


| | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|------------------------|
| Cornell Notes  | Topic/Objective: Evaluate Websites. | Name: Davico Patterson |
| | | Class/Period: DZ |
| | | Date: 11/29/18 |

Essential Question: How do I judge an Internet website for validity?

| Questions: | Notes: |
|-----------------------------|--|
| What makes a website valid? | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> ① The author is an expert <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - education background gives him/her authority - has college degree (M.D., J.D., Ph.D., M.H.) ② Information is written by a reputable organization, group, or corporation ③ The information is unbiased <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - does not favor one side of an issue - no opinions given - based on facts ④ Website is .gov or .org (be cautious of .com and .net) ⑤ Website does not include for sale ads or popups ⑥ Information is current <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - more than 10 years is too old - 0-5 years is better - Most current is best ⑦ Information is beneficial to the research ⑧ NEVER USE WIKIPEDIA!!!! |

Summary:

Website Evaluation (Evaluating Websites for Validity)

| Which website do you consider best for research? Circle one for each topic. | Explain why you consider that website the strongest of the two. Explanations should be written in well-developed paragraphs. | What made the other website not the best? |
|--|---|--|
| <p>1</p> <p>Drug Abuse Article 1</p> <p>Drug Abuse Article 2</p> | <p>Article 2 was written and reviewed by a government organization that focuses on drug abuse. The article is current as it was written June 2018. The information is strictly fact-based. The website does not attempt to sell anything through ads. The information can be used in my paper - like what happens to the brain when on drugs.</p> | <p>It was a ".com" and had too many ads.</p> <p>and how some people abuse drugs.</p> |
| <p>2</p> <p>Gun Control Article 1</p> <p>Gun Control Article 2</p> | <p>Article 7 has more factual information and its only one year old. It has no ads and shows statistics. This article web address uses ".org" which is one of the first things I noticed about this article. It successfully focuses on the topic of gun control as well.</p> | <p>Article 2 has ads. It also has what other people think in quotation marks which may not be proven true.</p> |
| <p>3</p> <p>Death Penalty Article 1</p> <p>Death Penalty Article 2</p> | <p>Article 2 information was provided from the Death Penalty Information Center. It has the year of 2018 which means the information is updated. The website doesn't have ads or information that can't be proven to be true. The image relates to the written part of the article.</p> | <p>Article 7 had pop up ads as soon as the page loaded. It doesn't have a year as to when it was updated.</p> |
| <p>4</p> <p>Eating Disorders Article 1</p> <p>Eating Disorders Article 2</p> | <p>Article 7 gives relevant information as it focuses on the topic of Eating Disorders. It was written in the year of 2011 which is only 7 years old. Information over 10 years old is not reliable. I didn't see any ads and it has ".org" within the web address.</p> | <p>Article 2 has the padlock icon with a caution sign meaning it's not secure or verified. There are sale ads.</p> |
| <p>5</p> <p>Global Warming Article 1</p> <p>Global Warming Article 2</p> | <p>Article 7 was last revised May 24, 2018 which means the information is updated. It shows graphs and significant data about global warming. The padlock icon says it was verified by Digital Incorporated which means it's secure.</p> | <p>Article 2 is from wikipedia which is not a reliable resource and is asking for a donation as a pop-up.</p> |