

Module Name: Academic Skills in the Digital Era Module Code: BMSW4013

Assessment 1: E-Portfolio Student Name: abdifatah osman Student

Number:2506066 deadline 27<sup>th</sup> February

AI acknowledged the use of ChatGPT (<https://chat.openai.com>) on 16 February 2026 to support planning and structuring this portfolio assessment. I used the following prompt(s): • “Help me structure an academic portfolio assignment.” • “Check my writing for clarity and academic tone.” • “Help summarize academic arguments concisely.” I confirm that I have not presented any AI-generated text as my own work. I confirm that I have retained copies neurosurgical conditions. The sources, nature, accuracy, and usefulness of this information have not been examined recently. The authors analyzed the results from searches of 10 common pediatric neurosurgical terms using a novel scoring test to assess the value of the educational information obtained.

[https://www.mdpi.com/3042-](https://www.mdpi.com/3042-8130/2/1/3#:~:text=Department%20of%20Theory,and%20AI%20Literacy)

[8130/2/1/3#:~:text=Department%20of%20Theory,and%20AI%20Literacy](https://www.mdpi.com/3042-8130/2/1/3#:~:text=Department%20of%20Theory,and%20AI%20Literacy)

Department of Theory and Practice in Teacher Education, College of Education Health and Human Sciences, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN 37996, USA

*AI Educ.* **2026**, 2(1), 3; <https://doi.org/10.3390/aieduc2010003>

Version Notes

Order Reprints

## Article Metrics

Article Views **396**

## Academic Editor



Savvas A. Chatzichristofis

[Savvas A. Chatzichristofis](#)

## Publication History

Received: **12 October 2025**

Revised: **1 January 2026**

Accepted: **15 January 2026**

Published: **8 February 2026**

## Related Articles

**Implementation of the Critical Thinking Blended Apprenticeship Curricula and Findings per Discipline: Foreign Language Teaching**

Ovidiu Ivancuet al. *Education Sciences*, 16 February 2023

Xinhua Zhu et al. *Sustainability*, 21 November 2021

## **Credibility Judgments in Higher Education: A Mixed-Methods Approach to Detecting Misinformation from University Instructors**

Katie Corbitt et al. *Education Sciences*, 7 August 2024

### **Abstract**

With the rise of social media and the sharing of information, as well as the use of AI tools like ChatGPT in education, the ability to evaluate information credibility has become a crucial skill. The CREDIBLE framework, standing for Credibility, Reliability, Evidence, Date, Intent, Bias, Logic, and Expertise, offers a practical, student-friendly approach to source evaluation, especially suited for secondary and postsecondary learners. Unlike models and frameworks designed for higher education, CREDIBLE helps learners critically assess both online and AI-generated content. This paper introduces the framework and explores how educators can embed it into instruction to foster critical thinking, academic integrity, and responsible digital literacy.

Keywords:

[source evaluation](#); [credibility](#); [accuracy](#); [reading online](#); [writing](#)

### **1. Introduction**

The concept of information credibility has long been central to information science and education, traditionally focusing on attributes such as accuracy, authority, and objectivity (Flanagin & Metzger, 2007). However, the digital transformation of information access and production has complicated this landscape. The rise of social media, user-generated content, and algorithmically curated feeds has diluted traditional gatekeeping mechanisms, making it more difficult for learners to distinguish trustworthy information from misinformation or disinformation (Metzger & Flanagin, 2013; S. Wineburg & McGrew, 2019).

Many individuals, including students, tend to rely on surface-level criteria to judge credibility, such as the professional appearance of a website or familiarity with a brand (Fogg et al., 2003; Metzger et al., 2010). While these criteria can sometimes serve as useful shortcuts, they are unreliable in an era where visual design can be easily manipulated or even fabricated, especially with the advent of AI-generated content. The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) tools such as ChatGPT and other large language models (LLMs) into educational contexts is transforming how students engage with

information. While these tools offer promising support for academic tasks (e.g., from summarization to idea generation), they also pose significant challenges to the credibility and reliability of the information students consume and also produce. Thus, the challenge for education is to foster critical, reflective evaluation skills.

The purpose of this work is to introduce the CREDIBLE framework (Credibility, Reliability, Evidence, Date, Intent (purpose), Bias, Logic, and Expertise (authority)) as a structured and adaptable approach to evaluating information credibility. The framework is designed to support learners in assessing the reliability and academic validity of information in AI-enhanced learning environments and evaluative tasks, and it is also applicable across a wide range of contexts in which individuals must critically examine the credibility of sources. In the following section, I outline the challenges of source evaluation. I then review relevant literature on credibility assessment and the epistemic implications of AI in education. Next, I present the CREDIBLE framework in detail, outlining its components and theoretical grounding. Finally, I discuss implementation strategies and challenges, and conclude with practical implications and research implications.

### *1.1. The Problem: Criticality in Access to Information*

Concerns about AI-generated content extend beyond isolated factual errors or fabricated citations; they raise epistemic questions about knowledge justification, source transparency, and responsibility for verification. Generative AI systems (GenAI) produce fluent and plausible text but lack epistemic grounding and accountability ([Himma-Kadakas & Ojamets, 2022](#); [Kim & Lee, 2024](#)). Consequently, students may encounter information that appears credible while being outdated, misleading, biased, or entirely fabricated ([Temsah et al., 2024, 2025](#)). Students routinely navigate environments where the line between credible and questionable content is more and more blurred and even more challenging to detect.

Existing digital and media literacy approaches have made important contributions to understanding how learners navigate online information, yet many were developed prior to the widespread adoption of GenAI and do not fully account for its epistemic implications ([Kasthuri et al., 2024](#)). In particular, traditional source evaluation frameworks often assume that sources are externally produced artifacts that can be traced and verified, assumptions that are increasingly challenged when content is detached from identifiable authorship.

The ability to evaluate information credibility, then, is no longer a supplementary skill; it is a central academic competency—and a life competency. Existing approaches may be examining source evaluation from print sources and even digital or media literacy, but

may not sufficiently account for the complexity introduced by generative AI. While frameworks for teaching source evaluation exist, they were largely (Kasthuri et al., 2024) developed prior to the widespread adoption of online print and literacy as well as AI in learning environments.

I argue that there is a pressing need for an updated framework that explicitly addresses the credibility challenges overall and the challenges presented by wide access to information and to generative AI. To illustrate the need for such a framework, consider the following scenario, where a student working on a research paper uses an AI chatbot to generate background information and suggested references. The generated output includes accurate-sounding claims and citations to scholarly-sounding sources. Upon further inspection, however, several of the references do not exist, and others misrepresent the arguments made in the original texts. Without prior training in source verification or a framework for evaluating credibility, the student incorporates these inaccuracies into their work, inadvertently undermining academic standards of accuracy and integrity, and sharing inaccuracies. In a different scenario, a student is working on a project and uses information they found in a blog or a non-peer-reviewed journal, completes their paper without checking the information, prepares videos and presentations sharing inaccurate information, and communicates to a larger audience what is essentially misinformation. These examples, increasingly common across educational contexts, demonstrate the importance of teaching credibility evaluation as a foundational literacy, one that accounts for the affordances and limitations of source evaluation and of generative AI.

It could be argued that academic settings should forbid the use of GenAI by students. However, it is rather unlikely that such a directive would be effective, as students may use those systems outside of academic settings for academic work. Thus, it is important to teach students how to evaluate outputs and how to evaluate sources for them to be critical readers and ethical users of such systems and of information at large. I argue that without structured strategies for evaluating source credibility, learners risk misinforming themselves and others, even when their intent is to engage ethically with online sources and GenAI outputs. Furthermore, an additional concern is the spreading of inaccurate information and the role of personal responsibility, as learners do not detect from the beginning that something is fabricated and share it on other platforms, spreading inaccuracies and engaging in misinformation.

## *1.2. Source Evaluation and AI Literacy*

| Task                    | deadline   |
|-------------------------|------------|
| 1. Finish research      | 16/02/2026 |
| 2. Draft first section  | 07/02/2026 |
| 3. Complete first draft | 21/02/2026 |
| 4. Final editing        | 26/02/2026 |

# Academic Skills Problems

<https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-012343014-4/50026-5>Get rights and content

## Publisher Summary

This chapter reveals a methodology of assessing basic academic skills focused on problem solving that has been designed to evaluate a student's skills and performance that is linked to intervention development and that can be used dynamically to show responsiveness to instructional intervention. It introduces the reader to the concepts of curriculum-based assessment (CBA) and describes how these strategies are being used in the assessment of basic skill development of elementary students. CBA has increasingly become a staple of the assessment process for students referred in schools for academic skills problems. The methodology draws on the foundations of behavioral assessment methodology and emphasizes measures that are frequent, repeatable, direct, and focused on the development and evaluation of instructional intervention. Use of graphic analysis is critical to interpretation. The data are useful for multiple purposes of assessment, including screening, eligibility determination, instructional development, and program evaluation. Although the measures are not designed to replace the use of

published, norm-referenced achievement tests, the purposes of CBA meet the important philosophical function of being closely linked to intervention.

## Reference list Academic Skills Problems

Author links open overlay panelEdward S. Shapiro, Milena A. Keller

[Show more](#)

Add to Mendeley

---

Share

Cite

<https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-012343014-4/50026-5>[Get rights and content](#)

### Publisher Summary

This chapter reveals a methodology of assessing basic academic skills focused on problem solving that has been designed to evaluate a student's skills and performance that is linked to intervention development and that can be used dynamically to show responsiveness to instructional intervention. It introduces the reader to the concepts of curriculum-based assessment (CBA) and describes how these strategies are being used in the assessment of basic skill development of elementary students. CBA has increasingly become a staple of the assessment process for students referred in schools for academic skills problems. The methodology draws on the foundations of behavioral assessment methodology and emphasizes measures that are frequent, repeatable, direct, and focused on the development and evaluation of instructional intervention. Use of graphic analysis is critical to interpretation. The data are useful for multiple purposes of assessment, including screening, eligibility determination, instructional development,

and program evaluation. Although the measures are not designed to replace the use of published, norm-referenced achievement tests, the purposes of CBA meet the important philosophical function of being closely linked to intervention.

## Reference list

<https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-012343014-4/50026-5>;

<https://doi.org/10.3390/aieduc2010003>

