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SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION & MATERIAL

LESSON 2: CRAAP TEST
http://libguides.csuchico.edu/c.php?g=414315&p=2822716

CURRENCY: the timeliness of the information

- When was the information published or posted?
- Has the information been revised or updated?
- Is the information current or out-of-date for your topic?
- Are the links functional?

RELEVANCE: the importance of the information for your needs

- Does the information relate to your topic or answer your question?
- Who is the intended audience?
- Is the information at an appropriate level (i.e. not too elementary or advanced for your needs)?
- Have you looked at a variety of sources before determining this is one you will use?
- Would you be comfortable using this source for a research paper?

AUTHORITY: the source of the information

- Who is the author/publisher/source/sponsor?
- Are the author's credentials or organizational affiliations given?
- What are the author's qualifications to write on the topic?
- Is there contact information, such as a publisher or e-mail address?
- Does the URL reveal anything about the author or source?

  examples: .com (commercial), .edu (educational), .gov (U.S. government),
  .org (nonprofit organization), or .net (network)

ACCURACY: the reliability, truthfulness, and correctness of the content, and

- Where does the information come from?
- Is the information supported by evidence?
- Has the information been reviewed or refereed?
- Can you verify any of the information in another source or from personal knowledge?
- Does the language or tone seem biased and free of emotion?
- Are there spelling, grammar, or other typographical errors?

PURPOSE: the reason the information exists

- What is the purpose of the information? to inform? teach? sell? entertain? persuade?
- Do the authors/sponsors make their intentions or purpose clear?
- Is the information fact? opinion? propaganda?
- Does the point of view appear objective and impartial?
- Are there political, ideological, cultural, religious, institutional, or personal biases?

By scoring each category on a scale from 1 to 10 (1 = worst, 10=best possible) you can give each site a grade on a 50 point scale for how high-quality it is!

45 - 50 Excellent | 40 - 44 Good | 35 - 39 Average | 30 - 34 Borderline Acceptable | Below 30 - Unacceptable
Lesson 4 is structured using a mashup of two hyperdoc models, predominantly the 5ES model, adding the Extend and Reflect portions of the Basic Hyperdoc model.

Basic HyperDoc Model

Engage: To engage students at the beginning of a lesson, insert video, image, quote, or another inspirational hook in this box.

Explore: Curate a collection of resources (articles, videos, infographics, text excerpts, etc.) for students to explore a topic.

Explain: Use this section of the HyperDoc to explain the lesson objective through direct instruction using your favorite web tool, or gather students together to teach the content.

Apply: Create an assignment for students to apply what they learn by using web tools to create, collaborate, and/or connect beyond the classroom.

Share: Collect student work to provide feedback, and/or include a section for students to share work with an authentic audience.

Reflect: Include an opportunity for face-to-face or digital reflection to guide students along their learning progression and set new goals.

Extend: Add links to more activities and online resources to extend the learning.

5 Es HyperDoc Model

Engage: Whole group activity to activate schema and engage students in the focus of the topic, skill, concept, or process to learn.

Explore: Independently, with partners, or in small groups, students participate in a shared experience to actively manipulate materials and explore new topics, skills, concepts, or processes.

Explain: Independently, with partners, or in small groups students verbalize their understanding of the content. Teachers direct instruction to teach new vocabulary and to explain topics, skills, concepts, or processes.

Elaborate: Students practice skills and extend thinking. The elaborate activity is an opportunity to develop a deeper level of understanding about the topic, skill, concept, or process.

Evaluate: Reflect and evaluate next steps for instruction based on student performance. Teachers assess for understanding of key concepts. Students assess their abilities and set new goals. Use the data to guide the next cycle of inquiry to teach and meet the individual needs of students.
ELECTIONS TIMELINE

1788-89: The United States presidential election of 1788–89 was the first quadrennial presidential election. It was held from Monday, December 15, 1788, to Saturday, January 10, 1789. It was conducted under the new United States Constitution, which had been ratified earlier in 1788. In the election, George Washington was unanimously elected for the first of his two terms as president, and John Adams became the first vice president.

As it did in 1789, the United States still uses the Electoral College system, established by the U.S. Constitution, which today gives all American citizens over the age of 18 the right to vote for electors, who in turn vote for the president. The president and vice president are the only elected federal officials chosen by the Electoral College instead of by direct popular vote. “Choosing each state’s Electors is a two-part process. First, the political parties in each state choose slates of potential Electors sometime before the general election. Second, on Election Day, the voters in each state select their state’s Electors by casting their ballots for President. The first part of the process is controlled by the political parties in each state and varies from state to state. Generally, the parties either nominate slates of potential Electors at their state party conventions or they chose them by a vote of the party’s central committee. This happens in each state for each party by whatever rules the state party and (sometimes) the national party have for the process. This first part of the process results in each Presidential candidate having their own unique slate of potential Electors. ... The second part of the process happens on Election Day. When the voters in each state cast votes for the Presidential candidate of their choice they are voting to select their state's Electors. The potential Electors' names may or may not appear on the ballot below the name of the Presidential candidates, depending on election procedures and ballot formats in each state. The winning Presidential candidate's slate of potential Electors are appointed as the state’s Electors—except in Nebraska and Maine, which have proportional distribution of the Electors. In Nebraska and Maine, the state winner receives two Electors and the winner of each congressional district (who may be the same as the overall winner or a different candidate) receives one Elector. This system permits the Electors from Nebraska and Maine to be awarded to more than one candidate. Members of the U.S. Congress, though, can’t be electors. Each state is allowed to choose as many electors as it has senators and representatives in Congress. The District of Columbia has 3 electors.”

In France, elections for the President and Parliament take place in two-phase voting. For the presidency, if an absolute majority is not reached after the first ballot, then only the two highest vote getters are considered for the second ballot, which is contested two weeks later.

In Australia it is an offence not to vote in elections. The offender will be fined at least $20. It is regarded as a duty for every citizen and should therefore be compulsory. It may also be regarded as undemocratic to force someone to vote.

Voting Restrictions 1789 - Electors from each state voted for the President. Only 10 of the original 13 states cast electoral votes. Only 6 of the 10 states had any form of popular vote for choosing elections. In any event only white male property owning citizens could vote.
Creating districts to favor certain ideologies (gerrymandering) also operated as a voting restriction. Difficulties in communication (no reliable mass media), poor roads, bridges, and postal service were also barriers to voter participation. Less than 2% of the overall population participated.

Voting Restrictions 2017 – requirements for strict voter ID, restrictions for persons who have previous criminal convictions, restriction on absentee ballots, restrictions on early voting, restrictions on voter registration drives, eliminating Sunday voting and voting on college campuses, making it more difficult for students to register to vote, making it more difficult for members of the general public to register to vote, re-districting (gerrymandering)

1870 – Fifteenth amendment – prohibits restrictions on voting because of race, color or previous condition of servitude

1920 – Women’s suffrage guaranteed at the Federal Level. Canada – 1916. United Kingdom - 1918. France -1944. While the right of women to vote had not been specifically enshrined in the U.S. Constitution prior to the 19th Amendment, it hadn’t been prohibited either. For instance, single women owning property “worth fifty pounds” were allowed to vote in New Jersey between 1776 and 1807 before the right was restricted to white males. In 1838 Kentucky allowed widows with school-age children to vote in school elections, and Kansas followed in 1861. Universal women’s suffrage for all women over the age of 21 was first enacted in Wyoming in 1869.


1957: SCOTUS implements the Civil Rights Act which, among other serious issues, finally enforces the 15th Amendment by establishing the Civil Rights Commission to investigate illegal discriminatory voting practices, giving the 1960’s a forward momentum seen neither before nor since in voter rights.

1960: Another SCOTUS decision with implications today, Gomillion v. Lightfoot which outlawed gerrymandering as a means to manipulate the black population of Tuskegee, Alabama out of voting in city elections. However, the ruling is considered somewhat vague, giving political parties a means by which they continue using gerrymandering as a practice to manipulate voter demographics.

1961: The 23rd Amendment grants voters of the District of Columbia the right to vote in presidential elections.
1964: The 24th Amendment abolishes all poll taxes in the US.

1965: The Voting Rights Act outlawed discriminatory election practices including literacy tests and other means of discriminatory voting behavior on the part of any state, significantly changing the relationship between states and the federal government and was upheld again in 1966 in South Carolina v. Katzenbach as was the illegal use of literacy tests again in Oregon v. Mitchell in 1970.

1971: The 26th Amendment sets the minimum voting age at 18. Prior to this amendment, the minimum age was 21, adding substantial fuel to anti-war protesters protesting the war in Vietnam; “we can die for our country, but we can’t vote.”

“Worrisome developments and voter apathy in the 21st Century have begun to erode many of the accomplishments made in the 20th Century. Gerrymandering is considered not only acceptable, but “essential” in preserving partisanship by the Democrats and GOP.”

SOURCES

Direct Instruction – this short lecture will cover the following:

Why is there a growing need to teach how to evaluate sources, especially web resources?

“Social media platforms such as Facebook have a dramatically different structure than previous media technologies. Content can be relayed among users with no significant third-party filtering, fact-checking, or editorial judgment. An individual user with no track record or reputation can in some cases reach as many readers as Fox News, CNN, or the New York Times.” Allcott, Hunt and Gentzkow, Matthew. Social Media and Fake News in the 2016 Election. Journal of Economic Perspectives, Vol. 31, No. 2, Spring 2017, 211–236. https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.31.2.211

Why is it important? People really believe the unverified stories posted by such individual users – for example in the “PIZZAGATE” incident an enraged citizen showed up to a pizza place, convinced that the business was a front for a child sex ring run by Hillary Clinton based on stories he had read on the internet https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/pizzagate-from-rumor-to-hashtag-to-gunfire-in-dc/2016/12/06/4c7def50-bbd4-11e6-94ac-3d324840106c_story.html?utm_term=.733daff2cd37

While his reaction was extreme, he is not alone in his inability to distinguish between fake news and what is real. In late 2016 NPR reported on a 2015 study from Stanford (https://www.npr.org/sections/thetwo-way/2016/11/23/503129818/study-finds-students-have-dismaying-inability-to-tell-fake-news-from-real), where researchers evaluated students' ability to assess information sources and described the results as "dismaying," "bleak" and "[a] threat to democracy." Some of the findings were -

Most college students didn't suspect potential bias in a tweet from an activist group.
The researchers sent undergraduate students a link to a tweet by MoveOn about gun owners' feelings on background checks, citing a survey by Public Policy Polling.

They asked students to evaluate the tweet and say why it might or might not be a good data source.

More than 30 percent of students thought a fake Fox News account was more trustworthy than the real one.

"Only a few students noted that the tweet was based on a poll conducted by a professional polling firm," which might make it a good source, the researchers wrote.

At the same time, less than a third of students cited the political agenda of MoveOn.org as a reason it might be a flawed source.

And more than half of the students didn't even click on the link within the tweet before evaluating the usefulness of the data.

Most Stanford students couldn't identify the difference between a mainstream and fringe source.
The American Academy of Pediatrics, which publishes the journal Pediatrics, has more than 65,000 members and has been around since 1930.

Less than a third of students thought MoveOn.org has a political agenda that might justify skepticism about its data on gun owners.
The American College of Pediatricians (ACPeds) split from AAP in 2002, over objections to parenting by same-sex couples. ACPeds claims homosexuality is linked to pedophilia. It's classified as a hate group by the Southern Poverty Law Center, which estimates that ACPeds has about 200 members.

In an article in Education Week, Wineburg and his colleague Sarah McGrew explain that they directed Stanford undergrads to articles on both organizations' sites. The students spent up to 10 minutes evaluating them, and were free to click links or Google anything they liked. "More than half concluded that the article from the American College of Pediatricians ... was 'more reliable,' " the researchers wrote. "Even students who preferred the entry from the American Academy of Pediatrics never uncovered the differences between the two groups."

The project began before the recent uproar over the prevalence of fake news online. But its relevance is immediately clear.

Wineburg told NPR on Tuesday that the study demonstrates that U.S. classrooms haven't caught up to the way information is influencing kids daily.

"What we see is a rash of fake news going on that people pass on without thinking," he said. "And we really can't blame young people because we've never taught them to do otherwise."

In fact, as Wineburg and McGrew wrote in Education Week, some schools have filters directing students to valid sources, which doesn't give them practice learning to evaluate sources for themselves. The solution, they write, is to teach students — or, really, all Internet users — to read like fact checkers.

That means not just reading "vertically," on a single page or source, but looking for other sources — as well as not taking "About" pages as evidence of neutrality, and not assuming Google ranks results by reliability.

"The kinds of duties that used to be the responsibility of editors, of librarians, now fall on the shoulders of anyone who uses a screen to become informed about the world," Wineburg told NPR. "And so the response is not to take away these rights from ordinary citizens but to teach them how to thoughtfully engage in information seeking and evaluating in a cacophonous democracy."  

Explain the infographic https://www.whoishostingthis.com/resources/evaluating-web-resources/in accordance with the steps below for evaluating resources as set in the CRAAP test taught earlier in the module
Influence on policy making

SOURCE
Figure 1
Predicted probability of policy adoption (dark lines, left axes) by policy disposition; the distribution of preferences (gray columns, right axes)

Average Citizens' Preferences

Economic Elites' Preferences

Interest Group Alignments
ASSIGNMENTS

1. Oral Presentation 10
2. Research Plan 20
3. Group Outline 20
4. Group Presentation 20
5. Literature Review 20
6. Class Participation 10

ASSESSMENT RUBRIC FOR LITERATURE REVIEW

A

- Central idea correctly identified and clearly explained
- Credible sources selected
- Reasoning in source material broken apart, bases and relationships explained, and biases (if any identified).
- Clear expression used in analysis
- Critical examination of material and ability to connect topic to wider community/national/global issues.
- Little to no spelling and grammar errors

B

- Difficulty identifying or clearly explaining central idea
- Most sources selected are credible
- Reasoning in source material identified and explained, and biases (if any identified).
- Clear expression used in analysis
- Attempt to critically examine material and connect topic to wider community/national/global issues.
- Little to no spelling and grammar errors

C

- Central idea not correctly identified or explained
- Most sources selected are not credible
- Little to no analysis of reasoning in source material or biases
- Poor clarity of expression
- No critical examination of material or attempt to connect topic to wider community/national/global issues.
- Spelling and grammar errors