We revised the measurable objectives.

**Revised Measurable Objectives**
1. Students will develop criteria to evaluate websites.
2. Students will rank and discuss the value of evaluation criteria based on research needs or scenarios.
3. Students will evaluate websites to determine their credibility and usefulness based on a set of criteria such as currency, relevance, authority, accuracy, and purpose.
4. Students will apply criteria to select websites appropriate for college-level assignments.
   [add something about recognizing the need to evaluate sources if we need 5 objectives to get noncredit approval through EDC]

**Decisions**
- Use one topic throughout the entire workshop
- Want it more structured
- Having one website comparison table immediately followed by another does not work well. Break these apart or do fewer.
- Don’t use too many questions in the table
- We like the criteria ranking activities
- John Locke example isn’t relatable. Need another topic.
- We want students to develop the criteria.
- Students think dualistically. We need to help them think more critically.
- Want to emphasize positive/good examples of websites.
- We still believe in the workshop program teaching strategy of not covering too much and breaking the workshop into manageable chunks in order to maximize retention of concepts.

We brainstormed ideas, discussed teaching philosophies (e.g., should we only cover positive examples? Should we critique bad examples?), and developed the following structure for the workshop.

**Proposed Structure**
1. Talk - this is where we start the criteria development activity. Ask, “How do you evaluate websites? What do you look for when evaluating information?”
2. Develop criteria in small groups. Have students share out their criteria, write on the board, group them, and then use our labels like “currency,” “authority,” etc. Emphasize that domain is a factor, but not the only factor.
3. Domain searching and using the domain as part of the evaluation process.
4. Introduce the research scenario
5. Evaluate a super good website. Lead them through applying the criteria to this website. Use a website that is the equivalent of “goodness” as the John Locke equivalent.

6. Rank criteria based on the website from #4.

7. Rank criteria based on other scenarios -- situations not necessarily academic.

8. Re-rank the criteria based on a given academic research assignment.

9. Evaluate one good website -- not great is ok. Apply the criteria that are most important to the scenario.

10. Summarize criteria and review domain searching

11. Find a great website in small groups.

12. Class votes on the best website. The winners get a dried-out highlighter. [Cut this part out if we run out of time.]

Next Steps
Pauline and Nora will revise the workshop based on the discussion. The revised workshop will most likely be ready to test in Fall. NOTE: We will probably want some input from workshop instructors throughout the development process.

Other
Pauline shared an idea for starting a monthly instruction “brown bag.” Anyone interested can meet to discuss and share anything related to instruction. Pauline will be sending an email about that soon.

Nora and I met after the meeting. We had a few more ideas.

Follow up ideas:

More team challenges? Ask Hong if she wants to help think of ideas.

Experiment -- Hong and Nora (or anyone interested) will swap the good website in step #9 with a bad website. Use the discussion to explain that most websites are not super good or super bad, but fall somewhere in between. You need to determine if it’s good enough for your situation. If your situation is that you’re writing a college research assignment, it needs to be pretty good. Lean more toward good. And what does “good” mean?