Lesson 1.1: Evaluating Sources Part 1

Name:

Websites:
1. www.noaa.gov
2. eps.berkeley.edu
3. Wikipedia.org/wiki/Marine_Life_Protection_Act
4. www.oceanfdn.org
5. www.mbgnet.net
6. www.theguardian.com/environment/georgemonbiot/2016/feb/15/save-uk-seas-from-governments-who-make-a-mockery-of-marine-conservation

---

PART 1 | Explore A Website

1. Website Information:

Website Title:	
Website Author:	
Publishing Date:	

2. List three things you learned from this website:

> 1)
> 2)
> 3)

3. Explain the author's point of view. What evidence do you find convincing? What evidence do you find questionable? Explain why.

PART 2 | Assess Website Credibility

Did the website provide information about the author's background?	
Did the author seem credible?	
Is it a well-known or respected organization or website?	

Does the website support any claims it makes with evidence?	
Did the links take you to credible websites?	
Is the information mainly facts or opinions?	

PART 3 | Assess Credible Sources.

Source	Credible?
A 2017 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service official report on the effects of pollution on marine life	
A pet owner's blog about her sick fish	
A current article about illegal waste disposal, published by a middle school newspaper	
An article in a recent issue of The New York Times about oil spills and bird life	

PART 4 | Domain Extensions

1. What do you think each domain extension is short for?

.gov	
.edu	
.org	
.com	
.net	

2. Is one type of domain extension more credible than another? Use evidence from the websites to explain your response.