

LWTech Library: Video Evaluation Matrix (Updated Winter 2020)

Questions or comments? Email library@lwtech.edu

Table 1 describing personal information, research question, and video information

Your name:	
Date:	
Your class:	
Research question:	
Video title/URL/Citation:	

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 2 - describing criteria to evaluate video

Category of Evaluation	More likely to be credible	Less likely to be credible	Credible based on this category? Y or N
Purpose of Video	Inform – teach a skill, overview of event or issue. Share information, methods, directions.	Advertise - product or service. Influence - beliefs, elections. Personal enjoyment - promote personal hobbies or interests. Share information – fandom, familial news.	
Sponsor	Government agency - share official information, .gov. Educational: school, college, university - .edu. Association - .org - if sharing information	Business, .com (often promote goods or services). News bureau, .com – news reports, stories, interviews. Personal – individual. Association - .org - if trying to recruit members	
Content	Movie, video or film clip. Focused on story or topic. Central theme present. Clear goal/purpose. Narrative structure. Stereotypes are challenged.	Focus of video not clearly tied to topic. Central theme, goal and purpose not clear. Stereotypes reinforced.	
Audience	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,	Intended audience not clear or specified	

Category of Evaluation	More likely to be credible	Less likely to be credible	Credible based on this category? Y or N
	graduate), specialists or professionals, researchers or scholars?		
Audio/Visual Qualities	Well-designed video. Adequate lighting. Frame continuous. Visual aspects clear in intent, relevant and professional looking. Audio clear and understandable. Absence of background noise. Video has captions.	Design of video not professional. Issues may include: poor lighting, jumps in frame, poor audio, background noise present. Video does not contain closed captioning.	
Accuracy of Video	Information shared is similar to or compliments that found in other types of sources.	Information shared in conflict with that shared in other credible sources on topic.	
Authority of Video	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?	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.	
Objectivity of Video	What goals/objectives does the video meet? How detailed is the information? What opinions (if any) are expressed?	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.	
Currency of Video	When was it produced? When was it updated?	Video produced more than 5 years ago or in a period of time that is outdated for the topic it covers.	
Coverage of the Video	Is topic covered comprehensively or as overview? Is this part of a series? Is the information presented correctly cited?	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.	
Usefulness	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.	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.	
Context	Video provides: Who, What, When, Where, Why.	Video does not identify who, what, when, where, or why of information.	
Bias	No inherent bias. Bias that exists is presented clearly.	Inherent bias that is not clearly stated.	

Source: Colorado State University Libraries. "How to do library research: How to evaluate a movie, video or flip clip." CSU Libraries, <https://libguides.colostate.edu/howtodo>.