

Media Literacy Standards to Counter Truth Decay

Appendixes

ALICE HUGUET, GARRETT BAKER, LAURA S. HAMILTON, JOHN F. PANE



For more information on this publication, visit www.rand.org/t/RRA112-12

Published by the RAND Corporation, Santa Monica, Calif.

© 2021 RAND Corporation

RAND® is a registered trademark.

Limited Print and Electronic Distribution Rights

This document and trademark(s) contained herein are protected by law. This representation of RAND intellectual property is provided for noncommercial use only. Unauthorized posting of this publication online is prohibited. Permission is given to duplicate this document for personal use only, as long as it is unaltered and complete. Permission is required from RAND to reproduce, or reuse in another form, any of its research documents for commercial use. For information on reprint and linking permissions, please visit www.rand.org/pubs/permissions.

The RAND Corporation is a research organization that develops solutions to public policy challenges to help make communities throughout the world safer and more secure, healthier and more prosperous. RAND is nonprofit, nonpartisan, and committed to the public interest.

RAND's publications do not necessarily reflect the opinions of its research clients and sponsors.

Support RAND

Make a tax-deductible charitable contribution at
www.rand.org/giving/contribute

www.rand.org

Preface

These appendixes are related to a report that is one in a series that is part of the Countering Truth Decay initiative. The original report, *Truth Decay: An Initial Exploration of the Diminishing Role of Facts and Analysis in American Public Life*, by Jennifer Kavanagh and Michael D. Rich, was published in January 2018 and identified a research agenda for studying and developing solutions to the Truth Decay challenge. In July 2019, the RAND Corporation released a follow-up report linking media literacy to Truth Decay (*Exploring Media Literacy Education as a Tool for Mitigating Truth Decay*); that was followed in August 2020 by a report describing a nationally representative survey of teachers' opinions on media in schools (*Media Use and Literacy in Schools: Civic Development in the Era of Truth Decay*). This report is the most recent in the series.

The authors would like to thank Michelle Ciulla-Lipkin, Julia Kaufman, and Susannah Faxon-Mills for their feedback on this report.

More information about RAND can be found at www.rand.org. Questions about this report should be directed to ahuguet@rand.org.

Funding

Funding for this research was provided by unrestricted gifts from RAND supporters and income from operations.

Contents

Preface	iii
Appendix A: Methodology for Identifying a Synthesized List of Standards	1
Appendix B: Standards Source Material	4
References	6

Appendix A: Methodology for Identifying a Synthesized List of Standards

We created the Truth Decay media literacy (ML) standards in a multiphase process. First, we sought existing published standards related to ML, digital literacy, and information literacy. We collected lists of these standards from a wide variety of sources—international organizations, such as UNESCO; state agencies, such as superintendents’ offices and departments of education; and professional associations, such as the American Association of School Librarians—ultimately collecting 28 sets of standards primarily focused on the aforementioned types of literacy. We then sought to augment our collection with other standards that we knew overlapped with ML competencies (such as those that are classified as 21st Century Skills or social and emotional learning) and core educational content area standards (such as the Common Core State Standards). We added seven sets from this group, for a final total of 35 sets of standards. We list these sets of standards in Table B.1.

Although we included standards that were written in 2000 at the earliest, more than one-half of these lists were published in the five years preceding this report. We wanted to balance fairly recent sets of standards, given many are highly dependent on an ever-changing technological world, with the traditional competencies used in older sets. We do not claim to have collated all ML and related standards that have ever been published. Given the dispersed nature of the ML landscape, we do not believe that doing so would be practical or helpful; many of the existing standards in our collected group already overlap, and it is unlikely that we would find novel additions by including additional sets. We also limited our standards to those applicable to students nearing the end of a standard U.S. kindergarten-through-12th-grade (K–12) education. Some sets of standards are written for specific grade levels or include varied iterations to cover different developmental stages. When we encountered this, we sought the standards that were geared toward high school students. We did so because this set of standards represents important knowledge that students should have when they complete the K–12 progression of schooling.

The next step in our process was to sort the individual standards within each set. We proceeded to narrow the standards to those directly relevant to Truth Decay, and then categorize those standards into inductive groups. To accomplish the former step, we read each standard in each set and applied a Truth Decay lens by asking: Does this standard relate to one of the four trends of Truth Decay? If the answer was yes, we included the standard in the next step: categorization. We wanted to make sure that, in synthesizing across these sets of standards, we included representations of a variety of competencies. We created the categories inductively as we read the standards. For instance, one of the earliest and most obvious categories to emerge was *discern credibility*; as we read the standards, we continued to refine the groupings. We did this iteratively, updating categories by splitting or combining them as we continued to sort

through the original sets of standards. Ultimately, we finalized categorization with 12 groups of standards from across all of those we had collected.

Next, we synthesized the standards into a shorter list that was more directly applicable to Truth Decay than any of the original sets were. To do so, each of our four team members individually created their version of a distilled list of standards from the categories and encapsulated the most-critical ideas related to Truth Decay. We used this categorization step as a way to ensure we covered a breadth of competencies—selecting from across categories. Our team members could rephrase the standards that we had categorized from the original sources. Once each member completed his or her own list, the team compared all the lists. When a standard was included in at least two team members' lists, it was added to the final set. When similar but not identical standards were included in multiple team members' lists, we summarized to create one standard. When a standard only appeared on one list, we discussed as a group whether it was significant enough to carry across to the final list. Once we had a single consolidated list, our team continued to discuss, critique, and regroup these standards to best—but succinctly—capture the breadth of ML competencies that apply to the trends of Truth Decay. Our finalized list features 15 standards.

To illustrate how we incorporated multiple standards in synthesizing our own list, we created Table A.1 as an example. We highlight one of the RAND Corporation ML Truth Decay standards and the corresponding standards that we used as sources. As shown in Table A.1, we narrowed the scope of the standard to reflect only what we believed was critical for addressing Truth Decay and in line with what we know about phrasing standards for learning. Not all content from every standard is in our version. In this way, we have attempted to both simplify existing standards and sharpen them to address Truth Decay while still capturing their core competencies.

Table A.1. Synthesizing and Simplifying Multiple Standards into One Truth Decay Standard

Truth Decay Media Literacy Standard	Contributing Standard	Source
<i>Standard 10:</i> Compare multiple viewpoints on a topic and use evidence to determine how to manage discrepancies	Integrate information from diverse sources, both primary and secondary, into a coherent understanding of an idea or event, noting discrepancies among sources.	Common Core State Standards English Language Arts and Literature
	Gather, read, and synthesize information from multiple appropriate sources and assess the credibility, accuracy, and possible bias of each publication and methods used, and describe how they are supported or not supported by evidence.	National School Library Standards Crosswalk with Next Generation Science Standards
	Analyze information from multiple sources and identify complexities, discrepancies, and different perspectives of sources.	Model School Library Standards for California Public Schools
	Compensate for the effect of point of view and bias by seeking alternative perspectives.	Standards for the 21st-Century Learner In Action
	Demonstrate ability to identify and compare sources of information and apply multiple evaluative criteria, including purpose, point of view, biases and stereotypes, accuracy, continuity and currency.	Information and Technology Literacy Framework
	Evaluate information and media through determining facts, opinion, bias, and inaccuracies by consulting multiple sources.	Arizona Educational Technology Standards
	Gather relevant information from multiple authoritative print and digital sources, using advanced searches effectively.	Next Generation Science Standards

NOTE: For more information on these sources, refer to Table B.1.

There are limitations to our process. First, we created this list methodically and used ongoing group discussion to develop consensus, but a degree of researcher bias is inherent in any process. If another team were to create this list, it might look somewhat different, though we believe the core concepts would remain. Second, by screening each standard for its fit with the trends of Truth Decay, we excluded a nontrivial portion of ML concepts and highlighted those we thought were most applicable to our narrowed scope. Therefore, our list should by no means be seen as an all-encompassing set of ML standards; rather, it distills ML standards that are highly applicable to today’s critical struggle with Truth Decay.

Appendix B: Standards Source Material

To develop our list of Truth Decay ML standards, we read across 35 existing sets of relevant standards and competencies. We collected these lists from a wide variety of sources, as illustrated in Table B.1. These are the sets of standards and competencies that we synthesized (see Appendix A for details) to create the final list that is included in the primary report.

Table B.1. Existing Standards Reviewed to Create Truth Decay Media Literacy Standards

Title	Organization	Year Published
Alaska Digital Literacy Standards	Alaska Department of Education and Early Development	2019
National School Library Standards Crosswalk with Next Generation Science Standards	American Association of School Librarians	2019
National School Library Standards Crosswalk with ISTE Standards for Students and Educators	American Association of School Librarians	2018
Standards for the 21st-Century Learner in Action	American Association of School Librarians	2009
State of Arizona Department of Education 2009 Educational Technology Standard	Arizona Department of Education	2009
K-12 Library Media Curriculum Framework	Arkansas Department of Education	2013
Digital and Media Literacy Competencies	Aspen Institute and Knight Commission	2010
Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education	Association of College and Research Libraries	2000
Computer Technology Standards of Learning for Virginia's Public Schools	Board of Education, Commonwealth of Virginia	2013
Model School Library Standards for California Public Schools	California Department of Education	2011
Literacy for the 21st Century: An Overview and Orientation Guide to Media Literacy Education (2nd ed.)	Center for Media Literacy	2008
Information and Technology Literacy Framework	Connecticut Department of Education	2006
Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts & Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects	Council of Chief State School Officers and National Governors Association Center for Best Practices	2010
Common Core State Standards Mathematics	Council of Chief State School Officers and National Governors Association Center for Best Practices	2010
DigComp 2.0: The Digital Competence Framework for Citizens. Update Phase 1: the Conceptual Reference Model	European Commission	2016
Information Literacy Core Competencies	Grand Valley State University, University Libraries	2013
ISTE Standards for Students	International Society for Technology in Education	2016
Kansas Curricular Content Standards for Library Information and Technology	Kansas Department of Education	2016
Michigan Integrated Technology Competencies for Students	Michigan Department of Education	2017
Media Literacy Education and the Common Core	National Association for Media Literacy Education	2014

Title	Organization	Year Published
State Standards		
Nevada Computer and Technology Standards	Nevada Department of Education	2010
New Jersey Social and Emotional Learning Competencies and Sub-Competencies	New Jersey Department of Education	2017
New Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standards—Technology	New Jersey Department of Education	2014
New York State Social Emotional Learning Benchmarks	New York State Education Department	2018
Next Generation Science Standards	NGSS Lead States	2013
Ohio's Learning Standards: Technology	Ohio Department of Education	2017
North Carolina Essential Standards, Grade 6, Information and Technology Essential Standards	Public Schools of North Carolina, State Board of Education	2010–2011
South Dakota Educational Technology Standards	South Dakota State Board of Education	2015
Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills for Technology Applications; Elementary	Texas Administrative Code	2011
K–12 Social and Personal Competencies Resource Guide	Tennessee Department of Education	2017
Global Framework of Reference on Digital Literacy Skills for Indicator 4.4.2	UNESCO	2018
Global Media and Information Literacy Assessment Framework: Country readiness and competencies	UNESCO	2013
Educational Technology Learning Standards	Washington Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction	2018
Social Emotional Learning Standards, Benchmarks, and Indicators	Washington Social Emotional Learning Benchmarks Workgroup	2019
Wisconsin Standards for Information and Technology Literacy	Wisconsin Department of Public Education	2017

References

- Alaska Department of Education and Early Development, *Alaska Digital Literacy Standards*, Juneau, Alaska, June 2019.
- American Association of School Librarians, *Standards for the 21st-Century Learner in Action*, Chicago, Ill., 2009.
- , “National School Library Standards crosswalk with ISTE Standards for Students and Educators,” Chicago, Ill., 2018.
- , “National School Library Standards Crosswalk with Next Generation Science Standards,” Chicago, Ill., 2019.
- Arizona Department of Education, *State of Arizona Department of Education 2009 Educational Technology Standard*, Phoenix, Ariz., May 19, 2009. As of November 10, 2020: <https://www.azed.gov/sites/default/files/2016/02/EdTechStandard2009.pdf?id=56ccd13baadebe1e24c20737>
- Arkansas Department of Education, “K-12 Library Media Curriculum Framework,” Little Rock, Ark., 2013.
- Association of College and Research Libraries, *Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education*, Chicago, Ill.: American Library Association, 2000.
- Beaubien, Sarah, Emily Frigo, Mary O’Kelly, and Kathryn Waggoner, *Information Literacy Core Competencies*, Allendale Charter Township, Mich.: Grand Valley State University, University Libraries, 2013.
- Board of Education, Commonwealth of Virginia, *Computer Technology Standards of Learning for Virginia’s Public Schools*, Richmond, Va., 2013.
- California Department of Education, *Model School Library Standards for California Public Schools*, Sacramento, Calif., 2011.
- Connecticut Department of Education, *Information and Technology Literacy Framework*, Hartford, Conn., 2006.
- Council of Chief State School Officers and National Governors Association Center for Best Practices, *Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts & Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects*, 2010.
- , *Common Core State Standards Mathematics*, 2010.

- “Digital and Media Literacy Competencies,” from Renee Hobbs, *Digital and Media Literacy: A Plan of Action*, Washington, D.C.: Aspen Institute, 2010. As of November 11, 2020: https://mediaeducationlab.com/sites/default/files/Digital%2520Media%2520Literacy%2520Competencies_0.pdf
- International Society for Technology in Education, “ISTE Standards for Students,” webpage, undated. As of November 11, 2020: <https://www.iste.org/standards/for-students>
- Kansas State Department of Education, *Kansas Curricular Content Standards for Library Information and Technology*, Topeka, Kan., 2016.
- Michigan Department of Education, “Michigan Integrated Technology Competencies for Students,” Lansing, Mich., 2017.
- Moore, David Cooper, and Emily Bonilla, *Media Literacy Education and the Common Core State Standards, NAMLE: An Educator’s Guide*, New York: National Association for Media Literacy Education, 2014.
- Nevada Department of Education, *Nevada Computer and Technology Standards: Classroom Technology Integration for the 21st Century*, Carson City, Nev., 2010.
- New York State Education Department, “New York State Social Emotional Learning Benchmarks,” Albany, N.Y., August 2018.
- NGSS Lead States, *Next Generation Science Standards*, Washington, D.C.: National Academies Press, 2013.
- Ohio Department of Education, *Ohio’s Learning Standards: Technology*, Columbus, Ohio, April 2017.
- Public Schools of North Carolina, State Board of Education, “North Carolina Essential Standards, Grade 6, Information and Technology Essential Standards,” 2010–2011. As of November 17, 2020: <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1csvgFe67YoDdvVB9cj6MYdIS0BAnVEuE/view>
- Small, Dennis, *Educational Technology Learning Standards*, Olympia, Wash.: Washington State Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, 2018.
- South Dakota State Board of Education, *South Dakota Educational Technology Standards*, Pierre, S.D., 2015.
- State of New Jersey Department of Education, “2014 New Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standards—Technology,” Trenton, N.J., 2014.
- , “New Jersey Social and Emotional Learning Competencies and Sub-Competencies,” Trenton, N.J., 2017.

- Tennessee Department of Education, *K–12 Social and Personal Competencies Resource Guide*, 2017.
- Texas Administrative Code, Title 19, Education, Chapter 126, Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills for Technology Applications, Subchapter A, Elementary, 2011.
- Thoman, Elizabeth, and Tessa Jolls, *Literacy for the 21st Century: An Overview and Orientation Guide to Media Literacy Education*, Malibu, Calif.: 2nd ed., Center for Media Literacy, 2008.
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, *Global Media and Information Literacy Assessment Framework: Country Readiness and Competencies*, Paris, France, 2013.
- , *Global Framework of Reference on Digital Literacy Skills for Indicator 4.4.2*, Montreal, Canada: Information Paper No. 51, June 2018.
- Vuorikari, Riina, Yves Punie, Stephanie Carretero Gomez, and Godelieve Van Den Brande, *DigComp 2.0: The Digital Competence Framework for Citizens. Update Phase 1: The Conceptual Reference Model*, Luxembourg: European Commission, 2016.
- Washington Social Emotional Learning Benchmarks Workgroup, *Social Emotional Learning Standards, Benchmarks, and Indicators*, 2019.
- Wisconsin Department of Public Education, *Wisconsin Standards for Information and Technology Literacy*, Madison, Wisc., 2017.