standards it has; today’s project is the practice.

“What Counts as a ‘Real’ Issue” — the criteria are non-negotiable. Real issue, locally or state-relevant, identifiable agency, real sources available.

“How to Approach the Mini-Project” — the five-step structure. Walk through each step briefly so students know the path.

“A Few Notes on Doing This Well” — the practical guidance. Stay specific. Cite sources. Take a defensible position. Be honest about uncertainty. Disclose AI use.

Activity 1: Issue Selection (10 minutes)

This is the moment many students will need scaffolding. Some will know exactly what they want to research; others will be stuck.

For students who have an issue in mind: check that it meets the “real issue” criteria. Is it specific? Is it local or state level? Can they identify an agency? Are sources findable? If yes, they’re ready to start research.

For students who don’t have an issue: offer the suggested topic categories from the reading. Have them pick one category, then narrow within it. “Local environment” is too broad; “water quality in [your local water body]” is workable.

For students who need more scaffolding: prepare in advance a list of 5–10 specific local issues you can offer. For Florida pilots, possibilities include (research these in advance for your specific county): - A current local government decision making news in your county - A current Florida legislative bill on a topic of likely student interest - A recent school board policy decision - A local environmental issue with active sources (news coverage, government documents)

Florida Regional Topic Starters

Use these as inspiration only; teachers should confirm local relevance before assigning.

South Florida / Miami-Dade / Broward / Palm Beach – Sunny-day flooding, drainage, and seawall planning – Transit access near schools and libraries – Heat safety for outdoor school activities – Everglades restoration and local water-management decisions

Central Florida / Orlando / Tampa Bay – Pedestrian safety near schools and commuter traffic corridors – Stormwater runoff into lakes – Affordable housing pressure near school communities – Public transit access for students and families

North Florida / Jacksonville / Gainesville / Big Bend – River and spring water quality – Hurricane shelter access and emergency communication – Rural broadband and library technology access – School bus route length and student transportation time

Panhandle – Hurricane recovery, beach access, and resilient infrastructure – Military-community traffic and housing pressures – Water quality in bays and coastal ecosystems – Public recreation access and park maintenance

Florida Keys – Sea level rise adaptation and road elevation – Marine sanctuary protection and tourism impact – Hurricane evacuation planning – Workforce housing for public-service workers

Teacher caution: Keep topics local, specific, and researchable. If a topic becomes too politically charged or too broad for one lesson, narrow it to a public agency question students can research today.

The goal of this activity is that every student leaves with a specific researchable question and a clear next step. Spend the 10 minutes on this; students who start without clear questions will produce thin briefs.

Activity 2: The Mini-Project (35–45 minutes core; project completion may extend beyond)

This is the core work of the lesson. Students follow the five-step structure from their reading.

Active facilitation during the project:

- **Circulate constantly.** This is high-variation independent work; students will need different kinds of help.
- **Push for specificity.** When students are working at too high a level of abstraction (“climate change,” “education funding”), help them narrow.
- **Push for verification.** When students are about to use an AI claim without checking it, prompt: “What’s your source for that?”
- **Push for honest position-taking.** When students are afraid to take a position, reassure: the grade is on whether the position is defensible from the sources, not on what the position is.
- **Push for AI use disclosure.** When students aren’t documenting AI use, remind them.

Common student situations and responses:

- *“I can’t find any sources.”* — help them think about which agency or office handles the issue; almost everything has at least an agency website. If truly nothing exists online, suggest a different (better-documented) issue.
- *“AI told me this fact and I can’t verify it.”* — leave it out, or note it as “AI-claim, unverified” with a clear note about why. Don’t fabricate sources to support unverified AI claims.
- *“I can’t decide what position to take.”* — that’s fine. The brief can include “I am not yet sure what I think because the evidence is mixed in these specific ways...” Honesty about uncertainty is a defensible position.
- *“My issue turns out to be more complicated than I thought.”* — that’s a real finding. Document the complication.

Activity 3: Class Sharing (5–10 minutes if time allows)

If time permits, have 3–5 students share their issue and main finding. Listen for similarities (what issues your students collectively care about) and differences (the range of approaches and depths).

This activity is optional. If time is tight, it can be cut, but losing it loses some of the community-building value of the project.

Closing (5 minutes)

Bring class back together. Acknowledge the work: “You just did real civic work. Not perfect. Not comprehensive. Real. The work of taking an issue, researching it with verification and source analysis, using AI responsibly, and producing a documented brief that you can defend. That’s what citizenship looks like in 2026 and beyond.”

Reflect on the week: “Look at what you built across this week. Five skills, five artifacts, one capability you’ll use for the rest of your life.”

Direct attention to the Pilot Feedback opportunity: “Your educator is going to ask you about this curriculum — what worked, what didn’t, what was missing, what should be different. Your honest feedback shapes what comes next. Take it seriously.”

Direct students to Reflection Questions and Self-Check.

Student Reading — Reproduced with Teacher Annotations

This week you’ve built a set of skills that, combined, are the foundation of civic technology literacy: [TEACHER NOTE: Recap of the week. Students often need to be reminded explicitly of what they’ve built — they don’t always notice the cumulative arc.]

Today you use all of those skills on a real issue. [TEACHER NOTE: The “real issue” framing matters. Reinforce during direct instruction.]

Why a Civic Project, Specifically? [TEACHER NOTE: The connection to Florida civics standards is explicit here. Make sure students understand why this is in the curriculum, not just what they’re being asked to do.]

What Counts as a “Real” Issue [TEACHER NOTE: The criteria are binding. Real, local-or-state-relevant, identifiable agency, real sources. Most student topic selections will need refinement against these criteria.]

Step 1: Choose your issue and frame the question. [TEACHER NOTE: This is where most projects succeed or fail. A vague topic produces a vague brief. A specific question produces useful work.]

Step 2: Identify the responsible agency or official. [TEACHER NOTE: This is real civic literacy. Students who can locate the right agency for an issue have a foundational citizenship skill.]

Step 3: Find official sources. [TEACHER NOTE: Florida’s Sunshine Law makes this particularly accessible in our state. Mention this — it is part of why civic research is more practical in Florida than in many states.]

Step 4: Use AI as a thinking partner — with verification. [TEACHER NOTE: This is where the curriculum’s argument gets demonstrated. AI is genuinely useful for civic research; verification and source citation are what make that use responsible.]

Step 5: Produce your artifact. [TEACHER NOTE: Three options offered. The Civic Issue Brief is recommended for most students; the letter and presentation options work for students with specific interests.]

Stay specific. [TEACHER NOTE: The most common student failure mode is staying too abstract. Push for specificity throughout the project.]

Take a position, but defend it. [TEACHER NOTE: This may need explicit reassurance. Students sometimes worry teachers will grade based on the position; reassure that the criterion is whether the position is defensible from the sources.]

Be honest about uncertainty. [TEACHER NOTE: Uncertainty is intellectually honest. Students who can say “I don’t know X” have done better work than students who pretend certainty.]

Vocabulary Teaching Strategies

Five terms today (agency, jurisdiction, policy, public official, public records). All are civics vocabulary students will see in social studies elsewhere; the lesson sharpens their meaning in a research context.

Agency: use a Florida-specific example. “The Florida Department of Education is an agency. The Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission is an agency. The Palm Beach County Sheriff’s Office is an agency. Each one handles a specific area of public responsibility.”

Jurisdiction: clarify the level question. “If your issue is about something the federal government decides, federal agencies have jurisdiction. If state, state agencies. If local, local agencies. Asking the wrong level of government about an issue is a common mistake. Knowing the right level is part of doing civic work well.”

Public records: Florida-specific framing. “Florida has a strong Sunshine Law. Most government documents in Florida are public records. This makes civic research easier in our state than in many places.”

For ELL students: “agencia,” “jurisdicción,” “política,” “funcionario público,” “registros públicos” all map cleanly.

Differentiation Notes

Below grade level readers

- Provide pre-selected issue options with relevant sources already gathered
- Allow students to use the Letter to a Public Official option (more concrete than brief)
- Pair below-level students with on-level partners for the project
- Reduce required source count to 3 (instead of 5)

Above grade level readers

- Push for a more substantive issue with more research depth
- Allow them to use the Class Presentation option (more advanced presentation work)
- Foundation Edition Chapter 16 covers civic engagement themes more deeply
- Have them produce a more complete Civic Issue Brief (full template, all sections substantive)

English Language Learners

- Allow Spanish-language sources for issues with Spanish-speaking community impact
- Pair with bilingual peers
- Provide the Civic Issue Brief template in two-column format (English and Spanish columns) for newcomer ELL students

IEP / 504 — ADHD / Executive Function

- Use the five-step structure as an explicit checklist
- Break the work into shorter visible segments with timer cues
- Provide pre-formatted Civic Issue Brief template with sections clearly demarcated
- Allow extended time for project completion if needed

IEP / 504 — Reading or Language Processing

- Allow oral presentation as the artifact (Letter or Presentation option works better than Brief for some students)
- Audio summaries of sources where possible
- Pair with on-level peer for source reading

Autism Spectrum

- The structured five-step process works well for many autistic students
- Allow private project work if class collaboration is overwhelming
- Provide explicit social expectations for the optional sharing activity
- A special-interest connection to the chosen issue can produce particularly engaged work

Anxiety / Emotional Regulation

- Reassure that the grade is on the process and the defensibility of the position, not on the position itself
- Allow private submission of the brief (not shared with class)
- Provide topic options that are less politically charged for students who would find charged topics anxiety-producing

Limited Technology Access

- Provide pre-printed source packets for the chosen issue
- Allow paper-based brief
- The Letter option works particularly well for students without device access (a letter to an official is naturally a paper artifact)

Gifted Students

- Allow them to take on a more complex issue (one with genuine policy debate, multiple stakeholders, contested evidence)
- Encourage longer-form briefs or actual letters they could plausibly send
- Foundation Edition Appendix D (AI Agent Platforms) connects to advanced civic tech work

Assessment Rubric: Civic Issue Brief

Evaluate primarily on whether the brief demonstrates the integrated skills the curriculum has built. Not all sections need to be exemplary; consistency across sections is more important than peak performance in one.

Criterion	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
Issue is real and specific	Issue is hypothetical or too broad	Real local or state issue, framed as specific question	Real issue with clear stakes for the student's community; question is precisely framed

Criterion	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
Responsible agency identified	Vague or wrong	Correct agency identified at correct level of government	Agency identified plus relevant officials or specific decision-makers named
Sources are real and varied	Few sources, all of one type, or AI-only	At least 3 sources of multiple types	5+ sources spanning government, news, and at least one other type
Verification done on factual claims	Unverified claims used	Claims cited with sources	Claims cross-checked across multiple sources; uncertainty acknowledged where present
Different perspectives represented	Single perspective only	Multiple perspectives summarized fairly	Perspectives summarized with each side's strongest argument; areas of agreement and disagreement identified
Position is defensible	No position, or position not supported by sources	Position stated; supported by reasoning from sources	Position stated; defended from sources; counterarguments acknowledged
Honest about uncertainty	Pretends certainty about everything	Acknowledges what student doesn't know	Specific articulation of which questions remain open and what would resolve them
AI Use Statement included	Missing or vague	Clear disclosure of AI use	Disclosure includes specific tasks, distinguishes assistance from authorship, confirms substantive work is student's
Citation completeness	Sources mentioned but not fully cited	Sources cited in consistent format	Citations enable a reader to find each source independently

Answer Key / Scoring Notes

Lesson 5 is a project lesson, so there is no single correct issue or position. The answer key is the civic-research structure: real issue, responsible agency, verified facts, multiple perspectives, defensible position, uncertainty, AI disclosure, and citations.

Issue-selection key: - Acceptable issues are real, local or state-connected, researchable, and tied to an identifiable agency, public official, school board, city/county office, or state office. - Too broad: "pollution," "school safety," "traffic," "climate change," "education." - Workable: "Should [county/city] add more crosswalks near [school/street]?", "How is [county] addressing water quality in [local water body]?", "Should the school board revise the phone policy for middle schools?", "What should the city do about flooding near [neighborhood/road]?"

Self-Check answer key: 1. A "real" issue is an actual public problem or decision connected to the student's school, neighborhood, city, county, or state, with real sources and a real responsible decision-maker. 2. A topic is a broad area; a researchable question is specific enough to investigate. Topic: "school traffic." Researchable question: "Should the city add a crossing guard or crosswalk near [school] during morning drop-off?" 3. An agency is a government office or public body responsible for a specific area of public work, such as a school board, city transportation department, county environmental office, Florida Department of Education, or Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission. 4. Public records matter because they let citizens inspect government information, decisions, agendas, budgets, reports, and correspondence instead of relying only on summaries or rumors. 5. The AI Use Statement matters because it shows what AI did and did not do, protects academic integrity, and helps readers trust that the student's research, reasoning, and position are their own.

Minimum proficient Civic Issue Brief: - Specific question rather than broad topic. - Correct responsible agency or official. - At least three cited sources, including at least one official or government source where available. - At least three verified facts. - At least two perspectives represented fairly. - A position or honest uncertainty statement supported by sources. - AI Use Statement, even if the statement says no AI was used.

Common grading mistakes to avoid: - Do not grade the student's political or policy position. Grade whether it is defensible from evidence. - Do not accept AI output as a source by itself. AI may help brainstorm, organize, or ask questions; factual claims still need real sources. - Do not require every student to produce a perfect full policy brief in one pilot lesson. Proficient work is specific, verified, and honest, even if compact.

Sample Proficient Artifact (for educator reference)

CIVIC ISSUE BRIEF

Student: L.M.
Date: May 15, 2026

Topic:
Traffic safety near school drop-off.

The Question I Researched:
Should the city consider adding a marked crosswalk or crossing guard near the intersection closest to our school's morning drop-off line?

Why This Issue Matters Locally:
Many students walk or bike near the school entrance while cars are turning into the drop-off line. The issue matters because it affects student safety and traffic flow during the same 30-minute window each morning.

Responsible Agency or Official:
The city transportation/public works department appears responsible for local crosswalks and traffic signs. The school administration and school board may also be involved because the issue is connected to school arrival procedures.

Key Facts With Sources:
1. The city public works page says residents can request review of traffic safety concerns through the city service request form. Source: city public works / transportation webpage.
2. The school handbook says morning drop-off begins at 7:45 a.m. and students

should use designated entrances. Source: school handbook.

3. A local news article about school-zone safety reported that driver speed and visibility are common concerns near schools. Source: local news article.

Different Perspectives:
Some parents may support a new crosswalk or crossing guard because they want a clearer safety procedure. Some drivers may worry that another crossing point will slow traffic or create confusion. The city may need evidence before changing signs or staffing a crossing guard.

What I Think Should Happen and Why:
I think the school should first collect arrival observations for one week and then send a request to the city transportation department. This is better than asking for a solution immediately because the city will need specific evidence about where students cross, how many cars pass, and when the risk is highest.

What I Don't Know:
I do not know whether the city has already studied this intersection. I also do not know how much a crossing guard costs or who pays for it.

AI Use Statement:
I used AI to brainstorm possible agencies connected to traffic safety and to help me make my research question more specific. I verified the agency information on the city website. The writing, position, and source notes are my own.

Sources Cited:
– City public works / transportation webpage, "Traffic Safety Requests."
– School handbook, arrival and drop-off section.
– Local news article on school-zone traffic safety.

This sample is **Proficient** because it frames a specific real issue, identifies a plausible agency, uses multiple source types, acknowledges uncertainty, and discloses AI assistance. It becomes **Exemplary** if the student provides exact URLs/titles/dates, uses a school board agenda or city traffic document, includes a stronger counterargument, and identifies the named official or department contact.

Additional Scored Exemplars

Use these examples to calibrate Civic Issue Briefs across levels and accommodations.

Exemplar A — Exemplary

Question: "Should the county add a marked crossing or traffic-calming review near the library entrance used by students after school?"

The student cites a county public works service-request page, a school dismissal policy, a local crash-data dashboard, and a local news article about school-zone traffic. The brief identifies the county public works department and the school principal as separate stakeholders. The position: request a one-week observation study before asking for a permanent traffic change. The brief includes a counterargument: new signage may slow traffic or require funding. The "What I Don't Know" section names the missing cost estimate and whether the road is city- or county-maintained. AI use is disclosed as brainstorm/search-term support only.

Score: Exemplary. The issue is precise, the agency logic is careful, sources are varied, uncertainty is honest, and the recommendation is proportional to the evidence.

Exemplar B — ELL-adapted Proficient

Question: "Should our city add more trash cans at [local park]?"

The student uses three sources: city parks webpage, a local news article about park cleanup, and an advocacy post from a neighborhood group. The writing uses sentence frames: "The agency is..." "The evidence says..." "I think..." The position is: add two trash cans near the picnic area and post signs before weekends. The student writes: "I do not know the cost. I need city budget information." AI disclosure: "I used AI to help translate 'public works' and 'parks department.' I checked the city website."

Score: Proficient. The language is simple, but the civic reasoning is present: real issue, agency, sources, position, uncertainty, and AI disclosure.

Exemplar C — IEP-modified Proficient

Artifact form: recorded two-minute presentation plus a one-page source checklist.

Question: "Should the school change the bike-rack location?"

The student identifies the school administration and district facilities office, uses a school map, a handbook excerpt, and a student observation tally. The student gives a defensible position orally and submits a checklist showing source titles and what each source proved. The AI Use Statement is read aloud and recorded: "No AI wrote this. I used AI to ask what office handles school facilities, then checked the district page."

Score: Proficient if oral presentation is an approved accommodation. The rubric criteria are met through an alternate format; do not penalize for not producing a full written brief.

Exemplar D — Beginning / needs reteach

Topic: "climate change is bad."

The student gives one AI paragraph, no agency, no local/state question, no cited source, and no AI Use Statement.

Score: Beginning. The student has not narrowed the issue, verified claims, identified a responsible agency, or documented AI use. Reteach topic narrowing and require a revised compact brief using a teacher-provided source packet.

Extension Options

Extension 1: Actually send the letter. If a student produced a Letter to a Public Official, encourage them (with parent permission and your guidance) to actually send it. Local officials respond to constituent letters more often than students expect.

Extension 2: Comparative civic project. Have the student do a parallel mini-project on the same issue in a different jurisdiction (a different Florida county, a different state). What's similar? What's different? Why?

Extension 3: Public records request. For students particularly interested in their issue, walk them through how to file a Florida public records request for relevant documents. Florida's Sunshine Law (Chapter 119, Florida Statutes) makes most government records accessible by simple written request — no formal forms required. A request typically identifies the records sought, the requesting party, and a delivery method; agencies must respond within a reasonable time and may charge for staff time and copying.

Extension 4: Foundation Edition reading. Chapters 15 and 16 of *The Open Source Student* (Foundation Edition) cover civic engagement and what students who build can shape. Connects to today's work.

No-Install Adaptation Notes

The mini-project requires source research, which means students need access to information. Two paths:

Path A — Internet access for student devices: The standard implementation. Students search, find sources, work on their briefs.

Path B — Limited or no student internet access: - Provide pre-researched source packets for 5–10 issue options - Each packet contains: a short issue summary, 3–5 cited sources reproduced or excerpted in print, identification of the responsible agency - Students choose from these packets and complete the brief using the provided sources - The work of source-finding is reduced; the work of analysis, position-taking, and brief production is preserved

For pilot adopters in settings without student internet, prepare these source packets in advance. The lesson is fully workable on Path B; only the source-discovery work is reduced.

For AI use during the project: same adaptation as previous lessons — teacher demonstration of an AI service in the role of research assistant; students observe and apply the demonstrated approach to their own briefs without necessarily having direct AI access.

Common Misconceptions

"Civic engagement means political activism." Civic engagement is broader. Researching an issue, writing to an official, attending a public meeting, voting, contributing to community discussion — all of these are civic engagement, regardless of political orientation.

"My issue isn't important enough." Local issues that affect the student's community are exactly the right scale for this project. The point isn't to take on the biggest national issue; it's to do real civic work at a real scale.

"I should be neutral." The brief includes a position because civic literacy includes the capacity to take a defensible position. Neutral journalism is valuable; it is not the only valuable form of civic communication. The brief asks for evidence-based position-taking.

"AI can do the project for me." The lesson and the disclosure requirement make this transparent. AI assistance is fine; AI authorship is not. The student must do the substantive work, including verification, position-taking, and synthesis.

"My teacher will grade me based on what I conclude." No. The grade is on whether the conclusion is defensible from the sources, not on what the conclusion is. Reassure students who are anxious about taking positions on charged topics.

Cross-Curricular Connections

Social Studies (Civics): the lesson is itself civics work in compact form. Connects to virtually every aspect of middle-school civics curriculum.

ELA (Communication — Argument and Research): the brief is substantive argument writing with sources. Directly serves B.E.S.T. ELA Communication-strand standards (note: B.E.S.T. ELA uses "C" prefix for what other frameworks call Writing) — specifically ELA.7.C.1.3 (argument with claim, evidence, counterclaim) and ELA.7.C.4.1 (research drawing on multiple reliable and valid sources).

Social Studies (History): civic issues often have historical context. Coordinate with the social studies teacher for issues with relevant historical background.

Science: environmental and health issues often have substantial scientific content. Coordinate with the science teacher when student topics intersect.

Mathematics: policy issues with quantitative dimensions (budgets, statistics, projections) require students to handle numerical claims. Coordinate with the math teacher for issues with significant quantitative content.

Parent Communication Notes

This lesson can produce strong student work that parents will want to see. It can also produce work on civic issues that may be charged.

A student produces particularly strong work. Share with the parent: “[Student] completed our culminating Civic Tech Mini-Project today on [issue]. The brief demonstrates real research, verification, and analytical thinking. You may enjoy reviewing it together.”

A student chooses a topic that may be sensitive in their family. Be neutral. The point is the skill, not the position. If the family asks about a particular topic choice, explain that the curriculum builds source-evaluation and civic-engagement skills regardless of position; specific topic choices are the student’s.

A student wants to actually send their Letter to a Public Official. Wonderful. Get parent sign-off. Provide guidance on how to send and what to expect. Real civic engagement at the middle school level is a positive outcome.

Closing the lesson well — and the pilot

This is the last lesson of the Pilot Kit. The closing should mark the achievement of the whole week, not just this lesson.

End-of-curriculum language: “You finished the Florida Pilot Kit. Five lessons. Five skills. Five artifacts in your portfolio. You can explain what AI is, you can verify, you can read across sources, you can use AI ethically, and you can do real civic work with all of those skills together. That is a real foundation. You will use it across your education and across your life.”

If feasible, take a moment to acknowledge the students individually — even briefly. The Pilot Kit is intentionally short; the relationships students built with the material this week are part of what will determine whether they keep using these skills.

Then transition to the pilot feedback. Direct students to know that their feedback (and their educator’s feedback) shapes the next version of the curriculum. They are not just consumers of this work; they are contributors to what comes next.

Lesson 5: Civic Tech Mini-Project

Student Edition

What you will learn today

By the end of this lesson, you will have completed a small-scale civic technology project: you will have picked a real issue in your community or state, researched it using everything you've learned this week (verification, source analysis, ethical AI use), and produced a verified civic artifact — a brief, a letter, or a presentation that documents what you found and why it matters.

This is the capstone of the Florida Pilot Kit. It puts everything together.

Bellringer / Warm-Up Options

Your teacher will choose one option.

For this warm-up, a **real civic issue** means a problem or decision connected to your school, neighborhood, city, county, or state that people could research and try to improve. Examples: traffic near school, school phone policy, water quality, public park safety, bus routes, recycling, library hours, local flooding, or a proposed Florida law.

Option A — Fast Start (3 minutes): Write down one real civic issue people might disagree about or try to improve.

Option B — Standard Warm-Up (5 minutes): Write down one real civic issue, then answer:

1. Who is affected by this issue?
2. What public agency, public official, school board, city, county, or state office might be connected to it?
3. What source could you check first to learn more? Examples: a school board agenda, city or county website, Florida agency page, local news article, or official meeting minutes.

Option C — Extended Launch (6-7 minutes): Write down one real civic issue, then answer:

1. Who is affected by this issue?
2. What public agency, public official, school board, city, county, or state office might be connected to it?
3. What source could you check first to learn more?
4. What would make this issue too broad, too vague, or too hard to research today? How could you narrow it?

This does not have to be your final project topic. It is a quick start for civic thinking.

Vocabulary

Five terms today, focused on civic processes.

Agency. A government office or organization responsible for a specific area — for example, the Florida Department of Education, the Palm Beach County Commission, the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission. Knowing which agency handles which issue is a basic skill of civic participation.

Jurisdiction. The area of authority. A federal agency has federal jurisdiction; a state agency has state jurisdiction; a county or city has local jurisdiction. Asking the right level of government about the right kind of issue is part of doing civic work well.

Policy. The rules or approaches a government uses to address an issue. Different policies produce different outcomes; comparing policies is part of civic analysis.

Public official. Someone elected or appointed to a government role — a city council member, a state representative, a school board member, a sheriff. Public officials are accountable to the people they serve and can be contacted by citizens.

Public records. Documents and information government must make available to the public — meeting minutes, contracts, budgets, agency decisions. Florida has particularly strong public records laws (the “Sunshine Law”), which makes civic research easier here than in many states.

Reading: Putting It All Together

This week you've built a set of skills that, combined, are the foundation of civic technology literacy:

- **Lesson 1:** What AI actually is, what it can do, where it fails
- **Lesson 2:** How to verify AI claims against real sources
- **Lesson 3:** How to read across multiple sources critically, identify bias and missing context
- **Lesson 4:** How to use AI ethically, protect privacy, maintain integrity

Today you use all of those skills on a real issue. Not a hypothetical. Not a textbook case. An actual local or state issue that affects your community.

This is the lesson where the curriculum's purpose becomes concrete. The skills you've built are not just academic exercises. They are what citizens do when they engage seriously with public life. By doing one Civic Tech Mini-Project, you are practicing the actual work of citizenship — research, verification, analysis, communication, action.

Why a Civic Project, Specifically?

Civic literacy is in your Florida standards because Florida (and the country) needs citizens who can engage thoughtfully with public issues. That engagement requires real skills: finding accurate information, evaluating competing claims, understanding how government works, communicating clearly with public officials, being accountable for the positions you take.

The Civic Tech Mini-Project gives you a small, manageable practice of all of these. You won't solve a major civic problem in one class period. You will demonstrate that you can do the work of approaching a civic problem the right way — with evidence, with verification, with respect for sources, with appropriate humility about what you don't know.

Doing this once well makes it possible to do it again, on bigger issues, in higher-stakes contexts, throughout your life.

What Counts as a “Real” Issue

The mini-project asks you to pick a real local or state issue. “Real” means an issue that:

- Actually exists (not hypothetical)
- Affects your community in some way (locally relevant)
- Has identifiable government agencies or officials responsible for some part of it
- Has real sources you can find — government documents, news coverage, advocacy materials, official records

Some examples that work well for Florida middle schoolers:

Local environment / sustainability: - Sea level rise and adaptation in your county - Water quality in a specific local water body (a river, lake, springs) - Endangered species protection in your area - Plastic waste / recycling policy in your city or county

Schools and education: - A current school board policy decision (cell phone use, curriculum adoption, school zoning) - Funding for a specific school program in your district - School safety / mental health support in your district - Library book selection processes in your district

Local government and community: - A current zoning or development decision in your community - Public transportation in your area - A proposed park, recreational facility, or community space - Affordable housing policy in your city or county

State-level civic issues: - A current Florida legislative bill on a topic you care about - A Florida agency's policy on something specific (Florida DEP, Florida DOE, Florida DOT, etc.) - An issue that has shown up in recent Florida legislative sessions

The best topic is one that meets these criteria AND that you have some reason to care about. Engagement is part of the work.

How to Approach the Mini-Project

The five-step structure for the mini-project mirrors the verification and analysis work you've practiced all week.

Step 1: Choose your issue and frame the question. Pick the issue. Then frame it as a specific question rather than a vague topic. “Sea level rise” is too broad. “What is Miami-Dade County doing to adapt its drainage infrastructure to sea level rise, and is the current funding adequate?” is a specific question you can actually research.

Step 2: Identify the responsible agency or official. Who is responsible for this issue at the level of government that matters? For local issues, this is usually a city council, county commission, or city/county department. For state issues, it's typically a Florida agency or the Florida Legislature. Knowing whose job it is to address the issue is fundamental — you can't engage with public issues effectively without knowing the right address for your engagement.

Step 3: Find official sources. Government has lots of public information available — much more than people realize. Florida's Sunshine Law makes this especially true. For your issue, find: official government statements or policy documents, official data (if available), records of agency decisions, current legislation if applicable. Use AI to help you search and organize, but the actual sources need to come from real government and reliable news, not from AI alone.

Step 4: Use AI as a thinking partner — with verification. AI can help you understand a complicated issue, summarize a long policy document, brainstorm what aspects to focus on. Use it. AND verify everything AI tells you against your real sources. Document your AI use with the disclosure practice from Lesson 4.

Step 5: Produce your artifact. Create something concrete that documents what you found and what you think. Three options:

- **Civic Issue Brief** (recommended): a 1–2 page document explaining the issue, summarizing key facts (with cited sources), identifying the responsible agency, and stating your reasoned position on what should happen
- **Letter to a public official:** a formal letter to the relevant official explaining the issue, citing your sources, and stating your position
- **Class presentation:** a 5-minute presentation walking the class through your issue, sources, findings, and position

The portfolio piece for Lesson 5 is the **Civic Issue Brief**, which is the recommended artifact and the form the rubric is calibrated for. If your educator approves the Letter or Presentation alternative for your project, that approved alternative serves the same portfolio purpose; the rubric is adapted to the form chosen.

A Few Notes on Doing This Well

Stay specific. A brief on “education funding in Florida” is too broad to be useful. A brief on “the funding allocation for special education services in [your specific district] for the 2025–2026 school year” is something you can actually engage with.

Cite your sources. Every factual claim in your artifact should have a source. If a fact came from AI and you couldn't verify it from a real source, leave it out — or note it as unverified and explain why you're including it anyway.

Take a position, but defend it. The artifact isn't supposed to be neutral journalism. You can take a position on what you think should happen. But your position should be defensible from your sources, not just an opinion. The difference is whether you can back up what you claim.

Be honest about uncertainty. Not every question has a clear answer. Sometimes the data is contested, sometimes the experts disagree, sometimes you don't have access to all the information. Saying "I don't have enough information to know X" is more honest than pretending certainty you don't have. Civic discourse benefits from people who can be honest about what they don't know.

Acknowledge AI use. Following the disclosure practice from Lesson 4, your artifact should include a brief AI Use Statement noting where AI helped your research, drafting, or thinking. This is the responsible practice.

Activity 1: Issue Selection and Question Framing (10 minutes)

Your teacher will guide a quick group discussion to help you choose your issue. Some students may know exactly what they want to work on; others may need to think it through.

If you don't have an issue in mind, use these questions to find one:

- What's a problem in your community you've heard adults talking about?
- What's a current event in Florida that you've seen in the news?
- What's something at your school or in your school district that you have an opinion about?
- What's an environmental issue specific to where you live?
- What's a local government decision happening right now (zoning, parks, transportation)?

Write down your topic. Then frame it as a specific question — narrow enough that you could actually research it in the time available.

Activity 2: The Mini-Project (40+ minutes)

Now you do the actual project. Work through the five steps from the reading.

Use the Civic Issue Brief template below as your structure.

Civic Issue Brief — Template

CIVIC ISSUE BRIEF

Student: _____

Date: _____

Topic: _____

The Question I Researched:

[A specific question, not just a topic]

Why This Issue Matters (locally):

[2–3 sentences on why this issue affects your community]

Responsible Agency or Official:

[Who is responsible for this at the relevant level of government?]

Key Facts (with cited sources):

1. [Fact + source]

2. [Fact + source]

3. [Fact + source]

[etc. – aim for at least 3–5 verified facts]

Different Perspectives on This Issue:

What do supporters of one view say? [+ source if applicable]

What do people who disagree say? [+ source if applicable]

Where do they agree? Where do they disagree?

What I Think Should Happen and Why:

[1 paragraph stating your position with the reasoning]

What I Don't Know (and would want to research more):

[1–2 things you couldn't fully resolve]

AI Use Statement:

[Brief disclosure of how AI helped – research, drafting feedback, organization, etc. – and confirmation that the writing and analysis are your own]

Sources Cited (full list):
[All sources used, in some consistent format]

Activity 3: Class Sharing (10 minutes if time allows)

Several students share their issue and main finding with the class. Listen for:

- What's similar about the issues other students chose?
- What's different about how they approached the research?
- What surprised you about what other students found?

The point isn't to grade each other — it's to see the range of civic issues your classmates care about and the range of approaches to thinking about them.

Reflection Questions

1. What did you learn about your topic that you didn't know before?
 2. What was hardest about the mini-project? What did you wish you had more time for?
 3. How did the verification habit (Lesson 2) and the source analysis framework (Lesson 3) help you in this project?
 4. Did you find yourself changing your initial position based on what you learned? Why or why not?
 5. What would you do differently if you did a longer version of this project?
-

Self-Check

1. What does it mean for an issue to be "real" in the sense this lesson uses?
 2. What is the difference between a topic and a researchable question?
 3. What is an "agency" in the civic sense?
 4. Why do public records matter for civic research?
 5. Why does your Civic Issue Brief include an "AI Use Statement"?
-

What This Pilot Has Built

This is the last lesson of the Florida Pilot Kit. Take a moment to look at what you've built.

You can explain what AI actually is — what it does well, where it fails, why hallucination is a structural risk that requires verification.

You have a verification habit. You can take any AI claim, find real sources, compare, document.

You can read across multiple sources critically, identify bias including in sources you trust, and recognize what's missing from any single account.

You can use AI ethically, protect your privacy, maintain academic integrity, and document your work honestly.

You can apply all of this to a real civic issue, find official sources, identify responsible agencies, and produce documented work that would hold up to scrutiny.

That is the capability. It is real. You will use it for the rest of your life — as a student, as a citizen, eventually as a working adult. The skills are not specific to AI; AI is the entry point. The skills are the durable thing.

Your Portfolio at the End of the Pilot

By now you should have:

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

Together, these five artifacts demonstrate everything the Pilot Kit teaches. Keep them in your portfolio. They support homeschool documentation, ESA documentation when the family applies for scholarship reimbursement (the actual eligibility/reimbursement determination is made by adults — program reviewers and Scholarship Funding Organizations — not by the artifacts themselves), and your own record of what you accomplished.

Looking Ahead

The Florida Pilot Kit is the introduction. If you want to go deeper:

- *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, Phase 3) 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

The pilot is over. The skills are yours.

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
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
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.
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.

Pilot Feedback Form

Structured feedback from Pilot Kit educators to inform the full curriculum.

This form takes about 10 minutes to complete after you finish teaching the five Pilot Kit lessons. Your feedback shapes Phase 2 (the nine-week module) and Phase 3 (the full-year edition). There are no wrong answers; honest feedback is the only useful kind.

Preferred submission path: use the online Google Form created from the Online Pilot Feedback Form Pack in this Implementation Readiness Packet. The Google Form is the live pilot intake mechanism.

Offline fallback: use this Markdown form only when a school, library, homeschool group, or family cannot use Google Forms. Completed offline responses can be returned through the CivicOS Labs contact channel and transcribed into the pilot response Sheet by CivicOS staff.

About you and your setting

Educator name (optional, for follow-up if you allow it):

Role: - ☐ Classroom teacher - ☐ Homeschool parent - ☐ Microschool facilitator - ☐ Library media specialist - ☐ After-school program leader - ☐ Other (please specify):

Setting: - ☐ Florida public middle school - ☐ Florida private middle school - ☐ Florida charter school - ☐ Florida homeschool (single family) - ☐ Florida homeschool co-op - ☐ Florida microschool - ☐ Florida library or community center - ☐ Other (please specify):

Approximate location in Florida (county or region, optional):

Number of students taught with the Pilot Kit:

Grade levels of students: - ☐ Grade 6 - ☐ Grade 7 - ☐ Grade 8 - ☐ Grade 9 - ☐ Mixed (please specify):

Pacing you used: - ☐ One-Week Intensive (default) - ☐ Two-Week Relaxed - ☐ Five-Week After-School Program - ☐ Weekend Microschool Intensive - ☐ Single-Day (not recommended, but used) - ☐ Custom pacing (please describe):

Are you willing to be contacted for follow-up questions? - ☐ Yes, contact me at: _____ - ☐ No, anonymous feedback only

About what you taught

Did you teach all five lessons? - ☐ Yes - ☐ No, I taught _____ of 5 (and which ones)

If you did not teach all five, what stopped you?

[free response]

Did you use the no-install default delivery, the local-installation extension, or both? - ☐ No-install default only - ☐ No-install default for most students; some students did the installation extension - ☐ Most or all students did local installation - ☐ Neither (used different approach — please describe)

Did you use any commercial AI services for teacher demonstration during lessons? Which ones?

[free response]

What worked

Which lesson worked best in your setting? Why?

[free response]

Which activity, exercise, or discussion landed most strongly with students?

[free response]

What surprised you in a good way?

[free response]

Were the Differentiation Notes useful? Did you use them?

- ☐ Yes, they were essential
- ☐ Yes, I used some of them
- ☐ I read them but did not use them this time
- ☐ No, I did not use them

☐ I did not see them

[Optional follow-up: which differentiation strategies were most useful?]

What did not work

Which lesson was hardest to deliver in your setting? Why?

[free response]

Where did students get stuck or disengage?

[free response]

What did you have to skip or modify because it didn't fit your setting?

[free response]

What was missing from the materials that you needed?

[free response]

What was confusing in the Teacher Edition?

[free response]

What was confusing in the Student Edition?

[free response]

About the format and structure

The Teacher Edition format included Lesson at a Glance, Background, Procedure with timings, Student Reading with annotations, Activities with answer keys, Reflection prompts, Differentiation Notes, Assessment Rubric, Extensions, and No-Install Adaptation Notes. Was this the right set of components? - ☐ Yes, this is the right set - ☐ Mostly right; one or two things could be cut (please specify): - ☐ Missing something important (please specify): - ☐ Too many components; could be simpler (please specify):

The Student Edition format included Lesson Title and Goal, Vocabulary, Student Reading at grade level, Activities, Reflection Questions, Self-Check, and Portfolio Artifact. Was this the right set of components? - ☐ Yes - ☐ Mostly right; one or two things could be cut (please specify): - ☐ Missing something important (please specify): - ☐ Too many components; could be simpler (please specify):

Was the reading level appropriate for your students? - ☐ Yes, well-matched - ☐ Slightly too hard - ☐ Significantly too hard - ☐ Slightly too easy - ☐ Significantly too easy - ☐ Mixed across students

Was the lesson timing realistic? - ☐ Yes - ☐ Generally too long - ☐ Generally too short - ☐ Too long for some lessons, too short for others (specify) - ☐ Wildly off

About the institutional support materials

Did you use the Implementation Readiness Packet (Teacher Quick Start, Administrator Overview, Principal & Superintendent Forward Packet, Google Classroom Upload Pack, IT Approval Checklist, Parent Letter, Student AI Use Agreement, Accessibility Statement, Data Privacy Statement, Pilot Feedback Form, ESA Documentation Guide, and the ESA Templates collection)?

- ☐ Yes, I used several of these documents
- ☐ Yes, I used one or two
- ☐ No, but I might use them next time
- ☐ No, I did not need them in my setting

Which Implementation Readiness Packet documents were most useful?

[free response]

Which were not useful or were missing something important?

[free response]

Did you encounter institutional resistance (administrator, IT, parent) that the Implementation Readiness Packet did not adequately address?

[free response]

About student learning

Did students reach the curriculum's learning objectives in your view?

For each lesson, please indicate whether students achieved the lesson's stated objectives:

- Lesson 1 (What AI Is and Is Not): ☐ mostly yes ☐ partly ☐ mostly no
- Lesson 2 (Verifying AI With Sources): ☐ mostly yes ☐ partly ☐ mostly no
- Lesson 3 (Media Bias, Claims, and Persuasion): ☐ mostly yes ☐ partly ☐ mostly no
- Lesson 4 (Privacy, Ethics, and Academic Integrity): ☐ mostly yes ☐ partly ☐ mostly no
- Lesson 5 (Civic Tech Mini-Project): ☐ mostly yes ☐ partly ☐ mostly no

Were students more engaged with this curriculum than with comparable curricula you have taught? - ☐ More engaged - ☐ Comparable - ☐ Less engaged - ☐ Hard to say

What did your students take away that you did not expect?

[free response]

What student misconceptions or questions surfaced that the curriculum did not address well?

[free response]

About civics co-primary framing

The curriculum's framing positions AI literacy and civic technology literacy as co-primary pillars. **Did this framing land with your students?**

- ☐ Yes, students engaged seriously with the civic dimension
- ☐ Partially — students engaged with AI content but the civic framing was less central
- ☐ No, the civic framing felt forced or did not land
- ☐ My setting did not really exercise the civic dimension (please explain)

Did the Civic Tech Mini-Project (Lesson 5) work?

- ☐ Yes, students produced meaningful work
- ☐ Partially — students produced something but it was thin
- ☐ No, this lesson did not land in our setting

What civic issue(s) did students choose for their Mini-Projects? (anonymized; we want to know what students cared about)

[free response]

About broader feedback

If you had to choose one thing to change before the next version, what would it be?

[free response]

If you had to choose one thing to keep exactly as it is, what would it be?

[free response]

Would you teach this curriculum again next year? - ☐ Yes - ☐ Maybe; depends on revisions - ☐ Probably not (please explain) - ☐ Yes if a longer version were available

Would you adopt the full nine-week module (Phase 2) or full-year edition (Phase 3) when they become available? - ☐ Yes, full nine-week module - ☐ Yes, full-year edition - ☐ Maybe; depends on what they look like - ☐ No (please explain)

Would you recommend this curriculum to other Florida educators? - ☐ Yes, strongly - ☐ Yes, with caveats (please specify) - ☐ Probably not (please explain) - ☐ No (please explain)

About the next phase

What feature, lesson, or material would you most want to see in the full curriculum?

[free response]

What other Florida educators do you know who might be interested in piloting the curriculum?

[free response, with permission to contact them]

Is there anything else we should know?

[free response]

How to submit

When you have completed this form:

1. Save your responses (the form is structured so you can complete it in any text editor or word processor)
2. Contact CivicOS Labs at civicoslabs.com and indicate you have Pilot Kit feedback to submit
3. We will provide submission instructions appropriate to your setting

For pilot adopters who want a more interactive feedback session: we offer 30-minute virtual conversations with the curriculum team in lieu of (or in addition to) the form. Contact us through the website to schedule.

Thank you

Real classroom and homeschool feedback is what makes this curriculum better. Pilot adopters are foundational contributors to the work — your feedback shapes what gets built next, what gets revised, and what gets cut. We genuinely appreciate the time and care you put into the pilot and into this feedback.
