Module 3: Find the Facts, Tell the Truth

Purpose: Participants learn how to investigate community questions, interpret data with context, verify information, and use artificial intelligence responsibly. The module prepares youth to ground advocacy in credible evidence without treating numbers, news, or technology as more important than lived experience and community knowledge.

Outcomes

- Ask focused, answerable research questions connected to advocacy goals.
- Distinguish primary sources, secondary sources, lived experience, opinion, and evidence.
- Read basic tables, charts, percentages, and disaggregated data with attention to context and limitations.
- Use a repeatable process to verify online claims, images, and news content.
- Explain the difference between misinformation, disinformation, satire, opinion, and reporting.
- Use AI to support advocacy tasks while protecting privacy, checking accuracy, naming assistance, and keeping human judgment in control.

Learning Journey

Question → Evidence → Context → Verification → Responsible Use → Action.

Youth begin with a community concern, locate and assess information, examine what data can and cannot show, verify claims before sharing them, and decide when technology can responsibly support advocacy.





Curriculum Connections

Connection	How This Module Fits
Builds from	Builds on the DC Future Agenda from Module 2 by turning priorities and unanswered questions into responsible research.
Reuses	Community knowledge and civic questions from Module 2; consent and shared-power commitments from Module 1.
Frameworks and tools	Research Question Builder; Data Story; PAUSE verification routine; PRIVY responsible-AI framework.
Products to carry forward	Carry the Research and Source Plan, Data Story, Claim Verification Checklist, and AI Use Plan into policy and campaign work.

Module at a Glance

Lesson	Primary Focus	Suggested Run Time	Key Product
1. Ask Better Questions.	Research questions, source types, and evidence	60 minutes	Research Question and Source Plan
2. Read the Numbers.	Data literacy, context, and community knowledge	60 minutes	Data Story Worksheet
3. Check Before You Share.	News literacy, misinformation, and verification	60 minutes	Claim Verification Checklist
4. Use AI with Integrity.	Ethical, transparent, and accountable AI use	Two 60-minute sessions	AI Use Plan and Disclosure Log

Lesson 1: Ask Better Questions

Purpose: Participants turn broad community concerns into focused research questions and identify the kinds of evidence needed to answer them.

Outcomes / Youth Learning Goals

- I can turn a broad concern into a focused research question.
- I can explain the difference between a primary source, secondary source, lived experience, opinion, and evidence.
- I can identify where I might find reliable information about a DC issue.
- I can create a plan for gathering information without assuming one source tells the whole story.

Age Adaptations

- **Ages 11–14:** Use familiar school or neighborhood examples and limit the source sort to four categories.
- **Ages 15–17:** Add questions about author, date, purpose, and missing voices.
- **Ages 18–24:** Include public records, legislation, budgets, agency reports, research studies, and community-generated data.

Process

Participants begin with questions they already have about their community, practice narrowing a broad topic, sort different kinds of sources, and build a short research plan connected to an advocacy decision.

Suggested Run Time

60 minutes. Follow the exact agenda below. If the group needs more processing time, reduce examples or a practice round; protect the welcome, check-in, youth choice, core participant product, reflection, and closing.

Materials and Preparation

- Chart paper, markers, sticky notes, and pens.
- Research Question Builder worksheet.
- Source-type cards.
- Internet-enabled devices, if available.
- One local issue fact sheet or public document per group.
- Posted community agreements.

Agenda and Activity Guide

Activity	Suggested Run Time	Purpose	Materials	Facilitator Instructions / Suggested Language
Welcome and Purpose	5 minutes	Connect research to advocacy.	Posted purpose and agreements	Welcome participants and explain: “Advocacy asks people to make decisions. Strong advocacy begins by asking the right questions, listening to people closest to the issue, and checking what we think we know.” Review participation options.
Check-In	5 minutes	Surface curiosity and lived knowledge.	Sticky notes	Ask: “What is one question you have about something happening in your school, neighborhood, or city?” Youth may share aloud, post anonymously, or pass. Group similar questions without judging them. Example: Who is choosing my school lunch?
Icebreaker: Question Makeover	10 minutes	Practice making questions more useful.	Broad-question cards	Give pairs a broad question such as “How do you feel about transportation in the district?” Ask them to make it more specific: who, where, what period, which outcome, and what decision. Invite quick shares.
Mini-Lesson: What Counts as Evidence?	10 minutes	Introduce source categories.	Source-type cards	Define: primary source, secondary source, lived experience, opinion, and evidence. Emphasize that lived experience is expertise, but one story does not automatically describe everyone. Ask which source types can work together.

Activity: From Question to Research Plan	25 minutes	Create a focused, answerable research question. Identify multiple ways to investigate.	Research Question Builder; Source Plan worksheet; chart paper or devices if available	Ask youth to choose a community concern or use the research question they identified in the previous activity. Say: "A strong research question helps us figure out what we actually need to learn. We want a question that is focused enough to investigate but open enough that we do not assume we already know the answer." Have groups work through: What is happening? Who is affected? Where is this happening? Over what period of time? What decision, policy, resource, or change are we trying to better understand or inform? Then ask groups to turn their answers into one focused research question. <u>Example</u> **Instead of:** "Why doesn't DC care about giving teens safe places to go?" **Try:** "What safe, free, or low-cost spaces are available to DC teens after school and in the evening, and what factors affect when and where those spaces are available?" **Once groups have a research question, ask:** "Who or what could help us answer this question?" **Have each group identify at least one source from each category:** **1. Community Voices.** Young people with lived experience, families, community members, organizers, service providers, or other people directly connected to the issue. **Ask:** What could they help us understand? Whose voices might still be missing?

				2. Official or Public Sources. Agency websites, laws, regulations, budgets, Council hearings, public data, meeting records, plans, or government reports. **Ask:** What facts or decisions could this source help confirm? What might an official source not tell us? **3. Independent Research or Reporting.** Research organizations, universities, nonprofits, local journalism, evaluations, or other credible reports. **Ask:** What additional context could this provide? Who created the information, and what perspective might be missing? **Emphasize:** "One source rarely tells us the whole story. Community experience, public information, and independent research can help us see different parts of the same issue." **Ask each group to review its research question and source plan and decide:** 1. What is our research question? 2. Which source should we start with, and why? 3. What is one source or perspective we want to make sure we do not leave out? Invite two or three groups to quickly share their question and first source.

Activity	Suggested Run Time	Purpose	Materials	Facilitator Instructions / Suggested Language
				Close by saying: “Research is not just searching online until we find something that agrees with us. Strong advocacy research means asking a clear question, listening to people closest to the issue, checking public information, and comparing what different sources tell us before deciding what we think should happen.”
Closing Reflection	5 minutes	Connect research to responsible action.	Exit slips	Ask: “What is one question you need answered before asking people to act?” Preview that the next lesson examines how numbers can inform but also distort a story.

Facilitator Check

Listen for whether youth can name a focused question, identify more than one type of evidence, and explain why a single source may be incomplete.

Lesson 2: Read the Numbers

Purpose: Participants interpret basic data, identify what is missing, and combine quantitative information with community knowledge.

Outcomes / Youth Learning Goals

- I can explain the difference between a number, a finding, and an interpretation.
- I can read a basic chart, percentage, rate, or comparison.
- I can ask who is included, who is missing, and how data was collected.
- I can avoid making a claim that is larger than the evidence supports.
- I can combine data with lived experience ethically.

Age Adaptations

- **Ages 11–14:** Use one simple bar chart and whole-number comparisons before percentages.
- **Ages 15–17:** Add sample size, time period, and correlation-versus-causation prompts.
- **Ages 18–24:** Include disaggregation, margins of error, methodology, administrative data, and community-based participatory research.

Process

Participants analyze a simple DC-related data display, practice separating observation from interpretation, identify limitations, and create a short evidence statement that includes both data and community context.

Suggested Run Time

60 minutes. Follow the exact agenda below. If the group needs more processing time, reduce examples or a practice round; protect the welcome, check-in, youth choice, core participant product, reflection, and closing.

Materials and Preparation

- Simple charts or tables from a credible public source.
- Data Story worksheet.
- Calculators, optional.
- Markers and chart paper.
- Issue-specific fact sheets.
- Posted definitions: count, percentage, rate, average, median, disaggregation.

Agenda and Activity Guide

Activity	Suggested Run Time	Purpose	Materials	Facilitator Instructions / Suggested Language
Welcome and Purpose	5 minutes	Frame data as a tool, not a verdict.	Sample chart	Say: “Numbers can reveal patterns and help us challenge harmful decisions. They can also hide people, erase differences, or be presented in misleading ways. Today we will practice asking better questions of data.”
Check-In	5 minutes	Connect numbers to daily life.	None	Ask: “Where do numbers affect decisions in your life: grades, attendance, prices, wait times, social media, sports, or something else?” Do they tell the whole story?
Icebreaker: Estimate, Then Check	5 minutes	Notice assumptions and uncertainty.	Jar/count image or simple estimation prompt	Ask youth to estimate a visible quantity or percentage, explain what informed the guess, then reveal the answer. Debrief: “What is the difference between an estimate and evidence?”

Activity	Suggested Run Time	Purpose	Materials	Facilitator Instructions / Suggested Language
Mini-Lesson: Read What Is There	15 minutes	Teach a simple process for reading charts and separating what the data shows from what we think it means.	Sample chart; posted questions	Display one simple chart and walk through four questions: 1. What do you notice? Describe only what you can see in the chart. 2. What do we need to know? Ask who collected the data, who is included, when it was collected, and what is being measured. 3. What can we compare? Look for differences, similarities, increases, decreases, or patterns. Check the numbers and scale before deciding whether a difference is big or small. 4. What can't this chart tell us? Identify any information or perspectives that may be missing, as well as questions that require further research. Model the difference between an observation and an explanation: Observation: "The bar for Ward 8 is higher than the bar for Ward 3." Explanation: "Ward 8 is higher because..." Remind participants: "The chart can show us a difference, but we need more information before we can explain why that difference exists."
Activity: Data Detective	10 minutes	Practice the four-step chart-reading process with a new data example.	Chart/table and Data Story worksheet, device if available	In small groups, give youth a new chart or table and ask them to use the same four questions from the mini-lesson: 1. What do you notice? 2. What do we need to know? 3. What can we compare? 4. What can't this chart tell us? Ask groups to identify the source, date, population, and what is being measured as they work. Then have them complete two statements: "The data shows or suggests..." and "The data does not tell us..." Remind youth to check titles, labels, numbers, time periods, and who is included before making a claim. Reinforce: "Our job is to say what the evidence supports—not more than the evidence supports."

Activity	Suggested Run Time	Purpose	Materials	Facilitator Instructions / Suggested Language
Activity: Add the Community Story	15 minutes	Connect quantitative and qualitative evidence.Show how community experiences can add context to quantitative data	Short community quotes or scenarios; completed Data Story worksheets	Say: “Our chart gave us part of the story. Now let’s see what we learn when we hear from people connected to the issue.” Give each group one or more short community quotes or hypothetical examples connected to the data. Ask: “What does this story help us understand that the chart could not?” “Does it help explain the data, raise a new question, or show us another perspective?” “What should we still avoid claiming?” Then ask groups to add the community story to their earlier statement: “The data suggests..., and this community perspective helps us understand...” Emphasize that one person’s experience should not be treated as everyone’s experience. Ask: “Whose voice might still be missing?” and “If this were a real person’s story, what permission or consent would we need before sharing it publicly?”
Closing Reflection	5 minutes	Practice careful evidence language.	Statement written out or slide	Ask participants to complete: “The evidence suggests..., but we still need to know...” Invite one or two examples. Close by saying: “Good research does not mean having every answer. It means being clear about what the evidence tells us, what it does not tell us, whose perspectives are represented, and what we need to investigate next.” Preview that the next lesson will help participants evaluate and verify information they encounter online, in news, and in other sources.

Facilitator Check

Listen for whether youth separate what the data shows from why they think it happened, name at least one limitation, and avoid claiming causation without evidence.

Lesson 3: Check Before You Share

Purpose: Participants learn how misinformation spreads and practice verifying online claims before using or sharing them in advocacy.

Outcomes / Youth Learning Goals

- I can distinguish reporting, opinion, satire, misinformation, and disinformation.
- I can pause before reacting to a surprising or emotional claim.
- I can investigate who originally published a claim and what evidence is provided.
- I can compare coverage across credible sources.
- I can explain what to do when a claim cannot be verified.

Age Adaptations

- **Ages 11–14:** Use low-stakes examples and emphasize pause, source, and evidence.
- **Ages 15–17:** Add manipulated context, impostor accounts, and reverse-image-search demonstrations led by an adult.
- **Ages 18–24:** Include coordinated disinformation, political persuasion, platform incentives, and correction strategies.

Process

Participants examine why content gets shared, learn key information categories, use a lateral-verification routine, and decide whether to share, correct, label, or withhold a claim.

Suggested Run Time

60 minutes. Follow the exact agenda below. If the group needs more processing time, reduce examples or a practice round; protect the welcome, check-in, youth choice, core participant product, reflection, and closing.

Materials and Preparation

- Prepared claim cards or screenshots with personal information removed.
- Claim Verification Checklist.
- Devices and internet access, if available.
- Posted PAUSE routine.
- Examples of source, evidence, date, and context clues.

Agenda and Activity Guide

Activity	Suggested Run Time	Purpose	Materials	Facilitator Instructions / Suggested Language
Welcome and Purpose	5 minutes	Set the tone.	Posted purpose	Explain: “Everyone can be fooled, especially when information confirms what we hope, fear, or already believe. Verification is not about proving we are smarter. It is a practice that protects our communities and our credibility.”
Check-In	5 minutes	Notice emotional reactions to information.	None	Ask: “What kind of online post makes you most likely to stop, react, or share?” Do not ask youth to display private feeds.
Icebreaker: Headline, Opinion, or Joke?	10 minutes	Practice identifying content type.	Prepared cards	Read short, harmless examples. Youth move to signs labeled Reporting, Opinion, Satire/Joke, Advertisement, or Not Sure. Ask what clues informed each choice. In this context reporting means the process of gathering, organizing, and communicating information or data to a specific audience.
Mini-Lesson: Misinformation and Disinformation	8 minutes	Build shared vocabulary.	Definition cards	Define misinformation as false or misleading information shared without necessarily intending harm; disinformation as false or misleading information deliberately created or spread to deceive; satire as humor not intended as factual reporting; and opinion as a viewpoint. Explain that intent can be hard to prove, so verification focuses first on the claim and evidence.
Activity: PAUSE and Investigate	15 minutes	Practice lateral verification.	Claim cards, checklist, devices	Use PAUSE: Pause before sharing; Ask who is behind it; Understand the evidence; Search beyond the post; Explain what you know and do not know. Have groups leave the original page or post to learn about the source, search the exact claim, locate original evidence, and compare credible coverage.

Activity	Suggested Run Time	Purpose	Materials	Facilitator Instructions / Suggested Language
Activity: Share, Label, Correct, or Stop	12 minutes	Choose a responsible response.	Response cards	For each claim, groups choose: Share with source; Share with context; Ask a question; Correct privately or publicly; Report through the platform; or Do not amplify. Discuss how corrections can repeat and spread a false claim if handled carelessly.
Closing Reflection	5 minutes	Commit to a verification habit.	Exit slips	Complete: “Before I share information for advocacy, I will....”

Facilitator Check

Listen for whether youth investigate beyond the original post, identify original evidence when possible, and are comfortable saying a claim is unverified rather than forcing a conclusion.

Lesson 4: Use AI with Integrity

Purpose: Participants decide when and how artificial intelligence can support advocacy while protecting privacy, accuracy, consent, fairness, and human accountability.

Outcomes / Youth Learning Goals

- I can describe useful and risky ways AI may be used in advocacy.
- I can identify information that should not be entered into a public AI tool.
- I can verify AI-generated facts, quotations, statistics, citations, and legal or policy claims.
- I can recognize that AI may reproduce bias or leave out community knowledge.

Age Adaptations

- **Ages 11–14:** Focus on privacy, fact-checking, and asking an adult before using AI for public work.
- **Ages 15–17:** Add prompt critique, citation verification, image consent, and disclosure.
- **Ages 18–24:** Include organizational policy, procurement, data governance, bias testing, copyright, environmental considerations, and documentation of AI-assisted workflows.

Process

Participants sort possible AI uses, examine an AI-generated advocacy draft for errors and omissions, apply an ethical-use decision tool, and create a transparent AI use plan.

Suggested Run Time

Two 60-minute sessions (120 minutes total). Part A: Understanding Responsible AI Use. Part B: Audit, Decide, and Disclose. Each part includes its own welcome or reconnection, choice-based participation, practice or creation time, reflection, and closing.

Materials and Preparation

- AI Use Decision Tool.
- Prepared AI-generated sample with intentional errors.
- Verified source packet.
- Privacy and consent scenario cards.
- AI Disclosure Log.
- Chart paper and markers.

Agenda and Activity Guide Part A: Understanding Responsible AI Use

Activity	Suggested Run Time	Purpose	Materials	Facilitator Instructions / Suggested Language
Welcome and Purpose	5 minutes	Set Context	None	Explain: “Today we are going to use those responsibilities to decide whether an AI-generated draft is something we can actually trust and use.”
Check-In	5 minutes	Reconnect participants to the responsible-use framework from Part A.	Post PRIVY Framework	Ask: “What is one responsibility you remember from PRIVY?” Briefly review: Protect private information; Review for accuracy and bias; Identify and verify sources; Voice and consent belong to people; You remain accountable.
Icebreaker: Human, AI, or Both?	10 minutes	Challenge assumptions about authorship and quality.	Prepared short examples	Show several short examples and ask participants whether they think each was created by a human, AI, or both. Allow discussion before revealing the answer when known. Ask: “What made you choose your answer?” Then debrief: “If it can be difficult to tell who or what created something, what should we pay attention to instead?” Guide participants toward accuracy, evidence, quality, purpose, and impact.

Activity	Suggested Run Time	Purpose	Materials	Facilitator Instructions / Suggested Language
Learning: The Five Responsibilities	15 minutes	Introduce an ethical-use framework.	Posted PRIVY framework	Introduce PRIVY: P-Protect private information: Do not enter confidential information, identifying youth stories, passwords, private records, or information you do not have permission to share. R-Review for accuracy and bias: Read the output carefully. Ask what may be incorrect, misleading, oversimplified, or biased. I-Identify and verify sources: AI-generated information is not evidence by itself. Find and check reliable sources, especially primary or official sources when appropriate. V-Voice and consent belong to people: Do not let AI replace someone's voice, create fake testimonials, or use people's experiences without their knowledge or permission. Y-You remain accountable: A person must make the final decisions and take responsibility for what is shared. After each responsibility, ask youth for a simple example of what following that responsibility could look like.

Activity	Suggested Run Time	Purpose	Materials	Facilitator Instructions / Suggested Language
Activity: Green, Yellow, Red Uses	20 minutes	Practice deciding when AI use is appropriate, requires caution, or should not be used for advocacy work.	Scenario cards; Green, Yellow, and Red signs	Explain: Green = generally appropriate with human review. Yellow = pause, check, or get additional review/permission. Red = do not use AI this way. Read or distribute scenarios and ask groups to sort them. Possible Green examples: brainstorming research questions, organizing notes, or simplifying language that a person later reviews. Possible Yellow examples: translating community materials, drafting a public statement, summarizing a complicated policy, or helping revise testimony; these require verification, context, and/or review by people affected. Possible Red examples: entering confidential youth stories, creating a fake testimonial, impersonating someone, inventing citations, or publishing an unverified policy claim. For selected scenarios ask: “What makes this green, yellow, or red?” “What would have to change to make this use more responsible?” “Who needs to review or approve it?” Allow disagreement when participants can explain their reasoning.
Closing Reflection	5 minutes	Commit to a boundary.	Exit slips	Ask participants to complete the prompt: “It’s important to use AI responsibly because….” Close: “Responsible AI use is not just about what the technology can do. It is about the choices people make when using it. Next, we will practice checking an AI-generated product before deciding whether it is accurate, useful, and appropriate to use.”

Agenda and Activity Guide Part B: Audit, Decide, and Disclose

Activity	Suggested Run Time	Purpose	Materials	Facilitator Instructions / Suggested Language
Welcome and Purpose	5 minutes	Reconnect responsible use to accountable action.	Posted PRIVY framework	Say: 'Part A helped us decide what responsible AI use requires. Today we will test an AI-assisted advocacy product before deciding whether it is accurate, useful, and appropriate to use.'
Check-In	5 minutes	Reconnect to one responsibility.	None	Ask: 'Which PRIVY responsibility feels most important when advocacy work may become public, and why?' Speaking, writing, drawing, and passing are allowed.
Icebreaker: Confident, Careful, or Unsupported ?	10 minutes	Notice that confident language is not proof.	Prepared statements	Read short claims in different tones. Youth sort them as supported, unsupported, or not enough information. Ask what evidence would be needed before using each claim.
Activity: Audit the AI Draft	20 minutes	Apply PRIVY to a realistic product.	Prepared AI draft; verified source packet; audit checklist	In small groups, mark factual claims, missing context, bias, private or identifying information, borrowed voice, citations, and decisions requiring human review. Compare the draft with verified sources and community goals. Revise only what the evidence supports.
Activity: AI Use Plan and Disclosure	15 minutes	Create a reusable accountability plan.	AI Use Plan; Disclosure Log	Participants decide what AI may help with, what it may not receive or decide, who verifies facts and bias, whose consent is needed, what assistance should be disclosed, and which named person is responsible for the final product.
Closing Reflection	5 minutes	Commit to an accountable next step.	Exit slip	Complete: 'Before I use or share AI-assisted advocacy work, I will...' Reinforce that AI output is not evidence by itself and that a person remains accountable for the final work.

Facilitator Check

Listen for whether youth protect private information, verify AI-generated claims using independent sources, identify bias or missing perspectives, and keep a named human responsible for final work.

Module Appendix

This appendix contains printable tools, sample examples, facilitator references, and sources for further research.

Appendix Index

- Appendix A: Research Question Builder.
- Appendix B: Source Plan and Source Check.
- Appendix C: Data Story Worksheet.
- Appendix D: Claim Verification Checklist.
- Appendix E: AI Use Decision Tool.
- Appendix F: AI Disclosure Log.
- Appendix G: Sample Completed Research Plan.
- Appendix H: Sources and Further Research.
- Appendix I: Visual and Video Resources for Facilitators and Youth.
- Appendix J: Facilitator Preparation for Real, Fake, or Missing Context?
- Appendix K: Facilitator Reflection.

Appendix A: Research Question Builder

Broad concern or topic:

_____

Who is affected?

_____

Where is this happening?

_____

What time period matters?

_____

What decision, policy, budget, or practice are we trying to understand?

_____

Focused research question:

_____

What would a useful answer help us decide or do?

_____

Appendix B: Source Plan and Source Check

Source or Person	What It May Tell Us	What It May Miss	How We Will Verify

Source-check prompt: Who created it? When? For what purpose? What evidence is provided? Is the original source available? What voices or data are missing? Can another credible source confirm the claim?

Appendix C: Data Story Worksheet

Source and date: _____

Population, place, and time period: _____

What is being counted or measured?

_____

What pattern can we directly observe?

_____

What comparison is being made? Is it fair?

_____

Who may be missing or grouped together?

_____

What does the data support?

_____

What does it not prove?

_____

What lived experience or additional evidence would add context?

_____

Appendix D: Claim Verification Checklist

- Pause before reacting or sharing.
- Identify the exact claim not just the headline or feeling.
- Investigate who created or published it.
- Check the date and original context.
- Locate the original evidence, document, image, video, or quotation.
- Search beyond the original post and compare credible sources.
- Check whether corrections or fact checks exist.
- State what is confirmed, uncertain, misleading, or false.
- Decide whether sharing will inform people or unnecessarily amplify harm.

Appendix E: AI Use Decision Tool

Use before an AI-assisted task. No youth account, personal information, confidential story, or live case detail is required.

Decision Area	Questions	Group Decision / Owner
Purpose	What are we trying to do, and why might AI help? Could a person or non-AI tool do it more safely or effectively?	
Green / Yellow / Red	Is the proposed use ready, in need of safeguards, or not appropriate?	
Privacy	What information must never be entered? Have identifying and confidential details been removed?	
Rights and credit	Whose words, images, work, culture, or story may be affected? What permission and credit are required?	
Integrity	Which claims, quotations, citations, and representations must a person verify?	
Voice and power	Could the tool flatten youth voice, reproduce bias, or make a decision people should make?	
Your responsibility	Who reviews, revises, approves, discloses, and remains responsible for the final product?	

Appendix F: AI Disclosure Log

Complete one row for each product in which AI provided meaningful assistance. The named person or team—not the tool—remains accountable for the final work.

Product / Date	AI-Assisted Task	Information Entered	Human Verification and Changes	Permission / Credit Check	Responsible Person	Disclosure Language
		Do not list private information; state the type of non-identifying material used.				

Appendix G: Sample Completed Research Plan

Field	Example
Broad concern	Young people report long waits for mental health services.
Focused question	How long do DC youth wait for publicly funded behavioral-health services, and how do wait times differ by service type or neighborhood?
Community evidence	Listening sessions with youth and caregivers, with consent and clear limits on story use.
Official evidence	Agency performance reports, budget documents, oversight testimony, and public dashboards.
Independent evidence	Research on youth access, local reporting, and provider data.
Limitations to watch	Administrative data may not include youth who never reached a provider; personal stories should not be generalized to everyone.
Advocacy use	Develop a specific budget or implementation request after verifying the responsible agency and current service standards.

Appendix H: Sources and Further Research

Last reviewed: September 10, 2026. Recheck time-sensitive laws, budgets, procedures, officeholders, program eligibility, and application deadlines before facilitation.

- Miao, F., Shiohira, K., & Lao, N. (2024). *AI competency framework for students*. UNESCO. Presents 12 student competencies across four areas: a human-centered mindset, ethics of AI, AI techniques and applications, and AI system design. The framework supports young people in becoming informed and responsible users and co-creators of artificial intelligence rather than passive consumers. Open resource.
- Miao, F., & Holmes, W. (2023). *Guidance for generative AI in education and research*. UNESCO. Provides guidance for the safe, ethical, equitable, and age-appropriate use of generative AI in education. It addresses human agency, data privacy, inclusion, age protections, digital access, and the need to independently validate AI-generated information. Open resource.
- News Literacy Project. (n.d.). *Checkology resources*. Provides classroom-ready news-literacy lessons, activities, infographics, verification exercises, and examples related to misinformation, credible sourcing, algorithms, artificial intelligence, and media bias. Some resources may require educators to create a free Checkology account. Open educational resource.
- News Literacy Project. (2021, August 18). *Fact-check it!*. Provides a collaborative classroom activity in which participants learn digital-verification skills, teach those skills to peers, and work together to fact-check examples of viral misinformation. A downloadable activity guide is also available. Open resource.
- News Literacy Project. (2024, May 2). *Three practical ways to detect and debunk misinformation*. Introduces practical habits for slowing down, investigating the original source, examining supporting evidence, and using responsible verification methods before accepting or sharing online information. Open resource.
- Faverio, M., & Sidoti, O. (2025, December 9). *Teens, social media and AI chatbots 2025*. Pew Research Center. Provides current survey data on U.S. teenagers' social-media habits and AI-chatbot use. The report can help facilitators ground discussions of youth technology use in research rather than assumptions about young people's online experiences. Open resource.
- Data.gov. (n.d.). *Data.gov: The home of the U.S. government's open data*. Provides a searchable catalog of federal, state, local, and other public datasets that participants can use for research, data analysis, mapping, and advocacy. Facilitators should help young people review each dataset's source, date,

definitions, methodology, and limitations before using it as evidence. Open resource.

- Government of the District of Columbia. (n.d.). *DC Open Data* Provides access to District government datasets, maps, dashboards, applications, and other public-data tools. The platform can support local advocacy research on topics such as transportation, housing, public safety, education, neighborhood conditions, and government services. Open resource.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (n.d.). *Census Academy: Your learning hub for data skills*. Offers free courses, short Data Gem videos, webinars, tutorials, and other learning tools that help users locate, understand, visualize, and cite Census Bureau data. The resource can support youth in using demographic and community data accurately in advocacy research. Open resource.
- Federal Trade Commission. (2023, March 20). *Scammers use AI to enhance their family emergency schemes*. Explains how scammers may use artificial intelligence to clone voices and impersonate trusted people. It provides practical consumer guidance for verifying urgent claims, protecting personal information, and avoiding emotionally manipulative scams. Open resource.

Appendix I: Visual and Video Resources for Facilitators and Youth

- Crash Course. (2019). *Evaluating Photos and Videos: Navigating Digital Information #7*. Offers an accessible video lesson about evaluating photographs and videos as evidence. It helps learners consider whether visual content is authentic, relevant, reliable, and presented in its original context. The video was produced as part of a digital-information series developed with MediaWise and the Stanford History Education Group. Open video.
- News Literacy Project. (2025). *Tricks of Context*. Provides a visual infographic showing how genuine photographs and videos can become misleading when they are cropped, relabeled, reposted with false captions, or removed from their original time and place. This helps facilitators emphasize that a real image can still support a false claim. Open visual resource.
- News Literacy Project. (2022, October 18). *RumorGuard Five Factors*. Provides a classroom poster and verification framework that encourages learners to examine authenticity, source, evidence, context, and reasoning. Suggested practices include reverse-image searching, lateral reading, and critical observation. Open visual resource.
- News Literacy Project. (2025). *How to Know What to Trust*. Presents a visual overview of common misinformation tactics, including authentic visuals used out of context, manipulated images, fabricated content, and misleading captions. It can be printed as a facilitator reference or displayed during a media-verification activity. Open visual resource.

Appendix J: Facilitator Preparation for Real, Fake, or Missing Context?

Review resources and find examples of the following:

- A genuine image with an accurate caption.
- A genuine image shared with a false date, location, or explanation.
- An AI-generated or digitally manipulated image.

Before revealing the answers, ask:

- What do you notice?
- What claim is being made?
- Who originally posted or published it?
- Can we find an earlier version of the image?
- Does a reliable source confirm the event?
- Is the image itself false, or is the caption creating the misinformation?
- What remains unknown?

Then have participants use a simple verification pathway:

Pause → Find the original → Check the source → Check the context → Look for confirming evidence → Decide whether to share

The strongest learning point is:

> Do not guess “real or fake” from appearance alone. Verify the source, context, and evidence.

Facilitator Safety Note

When displaying misinformation examples:

- Clearly label them as examples for analysis.
- Avoid examples that are graphic, humiliating, or likely to reinforce harmful stereotypes.

- Remove or blur private individuals’ usernames when they are not relevant.
- Do not ask youth to repost false content.
- Use screenshots or educator-prepared slides so the example is not accidentally recirculated.
- End every example by showing the accurate context and the steps used to verify it.

The News Literacy Project follows a similar practice by labeling misinformation examples and, when appropriate, obscuring account information to reduce the chance that false content will be spread further.

Appendix K: Facilitator Reflection

- Did participants ask questions before accepting a claim?
- Did the lesson value lived experience while avoiding overgeneralization?
- Did participants identify limitations and missing voices in data?
- Did verification move beyond the original post or source?
- Did AI activities protect privacy and preserve human accountability?
- What terms or activities need adaptation for the age group?
- What follow-up research or local sources should be added?