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STANDARDS:

* [CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.W.11-12.1.A](http://www.corestandards.org/ELA-Literacy/W/11-12/1/a/)  
  **Introduce precise, knowledgeable claim(s), establish the significance of the claim(s),** distinguish the claim(s) from alternate or opposing claims, and create an organization that logically sequences claim(s), counterclaims, reasons, and evidence.

* [CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.W.11-12.1.B](http://www.corestandards.org/ELA-Literacy/W/11-12/1/b/)  
  Develop claim(s) and counterclaims fairly and thoroughly, **supplying the most relevant evidence** for each while pointing out the strengths and limitations of both in a manner that anticipates the audience's knowledge level, concerns, values, and possible biases.

OBJECTIVES:

* I will research and *evaluate* **credible** sources to develop/refine my claim/thesis statement.
* I will create an **annotated bibliography** to document the source material (evidence).

**PART 1: RESEARCHING CREDIBLE SOURCES**

Your goal as a researcher is to establish **ethos** in your writing by using *credible* sources. Use the CRAAP test to determine whether a source is credible.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| CURRENCY | When was the material written/published?  Has the info been updated? Is the info out of date for your topic?  Are the links functional? |
| RELEVANCE | Is the info relevant to your research? To what extent does it answer your research question?  Who is the intended audience?  Is the info at an appropriate level? |
| AUTHORITY | Is the author a person, company, or organization?  Can you determine if the author is an expert on the topic?  Is the contact information included?  Does the URL reveal anything? |
| ACCURACY | Does the info seem accurate?  Is the info supported by evidence?  Can you verify the information? Has the info been peer-reviewed?  Does the language seem unbiased?  Are there spelling, grammatical, or other typographical errors? |
| PURPOSE | Is the purpose to inform? Teach? Sell? Entertain? Persuade?  Do the authors make their intentions clear?  Is the point of view objective and impartial?  Are there obvious biases?  Who is the intended audience? |

Now, look at a model using the CRAAP test to determine credibility for articles related to gun control:

SOURCE:<https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=j6cMYKRgqQ8C&oi=fnd&pg=PR5&dq=gun+control+2010&ots=_4cWU9W1iX&sig=38y_v8Pia3_X3G7Y8sZS_F3hy00#v=onepage&q=gun%20control%202010&f=false>

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| CURRENCY | *2010, links are functional* |
| RELEVANCE | *Relevant to research, somewhat answers research question* |
| AUTHORITY | *Economist, political commentator* |
| ACCURACY | *Supported by evidence, peer reviewed* |
| PURPOSE | *Persuade, so there is bias* |

* **Is it credible? Why or why not?** It is credible as an “expert” opinion piece, but there are more updated articles written since 2010, which may have less bias.

Now use the CRAAP test to determine credibility for (5) sources related to your topic.

SOURCE 1:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| CURRENCY |  |
| RELEVANCE |  |
| AUTHORITY |  |
| ACCURACY |  |
| PURPOSE |  |

* CONCLUSION – CREDIBLE OR NOT?

SOURCE 2:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| CURRENCY |  |
| RELEVANCE |  |
| AUTHORITY |  |
| ACCURACY |  |
| PURPOSE |  |

* CONCLUSION – CREDIBLE OR NOT?

SOURCE 3:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| CURRENCY |  |
| RELEVANCE |  |
| AUTHORITY |  |
| ACCURACY |  |
| PURPOSE |  |

* CONCLUSION – CREDIBLE OR NOT?

SOURCE 4:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| CURRENCY |  |
| RELEVANCE |  |
| AUTHORITY |  |
| ACCURACY |  |
| PURPOSE |  |

* CONCLUSION – CREDIBLE OR NOT?

SOURCE 5:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| CURRENCY |  |
| RELEVANCE |  |
| AUTHORITY |  |
| ACCURACY |  |
| PURPOSE |  |

* CONCLUSION – CREDIBLE OR NOT?

**PART 2: CREATING A RESEARCH FOCUS**

After you have evaluated your research SOURCES, confirm your research question is *researchable* and *debatable*, and type it below. Your question MUST be researchable and debatable. If you’re having trouble adjusting the scope of your question (too broad or too narrow), consult this resource:

* TOPIC:
* RESEARCH QUESTION:
* CLAIM (your response to the question):

Create a **Rogerian argument** with your CLAIM:

* SUPPORT:
* REFUTE:
* QUALIFY:
* REFLECT: How did your CLAIM change as a result of the Rogerian argument?

**PART 3: ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY**

SOURCE 1 (link):

* SUMMARY:
* EVALUATION (CRAAP test):
* APPLICATION/REFLECTION (how do you plan to use it?)

SOURCE 2:

* SUMMARY:
* EVALUATION (CRAAP test):
* APPLICATION/REFLECTION (how do you plan to use it?)

SOURCE 3:

* SUMMARY:
* EVALUATION (CRAAP test):
* APPLICATION/REFLECTION (how do you plan to use it?)

SOURCE 4:

* SUMMARY:
* EVALUATION (CRAAP test):
* APPLICATION/REFLECTION (how do you plan to use it?)

SOURCE 5:

* SUMMARY:
* EVALUATION (CRAAP test):
* APPLICATION/REFLECTION (how do you plan to use it?)

*Keep going! Copy/paste this frame as you add sources.*

SOURCE :

* SUMMARY:
* EVALUATION (CRAAP test):
* APPLICATION/REFLECTION (how do you plan to use it?)

**Now, continue your research by adding to your *annotated bibliography.***

***Copy /paste Part 3 into a new document. Title the file “ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY” and share it with me with 5 new entries by WEDNESDAY 2/17 11:59 PM. ETIC for entries before 2/17 12:00 am.***