Use the information in the table to determine if the video has credibility according to the criteria in each category. Answer Y or N. At the end of evaluation, the sum of your answers will help determine the level of credibility.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Evaluation</th>
<th>More likely to be credible</th>
<th>Less likely to be credible</th>
<th>Credible based on this category? Y or N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Movie, video or film clip. Focused on story or topic. Central theme present. Clear goal/purpose. Narrative structure. Stereotypes are challenged.</td>
<td>Focus of video not clearly tied to topic. Central theme, goal and purpose not clear. Stereotypes reinforced.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>The audience itself does not define credibility though it should be clear who the intended audience is. Intended audience is clear. Who is intended audience? General viewers, students (elementary, high school, college,</td>
<td>Intended audience not clear or specified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category of Evaluation</td>
<td>More likely to be credible</td>
<td>Less likely to be credible</td>
<td>Credible based on this category? Y or N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy of Video</td>
<td>Information shared is similar to or compliments that found in other types of sources.</td>
<td>Information shared in conflict with that shared in other credible sources on topic.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority of Video</td>
<td>Who published the video? Does the creator list their credentials? Is the creator an expert in this field? Check the domain of the document, what institution published it?</td>
<td>Lack of credentials listed for creator. Creator does not have logical expertise in field. Institution that published video does not give logical credibility to topic.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectivity of Video</td>
<td>What goals/objectives does the video meet? How detailed is the information? What opinions (if any) are expressed?</td>
<td>Goals and objectives of video unclear. Information shared generally with lack of detail on topic. Strong opinions on topic dominate information in video, and those opinions are not clearly expressed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currency of Video</td>
<td>When was it produced? When was it updated?</td>
<td>Video produced more than 5 years ago or in a period of time that is outdated for the topic it covers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coverage of the Video</td>
<td>Is topic covered comprehensively or as overview? Is this part of a series? Is the information presented correctly cited?</td>
<td>Topic is covered superficially or as overview. The video is a single video and not part of a series. The information presented is not properly attributed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usefulness</td>
<td>Information in video relevant to current research project. Supports or refutes an argument. Provides examples (case studies, real-life situations). Provides “wrong” information that can be challenged or disagreed with productively.</td>
<td>Information in video is irrelevant to current research project or purpose of research. Information in video does not support or refute argument of paper/project. No examples provided.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bias</td>
<td>No inherent bias. Bias that exists is presented clearly.</td>
<td>Inherent bias that is not clearly stated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>