# Step 2 - Evaluation of Current Event

Directions: Complete Section 1 to practice identifying the claim, evidence, and analysis in several paragraphs. Apply what you learn in Section 2 and identify the claim, evidence, and analysis in your selected article.

**Section 1: Practice - Identifying Claim, Evidence, Analysis**

Directions: Read the paragraphs below. For each paragraph, identify the Claim, Evidence, and Analysis. Copy a quote from the article for each, but summarize it in your own words.

## Example:

Televisions are not living things. In our observations, we saw that televisions did not reproduce or grow. We also discovered that televisions are not made of cells. In order for something to be alive, it must show all five characteristics of living things. Televisions can use energy and they show movement on the screen; however, they cannot grow or reproduce and they are not made of cells. Therefore, our observations show that televisions are not living things.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Summary | Quote from Article |
| Claim | Televisions are not alive. | “Televisions are not living things.” |
| Evidence | Televisions don’t grow or make baby televisions and are not made of cells. | “In our observations, we saw that televisions did not reproduce or grow. We also discovered that televisions are not made of cells.” |
| Analysis | Televisions don’t show all five characteristics of a living thing. | “In order for something to be alive, it must show all five characteristics of living things. Televisions can use energy and they show movement on the screen; however, they cannot grow or reproduce and they are not made of cells.” |

## Paragraph 1:

Rain is beneficial for the environment. From daily observations, I see that plants need water to grow and survive. Plants grew higher when they had access to water. Healthier plants also lead to healthier ecosystems because plants produce the oxygen that animals need to survive. Since rain helps plants, which are part of the environment, rain is good for the environment.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Summary | Quote from Article |
| Claim |  |  |
| Evidence |  |  |
| Analysis |  |  |

## Paragraph 2:

A deadly new disease has emerged that is wiping out amphibians. A number of viruses have been found in northern Spain that are killing frog, toad and newt species. Infected animals can suffer from ulcers on their skin and die from internal bleeding. Lead author Dr Stephen Price, from University College London, said: "Until the outbreaks, we didn't really know about this lineage of virus.” Two of the viruses, called CMTV-like Ranaviruses, were infecting large numbers of animals. What is unusual is that they can jump between a range of species, killing off frogs, toads and newts. The researchers believe the virus can even spread to reptiles. "We recorded a snake that had been feeding on amphibians infected with disease, and it showed signs of the virus," said Dr Price. Conservationists are especially worried about these new viruses because 41% of all amphibians already face extinction, according to the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN). Scientists fear that if the new viruses spread, they could have a devastating effect on these already vulnerable animals.

Source: BBC Science News

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Summary | Quote from Article |
| Claim |  |  |
| Evidence |  |  |
| Analysis |  |  |

## Paragraph 3:

The impala – an African antelope – eats grasses and trees and is itself eaten by wild dogs and leopards. Impala often munch on a tree called the acacia. Some acacia have thorns, and some don’t. The researchers found that the impala – perhaps not surprisingly – prefer thorn-free acacia. Also, the animals avoid woody areas where predators are more likely to hide. And as a result, the thorn-free, vulnerable acacia are more plentiful in woody areas with plenty of predators. But the thorny acacia are more numerous on the open savannah, where they need to defend themselves. The study is in the journal Science. The researchers say their findings show that both plant defenses and carnivorous predators help plants thrive. They also say that when humans influence – in part by eliminating large predators – we disrupt longstanding, complex systems. And that we should really try to better understand such systems, and our effects on them.

Source: Scientific American

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Summary | Quote from Article |
| Claim |  |  |
| Evidence |  |  |
| Analysis |  |  |

# Section 2 - Evaluation of your Current Event

Directions: Complete the tables below based on the current event article that you chose for your project. A sample for a trustworthy article can be found here. A sample for an untrustworthy article can be found here.

Website of Article:

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

## Part A-Identifying Claim, Evidence, Analysis

For Part A, summarize the author’s claim, evidence, and analysis in the argument and add a quote from the article that shows the claim, evidence, and analysis.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Summary | Quote from Article |
| Claim |  |  |
| Evidence |  |  |
| Analysis |  |  |

## Part B-Is the evidence trustworthy?

For Part B, answer questions about the evidence in your article to determine if the evidence is trustworthy.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Who made the discovery? What college/university or organization did they come from? |  |
| How was the evidence collected (experiment, survey, studying specimens, etc)? |  |
| What data or statistics were included about the topic? |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Is there evidence that is missing? Are there gaps in the experiment? |  |
| Use the answers in the questions above to answer the question: **Is the evidence trustworthy?** |  |

*For a Level 6: What other research has been done on this topic? Does this research agree with the conclusion of this article?*

## Part C-Is the analysis trustworthy?

For Part C, answer questions about the analysis in your article to determine if the analysis is trustworthy.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| What is the author’s analysis? |  |
| Does the analysis make sense? Is it logical? |  |
| How does s/he explain that the evidence supports the claim? |  |
| Are there any mistakes in their reasoning or false reasoning? |  |
| Use the answers in the questions above to answer the question: **Is the analysis trustworthy?** |  |