Reliability Analysis Pathogen Project Micr-22, revised Fall 2016

Objectives

- This assignment is intended to motivate some discussion of the reliability of information sources.
- Premise: You are a microbiologist, and these pathogen charts are a tool you are considering using to diagnose various infections.

Instructions

1)	a) b)	 Website # 1: "Climate Change Myths." http://rense.com/general88/climchn.htm Website # 2: "Climate Change." http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/
2)	Wo	rk with pathogen charts:
	a)	Obtain a set of five pathogen charts from a classmate.
	b)	Evaluate the charts in three ways: i) Your classmate's charts, overall ii) One trustworthy source from your classmate's charts iii) One questionable source from your classmate's charts Your classmate's charts, overall: Note your observations of the overall reliability of charts themselves: Completeness Clarity of language and terminology Neatness Citations present or absent
		 One trustworthy source, and one questionable source: Choose just one source that seems generally credible, and one about which you have some doubt. If the charts are devoid of citations, look back at your own charts at this point. If the charts are impeccable, consider an unreliable source you encountered in your own research. Examine both sources carefully. Consider starting with and building from Distante's questions. Be sure to address the elements below for each of the two sources you evaluate:
		 Date published Author named Author contact info Peer review Conflict of interest: for author, for website, for author's organization Influence of advertisers
3)	Sur	nmarize your findings:
	a)	Write up your findings in 1-2 pages of double-spaced type. Include the name of the person who wrote the original charts. An excellent analysis will find a way to address all of the elements from step 2(b).
		Rubric for full credit: □ Part (i) complete □ Part (ii) complete □ Part (iii) complete □ Spelling, grammar, punctuation

Evaluating Sources

Adapted from Deb Distante, Mt. SAC Library

To evaluate any source of information, consider the following:

Are there clues that this is "good" information?

- Date: Is the date the information was written and/or last updated clearly marked?
- Author: Who is responsible for the information? Does the source list professional credentials or experiences which qualify that person/organization as an expert on the topic?
- Affiliations: Is the author identified with any group or organization which might influence their viewpoint?
- Contact Information: Is there a way to contact the author (email, phone number, or postal address)?
- Background: Is the information presented verifiable, in outside sources?

Who is responsible for the information being presented?

- Is it from an individual or an organization?
- What are the goals of the author in presenting this information? Potential for "conflicts of interest."
- Are the qualifications that allow the author to speak authoritatively on the topic listed?
- Are the background and expertise of the individual/organization given?
- If you have questions about any of these, contact the author and ask.

Where is the information coming from?

- For websites, domain names give general information on where the data is originating. The domain name is the first piece of information after the http:// of an Internet address. For example, the domain name for Mt. SAC is www.mtsac.edu.
- Web address extensions such as .edu or .com can indicate the type of organization that is responsible for the information, but these are **not** good indicators of reliability.

Did someone else consider this information to be acceptable?

- Was it reviewed or recommended in a professional journal?
- For websites, was it linked from another site whose authority and reliability you trust?
- Note: Most search engines do not screen or evaluate the sites that they index. Directories and pathfinders are based on the selectivity of their creators.

One way to check your judgment: Can you write a 1-2 sentence explanation of why the source is authoritative enough to include in a list of works cited?