



#PodcastsInTheClassroom

Reflection on a Podcast: "Deconstructing a Climate Skeptic" by America Adapts

Due Date:

Course Weighting: x% of total final grade

Description: Listen to the podcast by America Adapts titled "Deconstructing a Climate Denier: The Marc Morano Podcast". Write a 1-page reflection on the podcast.

You may source up to 5 references, which are not included in the page-limit. References should be written according to the style outlined by Environmental Health Perspectives (see link below).

When writing a reflection, you are expected to take the material from the podcast and consider how it shapes your opinions, not summarize the entire podcast. This assignment requires you to express your ideas and opinions concisely, building on the ideas in the podcast. You are not required to breakdown the entire 1-hour podcast in 1-page. Rather, reflect on a few important and/or influential points and dig deeper. Reflective writing requires that you acknowledge your assumptions and preconceived ideas.

Consider the following questions (but you only need to answer a few!) to help you prepare your reflection:

- **Context:** How does this material fit within this course? Provide a very brief summary of the podcast and the opinions that were expressed.
- **Information:** What is the main point? What is the theoretical framework or impact of the information?
- **Relevance:** What ideas stood out to you? Why did they resonate with you?
- **Knowledge:** What previous knowledge do you have on this topic?
- **Assumptions:** What were your prior assumptions about this material? Does this challenge your earlier assumptions?
- **Connections:** How do you feel about this podcast? Does it elicit an emotional or visceral response? How does this impact your learning in the course thus far? How will you use this information in the future?

Format: Your reflection should be 1-page, single-spaced, 12-point font (Arial or Times New Roman) with 1-inch margins. Include your name and student ID in the header, and a title at the top of the page.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/).

Resources:

- Podcast link: <http://americaadapts.org/2017/08/07/deconstructing-a-climate-skeptic-the-marc-morano-podcast/>
- Link to Environmental Health Perspectives (Reference List): <https://ehp.niehs.nih.gov/manuscript-style/>

Rubric:

Criteria	Above Expectation (5)	Met Expectation (4)	Below Expectation (3)	Insufficient (0-2)
Depth of reflection (worth 3x other sections)	The reflection demonstrates deep reflection of the material in the podcast and obvious links between the podcast and the course and personal life. The viewpoints and reflective statements are deep, insightful, and well-supported. Clear and detailed examples are provided where appropriate. (12-15)	The reflection shows general reflection of the material in the podcast and clear links between the podcast and the course and personal life. The viewpoints and reflective statements are presented and supported. Some examples are provided where appropriate. (9-11)	The reflection shows some reflection of the material in the podcast and some links between the podcast and the course and personal life. The viewpoints and reflective statements are presented with limited support. Few examples are provided where appropriate. (6-8)	The reflection shows minimal reflection of the material in the podcast and few links between the podcast and the course and personal life. The viewpoints and reflective statements are poorly presented with limited support. Minimal/ no examples are provided where needed. (0-5)
References	Meaningful and useful references were selected and accurately cited, adding depth to the reflection.	References added to the reflection and cited with minimal errors.	References did little to add to the depth of the reflection and/or were cited with errors.	References did not add to the reflection and/or were not used and/or were cited with many errors.
Writing style	Writing is clear, articulate, and grammatically correct.	Writing is clear and has minimal errors.	Writing is somewhat unclear and/or has some errors.	Writing is unclear and/or has many errors.
Formatting	All formatting guidelines were followed with no errors.	Guidelines were followed with minimal errors.	Guidelines were followed with some errors.	Guidelines were not followed.

Final grade marked out of 30.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/).