**Web Site Evaluation**

| Name: Michelle Pozen |
| --- |
| Course:CIS 101 |
| Instructor: Kayode Jowosimi |
| Web Site Title: Climate & Ocean- Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution |
| Web URL:https://www.whoi.edu/know-your-ocean/ocean-topics/climate-ocean/ |
| Date Visited: 9/8/2021 |
| Brief description of the contents of the site:  An educational writeup about the ocean’s role in the Earth’s climate change and weather patterns. |

| **Criteria and types of evidence** | **How the Web site being evaluated met the criterion** | **Rating** | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **1**  **(low)** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5 (high)** |
| 1. Authority with regard to topic—who is responsible for the site?:   * Author of site (individual/institutional affiliation, organization * Credentials, expertise, experience * Contact information (name, e-mail, postal address) * URL type suggest reputable affiliation (.edu=educational institution; .org=non-profit organization; .com=commercial enterprise; .net=Internet Service Provider; .gov=governmental body; .mil=military) | Institution is reputable and has existed for decades. Organization membership is transparent and up-to-date.  Contact info is shown.  URL is .edu. |  |  |  |  | X |
| 2. Objectivity—is the purpose of the site clear, including any particular viewpoint?   * Statement of purpose/scope * Intended audience * Information presented as factual or opinion, primary or secondary in origin * Criteria for inclusion of information * Disclosure of sponsorship or underwriting | Intended audience is general audiences.Source is primary, this is a research organization and cites itself.  Industry partners, vendors and contractors can apply on their website but are not disclosed as far as I can see. |  |  |  | X |  |

| **Criteria and Types of Evidence** | **Web Site Evidence** | **Rating** | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | 1  (low) | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 (high) |
| 3. Accuracy—is the information accurate?   * Facts documented or well-researched * Facts compare to related print or other online sources * Links provided to quality Web resources | Again, citations are of themselves, but facts are well-researched. They are a primary source. Info does not contradict what could be found in other reputable sources online. |  |  |  |  | X |
| 4. Currency—is the information current?   * Evidence of current content * Pages date-stamped with latest update | Information is from Fall 2019 issue of Oceanus. |  |  |  | X |  |
| 5. Usability:—is the site well-designed and stable?   * Site organization logical and easy to maneuver * Content readable by intended audience * Information presented is error-free (spelling, punctuation) * Readily identifiable link back to the institutional or organizational home page * Site reliably accessible * Pages loaded quickly | Without Javascript on, top of main text is not visible. Intended audience probably isn’t blocking Javascript. |  |  |  |  | X |
| **Sub-Total** by rating of points awarded for each of the five criteria |  |  |  |  |  |  |

| **Assessment of Web Site** | |
| --- | --- |
| **Rating** based on the total number of points:  5-9 points: poor  10-14 points: fair  15-19 points: good  20-25 points: excellent \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_23\_\_\_\_ | **Your personal assessment**—would you recommend this site? Why or why not?  Sure, why not! They’re a well-established and reputable research organization. |
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