

Know News: Engaging Across Allied Professions to Combat Misinformation



Please cite this as:

Saunders, L., Gans-Boriskin, R., & Hinchliffe, L. (2018). *Know News: Engaging across allied professions to combat misinformation*. Boston, MA: Simmons College.¹

This project was made possible in part by the Institute of Museum and Library Services LG-98-17-0137-17

¹ This paper refers throughout to Simmons College. Please note that as of September 1, 2018, Simmons College official name changes to Simmons University

Table of Contents

Introduction	p.1
DAY ONE	
Opening	p.3
Definitions	p.3
Stage Setting: Background, Challenges, & Current Context	p.3
Keynote: Recognizing News in an Era of Content Confusion	p.4
Inventory and Inform: Standards, Values, and Practices of Information Assessment and Dissemination	
Standards, Practices, & Values by Field	p.9
Convergences	p.10
Divergences	p.10
Standards across Fields: Discussion	p.11
Conclusions from Day One	p.11
DAY TWO	
Innovate & Initiate: Idea Development	p.12
Proposal Development	p.14
Final Phase: Press Releases & Voting	p.15
Press Release Debrief & Discussion	p.18
Conclusions & Next Steps	p.23
References	p.24

List of Figures

Figure 1: Stage Setting and Recognizing News in an Era of Content Confusion	p.8
Figure 2: Inventory & Inform	p.9
Figure 3: Day One Conclusions	p.13
Figure 4: Libraries as Living Laboratories	p.15
Figure 5: Table Proposals	p.18
Figure 6: Proposal to Press Release	p.19
Figure 7: Press Release Voting	p.23
Figure 8: Wrap-up Discussion & Closing Comments	p.23
Appendices A-I	p. 31-43

Know News: Engaging across Allied Professions to Combat Misinformation

Introduction

Access to information is and has always been a critical component of everyday life and is essential to the functioning of a participatory democracy. Citizens need reliable and trustworthy information to support decision-making in everything from voting in elections to making safe and healthy lifestyle choices. The primary importance of access to information has been affirmed through legal arguments that claim such access is a human right that underpins the exercise of all other rights (Bishop, 2011; Weeramantry, 1995), and is enshrined in Article 19 of the United Nations' (1948) *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, which states that all people should have the freedom to “seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.” However, this right is threatened by the proliferation and dissemination of mis- and disinformation. The World Economic Forum identified mis- and disinformation, and the ease with which it is shared, as one of the top three global threats, noting “our hyperconnected world could also enable the rapid viral spread of information that is either intentionally or unintentionally misleading or provocative, with serious consequences” (Howell, 2013).

Whether shared intentionally or not, mis- and disinformation can influence people's opinions and beliefs and impact their decision-making in long-lasting and detrimental ways. Once people are exposed to inaccurate information and faulty facts, it can be extremely difficult to correct that knowledge, meaning that misinformation often will continue to impact their beliefs and decisions, even after they are confronted with the correcting information, a phenomenon known as the continued influence effect (Ecker, Lewandowsky, Swire, & Chang). The persistence of misinformation is also aided by confirmation bias, in which people seek out and believe information which reinforces their existing world view (Heshmat, 2015).

Librarians, who have long been champions of information literacy, could have a unique role to play in responding to these challenges. Numerous writers and researchers point to libraries as a first line of defense in countering mis- and disinformation (Banks, 2016; Najmabadi 2017; Rosa, 2017). As trust in news media erodes, libraries continue to be respected and trusted, and librarians could build on that trust to bring quality information and education in information literacy to the public (Johnson, 2017). Alvarez (2016) asserts that “because of their unique positions as partners, educators, and community champions, librarians have an opportunity to teach information and media literacy, as well as reframe ideas about navigating the Internet” (2016, p. 26). However, librarians are certainly not the only professionals impacted by mis- and disinformation, nor do they need to work alone in responding to it. Librarians should engage with professionals from other fields impacted by these issues including: journalists struggling with a gatekeeping role that requires them to provide access to divergent points of view while not propagating false information; social media professionals grappling with the ways their platforms and algorithms are implicated in the spread of mis- and disinformation; and educators trying to equip their students with the information and media literacy competencies needed to

navigate today's media environment. A number of sources assert the need for librarians to partner with other professionals such as journalists, educators, and people in the tech sector (Banks, 2016; Beard, 2018; Lief, 2016), with Banks (2016) identifying journalists and librarians as "natural allies" in combating disinformation (2016, para. 5).

Too often, however, librarians, journalists, and other allied professionals work in silos without sharing ideas, expertise, and resources. Noticing this gap, and motivated in part by a desire to facilitate a wider conversation across these fields, the principal investigator, Laura Saunders, Associate Professor at Simmons College School of Library and Information Science, and two co-PIs, Rachel Gans-Boriskin, Senior Lecturer at Simmons College Gwen Ifill College of Media, and Arts, and Humanities, and Lisa Janicke Hinchliffe, Professor and Coordinator for Information Literacy Services and Instruction at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, sought a grant from IMLS to convene a symposium to host a gathering of librarians, journalists, and allied professionals for 2 days of cross-disciplinary discussion, brainstorming, and proposal development. The main goals for the symposium were to:

1. Identify ways journalists, librarians, educators, and allied professionals can work together (at local and/or national levels) with consumers to enhance access to, and understanding of, news,
2. Identify ways for LIS and Journalism educators to best prepare the next generation of professionals, and,
3. Develop a set of cross-disciplinary project proposals to respond to the challenges of mis- and disinformation

At the symposium, which was held at Simmons College in Boston on April 21-22, 2018, participants engaged in discussions on:

- How we construct, assess for, and signal authority and authoritative information
- How we develop public trust
- How we can leverage expertise and market reach across disciplines to develop impactful and sustainable responses to the challenges of mis- and disinformation.

An overview of the symposium, including a link to the Bio Book featuring a majority of the attendees, can be found at <http://slis.simmons.edu/blogs/disinformation>.

DAY ONE

Opening

Symposium facilitator Roberta Shaffer, retired Law Librarian of Congress, opened the conference with a brief look at the historical and current context of mis- and disinformation, followed by a keynote address focused on *Recognizing News in an Era of Content Confusion*, by Michelle Amazeen, Assistant Professor at Boston University's Department of Mass Communication, Advertising, and Public Relations. From there the symposium transitioned into a working session in which participants moved through facilitated brainstorming and small and large group discussions to share professional standards and practices, brainstorm ideas, and develop proposals to respond to the challenges of mis- and disinformation. Output of all the sessions and discussions were recorded by Sita Magnuson, a graphic facilitator who synthesized the conversations in a visual format. Excerpts of Sita's illustrations are included throughout this report. The rest of this white paper will describe the process and outcomes of the symposium and conclude with next steps.

Definitions: "Fake News," Misinformation, and Disinformation

Despite its popularity, the term "fake news" is not always used consistently, and that has led to confusion over its precise definition. Traditionally, fake news was limited to falsified new stories, or perhaps to fake news outlets that present themselves as legitimate, often by mirroring real news outlets and even adopting names and urls that integrate parts of the real outlet (Bradley, 2017). Recently, however, the term has been adopted widely, especially by politicians, to refer to any negative news coverage or any news with which they disagree. According to one poll, 65% of Americans say fake news encompasses not just false information, but also editorial decisions about which stories to cover (Monmouth, 2018). For some, overuse and perhaps misuse has "rendered the term meaningless. All sorts of things - misinformation, spin, conspiracy theories, mistakes, and reporting that people just don't like - have been rolled into it" (Wendling, 2018). The lack of precision over terminology, and the perceived weaponization of the phrase, has led some to avoid using the term fake news and seek to replace it with other terms. For the sake of clarity, this paper will use the terms mis- and disinformation, rather than fake news. Disinformation, also sometimes called propaganda, is false or misleading information that was constructed knowingly and disseminated with intent to deceive. Misinformation is inaccurate information that was generated without intention to deceive.

Stage Setting: Background, Challenges, and Current Context

The challenges of mis- and disinformation are not new. However, what is new is the speed with which mis- and disinformation can be shared, and the penetration that it has with audiences, in part due to sharing on social media platforms. People are overwhelmed with the amount of information in their newsfeeds, and as a result, many people will like or share information without reading past the headline or investigating the source. Often, they will trust

the friend or family member who shared the information with them, without questioning the original source of the information. In addition, new technology tools have made it possible for nearly anyone to create and share their own content, bypassing the traditional editorial processes of fact-checking. While some misinformation is created or shared inadvertently, there are bad actors whose intention is to confuse or deceive. These agents have become adept at developing sites that mirror trusted sources, thus adding to the content confusion. These actors use demographic data to target their message to audiences they know are likely to be receptive.

The challenges of mis- and disinformation are further complicated by the shifting roles and focus of public institutions and traditional media sources, as well as by a rise in partisan and extreme thinking. There are examples of governments retreating from data collection and dissemination, which leaves space for non-state and non-traditional players to step in. A focus on entertainment over journalistic news means that people are consuming information that has been packaged to appeal to them in specific and sometimes partisan ways. The rise in partisanship has fueled feelings of alienation and sometimes a sense of anti-intellectualism, which can manifest itself in a lack of patience for in-depth reporting and analysis, as well as a decline in civil discourse. In addition, at the same time that we are seeing a rise in global culture and globalization, we are witnessing a decline in local news sources, which can also contribute to feelings of alienation and a loss of community engagement. One of the biggest threats of mis- and disinformation, as Roberta asserted, is not that we might believe what is fake, but that we stop believing in anything. And for that reason, she suggested, the timing of this symposium to bring together journalists, librarians, and allied professionals to discuss these topics and wrestle with how to combat mis- and disinformation while still engaging the community and building public trust, is perfect.

Keynote: Recognizing News in an Era of Content Confusion

This section summarizes Michelle Amazeen's (2018) keynote address. While the focus is on the content she provided, there are a few sections that provide additional information and context, identified as [Note]. These notes are supplementary, and do not come directly from Amazeen's presentation.

In her keynote address, Michelle Amazeen (2018) drew on the work of First Draft News, a project on fighting misinformation from the Shorenstein Center on Media, Politics, and Public Policy at Harvard University's John F. Kennedy School of Government, and identified a range of misinformation types, including:

1. Satire or parody: no intention to cause harm but potential to fool
2. Misleading content: misleading use of information to frame an issue or individual
3. Imposter content: when genuine sources are impersonated
4. Fabricated content: new content is 100% false, designed to deceive and do harm
5. False connections: when headlines, visuals, or captions don't support the content
6. False context: when genuine content is shared with false contextual information

7. **Manipulated content:** when genuine information or imagery is manipulated to deceive (Wardle, 2017).

Amazeen noted that misinformation can be financially or politically motivated, and she provided a number of examples, including celebrity rumors, native advertising, and conspiracy theories. In discussing how mis- and disinformation spread, Amazeen focused especially on native advertising, or paid content that is embedded into news and other web sites. This content is equivalent to a television commercial, but while television commercials are clearly separated from the programming they support, native advertising is often difficult to distinguish, even if they are marked as paid content. Studies have found that less than one-quarter of people were able to identify native advertising (Amazeen & Wojdyski, 2018; Amazeen & Muddiman, 2017).

The challenge of mis- and disinformation lies not just in identifying it, but in the fact that it is notoriously hard to correct once people have been exposed to it. A number of cognitive and other biases can influence people's acceptance and trust of information and its sources, including:

- **Continued influence effect:** According to this phenomenon people will continue to believe incorrect information even after inaccurate information has been retracted or superseding facts have been introduced (Ecker, Lewandowsky, Swire, & Chang).
- **Confirmatory bias:** People are more likely to trust and believe information that reinforces their existing world-view and fits into their current beliefs.
- **Low source recall:** News outlets work hard to build name recognition and cultivate trust, but in a distributed media environment, it is often difficult for people to recall sources. Rather, people are also more likely to remember the information than the source, which makes the brand credibility of legacy news sources less impactful.
- **Source familiarity effect:** Bad actors exploit these tendencies by creating sites that closely mimic legitimate news sources, often using variations of the trusted names and urls for their sites. People confuse or associate the fake site with the legitimate news source, and are likely to trust the fake site.
- **Illusory truth effect:** People are more likely to remember and believe information that is repeated. Given how widely and deeply misinformation spreads on the web, and given that algorithms are written to feed people news stories that match their interests, there are great opportunities for people to be exposed to misinformation, and to be exposed to it repeatedly.
- **Regulations:**
 - Drawing on Basen (2012), Amazeen suggests that “blurring the distinction between journalism and advertising muddies the waters creating an undifferentiated content swamp,” (Amazeen, 2018, slide 26), resulting in lower overall trust of news media. Gallup polls show that trust in news media has declined consistently since 1997 (Swift, 2016), although local news sources are somewhat more trusted than national news sources (Mitchell, 2016).

- Amazeen suggested three possible avenues for responding to misinformation: regulation, education, and structural responses.
 - The industry could self-regulate by developing systems such as NewsGuard to evaluate the trustworthiness of news brands.
 - Federal regulations can offer some measure of control, such as requiring disclosure statements for native advertising or through legislation such as the Honest Ads Act.
 - Social media platforms can self-regulate by creating policies and mechanisms for identifying and/or blocking false news.
 - The industry can also offer a measure of regulation through fact-checking organizations. A few of these include: Politifact.com, Snopes.com, Factcheck.org, and *The Washington Post Fact Checker* (<https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/fact-checker/>) which rates the credibility of stories using a Pinocchio graphic. However, the pace and volume of news far outpaces the ability of these organizations to keep up.

[Note]: The question of regulation has been widely discussed. Social media platforms like Facebook are already experimenting with policies and systems aimed at reducing the spread of disinformation, which include authenticating advertisers and large page administrators (Hern, 2018), as well as tweaks to try to boost the placement of legitimate news in people's newsfeeds and using algorithms to identify misinformation (Constine, 2018). At the moment, it remains unclear how effective these steps are. Some early research suggests that Facebook has experienced a form of the backfire effect, a phenomenon in which people who are confronted with facts or warnings that contradict their current beliefs not only do not change their minds, but actually hold more firmly to their original beliefs (Nyhan & Reifler, 2010), as red flag icons meant to warn users that a certain news story might be fake seemed to prompt the users to share that information even more (Constine, 2018). However, others question the veracity of the backfire effect, noting that the studies are inconsistent (Engber, 2018).

In the meantime, while the United States Congress has mulled the possibility of government regulations after hearings with the CEOs of some of the top social media platforms (Carr, 2017). There are, however, First Amendment issues that arise in the American context regarding regulation. Various countries around the world including France, the Czech Republic, Germany, Brazil, India, and Singapore have proposed, and in some cases passed, laws and policies to try to stem the flow of fake news. For example, France's legislation would increase transparency requirements and allow judges to remove fake content from web sites (Reuters Staff, 2018), while Malaysia proposes a jail sentence up to 10 years for people who publish fake news (Agerholm, 2018). In the United States, research suggests that the majority of Americans prefer that technology companies take steps to stem the flow of mis- and disinformation than government regulation to restrict misinformation (Mitchell, Grieco, & Sumida, 2018).

- **Education:**

- News literacy programs in schools can help to cultivate good, critical reading habits.
- The public learn to battle the continued influence effect through repeated retractions. Repetition of accurate information might help to displace the inaccurate.
- Libraries continue to have high public trust, and communities indicate an interest in having libraries teach digital literacy skills (Horrihan, 2016). Libraries can use their resources to help curate good information and facilitate the critical evaluation of information.

[Note]: Librarians have long been proponents of information literacy, which includes the competencies needed to locate, access, evaluate, and use information within legal, ethical, and social guidelines (ALA, 1989; ACRL 2016). Media and news literacy can be understood as branches of information literacy that focus specifically on understanding and evaluation of news media. The Center for News Literacy (2016), which was represented at the symposium by Michael Spikes, has developed a curriculum in which students are “taught to evaluate information primarily by analyzing news as well as new forms of information that are often mistaken for journalism.” Symposium attendee Jennifer Fleming (2014) assessed Stony Brook’s curriculum and concluded that students were highly engaged with the content and reported developing a deeper understanding of journalism through the instruction.

There are some studies that suggest that explicit instruction can decrease a person’s susceptibility to media bias (Babad & Peer, 2010; Babad, Peer, & Hobbs, 2012). One study showed that young adults age 15 to 27 were more likely to assess a news story as accurate if it aligned with their political beliefs, but that those youths who reported higher levels of media literacy education were more likely to assess information accurately and were better able to discern the difference between misinformation and evidence-based information (Kahne & Bowyer, 2017). As a result, the authors concluded that “media literacy education is an essential support for judgment in a highly partisan digital age” (Kahne & Bowyer, 2017, p.27). Miller and Bartlett (2012) found that teachers rated their middle and high school students’ abilities to assess information on the web as poor, and nearly 90% supported increased attention to these skills in the curriculum. While they do not use the terms information or media literacy Lewandowsky, Ecker, Seifert, Swartz, and Cook (2012) contend that skepticism can help decrease people’s vulnerability to mis- and disinformation, as research suggests that when people are skeptical of information and its sources they tend to assess that information more accurately (Lewandowsky, Stritzke, Oberauer, & Morales, 2005). Information and media literacy instruction which trains people to question and critically analyze information and its sources encourages this sort of critical thinking and skepticism.

- **Structural efforts:**
 - Establish procedures for protecting public media against political interests and commercial pressures through sustained federal subsidies
 - Restructure tax law to provide new designations to low-profit and nonprofit news organizations
 - Form collaborations and partnerships between librarians and journalists to leverage each other's resources and expertise.

[Note]: The Center for Media and Social Impact outlines a number of policies necessary at the infrastructure, platform, and production level to ensure a stable public media. These include: a national broadband policy, net neutrality, taxpayer support of public media outlets, and tax incentives for non-profits to create information banks and public media tools (Aufderheide & Clark, 2008). Symposium attendee David Beard (2018) has written about actual and potential ways that librarians and journalists can collaborate. He profiles librarian Mike Sullivan of Weare, New Hampshire, who became the editor of his local newspaper and fellow symposium attendee Tom Huang of Dallas Morning News, who works closely with the Dallas Public Library on feature and community engagement stories.

Figure 1 summarizes Roberta's stage setting and Michelle's keynote address.

Figure 1: Stage Setting and Recognizing News in an Era of Content Confusion



[For better viewing, this figure is reprinted as Appendix A]

With the conclusion of the keynote, the symposium segued into a working meeting. Over the next two days, attendees participated in a series of facilitated brainstorming sessions and small and large group discussions, which was organized around the following outline:

- Inventory & Inform
- Integrate & Incorporate
- Innovate & Initiate

Inventory and Inform: Standards, Values, and Practices of Information Assessment and Dissemination

During this portion of the symposium, attendees were seated in groups by field: librarians, journalist, and “allied professionals.” For the first session, each group was asked to take inventory of the standards, values, and practices of their field related to sharing information, establishing and signaling authority, and building public trust. Discussion was guided by the following questions:

1. Within our field, how do we assess information sources for authority?
2. How do we signal our own authority and the authoritativeness of the information we share?
3. What do our users/clients/patrons value and trust about our work?
4. How do we value information as professionals?
5. How do our users value information?
6. What are the ways in which we correct the record?
7. How are our practitioners educated and “enculturated” to follow proper and preventative protocols and practices for sharing information?
8. What are the key and unique roles of our profession in relation to mis- and disinformation?
9. What is our profession’s unique mandate?

During report out, participants shared their practices, values, and standards by profession, which were captured both in text and graphic form. The report out was followed by a gallery walk, in which participants reviewed the collected standards, values, and practices and reacted to them. Using post-it notes, participants reacted to the standards with comments and questions, but they also marked places where they saw convergences between professional standards with an “+” and marked places where they saw divergences with a “-.” After the gallery walk, participants regrouped in small groups to discuss what they learned from the inventory activity, and how they might build on each other’s standards, values and practices. The directions for the gallery walk and discussion are included as Appendix C. Figure 2 illustrates the outcomes of these conversations and gallery walk, which are then summarized in text form below.

Figure 2 Inventory and Inform



[For better viewing, this figure is reprinted as Appendix B]

Standards, Practices, and Values by Field:

Journalists discussed the issue of transparency of both content and process; giving their audience insight into how stories are identified and developed, as well as in the sources of information for new reporting. In discussing sources, they emphasized the importance of credibility and independence from bias, and also noted the importance of avoiding conflicts of interest, including financial and political. With regard to signaling authority, journalists are also concerned with trust in brand names, as well as credentials and reputation. Journalists are aware of their role or mandate as a check on powerful interests. One table summed it up that “journalism remains vital today to serve as an independent source of information vital to the public interest.”

Librarians discussed the local and community aspects of libraries. They noted that libraries value access to information and patron privacy. The librarians also discussed issues related to objectivity, noting that librarians are trained to be non-judgmental, and some described the library as a neutral place that is for everyone. However, there was also some pushback on this topic. Some librarians questioned if libraries can truly be neutral, and suggested other terms such as fair, even-handed, or open-minded as alternative words. Some librarians also noted that while the library might ostensibly be for all people, not everyone uses the library, and some people might not feel welcome there. Librarians also emphasized the high level of public trust in libraries. They noted that people tend to trust libraries as sources of information, but some wondered how this trust might be impacted as many libraries shift selection of materials to vendors, or purchase packages rather than individual items. They saw the unique mandate of the library as a place that provides information without an agenda or judgment, and which protects patron’s privacy and intellectual freedom in their pursuit of information.

The allied professionals indicated that in evaluating authority, they value brand association, expertise and credentials. They also acknowledged the importance of personal experience, as well as the presentation and format of information. They suggested that users value experience and expertise when evaluating information, and that professionals like journalists, librarians, and others have skills sets that help to fill gaps for users. They also asserted that credibility must be established over time. In terms of responding to mis- and disinformation, allied professionals saw a positive potential role for artificial intelligence (AI) in discrediting sources, and suggested crowd-sourced fact-checking as a human alternative. They also asserted the importance of respectful conversations and the value of education. To that end, they envisioned finding ways to facilitate conversations that are not grounded in fighting, and fostering a joy of learning.

Convergences

The standards, practices, and values inventory revealed a number of areas of convergence across the fields. Journalists, librarians, and “allied professionals” are all concerned with the quality of information and with how to signal authority and credibility. They understand and value certain sources of information for their brand, credibility, authority, and expertise. There

was also a shared concern about the impacts of market forces and financial interests on the professions. These concerns included the corporatization of information sources, including media outlets and other information vendors, and a lack of willingness on the part of consumers to pay for the services of information providers like journalists.

All the professionals are also concerned with how best to build trust with their communities. Journalists and librarians are interested in transparency and are also committed to representing different perspectives. Both librarians and journalists are guided by professional codes of ethics that emphasize objectivity and avoidance of bias in the gathering and presenting of information (American Library Association, 2008; Society of Professional Journalists, 2014), and there is a sense that, especially if the public recognizes them, those ethical standards help to establish trust. Each of the groups also expressed an interest in creating spaces for and facilitating both civic and civil discourse.

Divergences

Of course, there were also places where the standards, practices, and values of the fields diverged. In particular, journalists were concerned with correcting the record, and see such corrections as a way of building credibility and trust. Librarians, however, did not always see it as their role to correct existing information, but instead were concerned with preserving the record, including inaccurate information. Indeed, some librarians suggested that providing access to misinformation is part of the role of upholding intellectual freedom. In other words, people have a right to access misinformation if they want. Further, people might be interested in misinformation for various reasons, including working to debunk it.

The allied professionals noted that we are assuming that there is a record to correct referring, perhaps, to the transient nature of information online. There was a sense that public libraries' role as publicly funded spaces makes them unique, since many news outlets rely on advertising. The librarians' emphasis on patron privacy was also unique. There seemed to be a struggle across the professions to balance the need and desire to make information public and to provide as much access as possible to information with a need to protect people's privacy and provide them with safe spaces for exploration. Finally, there were some differences in suggested responses to mis- and disinformation. The allied professionals suggested using technological solutions, including AI, to discredit certain sources of information, but this suggestion was marked with several minuses, indicating that librarians and journalists might favor human-based solutions.

Standards Across Fields: Discussion

After the small group report-outs and gallery walk, the attendees engaged in a large group discussion around the convergences and divergences in professional standards, practices, and values. Many of the points from this and later discussions were shared on Twitter with the hashtag #knownews2018. One library professional noted that journalism and librarianship are two fields with strong core values and are facing similar problems. One challenge is the

emergence of new ways of sharing information that are not governed by those same ethics. Another challenge relates back to the concerns over market forces and financial interests. An academic librarian pointed out that while libraries are non-commercial, they exist in a for-profit world, and as such they must contend with market forces, including the financial cost of providing access to information. Another librarian asserted that if we value information and information service providers like journalists and librarians, we must demonstrate that value through monetary support, which could take the form of subscriptions to news sources and public tax dollars to support libraries.

Attendees focused on the issues of trust and authority as critical concepts. However, it was posed that searching for and defining authority can be a problem, and that the focus should be on individual empowerment to critically analyze and evaluate information, rather than abdication to an overarching “authority.” Others noted that critical thinking is hard, time-consuming, and tiring, and that often people fall to “satisficing” or settling for information that is good enough. There was also a sense that we cannot just focus on finding and evaluating information, but on creating spaces for and fostering discourse. Given the focus on the need for education, one librarian noted the absence of K-12 educators in the room and suggested that their voices need to be brought into the conversation. Another attendee noted that libraries are regarded as trusted sources but wondered whether the people who trust libraries really understand what they do, or whether they are relying on a mythology. A public librarian responded that what is most important is that libraries continue to act in ways that are worthy of trust. One of the allied professionals who runs a start-up company discussed how relationships are really at the center of all of the issues. She argued for the need to show compassion and respect for individuals as well as finding ways to empower them and build trust through empathy.

Focusing on the question of trust, a faculty member in journalism wondered why librarians would be interested in working with journalists when trust in journalism is so low. A library science faculty member tied the question back to an earlier comment about people’s awareness of what libraries do. She suggested that if libraries are not well understood, then journalists could work with libraries to help them tell their story and get their message out. At the same time, libraries might be able to lend credibility and authority to journalistic news. A librarian and researcher pointed out that libraries need current collections of content—which journalists can help provide—and that their trustworthiness depends on that. One of the journalists asserted that having librarians and journalists come together is not a choice or an option... it has to happen.

Conclusions from Day One

Lisa Hinchliffe summed up the first day’s discussions by offering conclusions centered on the following areas:

- **Cognition:** in order to develop responses to mis- and disinformation and educate people to think critically, we must first begin to understand the complexities of how the human brain works.
- **Community:** we all work and practice across various communities: our audience and the people we serve, our professional communities, and our communities of practice. We need to be aware of and responsive to each of these communities as we engage in our work. We also need to show compassion to all of our communities, not just those who think like us.
- **Credibility:** across our fields, there are certain common markers or criteria for authority and trust, and these criteria are applied both to the documents and to the people creating the information.
- **Context:** Lisa drew on Emily Drabinski's (2017) work on Kairos (a Greek word meaning a moment in time, this moment, today) to note that we have challenges—maybe even crises—that are local, national, and global in context. Kairos can signal a sense of urgency and this symposium is a call to action to begin responding.
- **Capitalism:** we need to be willing to pay for the things we value, rather than looking to technology to fix problems. We need to deal with the bigger issues of the financialization of the attention economy.
- **Crisis:** the challenges of mis- and disinformation are great, but they also create an opportunity for us to work together.
- **Conclusion:** we need to build our community of practice to service our communities in current context, perhaps a crisis of cognition - communicate our collective contribution

Figure 3 illustrates the conclusions from day one.

Figure 3: Day One Conclusions



DAY TWO

Innovate & Initiate: Idea Development

For the second day of the symposium, attendees were seated at interdisciplinary tables, with each table featuring at least one librarian, one journalist, one educator, one allied professional, and one student. The purpose of these groups was to work together across the disciplines to brainstorm and develop specific proposals building on the take-aways and conclusions from Day One. In the spirit of the Institute of Museum and Library Services strategic goal of libraries as community anchors (IMLS, 2012), participants were asked to develop proposals that incorporated libraries as living laboratories for implementing ideas.

Lisa Hinchliffe outlined the concept of libraries as living laboratories as illustrated in Figure 4, below. Lisa encouraged symposium attendees to think broadly about the possibilities of libraries as living laboratories. She explained that laboratory does not mean we are thinking of libraries as places to experiment on patrons, but rather as places for our users to experiment. She suggested that as participants developed ideas, they consider libraries as safe spaces for our communities to inquire, engage, and investigate. This initial brainstorming session was meant to be very open-ended. Participants were directed not to worry about resources or funding at this point, but to focus on developing ideas that they would like to implement, or that they could imagine being done by others. Lisa provided a few examples of possible directions for brainstorming centered on what our communities' interests, including:

- **Consume and evaluate:** people need access to sources of information, and guidance in evaluating what they find.
- **Investigate and inquire:** people need space, whether physical, virtual, or intellectual, to pursue interests and answer questions
- **Check and document:** libraries can provide services to assist with fact-checking and documenting sources and evidence. Lisa pointed to the Seattle Public Library's [Living Voter's Guide](#) as an example.
- **Produce and create:** increased access to technology tools means that people can create and disseminate information, rather than just consuming it. Libraries can provide makerspaces for people to develop their own news. These makerspaces could include both the media and technology necessary to produce news, but also the intellectual support and expertise to facilitate learning how news is created.
- **Archive and preserve:** libraries document and save what is created, including local and community news.

With this guidance, groups were given an hour of uninterrupted free brainstorming time.

Figure 4: Libraries as Living Laboratories



Proposal Development

One of the planned outcomes of the symposium was to develop a series of interdisciplinary proposals to respond to the challenges of misinformation centered on libraries as living laboratories. Once groups had generated a list of ideas, the groups were segued into idea selection in preparation for proposal development. Each table was given a set of criteria to guide them in selecting the idea they would like to develop into a fuller proposal. The criteria for idea assessment is included as Appendix D. In introducing the criteria, Laura Saunders encouraged groups to begin to consider the viability of the projects, including what resources would be needed to launch and sustain them. She also emphasized the importance of being clear about the problem that the idea was meant to solve, and the audience it was meant to target. As she explained, these ideas are not going to solve the problem of misinformation generally, but might address some aspect of the issue, and support a particular user group or community's access to and interaction with information.

After idea selection, the groups moved on to proposal development. The aim of this portion of the symposium was to flesh out the selected idea more fully by identifying and defining specific aspects of the project in order to give each proposal shape and focus. Rachel Gans-Boriskin introduced this session, guiding participants to define the specific audience they hoped to reach, identify the space in which the project would take place, and identifying the specific resources, including funding sources, that would be needed to implement the project. She also asked groups to address their proposal's relationship to existing projects and consider

how their proposed project could be assessed. The full list of criteria for proposal development is included as Appendix E.

Once the proposals had been further developed, each table shared out its initial proposal idea. The broad ideas were shared on flip charts posted around the room. Laura asked participants to write any comments or questions for each proposal on small post-it notes which could be added to the appropriate flip chart during break. Each table could use these questions and comments to further guide further proposal development. A list of the participants at each table can be found in Appendix F. The initial proposal ideas were as follows:

- **Table A: #Checkitout #ThinkLikeALibrarian**
 - Patrons could ask questions of news outlets through the library, on the model of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Undergraduate Library Question Board. The answers could link into relevant news stories, and journalists and librarians could work together to heighten transparency by describing the processes used to create the stories. Answers to questions and links to the stories could be shared through Twitter with the hashtags.
- **Table B: Civic Information Literacy Collaborative (CLIC)**
 - A learning community for professionals. The Collaborative would develop media literacy standards, and provide space for collaborators to share resources, case studies, and projects. CLIC could create curriculum and toolboxes for professionals that could center libraries (e.g., Media Literacy @your Library), recognizing libraries a place of civic engagement and cornerstone of American democracy.
- **Table C: Memo of Understanding (MoU)**
 - This project centered on creating contracts between local media professionals and libraries. The group proposed a continuum of possibilities from basic partnerships through which librarians and journalists would help to promote each other's events and share programming; to a model of "journalist librarian" where professionals could engage in cataloging community events and information, provide media research assistance, and open lines of communications across groups; to a merger in which the professionals would create a community news center as a library brand, with the news department embedded in the library. The proposal also outlined a continuum of professional activities ranging from attending each other's conferences to working together on election education, to interviewing each other for community programming.
- **Table D: Hyperlocal Alternatives**
 - Table D organized their suggestions around a theme of designing tools and platforms that are rooted in community care and consent. They highlighted the fact that the crisis is at the mass media level and proposed hyperlocal initiatives in response. They proposed leveraging existing infrastructures and resources and

recognizing spaces in our communities where expertise already exists, and providing space for that expertise to be shared.

- **Table E: Teen “Bull” Buster**

- Table E chose to focus on teens and youth as its audience. They acknowledged the many ways in which teens are taking an activist role and calling “bullsh-t” on propaganda, citing the Parkland teens specifically. Their proposal was to teach teens storytelling skills in order for them to create alternative narratives to help dispel the misinformation. The proposal would include a media and storytelling space for teens, as well as training in techniques.

- **Table F&G: News Makerspace**

- Tables F and G combined efforts to propose a three-pronged solution at the college level that would include tools for reading and fact-checking news, a curriculum for news literacy, and a makerspace. The library would work with journalists to develop a makerspace for college students that would provide the resources and training to develop news. They proposed working with the student newspaper or other student media outlets like campus radio stations, and finding funding to pay student journalists and interns. The professionals would also develop a curriculum to teach students news literacy skills.

- **Table H: Real News for Real People**

- Table H’s proposal included news literacy instruction for patrons as well as a “train the trainer” model. In this proposal, librarians and journalists would work together as educators. One aim would be to support the acquisition of news literacy skills in patrons by finding ways to insert news literacy instruction into existing programs. This could include layering news literacy into formal instruction programs, as well as adding news literacy tips into other interactions with patrons such as reference transactions. They also suggested that part of the program could include creating native advertising about native advertising to be inserted into news and library outlets. Finally, the program would include a curriculum component to train librarians to ensure that they had the necessary knowledge to then instruct patrons.

- **Table I: Pop-up Newsrooms**


- Table I focused on the problem of “news deserts” and the need to create a space for listening and learning. They proposed for librarians and journalists to create pop-up news events around issues of local concern, bringing together resources and information on the topic, but also creating a space for everyone in the community to be listened to and heard. The pop-up events would focus on issues of relevance to the local community with a goal of building increased trust across the community.

- **Table J: Drawing people into the Square**

- Table J asserted that libraries and politics are local, and identified the main problem as a lack of critical thinking about information and sources. They saw a need to bring people in the community together, including drawing in groups that had been previously excluded in order to have a better representation of the library’s community. They proposed using hyperlocal issues to bring people in and facilitate civil and civic discussions. The aim would be to leverage interest in local topics to teach people the mechanisms of a civil society, with the outcome of the library as an instrument of community learning.

Figure 5 shows photos of several of the table flip charts outlining table proposals.

Figure 5: Table Proposals



Final Phase: Press Releases & Voting

The final phase of the symposium was to refine the proposal ideas and to create press releases based on the final proposal. The groups were given a series of three worksheets that walked them through the process of creating a press release (Appendices G-I). The grant principals and symposium facilitator chose press releases as a final activity because it encouraged participants to think through the full process of implementation of a project, including specifics such as funding resources and project scope. As a result, most of the proposal ideas were refined further and took on additional shape for the press release. Figure 6 depicts the original proposal ideas and final press release announcements, and a summary of the press releases for each project follows.

Figure 6: Proposal to Press Release



Table A:
#CheckItOut

#CheckItOut proposed an enhanced question-answering service that would be staffed by a team of librarians and journalists. This team would go beyond providing simple answers to questions by including background information, tips on research, and guidance on how to evaluate sources.

Table B:
Civic Literacy Information Collaborative (CLIC)

Table B outlined a collaborative of centralized resources for librarians and other information professionals to form partnerships and share resources to position libraries across the country as centers for civic literacy and collaboration in the digital age. They proposed hiring a director, convening stakeholders, and building a platform to facilitate collaboration and communication between librarians, information professionals, educators, and community members. The initiative would also host a learning community and run symposiums.

Table C:
Anytown Announces First Journalist Librarian

Table C proposed creating a position of Journalist Librarian, who would serve as a liaison between the town’s local newspaper and the library. The Journalist Librarian would engage in programming such as voter education to build civic engagement.

**Table D:
Our True Story**

Our True Story was proposed as a collaboration between journalists and librarians to encourage civic dialogue, give community members a chance to tell their stories, and fill a gap in local newsgathering while providing an opportunity to reconcile differences in the narrative about who we are as communities and as a nation. This group proposed a pilot project to be conducted in Southern Minnesota, which will bring indigenous voices, the voices of long-settled Minnesotans proud of their immigrant roots, and recent immigrants together to discuss the differing narratives of a historic event – the US-Dakota war of 1862 and the largest mass execution in US history, conducted near the current site of the Blue Earth Public Library and its adjacent Reconciliation Park. The pilot would provide a technical infrastructure and a replicable toolkit for community engagement, and serve as a testbed for other communities to learn journalistic elements of the storytelling craft, to give individuals opportunities to learn new skills, and to open spaces, physical and emotional, for much-needed dialogue.

**Table E:
To Be Honest**

Table E proposed T.B.H (To Be Honest): Teens Telling True Stories, an initiative that would give teens the tools they need to tell their own stories through social media, storyboards, and other creative means. Journalists and librarians would work together to hold informative sessions at local public libraries aimed at equipping youth with media literacy and storytelling skills in order to share their personal experiences. The project hopes to change the way communities think about young people, give young people a stake in the value of truth-telling and an appreciation for critical thinking, and prime teens to be the guardians of a free and open society.

**Table F & G
Newsmaker Space**

Tables F & G proposed The Newsmaker Space Public Library Program, to provide resources to public libraries in the U.S. for students and journalists to collaborate and produce local news, podcasts, video and creative content. The aim of the project is to increase news literacy in the community and create opportunities for students and young professionals to engage with the news. Local news stations, assisted by college interns and local professionals, would play a large role.

The project also proposed a parent site at ALA where participating libraries could share all produced content digitally.

**Table H:
Librarians and Journalists Join Forces to Fight ‘Fake News’**

With false news stories disrupting and distorting civil discourse every day, a pair of society’s most important information providers -- librarians and journalists -- are teaming up to help citizens decide for themselves what’s reliable information and what isn’t.

Table H outlined a bootcamp led by journalists, educators and librarians to provide tools aimed at addressing the crisis in news media literacy. The bootcamp would be a “train the trainers” model aimed at helping librarians learn how to train others on news literacy. The camp would include livestreams of the training as well as follow-up webinars based on the curriculum.

The goal is to prepare librarians to help citizens answer questions such as: How can I tell when a news story is accurate? How do I vet the news sources that I use? What are signs that a story is less than credible - and perhaps even made up? How can I be a smarter consumer of news and information on social media?

**Table I:
Information Oasis**

Information Oasis is a proposed a toolkit that will help information professionals build trust between communities and information providers. The toolkit would consist of best practices for programming, building relationships with local news sources, supplementary materials for conversation starters, and printable templates.

**Table J:
Civic Conversations Toolkit**

The Civic Conversations Toolkit is a proposal to create resources and materials to assist local public libraries in developing programming for civic dialog. The programming would be aimed at providing citizens with the tools and processes to engage thoughtfully with pressing issues in their local communities.

The main ideas from the press releases were captured on flip-charts. Once all of the press releases had been read out, each participant was given three star stickers and asked to vote for their top three project ideas, focusing on those they felt were most viable. Table 1 below shows the voting tallies, and Figure 7 shows photos of the voting flip charts

Table 1: Press Release Voting Tallies

Table	Title	Votes
F & G	Newsmaker Space	29
E	To Be Honest	28
H	News Literacy Bootcamp	21
I	Information Oasis	19
A	Check It Out	16
B	Civic Literacy Information Collaborative	11
D	Our True Story	10
C	Journalist Librarian	9
J	Civic Conversations Toolkit	7

Figure 7: Press Release Voting



Press Release Debrief & Discussion

After reviewing and voting on the press releases, the symposium attendees engaged in a final large group discussion. This discussion largely revolved around themes of economics, project scale and roles, and engagement. Several people voiced concern over corporate influences on information and news sources. One librarian asked how we can push back against corporate power. Another attendee expressed that although she loves journalists, she feels a tension with regard to the role of profit and finds the business side of journalism and libraries troubling. One librarian noted that the funding sources identified in the press releases were all well-known and predictable, and several people agreed that there is a need to research and identify new funding sources.

A couple of attendees observed that most of the projects seemed local or small-scale, and one worried that these projects won't have a large impact. She wondered if instead of pursuing projects like these, libraries should be supporting larger national movements like Sleeping Giants, Black Lives Matter, and Me Too. Another attendee responded that most of the participants identify themselves as educators, and wondered if it is the appropriate role of educators to advocate for activist movements, or if they should focus on facilitating learning. One attendee noted the importance of including people from ideologically different backgrounds.

Ultimately, however, most attendees seemed eager to continue the conversation. An allied professional who runs a start-up company implored his fellow attendees not to let the conversation end when the weekend ended, but to keep engaging with each other. Another noted that librarians are among the most siloed professionals that he has worked with. He appreciated the symposium bringing together professionals across fields and he also urged his fellow attendees to keep the cross-disciplinary conversation going. There was a sense of wanting to bring isolated and often disconnected institutions and professionals together. One attendee acknowledged the energy and perspective that the undergraduate and graduate student attendees brought to the conversation. Several people agreed that involving students and youth in these discussions is essential. Two attendees both emphasized the need to find ways to move from

participation to mobilization, which leads directly into the conclusions and next steps for the symposium.

Conclusions & Next Steps


Laura Saunders concluded the symposium by highlighting the broad themes and outlining the next steps for the group. In her closing comments, Laura highlighted the following themes:

1. There were more convergences than divergences between and across our fields-- all the professionals involved care about the quality of information and care about connecting communities to information and to each other. Michael Spikes identified librarianship and journalism as mission compatible and the discussions emerging from the symposium suggest that there is a solid basis for some real partnerships and collaborations.
2. Professionals across the fields see a real need for space for both civic and civil discourse. Working in collaboration, librarians, journalists, and allied professionals could create space for such conversations, but also facilitate meaningful and respectful conversations.
3. Critical thinking is essential to news literacy and to combatting mis- and disinformation. Many people in the room identify as educators, and as such we need to find ways to inspire enthusiasm around learning and critical thinking.
4. There's a hunger to drive big change, but also an understanding of a need for more local engagement. Several groups proposed local and hyper-local responses. These projects seem to emerge at least partly in response to the loss of local and community news outlets in many areas, and a sense that engagement and trust usually begin at the local level. Big change might grow from local projects.
5. Communities were at the center of all of our projects and discussions. The professionals involved in the symposium acknowledge a need to recognize and honor our authority and expertise and that of our communities, all of whom bring important experiences and knowledge to our interactions. In our professional roles we should not be just creating and pushing content but engaging our communities.
6. There is a need to invite more voices into the conversation, including K-12 educators, people from the tech sector who are developing technological and AI solutions, neuroscientists and psychologists who study how humans process and interact with information, funders, and also our broad communities. If we want to develop projects that engage our communities and answer their needs, we first must talk to the communities and not assume that we understand what they want and need. Symposium attendee Matthew Sullivan (2018) emphasizes the need to draw on research, especially from the fields of psychology and neuroscience in order to understand how humans process information before developing solutions.
7. We need to be willing to support-- and pay for-- the things we value
8. We need to value journalists' role of broadly educating and informing people to promote democracy.

- We need to value librarians' role of connecting people to information and answering questions without agendas or judgment.

Figure 8 illustrates the outcomes of the final discussion and closing comments.

Figure 8 Wrap-up Discussion and Closing Comments.



Next Steps

This white paper is only the first step in continued engagement with the symposium topic. The Know News web site (slis.simmons.edu/blogs/disinformation) will continue to be updated with news and initiatives.

Two weeks after the symposium, the conveners sent a follow-up survey to attendees. Forty-five people completed the survey, for a response rate of 57%. Of these respondents, 93% strongly agreed or agreed that the symposium was engaging, and that they engaged in meaningful conversations. Eighty-two percent said they left with new ideas. In addition, just over three-quarters of respondents said they have discussed the symposium with someone who did not attend, and nearly two-thirds indicated that they have been in contact with someone they met at the symposium. Finally, 91% signed up for a listserv to receive occasional updates about the Know News project, showing that the vast majority are interested in continuing to engage on the topic.

In order to facilitate this continued engagement, the symposium conveners are exploring platforms to create a learning community of interested professionals to network, share ideas and

resources, and carry on conversations. Details of this learning community will be posted to the Know News web site as it is developed.

At the suggestion of attendee Anna Kassinger, the symposium conveners are proposing a Twitter conversation using the symposium hashtag #knownews2018. The conversation will revisit some of the main ideas and questions of the symposium and offer attendees a way to reconnect. If interest remains after the first conversation, the symposium conveners and interested attendees could create a schedule for hosting such conversations regularly. Details of the Twitter conversation will be emailed to participants and posted on the Know News website.

The conveners have already taken the following concrete steps as follow-up to the symposium:

- The co-PIs presented on the outcomes of the symposium at the LOEX 2018 conference in Houston Texas in May, and have been accepted to present on the topic at the ECIL 2018 conference in Oulu, Finland in September. They have also submitted a proposal to UNESCO's Global Media and Information Literacy conference, which will take place in Lithuania and Latvia in October, 2018. Symposium conveners will seek to disseminate information about the symposium through a variety of professional venues, including professional journals and conferences, beginning with papers, presentations, and other materials from these venues will be posted to the Know News website.
- A group of symposium attendees have also joined with the original symposium conveners to build on the #CheckItOut project proposal. A proposal based on this idea has been submitted to the Misinformation Solutions Forum, a grant funded by the Rita Allen Foundation. If the proposal is selected, the group will pilot a #CheckItOut service in a local public library during 2019. The principal investigators will continue to research other funding opportunities as well.
- A class of Simmons College journalism undergraduates attended the symposium as participants. As part of the work of their seminar, these students continue to build on the discussions and ideas from the symposium. They created a multimedia website, which includes an infographic summarizing the main outcomes of the symposium, and a brief video overview. Several students are continuing related work. Over the fall 2018 semester, they will develop a game-based interactive web site in which users can take on different roles (e.g. journalist, librarian, student) to solve a mystery by evaluating information and identifying misinformation.

The discussions outlined in this white paper, and especially the nine proposal ideas, can serve as an action plan for librarians, journalists and allied professionals. The symposium conveners invite attendees and all allied professionals to adopt, adapt, and use these ideas as a basis for their own projects. These proposal ideas could also serve as seeds for grant proposals. The symposium conveners will be exploring options for funding and implementing these ideas over the next few months and invite anyone interested in collaborating to get in touch.

References

- Agerholm, H. (2018, March 26). Malaysia plans to make fake news punishable by up to 10 years in prison under new law. *Independent*. Retrieved from <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/asia/malaysia-government-fake-news-10-year-prison-free-speech-a8273836.html>
- Alvarez, B. (2016). Public libraries in the age of fake news. *Public Libraries*, 55(6), 24-27.
- Amazeen, M. (2018). Recognizing news in an era of content confusion [PowerPoint slides]. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/36471751/Recognizing_News_in_an_Era_of_Content_Confusion
- Amazeen, M.A., & Wojdyski, B.W. (2018). The effects of disclosure format on native advertising recognition and audience perceptions of legacy and online news publishers. *Journalism*. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1464884918754829>
- Amazeen, M.A., & Muddiman, A. R. (2017). Saving media or trading on trust? The effects of native advertising on audience perceptions of legacy and online news publishers. *Digital Journalism*, 6(2), 176-195. doi: [10.1080/21670811.2017.1293488](https://doi.org/10.1080/21670811.2017.1293488)
- American Library Association (ALA). (2008). Code of ethics. Retrieved from <http://www.ala.org/tools/ethics>
- Association of College & Research Libraries (ACRL). (2016). *Framework for information literacy for higher education*. Retrieved from <http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/ilframework>
- Aufderheide, P., & Clark, J. (2008). The future of public media FAQ. *The Center for Media and Social Impact*. Retrieved from <http://cmsimpact.org/resource/1924/>
- Babad, E., Peer, E., & Hobbs, R. (2012). Media literacy and media bias: Are media literacy students less susceptible to nonverbal judgement biases? *Psychology of Popular Media Culture*, 1(2), 97-107.
- Babad, E., & Peer, E. (2009). The effect of media literacy education on susceptibility to media bias. Paper presented at the International Communication Association Conference. Retrieved from <https://content.ebscohost.com/ContentServer.asp?T=P&P=AN&K=45286159&S=R&D=ufh&EbscoContent=dGJyMNHX8kSeqLY4v%2BbwOLCmr1Cep7FSsKi4SK%2BWxWXS&ContentCustomer=dGJyMPGqsE%2B3p7ZJuePfgeyx43zx>
- Banks, M. (2016, December 27). Fighting fake news: How libraries can lead the way on media literacy. American Libraries. Retrieved from <https://americanlibrariesmagazine.org/2016/12/27/fighting-fake-news/>
- Barthel, M., Mitchell, A., & Holcomb, J. (December 15, 2016). Many Americans believe fake news is sowing confusion. *Pew Research Center, Journalism and Media*. Retrieved from <http://www.journalism.org/2016/12/15/many-americans-believe-fake-news-is-sowing-confusion/>
- Basen, I. (2012, December 19). Breaking down the wall. *Center for Journalism Ethics*. Retrieved from <https://ethics.journalism.wisc.edu/2012/12/19/breaking-down-the-wall/>
- Beard, D. (2018, January 19). A tale of 2 polls: What do librarians have that journalists don't? *Poynter*. Retrieved from <https://www.poynter.org/news/tale-2-polls-what-do-librarians-have-journalists-dont>

- Bishop, C.A. (2012). *Access to information as a human right*. El Paso, TX: LFB Scholarly Publishing LLC.
- Bradley, J. (2017, June 23). Gaming the system: The self-feeding circle of fake news. *Forbes*. Retrieved from <https://www.forbes.com/sites/tonybradley/2017/06/23/gaming-the-system-the-self-feeding-circle-of-fake-news/#7c242d4d5324>
- Cakebread, C. (2017, September 25). Brazil is more worried about fake news than any other country. *Business Insider*. Retrieved from <http://www.businessinsider.com/brazil-is-more-worried-about-fake-news-than-any-other-country-chart-2017-9>
- Carr, A. (2017, October 31). Senators grill Facebook, Twitter, and Google on fake news: “Your power scares me.” *Fast Company*. Retrieved from <https://www.fastcompany.com/40489793/senators-grill-facebook-twitter-google-on-fake-news-your-power-scares-me>
- Center for News Literacy. (2016). What is news literacy? Retrieved from <https://www.centerfornewsliteracy.org/what-is-news-literacy/>
- Constine, J. (2018, April 27). Facebook shrinks fake news after warnings backfire. TechCrunch. Retrieved from <https://techcrunch.com/2018/04/27/facebook-false-news/>
- Drabinski, E. (2017). A Kairos of the critical: Teaching critically in a time of compliance. *Communications in Information Literacy*, 11(1), 76-94. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1148823.pdf>
- Ecker, U.K.H., Lewandowsky, S., Swire, B., & Chang, D. (2011). Correcting false information in memory. Manipulating the strength of misinformation encoding and its retraction. *Psychonomic Bulletin Review*, 18(3), 570-578. doi: 10.3758/s13423-011-0065-1
- Engber, D. (2018, January 3). LOL something matters. *Slate*. Retrieved from <https://slate.com/health-and-science/2018/01/weve-been-told-were-living-in-a-post-truth-age-dont-believe-it.html>
- Fleming, J. (2014). Media literacy, news literacy, or news appreciation? A case study of the news literacy program at Stony Brook University. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, 69(2), 146-165.
- Hern, A. (2018, April 6). New Facebook controls aim to regulate political ads and fight fake news. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2018/apr/06/facebook-launches-controls-regulate-ads-publishers>
- Heshmat, S. (April 23, 2015). What is confirmation bias? Psychology Today. Retrieved from <https://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/science-choice/201504/what-is-confirmation-bias>
- Horrigan, J. B. (2016, September 9). Libraries 2016. *Pew Research Center: Internet & Technology*. Retrieved from <http://www.pewinternet.org/2016/09/09/libraries-2016/>
- Howell, L. (2013). Global Risks 2013. *World Economic Forum*. Retrieved from <http://reports.weforum.org/global-risks-2013/title-page/>
- Institute of Museum and Library Services. (2012). *Strategic plan*. Washington, DC: IMLS. Retrieved from https://www.imls.gov/sites/default/files/legacy/assets/1/AssetManager/StrategicPlan2012-16_Brochure.pdf
- Johnson, B. (2017). Information literacy is dead: The role of libraries in a post-truth world. *Computers in Libraries*, 37(2), 12-15.

- Kahne, J., & Bowyer, B. (2017). Educating for democracy in a partisan age. *American Educational Research Journal*, 54(1), 3. doi:10.3102/0002831216679817
- Lewandowsky, S., Stritzke, W. K., Oberauer, K., & Morales, M. (2005). Memory for Fact, Fiction, and Misinformation: The Iraq War 2003. *Psychological Science*, 16(3), 190-195.
- Lewandowsky, S., Ecker, U. H., Seifert, C. M., Schwarz, N., & Cook, J. (2012). Misinformation and Its Correction: Continued Influence and Successful Debiasing. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 13(3), 106-131. doi:10.1177/1529100612451018
- Lief, L. (October 24, 2016). What the news media can learn from librarians. *Columbia Journalism Review*. Retrieved from https://www.cjr.org/innovations/librarians_journalism_lessons.php
- Metcalf, A. (2018, January 8). 2017 word of the year is fake news, as voted by the American Dialect Society. American Dialect Society. Retrieved from <https://www.americandialect.org/wp-content/uploads/2017-Word-of-the-Year-PRESS-RELEASE.pdf>
- Miller, C., & Bartlett, J. (2012). 'Digital fluency': Towards young people's critical use of the internet. *Journal of Information Literacy*, 6(2), 35-55.
- Mitchell, A., Grieco, E., & Sumida, N. (2018, April 19). Americans favor protecting information freedoms over government steps to restrict false news online. *Pew Research Center*. Retrieved from <http://www.journalism.org/2018/04/19/americans-favor-protecting-information-freedoms-over-government-steps-to-restrict-false-news-online/>
- Mitchell, A. (2016, July 7). Key findings on the traits and habits of the modern news consumer. *Pew Research Center*. Retrieved from <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2016/07/07/modern-news-consumer/>
- Monmouth University. (2018, April 2). 'Fake news' threat to media; editorial decisions, outside actors at fault. Retrieved from https://www.monmouth.edu/polling-institute/reports/monmouthpoll_us_040218/
- Najmabadi, S. (March 3, 2017). Information literacy: it's become a priority in an era of fake news. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, (26). 6.
- Nyhan, B., & Reifler, J. (2010). When corrections fail: The persistence of political misperceptions. *Political Behavior*, 32(2), 303-330. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11109-010-9112-2>
- Reuters Staff. (2018, January 3). Macron plans law to fight 'fake news' in 2018. *Reuters*. Retrieved from <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-france-macron/macron-plans-law-to-fight-fake-news-in-2018-idUSKBN1ES1LJ>
- Rosa, K.S. (2017). The state of America's libraries 2017. *American Library Association*. Retrieved from <http://www.ala.org/news/sites/ala.org.news/files/content/State-of-Americas-Libraries-Report-2017.pdf>
- Society of Professional Journalists. (2014). SPJ code of ethics. Retrieved from <https://www.spj.org/ethicscode.asp>
- Sullivan, M. C. (2018). Why librarians can't fight fake news. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science*. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1177/0961000618764258>

- Swift, A. (2016, September 14). Americans' trust in mass media sinks to new low. *Gallup Politics*. Retrieved from <http://news.gallup.com/poll/195542/americans-trust-mass-media-sinks-new-low.aspx>
- Taub, A. (2017, January 11). The real story about fake news is partisanship. *The New Yorker*. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/11/upshot/the-real-story-about-fake-news-is-partisanship.html>
- United Nations. (1948). *Universal declaration of human rights*. Retrieved from http://www.ohchr.org/EN/UDHR/Documents/UDHR_Translations/eng.pdf
- Weeramantry, C.G. (1995). Access to information: A new human right. The right to know. In K.W. Sik, J.J.C. Syatauw, & M.C.W. Pinto (Eds.), *Asian yearbook of international law* (pp. 99-125). Boston, MA: Kluwer Law International.
- Wardle, C. (2017). Fake news. It's complicated. *First Draft*. Retrieved from <https://firstdraftnews.org/fake-news-complicated/>
- Wendling, M. (2018, January 22). The (almost) complete history of 'fake news.' BBC News: BBC Trending. Retrieved from <http://www.bbc.com/news/blogs-trending-42724320>

Appendix C

Inform: Sharing across Fields

Guiding questions for gallery walk small group discussion

Gallery Walk

We have recorded the various standards, values, and practices related to creating, sharing, and assessing information. Take a few minutes to browse and respond to the outputs from each group:

1. Where are there overlaps and where are there divergences?
2. What surprises or excites you?
3. What questions do you have?

In responding to the information on the posters, use a + sign to indicate areas where you see cross-over between fields and a - to indicate divergences or differences.

Regroup and Discussion

During this session, you are asked to regroup with your original table and reflect on and incorporate what you've learned from reviewing the standards/values across disciplines. Consider the following questions:

1. What did I learn as a professional?
2. What is new, what frames can I take away, what is there from other professions that I could use or build on?

As you discuss, we would encourage you to think about who might fund projects related to mis- and disinformation within your field. Develop a list of funding agencies to be shared.

This project was made possible in part by the Institute of Museum and Library Services LG-98-17-0137-17

Appendix D

Know News: Engaging with Mis- and Disinformation Symposium

#knownews2018

Criteria for Idea Assessment

Now that you have brainstormed ideas for responses to mis- and disinformation with the library as living laboratory, it is time to select a final idea on which your group will develop a proposal.

Here are some questions/criteria to help you select a viable idea:

Clarity – does the idea have a clear focus? Is it easy to explain, or grasp?

Usability – does the idea serve a practical need or solve a particular problem?

Scalability – could the original idea be scaled up? Can it be duplicated with consistency, meet continuous standards?

Resources – can the idea be implemented mostly with existing resources? Would it require a substantial influx of staff, money, or other resources? How feasible is it to acquire the resources?

Skillset – what skillset would be needed to implement this idea? Are there people on the team with these skills? Or, how would you gain the necessary skills?

Passion – do you feel passionate about the idea? Do others? Do you think the intended audience would feel passionate about it?

Questions:

- Does it fit with people's needs? Is there demand?
- Does it really meet the goals set initially?
- Is it different enough from what exists to add additional value?
- Is the technology available?
- Will we be able to roll it out with the available resources?
- Can we get approval from decision makers?

References:

Bacharach, S. (2016). *7 criteria to select the best idea*. Retrieved from <https://www.inc.com/samuel-bacharach/7-criteria-to-select-the-best-idea.html>

Dam, R., & Siang, T. (n.d.). *How to select the best idea by the end of an ideation session*. Retrieved from <https://www.interaction-design.org/literature/article/how-to-select-the-best-idea-by-the-end-of-an-ideation-session>

Fishbein, M. (2018). *9 Factors for evaluating business ideas and opportunities*. Retrieved from <https://mfishbein.com/evaluating-business-ideas/>

This project was made possible in part by the Institute of Museum and Library Services LG-98-17-0137-17

Appendix E

Know News: Engaging with Mis- and Disinformation Symposium

#knownews2018

Proposal Development

Now that you have selected an idea, it is time to outline a proposal built on that idea.

As you develop your proposal, you will want to address the following areas:

Audience	Who is the main or target audience for the proposed idea?
Space	Where will this idea live or happen? Is it in real space? Virtual? Urban? Rural?
Outcomes	What are the intended outcomes of this project?
Resources	What materials, staff, technology, and other resources would you need to implement this idea?
Scale	Is this project local, hyper-local, regional, or national in scale?
Relationship to existing projects	Does this proposal build on, supplement, or complement an existing project? Or is it completely new?
Funding	How would this idea be funded? Is there existing money? Are there donors or grants available?
Assessment	How would you define and measure success for this project?

This project was made possible in part by the Institute of Museum and Library Services LG-98-17-0137-17

Appendix F

Table Participants for Proposal and Press Release Development

Table A		
Ellen Grabiner	Chair, Communications Department	Simmons College
Christina Hager	News Reporter	WBZ-TV, CBSBoston
Isabella Moore	Student	Simmons College
Mary Carter	Community Services Librarian	Belmont Public Library
Steve Runge	Learning Commons Manager	Boston College Libraries
Mary Minow	Fellow	Berkman Center for Internet and Society, Harvard University
Heather Brodie Perry	Reference Librarian/Asst. Professor	Stonehill College
Panagiotis Metaxas	Professor of Computer Science	Wellesley College
Table B		
Michael Antonio Spikes	Director, Digital Resource Center/Chicago Programming	Stony Brook University Center for News Literacy
Jennifer Fleming	Professor	California State University, Long Beach
Uma Hiremath	Executive Director	Ames Free Library
David Leonard	President	Boston Public Library
Eileen Abels	Dean and Professor	Simmons College
Brooke Binkowski	Managing editor, snopes.com	Snopes.com
Table C		
Sofia Rivera	Student	Simmons College
Susan Fleischmann	Executive Director	Cambridge Community Television
Beryl Lipton	Senior Reporter/Project Manager	MuckRock
Melanie Fernandes	SLIS Graduate Student	Simmons College
James LaRue	Director, ALA's Office for Intellectual Freedom	ALA & the Freedom to Read Foundation

Table D		
Erica Moura	Lecturer, Simmons College Radio Faculty Advisor	Simmons College
David Beard	Research Fellow	Shorenstein Center, Harvard Kennedy School
Bibi Reisdorf	Dr.	Michigan State University
Heather Jagman	Coordinator of Reference, Instruction and Academic Engagement	DePaul University
Nicole Cooke	Assistant Professor & MS/LIS Program Director	School of Information Sciences, University of Illinois
Barbara Fister	Academic Librarian and Professor	Gustavus Adolphus College
Troy Swanson	Library Department Chair	Moraine Valley Community College
Vanessa Rhinesmith	Program Manager	digital HKS
Table E		
Nancy Benson	Interim Journalism Department Head	University of Illinois
Haley Verre	Student	Simmons College
Lisa Mullins	News Anchor	WBUR
Elizabeth Boden	Graduate Assistant	University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign
Colin Rhinesmith	Assistant Professor	Simmons College
Laura Jenemann	Communication, Media, & Film Librarian	Boston University
Joanna M. Burkhardt	Librarian/Professor	University of Rhode Island
Elsa Sze	Founder	Agora
Table F & G		
Haley Rosenthal	Student	Simmons College
Bill Shribman	Senior Executive Producer & Director of Digital Partnerships	WGBH
Rafael Lorente	Associate Dean	University of Maryland Philip Merrell College of Journalism
Melissa Wong	Adjunct Instructor	iSchool, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Zach Newell	Doctoral Student	Simmons College
Joyce Garczynski	Assistant University Librarian for Development & Communications	Towson University
Phoebe Knox	Student	Simmons College
John Wihbey	Assistant Professor	Northeastern University

Meredith Farkas	Faculty Librarian	Portland Community College
Phoebe Ayers	Librarian for Electrical Engineering and Computer Science	MIT
Emily Drabinski	Coordinator of Instruction	Long Island University, Brooklyn
Anna Kassinger	Curriculum Manager	Newseum
Table H		
Tom Huang	Assistant Managing Editor	Dallas Morning News
David Mark	Executive Editor	Morning Consult
Mackenzie Farkus	Student	Simmons College
Mary Davis Fournier	Deputy Director, Public Programs Office	ALA
Simone Groene-Nieto	Coordinator of Services to Diverse Communities	Jefferson County Public Library
Rebecca Starkey	Librarian for College Instruction & Outreach	University of Chicago Library
Table I		
Catie Algieri	Student	Simmons College
Stephanie Craft	Associate Professor	University of Illinois
Patricia Pelosi	News Producer	WCVB-TV
Barbara Alvarez	Head of Adult Services	North Shore Library
John Bracken	Executive Director	Digital Public Library of America
Linda Schuller	Librarian	Simmons College
Jessica Chapel	Student	Simmons College
Table J		
Marcus Banks	Journalist and Consultant	marcusabanks.com
Stephanie Edgerly	Assistant Professor	Northwestern University
Aimee Rinehart	Partner Network and Special Projects Manager	First Draft/Shorenstein Center Harvard Kennedy School
Rory Litwin	President	Litwin Books
Matthew Sullivan	Librarian for Collection Development and Planning	Harvard University, Widener Library
Dustin Fife	Director of Library Services	Western State Colorado University
John Pettus	Founder and CEO	Fiskkit

Additional Symposium Attendees included:

1. Noah Bombard, Managing Producer, MassLive
2. Rachel Gans-Boriskin, Senior Lecturer, Simmons College
3. Lisa Hinchliffe, Professor/Coordinator of Information Literacy & Instruction, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
4. Scott Jaschik, Editor, Inside Higher Ed
5. Ken Liss, Head of Liaison and Instruction Services, Boston University
6. Tom Nichols, Professor, U.S. Naval War College
7. Kevin O’Kelly, Head of Reference, Somerville Public Library
8. Laura Saunders, Associate Professor, Simmons College
9. Roberta Shaffer, Retired Law Librarian of Congress
10. Ian Singer, General Manager, Credo Reference

Appendix G

Know News: Engaging with Mis- and Disinformation Symposium

#knownews2018

What Happens If...?

Identify the **best** thing that could happen for this initiative:

How should we respond if this happens?

Identify the **worst** thing that could happen for this initiative:

How should we respond if this happens?

Identify the **most likely** thing that could happen for this strategic initiative:

How should we respond if this happens?

This project was made possible in part by the Institute of Museum and Library Services LG-98-17-0137-17

Appendix H

Know News: Engaging with Mis- and Disinformation Symposium

#knownews2018

Press Release Worksheet

Title:

What is the headline?	
Who/what organization will do what?	
For what purpose?	
What resources will be used (financial, partnerships, skills, etc.)?	
Enabled by?	

Criteria to judge success?	
Who to contact for more information or to get involved?	
Who to approach for quotes related to what aspects?	

This project was made possible in part by the Institute of Museum and Library Services LG-98-17-0137-17

Appendix I

Know News: Engaging with Mis- and Disinformation Symposium

#knownews2018

Press Release – Announcing Launch of an Initiative

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

{Who} is {pleased/thrilled/proud/excited} to announce the launch of {name of initiative}, a {description} that will {do what}. The official launch date for {initiative} is {date}.

|
|

{Sponsor(s)/Partners} believe(s) that {initiative} will {more details about what the initiative will do, maybe compared to what its predecessors and/or alternative projects already do or maybe how it builds on what is already done}.

|
|

{More details about launch, such as what kinds of marketing will be employed, if there is to be a formal launch ceremony, etc.}.

|
|

{Quote from someone related to this launch, using a relevant quote that gets people excited/interested and/or gives them more information}.

|
|

{Boilerplate about organization(s) and any prominent individual(s) involved in this product launch}.

|
|

Adapted from <https://www.pressreleasetemplates.net/click2.php>

This project was made possible in part by the Institute of Museum and Library Services LG-98-17-0137-1