

## **Part 4: Library: Evaluation framework**

[MUSIC PLAYING]

KAREN FOLEY: We've looked at reflective learning. We've looked at critical thinking. We've looked at how you might go about doing that, and how to impress your tutor in doing so. But we need some frameworks, as we've all acknowledged through the way. So to join me in giving you some frameworks, we have Wendy Chalmers and Nicola Beer from the library. Welcome both. Thank you for coming along.

Oh, I see you two have brought a brain for our session.

WENDY CHALMERS: A cabbage.

KAREN FOLEY: A cabbage. Oh, right, sorry. My mistake.

NICOLA BEER: [INAUDIBLE].

[INTERPOSING VOICES]

KAREN FOLEY: OK, good, because-- yeah, so I'm glad you got the message about healthy eating, which is what we're doing this week.

WENDY CHALMERS: We always bring a cabbage with us.

KAREN FOLEY: Oh, OK.

NICOLA BEER: It's good brain food.

KAREN FOLEY: Yes. Yes. A lot of our students are into all this cabbage spinach. Also I've been having a green smoothie. It's been delicious, actually.

You're both learning and teaching librarians, and you have various interactions with students. And some of our students may have spoken to you on the help desk, for example. And you're also involved in helping produce model materials and various other things at The Open University. But we wanted to come and talk to you today about what to trust. And people have been picking up on this very early on in the session. They've been taking about referencing, they've been talking about Wikipedia. And we'll show you some widgets which we're going to use in the session, but I want to just show you them so that you don't think that there are going to be a lot of them during this one.

We've got one about which is true or false, and we've got one about a continuum poll. So we'll be using those as and when in the session, but they will appear in your widget panel very shortly, if they're not there already.

OK. So what are we going to talk about, and what is all this stuff that you've brought in today?

NICOLA BEER: Well, we're actually going to start by talking about April Fool's jokes.

KAREN FOLEY: Oh, good.

NICOLA BEER: OK? And the reason's because every year, you get a whole load of silly stuff gets put out on April Fools' Day. You know, like all sorts of people, all sorts of organisations, they all get involved in trying to trick us. And firstly, I was aware, I've definitely been caught out a few times. And I was a little bit worried. I was like, am I the only one? I'm sure I'm not the only one.

So we did put a little poll out on Twitter this week to see if anybody else has. And we had almost 70% of the people who responded said that they'd been caught out. So I was like yes, OK, it's not just me. So we had a little look at some examples. And Wendy's actually got a couple of brilliant ones.

WENDY CHALMERS: One of my favourites you may recall seeing BBC Panorama documentary about growing spaghetti crops in Switzerland. This was recorded some time ago, and it covered the spaghetti harvest, the spaghetti bushes. And it was broadcast at a time when spaghetti wasn't perhaps a popular part of our diet. And many people fell for this.

So this is one of my favourites. And one of my colleagues was telling me about, again, a few years ago, Freddie Laker and Laker sky dot. This was published in The Observer. And the plan was that people would be reduced in size to increase the speed of air travel. So they'd be reduced in size and then transmitted by laser beams to their destination. And it may be difficult to believe, but many people did fall for this, as well.

So Nicola said she was happy to be reduced in size, but she would prefer to travel by airplane. So this is our airplane.

NICOLA BEER: Yeah, I thought I'd leave the lasers for later.

KAREN FOLEY: Yeah. [LAUGH]

[INTERPOSING VOICES]

NICOLA BEER: We'll stick with the plane for now. But yeah, so you might be wondering what on Earth this has got to do with all the evaluating. But actually, April Fool's jokes, although they seem now, when you look at them, they seem absurd, and you think how on Earth did anyone ever fall for these things, but actually, they can be really convincing. And if something comes from somewhere that you trust, you're kind of naturally inclined to think, oh, OK, yeah, that's probably true. They're telling me about this thing. Why would they tell me if it wasn't true?

So it is really easy to be misled. And it's not just-- it doesn't just happen once a year on April Fool's Day. And it might not necessarily always be quite so much in the trickery sense, but lots of stuff that you read online, or even some scholarly information, you need to kind of think a little bit carefully about where is this coming from. What are all the sources. Is this really completely true, or do I need to think about bias, that kind of thing. So we wanted to kind of lead on from that into some evaluation frameworks.

KAREN FOLEY: Brilliant. Excellent. We've spoken about some a little earlier. And one that Jeanette was mentioning, because her and I both teach on this science module that has a lot of

these frameworks, the prompt framework in particular, and how useful these can be to students. And so people are really keen to hear about them.

NICOLA BEER: Yes. We're going to come to prompt in particular a little bit later. But first of all, we've got a poll.

WENDY CHALMERS: Yeah. So before we get started to discussing some issues and how we can critically assess some of the sources, there is a poll. And we'd like you to select which of these statements you believe to be true. Hot dogs have been found containing human meat. You can buy selfie shoes into which you can plug your smartphone and use your foot and leg as a selfie stick. Could be interesting. EU bans bendy bananas. And there's a land of stray dogs where dogs roam free.

So we'll come back to these later. But if you can select at the moment.

KAREN FOLEY: We've got the results. People have been going mad for this already. And we've got 58% of people, which is the highest of the score, saying that the EU banned bendy bananas. 26%-- 25% now say that there is a land of stray dogs. Oh, these are going up and down all the time. We're influencing things. Selfie shoes are 16%, and hot dogs contain human meat is 1%, partly I think because we had a bit of a hot dog incident, to be honest with you, in the first week. Sophie brought in a microwave into the studio and started cooking her lunch. So we had a look at what was in hot dogs, and I don't think we found any human meat-

WENDY CHALMERS: Thankfully.

KAREN FOLEY: --as such. So we've already done a bit of prep.

[LAUGHTER]

NICOLA BEER: Little bit of research.

KAREN FOLEY: Yeah.

WENDY CHALMERS: A small sample.

NICOLA BEER: Yes. Now luckily, I can tell you that the hot dogs human meat thing isn't true. It's not true. It's not true. Actually, the one that was true is the land of stray dogs. So there is actually a place in Costa Rica where there's a whole lot of dogs all roaming free. You can go and visit them. You can adopt one if you want to. And they're just running around enjoying their life.

KAREN FOLEY: Oh, how lovely. They'd be perfect for TMA results. Go there and be really happy.

NICOLA BEER: They would, yeah. And but the point of that little poll was kind of to illustrate that you can't really tell with just a little bit of information how-- you know, what is true and what isn't.

KAREN FOLEY: Especially when there's so many ridic-- I mean, today is International Talk like a Pirate Day, for example, which is true. But is anyone talking like a pirate in the chat, Ben?

BEN: Nar.

[LAUGHTER]

KAREN FOLEY: Oh, sorry.

BEN: Not at the moment. Give it some time.

KAREN FOLEY: That was asking for it. Yes. Sorry.

NICOLA BEER: All right. Well, we'll try and be a bit more serious. And we've got a few other examples of things that kind of a little bit not quite right. So this is one of my favourite stories, actually, from last year sometime, I think it was. And this is why we've got a cabbage. This is one of the reasons we've got a cabbage. We're quite cabbage-mad today.

This was a story all about Chinese teenagers who were supposedly taking their cabbages for a walk to help them get over depression. And it looks great. It was a brilliant little story. There was all sorts of quotes in it, supposedly from the teenagers themselves, so saying things like, it was much easier than walking a dog because it didn't bark. So you know, it was a really well taken up story. It was circulated quite widely in all the kind of Western news outlets.

But unfortunately, it's not true. And so it actually turned out that what had happened was there was a performance art piece at a festival in Beijing. And they were walking cabbages as part of that. But it got picked up, circulated around, and the facts were kind of twisted. So that's just one illustration of how even with a photograph, you think you know what's going on, things aren't always necessarily what they seem.

KAREN FOLEY: Interesting.

WENDY CHALMERS: So here's another interesting headline. Dating scams add to 27% increase in fraud. Quite a--

[INTERPOSING VOICES]

WENDY CHALMERS: --attention grabbing headline. But when you actually read the story, there's a quote from a spokesman from the Office of National Statistics saying the rise in fraud has been partially attributed to the change in the way data is collected, which is completely different from what the headline says. So there's no actual evidence for the rise.

So this shows you why it's important to read beyond the headlines. And many good news stories will give you information about the report, so you can access the original report and the statistics, and look at the origin of the statistics.

NICOLA BEER: Yeah. Statistics in particular are one of those things that quite often they get kind of thrown around, they're kind of quoted and then requoted, and everyone's seen them, but no one actually goes and checks, you know, where did this come from? Is this true? And

there's that famous quote, you know, 67% of statistics are made up, which illustrates quite well

KAREN FOLEY: Yeah, yeah, yeah.

NICOLA BEER: And yeah, so it's something that you might have noticed in the EU referendum.

KAREN FOLEY: Or, I guess, taking it completely out of context. Because you can have one statistic, but without knowing how something was actually done, you don't really know what it's saying.

NICOLA BEER: Exactly. Yeah. That was something that you might have noticed with the EU referendum recently. There was quite a lot of that going on. There were statistics quoted kind of all over the place, but actually they were out of context, and they weren't-- didn't necessarily mean what you thought they meant.

WENDY CHALMERS: And Nicola said they're quoted and they're requoted, and people think, well, where does that originate? So back to our theme of cabbages. One statistics which was reported during the EU referendum campaign in social media and newspaper was that there's 26,911 words of EU regulation on the sale of cabbages. Now, more or less, the BBC radio programme actually investigated this. And they found something completely different, that there has only ever been less than 2,000 words of EU regulation. And in fact, there's now zero words on the sale of cabbage. So it just shows how these things are repeated, and they can sometimes become accepted knowledge. So when you do come across statistics, don't take them at face value, and try and go back to the source, if you want to--

KAREN FOLEY: I'm glad they've stopped procrastinating and writing about cabbages when they've got more important things to be doing. Ben, how's everything on the hot desk?

BEN: So it's-- it's--

[BUZZING]

Thank you for the SWOT information you're sending through. Really appreciate it. So the social media desk is going nuts again, surprise surprise, on the media side of things. So Janet May mentioned the media twisted the facts. That's hard to believe. Lorella McDonald is saying, yes, look beyond the headlines. And really there seems to be the element of distrust of the media and how they change things, because they're a business. So, yeah. All agreeing with your points.

KAREN FOLEY: Absolutely. I think that there are some things that are very obvious, and in particular the examples that when Nicola introduced from the library today. But also, just to sort of link this, I guess, with some of the module material, as well, in terms of how having that critical view on things, whilst we're talking about examples that may be a little bit more interesting and funny, there are ways of actually analysing this in terms of things that are printed in your books, which you may believe slightly more than you would, say, something in The Sun, for example.

NICOLA BEER: Yes, absolutely. We've actually got one more example that we wanted to show. And this one kind of illustrates brilliantly how you can use something like an evaluation framework to do kind of a structured assessment of something, and come to the conclusion, you know, is it exactly what it seems, is it not. And this is a much more serious example, which Wendy is going to show us.

KAREN FOLEY: OK.

WENDY CHALMERS: Some more newspaper headlines. I don't know if you can see that from there. Three newspaper headlines. These were published earlier this year. Caused some confusion and controversy. First of all, from The Mail, statins may be a waste of time. From The Times, bad cholesterol helps you live longer. And then a more critical report from The Guardian, don't throw away your statins yet. And these headlines were all based on a study that was published in BMJ Open, which is an open access journal. And it did cause a lot of confusion, and particularly amongst the statin-taking members of the population.

So "NHS Behind the Headlines"-- it looks at an unbiased analysis of health stories. It's quite a good reference point. And it looked at this study, and reported on the study. And just pick a couple of points, it looked at the methodology of the study. And it was critical of the methodology, because it felt like the authors had only selected evidence which was-- suited their needs. So they'd been quite selective about the evidence they'd use in report.

And they also said there might have been a risk of bias, because four of the authors were actually members of I think it was an international group of cholesterol sceptics. So it may be that they had arrived with a preconceived bias. So that's the kind of analysis that is done-- was done by that particular organisation. But it's a type of analysis that students and all of us can apply to information they come across.

NICOLA BEER: Yeah. That particular example is the kind of thing that perhaps if you were doing a web search for a TMA, you know, about high cholesterol or something, that's the kind of information that you might come across. And you can see the NHS did a brilliant job of kind of breaking it all down and properly critically analysing it, coming to a conclusion about it. But at some point, you might need to know how to do that yourself. And that's where the evaluation frameworks really come in.

KAREN FOLEY: Yeah. No, absolutely. I'd like to have a look at those. And in particular, it's really highlighted how-- I mean, Jen was saying, you know, if we can't trust the BBC, who can we trust. So there is this issue, I guess, about how information is being used. What does-- I mean, apart from the cabbages, you know, are people deliberately trying to mislead, or is this just a case of us needing to evaluate things more effectively in terms of how we use that knowledge? Do you know what I mean? In all seriousness.

NICOLA BEER: I think most of the time, it's a case of just needing to have a critical eye to make sure that what you're reading suits your needs, you know, it is going to be decent enough for your TMA. I don't think a lot of people are out there to purposely mislead you. There are cases, particularly kind of like stuff that circulates on social media. Some of that you might find people are trying to mislead because they've got an agenda and they want people to believe certain things. But the stuff that you're likely to come across in your modules, things to help you with your TMAs, they're not likely to be trying to mislead you.

Just need to think about what might they be trying to tell you, and is there perhaps another side to the story.

KAREN FOLEY: That word agenda is such a good one. Jeanette was talking about that when we were looking at how tutors know when you're critically thinking, and how to do that. And how things can be written by someone with a particular perspective, and often be funded by somebody with particular aims.

WENDY CHALMERS: Absolutely.

KAREN FOLEY: Lovely. So what then are some of these frameworks we can look at?

WENDY CHALMERS: Well if we first of all look at-- this is--

WENDY CHALMERS: --the WWW, who, why, when, criteria. And this is a fairly simple framework. And it can be applied to websites. So when you come across a new website, perhaps when you're doing some research, it's who, why, when. And so if we look at this website here, this is the website of the agreement on the conservation of African Eurasian migrating water birds. Could have picked a shorter title.

But first of all, the who, at the bottom, so we can see here it's the United Nations Environment Programme and [? EEW, ?] who are behind this website. And the about, there's normally an about on a website. And that usually tells you the aims of the website-- why it exists, and what you'll find there. And in this case, it's to provide information and to promote protection of these water birds. So that's a fairly simple criteria that you can apply to websites.

NICOLA BEER: Yeah. So that's a really useful, quick one, WWW, especially when you're kind of just surfing the web, just finding quick bits of information. This one, which you've probably heard mentioned before, is PROMPT.

WENDY CHALMERS: So first of all, we have presentation. And you could apply that to a website, talking about how easy it is to navigate the website or the structure. But you could also talk about the clarity of the language, or how well an author communicates their ideas.

And the next criteria is relevance. So that's probably relevance to your needs, so if you're looking for a source for your assignment. So it could be something like is it the right geographical area. You could think about whether it's the right level for you, because different information is written. It could be useful for a PhD student, or it could be relevant or useful to someone doing their school homework. So think about if it's written at the right level.

And then there's the emphasis, as well. So for example, you're looking for something about illegal drugs. And that could be about the crime figures, social cost, or the psychological aspect. So there's different emphasis on an article.

And then we have objectivity. And there, you might look for bias. So is it-- you were talking about agenda earlier. Is it written by a company. Is it trying to promote something. You can look and see whether there are balanced arguments in an article, and whether the arguments

are supported by evidence. So if the evidence is important, or whether it's just an opinion supported by facts.

NICOLA BEER: And then we've got method. So that's when you'd be thinking about the methodology of how a piece of research has been carried out. So if, for example, it's a trial, like a clinical trial or something, then you might want to think about how many participants did it involve, and was it enough really to have conclusive results. Was there a control, that kind of thing.

Provenance. So, where does the information come from. So that's kind of who's the author. Is it someone well-known, in which case you'd think, you know, they've written a lot about this. You can probably trust them. Or is it someone brand-new in the field, or can you not tell who it is at all. It's all things to think about.

And then finally, we've got timeliness. So this one's really useful to kind of, depending on what information you're looking for, you might need to have the most relevant kind of up-to-date stuff. So in science-y kind of topics, for example, you probably want to know that you've got the most current research. So you want to have a look at the dates. But if you're studying the arts or history and you're interested in finding out what was going on 100 years ago, you might want to find a primary source. So something that was actually written at the time 100 years ago would tell you more about it than now. So that's PROMPT.

KAREN FOLEY: Now these are really useful because they make it seem so easy to do. If you've got a framework like this, you can just fill in that table and you can start looking at it. In terms of I guess-- I know you've got more prompts to go through, but just briefly, bringing it back to the idea of critical thinking, where would be the most interesting, juicy bits you'd get out of that PROMPT form that you could then use in your critical thought? I'm pretty sure that's a difficult one without a subject or an area or discipline. But what sorts of aspects from that would really sort of be something that people could talk about?

NICOLA BEER: I think the kind of the agenda and the why. So with the WWW, it's the why. And with PROMPT, kind of the provenance and the objectivity, it's the why is someone telling you this. I think that's the one that really gives you a good idea of what's going on, because once you've got an idea of why someone's trying to tell you a certain piece of information, you-- it sets off alarm bells sometimes, or it reassures you other times. You know, either they're just trying to teach you something, or they're trying to convince you of something, or trying to sell you something. And it really helps, I think, once I know that, to have a better idea of how I feel about a piece of information.

KAREN FOLEY: No. And I guess it's about also being appropriate with that. Like sometimes, you will have someone funding a clinical trial. Sometimes, you will have people who are prolific researchers in a certain field, and so you might think, well, they're obviously trying to do this, which they are. They're trying to develop something. But then sometimes you might read a module chapter and you might then want to think back to the learning outcomes maybe, or thinking again about why you're trying to tell me this story. What are you trying to do here.

Before we talk about the other ones, can I briefly just catch up with Ben. How's it all going there, Ben?

BEN: Good. There's a lot of questions about where Annie is. I can confirm she's actually reshelving the OU library at the moment to house all the 72 books that HJ had in his bag. So-- no wonder it's so heavy.

KAREN FOLEY: I bet he's got a lot of overdue fines, because he is always in the library.

BEN: Boris Johnson's autobiography was in there, as well, so-- good.

KAREN FOLEY: Aw, Annie, come back. We need you here.

BEN: So there's a deluge of information on here. It's quite difficult to keep up at times. But Jane Grithis-- Griffiths, sorry Jane-- had a question on if tutors see feedback or marks from previous modules. Would you be able to shed any light on that one for us?

KAREN FOLEY: Well as a tutor, I can say that we do get a vague idea about what's happened in your previous module. So your tutor will have an idea about what marks you've had before in terms of your overall grades. And if you're doing concurrent modules, they can sometimes see how your marks are going with that.

The useful thing with that from a tutor perspective is, I guess, just to see how people are doing. If you're a level one student, it doesn't necessarily mean that that will transfer to the next module in terms of those grades. And tutors have a really strict criteria with which they need to mark. So that will depend on the module that you're doing, the component that you're being assessed on, et cetera. And we have really tight marking guidelines. So even if we think, aw, this is a-- you know, we don't. But even if you were to think, well, you're bracketing as a level one, two, or three student, or past one, two, or three, whatever, tutors can't actually mark that way, even if they were to know about that.

So yes, they can see your overall feedback in terms of your record, but they can't see the detailed ones. And no, it doesn't influence how they mark you, because we all have to comply with the marking guidelines for that particular module. Does that answer the question, Ben?

BEN: Yeah, I think so.

KAREN FOLEY: Good, good.

BEN: Claire Fleetwood-Smith asked, where do we find correct sources and relevant sources. What are your top tips to track them down?

KAREN FOLEY: Ah, we'll ask the library that. A good question.

WENDY CHALMERS: Well, there is the library. It depends on the area. Top sources, I mean, you're looking-- for academic work, you might be looking at journal articles. And that's where the provenance comes in. Think about your sources. For example, you think something which is published in the British Medical Journal is a good source. And these are-- a lot of these articles are peer-reviewed. So they're reviewed by other experts in the field. So that's a good tip, to look for peer-reviewed articles.

And as I mentioned earlier, if you do find a newspaper report, look at the source of that report. Where did that report go to, and try and go back to that report. And we may be talking about Wikipedia later, but a similar thing-- go back to the references, so the report.

KAREN FOLEY: We've only got 10 minutes before the complete end of the show, and we've got a lot of other bits to get through in the meantime. Were there any other criteria that you wanted to look at?

WENDY CHALMERS: Just like to mention another one. This is CAN-- credibility, agenda, and need. And this could be particularly useful if for social media. Credibility is similar to provenance. So you might be thinking about how much do you know about this person. Is this person using their real name when posting online. So how much do you know about them.

Agenda. Similar to bias, what is the individual's agenda. Why are they posting online. Is it balanced. And then need. Need perhaps I would also relate to relevance. Is it relevant to your own needs, and how much do you need this particular source. So that's another sort of quick evaluation which is quite useful.

And you'll find more about CAN, PROMPT, and other evaluation criteria on the Being Digital site. So that's a collection of short activities. It covers a wide area. It's finding information, referencing, but also trust online. So that'd be a useful place to visit.

KAREN FOLEY: Good. Well this is all well and good and very theoretical, but I believe you have a task for us to do.

NICOLA BEER: We do. We do have a task.

KAREN FOLEY: We like our homework and our assignments.

NICOLA BEER: I feel quite mean making you do something before you've properly started to study, but here we go. This is a page of a website. And what we'd like you to do is have a quick read of it. You don't need to read it too carefully, because there are some hints elsewhere on the page, not in the text. And think about those evaluation frameworks that we were talking about, and decide whether you think this would be a trustworthy source to use in a TMA, and a TMA perhaps on health benefits. And there should be a sliding scale on the screen. So you can plot on where on the screen you think it is between kind of very trustworthy or not trustworthy at all.

KAREN FOLEY: Brilliant. So you're asking people to vote based on this example here, which is just-- this is just a quick exercise.

NICOLA BEER: It is quick.

KAREN FOLEY: So yeah, if you can just base on that continuum poll, where do you think you would position yourself on that scale. And we'll have a look at that.

NICOLA BEER: Just a quick hint.

KAREN FOLEY: A quick hint.

NICOLA BEER: Have a little think about where the information is coming from, how old it is, and what they might be trying to convince you, and use those. That should help you.

KAREN FOLEY: OK, good. So frameworks all the way are the way to look at these things. Excellent.

All right. Now, we'd said at the start-- while we're waiting for the results of that poll, people were asking about Wikipedia. And I'd like to touch on this because it's a commonly used thing. A lot of students use it very sensibly to get information around something they may not understand. But should it come into an assignment, when should one use it, and what are your views on it?

WENDY CHALMERS: Well, it's often the first point of call for everyone-- for myself, for students, for many people. And there are alternative. There's some excellent reference sources in the library, which students can use. Wikipedia, mixed views. There are concerns about the quality of the content. As you were probably aware, anyone could contribute. So there's variation in the level of the material. It can be understood by a school child, or you may need a PhD in the subject to understand.

And there's also variation in the amount written. So it really depends on the popularity of a topic how much is written in it. And it's not always written by the experts. It's written by those who have an interest in it, which may well be the experts, but not always. And it has been subject to vandalism in the past, which is just something to be aware of.

There are guidelines. People are supposed to write from a neutral point of view. There should be no original search. It should be balanced. And everything should be verified by citing references. So that's an important thing, to look at the references.

KAREN FOLEY: But should you ever put it in your TMA?

WENDY CHALMERS: Well, I'll pass over to

[LAUGHTER]

NICOLA BEER: Our view is I think that's going to have to be a no.

KAREN FOLEY: Good.

NICOLA BEER: But, like Wendy said, there are actually plenty of good points about Wikipedia. It can be really useful as a starting point. But the thing is, it is supposed to cite everything that they've used. So what you should really do is, if you find something on Wikipedia-- and there's no harm in using it as a starting point and finding out something useful from it-- but you should then go and have a look at the references and, you know, go to that reference, the one that tells you that little bit of information, and see if you can back it up somewhere else.

So basically, use Wikipedia, by all means, but don't stop with Wikipedia. Make sure that you follow it up and you find it somewhere else.

KAREN FOLEY: Brilliant. Excellent. I quite agree. I hate seeing Wikipedia mentioned in things, because sometimes you think, well, we've explained it really well in the module material. Why aren't you listening to that? But equally, like you say, it can be a good idea to look around.

Would you like to see what our students thought about your poll?

NICOLA BEER: Yes.

KAREN FOLEY: OK. Now, you did prime them and you did say there's a clue here. And I think this has influenced it, because most people have said they think it is a very bad source. The library have brought in a very bad source. We do not approve. Tell us why is it such a bad source.

NICOLA BEER: OK. Let me try and hold it up again. So yes, that's exactly what we were hoping for, is that you'd all think it was a bad source. And the reason why is because when we read it through, actually it's written fairly well, and we think it's probably presented OK. But there are a few things about it that set off a few alarm bells with us.

So the first was where it's come from. So, natural health, your guide to alternative health treatments. So you can see that that's not going to be based on medicine. So you know, that's not to say it might not be valuable information, but we don't know that. It's not going to be mainstream stuff that we're used to.

It does mention a scientific study, but it doesn't tell us what that is. So we're going to have to go and find that out for ourselves if we think we're going to use this. And it's also trying to sell us something. So it's likely that this is going to be persuasive. They'll not have mentioned perhaps some of the bad points.

And it was last updated in 2004, which is ages ago. So if that scientific study was real, it's very, very old. So we definitely would think twice about using this one in a TMA.

KAREN FOLEY: Well I don't think you should buy noni juice. I think you should make homemade green smoothies, personally. Excellent.

WENDY CHALMERS: cabbage juice.

KAREN FOLEY: So what are the take-home tips, then, for people in terms of what to and not to trust? Oh, no. Come on.

[LAUGHTER]

WENDY CHALMERS: Not which specific source, but I think always approach it-- for me, don't take things at face value. Think about some of the evaluation criteria. You might want to, if it was an in-depth study, look at the methodology, or look at the source. Don't necessarily accept a statistic, but think about where did-- question it. Where did that come from. Is it valid. Is it real. Is it true.

NICOLA BEER: Yeah. I think I'm going to reiterate the Wikipedia tip, which is don't stop at Wikipedia. Go and check it out yourself. And because you can apply that to pretty much

anything. Everything that you find, go and check it out yourself. Make sure that it comes from somewhere else.

KAREN FOLEY: Brilliant. Excellent. Thank you so much. So Nicola Beer and Wendy Chalmers, you've been brilliant today. And our students do love talking to you on the help desk, and getting all of the access to the library. And you can find out more from the Resources page about how you can get involved in various online activities with the library. So thank you both very much for coming along today.

Well, that's nearly all we've got time for. We're going to wrap up now. So I'm going to show you some different widgets. And I'd like you to sum up, hopefully, if you can, in three words-- if not, just put an x in the remaining ones-- which three words best describe your experience of today's session. So it would just be really nice for you to say some things that have come to mind about how you find being here today. That's both in terms of the content, and just generally being here.

We'd also like to check our learning outcomes, because you know we like these. So I'd like to know do you think that you now know more about critical thinking, yes or no. Do you feel that you know more about reflective learning, yes or no. And the killer question, are you going to come back next week. I hope you are.

Ben, how's it all going? You've got a sterling job there whilst Annie's been on bag-hunting duty, and now has been commandeered to the library.

KAREN FOLEY: She's probably going to be exchanged for these two now. I hear you've got a bit more filing to do when you get back.

NICOLA BEER: It's all right. Luckily, we don't have very many books, so there's plenty of space on the shelves. Everything's online.

BEN: And Annie's putting you some more up, as well, so excellent. Got a few more selfies to go through quickly.

So Amy has chosen Olaf as her study buddy there.

KAREN FOLEY: Aw.

BEN: Can't escape the cake. Holly's carrot cake with the caramel filling. And we've got Ardie's tech messy desk, which is rivalling HJ's, apparently.

KAREN FOLEY: Oh, I love having messy desk pictures in here, because all of these very organised ones are so intimidating, I find.

BEN: That's Andrea's study space and hardworking cats there.

KAREN FOLEY: Good.

BEN: And then we've got Mike's worried selfie, lonely and aged in Cheltenham.

KAREN FOLEY: Aw.

BEN: You don't look old at all, sir.

KAREN FOLEY: Aw, no, that's true actually. There's such a range of students. And not lonely, as well, because there's all of us here. And I hope that being here online has made it a little bit more of a community, a bit more of a friendly place here. So thanks for sending all those selfies in. Ben, are we going to get things out to people, then, for that?

BEN: We will indeed. So I've chosen--

KAREN FOLEY: And what's the plan?

BEN: Lee is going to win the wild weather one--

KAREN FOLEY: Right.

BEN: --as he's ready for the wild weather. I am going to send the Law one to Lee, because something's a bit fishy. You have to excuse these ridiculous puns.

And then Marilyn's study buddy wins the streets guide, because he might like to have a walk. So, yes. That's that. If you could send us through your details, guys, to the e-mail address, which is [studenthub@open.ac.uk](mailto:studenthub@open.ac.uk), we can get those sent out to you.

KAREN FOLEY: Brilliant. Ben, thank you so much. You have done a sterling job on your own there, albeit with some questionable jokes.

BEN: Yeah.

KAREN FOLEY: But thank you very much. I know everyone has really appreciated that. Let's see how you have experienced today's session with our wordle.

Fun, informative, confident, helpful, satisfying, knowledgeable, educational, enthusiastic, cake, friendly, helpful. OK. Brilliant. Aw, no Annie, no HJ, missing HJ. HJ, you're not supposed to fill in the widgets yourself. Only joking.

Thank you so much. I'm really glad you found it useful, although there has been a considerably less amount of food here. 93% of you say that you now know more about critical thinking, 97% about reflective learning. And I'm really pleased 100% of you are coming back next week. That's brilliant news, because we have a massive programme lined up for you next week. You're going to need cake for this one for sure.

I'd like to thank my guests before I tell you about that, who have been John Butcher, talking about critical thinking. Jeanette Wallace was talking about using critical thought in a TMA. Tyrrell Golding and Steve Harrison were talking about being reflective learners. And Wendy Chambers and Nicola Beer from the library were talking about evaluation frameworks.

So we've got some forums on the website. If you'd like to discuss anything there from this week's session, please, please do. There's also some feedback on the website. It's a very short little form. We'd love to know what you thought of this session, and if you have any ideas or suggestions for improvement. Again, we can be reflective about those.

There's a Count Me In button on the website. And if you give us your email address, we can keep you up to date with when we've got events. You can also email us, [studenthub@open.ac.uk](mailto:studenthub@open.ac.uk). And in fact, if you've sent in a selfie, we will send you out one of our featured merchandise. So do send us your email-- sorry, your postal address, and we'll get that in the post to you, and which one you would prefer.

A hashtag of [studenthublife16](#), so you can keep the conversation going there. And we'll have the chat room open for another half an hour or so. And we'll play you a short video if we can after this session.

Now our next event is on Monday the 26th. And that is all about assessment. That's going to be really amazing. We're going to talk to you about how to find your TMAs, what to do when you've found them, how to submit them. That is going to be really good, especially if you're new to the Open University.

And then we're going to have a summary. In fact, we're going to have a boxing match, because the philosophy department love boxing matches. So we're going to have a boxing match and see who wins in terms of who's learned the most. So that will be loads of fun.

But that's not all, because then we're going into our Student Hub Live freshers fair, which is going to start in the evening. So for those of you who haven't been able to make the evening sessions, I hope you'll join us. We're going to be having quizzes. We're going to be finding out about being a volcanologist with Hazel Rhimer. Then we've got jam-packed programmes on the 27th and 28th. And then for those students who are studying business and law, we have a special induction for you on the 29th.

So I hope you can join for those packed weeks of sessions in the daytime and the evening all week next week. But until then, I will see you on Monday. And that's all from us here at Student Hub Live Keep. Chatting in the chat room for another half an hour, and thank you for being here. And we hope to see you very soon.

[MUSIC PLAYING]