## **SMELL Test Evaluation Checklist**

SMELL: S = Source; M = Motivation; E = Evidence; L = Logic; L = Left Out

Using the same checklist to consistently evaluate all of your sources can save time and effort, and help you to compare sources. Downside: You could still miss something important that's not on the checklist. Some sources, like Wikipedia, may pass these initial tests but still may not be acceptable for college level research assignments.

Source being evaluated	Date:
Title:	
Author:	
Location or URL:	

Check with your professor or librarian for advice and guidance. Be skeptical and be critical. You may still have concernsif so, follow those concerns. Look for other clues, ask more pointed questions. For each criteria, answer the questions, and then rank quality on a scale of one to ten.

Allow one plus point for each positive criteria that is included. Subtract the minus points for problems, errors, inconsistencies. Higher score means better quality.

Cuitouio	Plus Points	Minus Points
Criteria	Plus Politis	Willius Politis
<b>Source</b> Who is providing the information?	<ul> <li>□ Author's name is provided</li> <li>□ Author's credentials provided</li> <li>□ Author's relevant experience or education is provided</li> <li>□ Easy to find more information about the author</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>□ No author's name (or organization name)</li> <li>□ No credentials</li> <li>□ Credentials don't match topic, experience is not relevant</li> <li>□ Author not found anywhere else, or negative info found</li> </ul>
Motivation Why are they telling me this?	<ul> <li>☐ Clearly stated, for information only</li> <li>☐ No pressure or encouragement towards a position</li> <li>☐ Not selling anything or any product</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>□ Purpose not clear or misleading</li> <li>□ Strong pressure to get agreement with a position</li> <li>□ Selling a position or product</li> </ul>
Evidence What evidence is provided for claims or generalizations?	<ul> <li>□ Evidence with links, citations, or references</li> <li>□ Evidence matches to claims</li> <li>□ Evidence accessible, easy to follow up on</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>□ No evidence, only claims and assertions or opinions</li> <li>□ Some evidence, but no links, citations, or references</li> <li>□ Some evidence, but doesn't match claim</li> </ul>
Logic  Do the facts logically compel the conclusions?	<ul> <li>□ Data and facts are verifiable, clear, correct</li> <li>□ Facts line up with conclusions</li> <li>□ Explanations and arguments are reasonable and logical</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>□ Data used is unclear or misleading</li> <li>□ Circular reasoning, "everybody knows" or facts unrelated to claim</li> <li>□ Appeals to emotion, direct or implied attacks, insults, slurs, blaming</li> </ul>
Left out What's missing that might change our interpretation of the information?	<ul> <li>□ Incompatible data is acknowledged</li> <li>□ Other explanations are considered</li> <li>□ Diverse perspectives are included</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>□ Incompatible data ignored or misused</li> <li>□ Absolute positions, right/wrong</li> <li>□ Diverse perspective excluded, not considered</li> </ul>
Subtotals	Plus Points Total	Minus Points Total