# Research and Source Evaluation Close Reading Worksheet - Review Reading Progress

Research and Source Evaluation | Review Reading Progress | Asset ID BOOK-20-02-10

**Purpose: This original printable close reading worksheet helps readers, book clubs, students, families and independent writers work with research and source evaluation while pursuing one defined outcome: use records to choose the next reading goal. Its method is to locate, quote minimally, paraphrase and explain the relevance in original words. Use the pages as a working record, not as a substitute for the source text, edition details and qualified educational or rights guidance where those are needed.**

## Resource Map

The subject focus is to judge a book's source trail, authority and limits before relying on it. The six working areas below define the scope for this specific resource. Complete only the rows that matter to the present reading session, and date any observation that may change.

| # | Working area | Current evidence | Next check |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Author Expertise | Known / estimated / not checked | _____ |
| 2 | Publisher Context | Known / estimated / not checked | _____ |
| 3 | Citation Quality | Known / estimated / not checked | _____ |
| 4 | Date And Edition | Known / estimated / not checked | _____ |
| 5 | Corroboration | Known / estimated / not checked | _____ |
| 6 | Scope Limit | Known / estimated / not checked | _____ |

### Learning and Adaptation Starting Brief

- Gather: Which evidence separates author expertise from publisher context in this case? Gather enough records to review the work fairly.
- Align: How does citation quality change the interpretation of date and edition? Align dates, conditions and measures before comparison.
- Detect: What boundary on corroboration must be checked before relying on scope limit? Detect a repeated strength, gap or turning point.
- Explain: Which observation links publisher context to corroboration, and what remains uncertain? Explain the pattern without hiding contradictory evidence.
- Prioritise: What alternative explanation could account for both date and edition and author expertise? Prioritise one adjustment with the highest useful value.
- Edition success means: select one evidence-based adjustment for the next cycle

## Close Reading Worksheet

This format is designed to capture selective observations before forming an interpretation. For research and source evaluation, apply the method in a deliberate sequence: locate, quote minimally, paraphrase and explain the relevance in original words. The edition target is review reading progress, so each entry should show what was noticed, what was tried and what changed.

| Working step | What to record | Evidence or source | Status |
|---|---|---|---|
| Gather Author Expertise | Which evidence separates author expertise from publisher context in this case? | Review set / date | Open / checked |
| Align Publisher Context | How does citation quality change the interpretation of date and edition? | Comparable record / date | Open / checked |
| Detect Citation Quality | What boundary on corroboration must be checked before relying on scope limit? | Learning pattern / date | Open / checked |
| Explain Date And Edition | Which observation links publisher context to corroboration, and what remains uncertain? | Bounded explanation / date | Open / checked |
| Prioritise Corroboration | What alternative explanation could account for both date and edition and author expertise? | Next priority / date | Open / checked |
| Schedule Scope Limit | What next check on scope limit would make the record about citation quality more useful? | Review date / date | Open / checked |

### Completion Standard

- Keep the work tied to research and source evaluation, not to a vague general intention.
- Apply this adjustment: compare planned sessions, completed sessions and retained learning
- Which single adjustment is best supported by the complete review record?
- Expose this outcome risk if it appears: noise is mistaken for a pattern.
- Use original notes and explanations; quote only when necessary, lawful and properly attributed.
- Ask a reader, educator, librarian, editor or rights adviser to challenge one material assumption where appropriate.
- Close with one decision and one follow-up rather than an unranked list of ideas.

### Working Note

Edition BOOK-20-02-10 pairs close reading worksheet with the outcome 'Review Reading Progress'. That pairing is the boundary for this workbook: material that does not help that outcome belongs in a separate record.

## Evidence x Learning and Adaptation Focused Practice Lab

This lab pairs a evidence method with a learning and adaptation outcome lens. Work through the six actions to turn the subject focus - judge a book's source trail, authority and limits before relying on it - into evidence for review reading progress. Preserve any gap that prevents a supported conclusion.

| # | Action | Constraint | Record |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Collect / Gather corroboration | Which evidence separates author expertise from publisher context in this case? Gather enough records to review the work fairly. | Evidence list / Review set |
| 2 | Classify / Align scope limit | How does citation quality change the interpretation of date and edition? Align dates, conditions and measures before comparison. | Source / Comparable record |
| 3 | Trace / Detect author expertise | What boundary on corroboration must be checked before relying on scope limit? Detect a repeated strength, gap or turning point. | Trace / Learning pattern |
| 4 | Verify / Explain publisher context | Which observation links publisher context to corroboration, and what remains uncertain? Explain the pattern without hiding contradictory evidence. | Verification / Bounded explanation |
| 5 | Reconcile / Prioritise citation quality | What alternative explanation could account for both date and edition and author expertise? Prioritise one adjustment with the highest useful value. | Exception / Next priority |
| 6 | Approve / Schedule date and edition | What next check on scope limit would make the record about citation quality more useful? Schedule the next check and preserve the review trail. | Sign-off / Review date |

### Common Failure Modes

- For corroboration, watch for the source has no date together with the review set is selective.
- For scope limit, watch for the evidence is second-hand together with unlike records are compared.
- For author expertise, watch for two records disagree together with noise is mistaken for a pattern.
- For publisher context, watch for a value lacks units together with contradictory evidence is omitted.
- For citation quality, watch for the context has changed together with too many adjustments are prioritised.

### Independent Review Question

Format question: Which source is strongest for this decision, and what limitation remains? Outcome question: Which single adjustment is best supported by the complete review record? Ask a reader, educator, librarian, editor or rights adviser where appropriate, then answer before the next reading session: _____

## Reading Session Plan for Review Reading Progress

Use one defined reading session to test the outcome rather than attempting every possible task. This edition pairs evidence with learning and adaptation to pursue this objective: use records to choose the next reading goal. Preserve the starting condition and both evidence trails.

| Plan field | Entry |
|---|---|
| Purpose | Review Reading Progress |
| Starting condition | _____ |
| Chosen working area | _____ |
| Bounded explanation | compare planned sessions, completed sessions and retained learning |
| Evidence to capture | _____ |
| Stop or review condition | _____ |

### Thirty Minute Reading Shape

| Stage | Action | Evidence |
|---|---|---|
| 0-5 min | Which evidence separates author expertise from publisher context in this case? Identify the evidence required. | Evidence list / Review set |
| 5-10 min | How does citation quality change the interpretation of date and edition? Collect one traceable record. | Source / Comparable record |
| 10-18 min | What boundary on corroboration must be checked before relying on scope limit? Label its date, owner and context. | Trace / Learning pattern |
| 18-24 min | Which observation links publisher context to corroboration, and what remains uncertain? Cross-check the material independently. | Verification / Bounded explanation |
| 24-27 min | What alternative explanation could account for both date and edition and author expertise? Resolve or expose one gap. | Exception / Next priority |
| 27-30 min | What next check on scope limit would make the record about citation quality more useful? Record the supported conclusion. | Sign-off / Review date |

### Evidence Record Log

| Evidence Record | Condition | Observation | Decision |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Same / changed | _____ | Keep / change / check |
| 2 | Same / changed | _____ | Keep / change / check |
| 3 | Same / changed | _____ | Keep / change / check |
| 4 | Same / changed | _____ | Keep / change / check |
| 5 | Same / changed | _____ | Keep / change / check |

## Source and Evidence Reconciliation - Learning and Adaptation Lens

This comparison tests research and source evaluation against review reading progress through two independent questions. Format: Which source is strongest for this decision, and what limitation remains? Outcome: Which single adjustment is best supported by the complete review record? Record material setting differences instead of averaging them away.

| Evidence area | Baseline | Alternative | Interpretation prompt |
|---|---|---|---|
| Citation Quality | _____ | _____ | Which evidence separates author expertise from publisher context in this case? |
| Date And Edition | _____ | _____ | How does citation quality change the interpretation of date and edition? |
| Corroboration | _____ | _____ | What boundary on corroboration must be checked before relying on scope limit? |
| Scope Limit | _____ | _____ | Which observation links publisher context to corroboration, and what remains uncertain? |
| Author Expertise | _____ | _____ | What alternative explanation could account for both date and edition and author expertise? |
| Publisher Context | _____ | _____ | What next check on scope limit would make the record about citation quality more useful? |

### Format Decision Test

| Field | Record |
|---|---|
| Review question | Which source is strongest for this decision, and what limitation remains? |
| Outcome question | Which single adjustment is best supported by the complete review record? |
| Acceptance lens | select one evidence-based adjustment for the next cycle |
| Conditions held steady | _____ |
| Evidence supporting the choice | _____ |
| Evidence against the choice | _____ |

### Evidence Confidence Check

- Review set: what was actually seen, heard, measured or read?
- Format evidence: which record best demonstrates exceptions resolved?
- Outcome evidence: which record best demonstrates patterns detected?
- Challenge: could noise is mistaken for a pattern explain the result?
- Subject boundary: what does this comparison leave unresolved about author expertise?

## Evidence x Learning and Adaptation Scenario Cards

Use these paired scenarios to rehearse judgement for review reading progress. Each card joins a evidence failure mode to an outcome-specific risk. State what remains open and which evidence named in the final column should be collected next.

| # | Situation | Review question | Decision |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Author Expertise: the context has changed. | Which evidence separates author expertise from publisher context in this case? | Review set |
| 2 | Publisher Context: approval is missing. | How does citation quality change the interpretation of date and edition? | Comparable record |
| 3 | Citation Quality: the source has no date. | What boundary on corroboration must be checked before relying on scope limit? | Learning pattern |
| 4 | Date And Edition: the evidence is second-hand. | Which observation links publisher context to corroboration, and what remains uncertain? | Bounded explanation |
| 5 | Corroboration: two records disagree. | What alternative explanation could account for both date and edition and author expertise? | Next priority |
| 6 | Scope Limit: a value lacks units. | What next check on scope limit would make the record about citation quality more useful? | Review date |

### Decision Record

| Field | Notes |
|---|---|
| Chosen format scenario | _____ |
| Outcome lens | Which single adjustment is best supported by the complete review record? |
| Evidence available | _____ |
| Evidence missing | _____ |
| Controlled next step | _____ |
| Person / review date | _____ |

## Eight Evidence and Learning and Adaptation Evidence Tracker

Track review reading progress across eight reading sessions using the evidence method and the learning and adaptation outcome lens. Keep conditions visible and use this review question: Which single adjustment is best supported by the complete review record?

| # | Focus | Condition | Result | Next action |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Date And Edition | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 2 | Corroboration | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 3 | Scope Limit | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 4 | Author Expertise | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 5 | Publisher Context | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 6 | Citation Quality | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 7 | Date And Edition | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 8 | Corroboration | _____ | _____ | _____ |

### Evidence Evidence Dashboard

| Measure | Baseline | Current | Evidence location |
|---|---|---|---|
| Author Expertise: Sources Identified / Records Gathered | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Publisher Context: Dates Captured / Conditions Aligned | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Citation Quality: Records Traced / Patterns Detected | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Date And Edition: Cross-Checks Completed / Explanations Qualified | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Corroboration: Exceptions Resolved / Adjustments Prioritised | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Scope Limit: Conclusions Supported / Reviews Scheduled | _____ | _____ | _____ |

### Interpret the Trend

- I included evidence that challenged the most convenient explanation.
- I selected one next adjustment and scheduled when it will be reviewed.
- Keep the method only when the evidence for review reading progress improves without hiding noise is mistaken for a pattern.
- What alternative explanation could account for both date and edition and author expertise?
- Use a reader, educator, librarian, editor or rights adviser when the evidence crosses a safety, rights, health or authority boundary.

## Evidence x Learning and Adaptation Next Step Plan

Finish by turning the paired format and outcome record into one owned action. For this close reading worksheet, the intended result was review reading progress; the outcome test is: Which single adjustment is best supported by the complete review record? The close-out standard remains: select one evidence-based adjustment for the next cycle.

| Close-out field | Record |
|---|---|
| Most useful evidence | _____ |
| Important limitation | _____ |
| Decision | Keep / adapt / pause / seek review |
| Next action | _____ |
| Owner and date | _____ |
| Evidence location | _____ |

### Completion Review

- Subject check: Which evidence separates author expertise from publisher context in this case?
- Subject check: How does citation quality change the interpretation of date and edition?
- Format check: I linked each conclusion to a dated, traceable source.
- Outcome check: I included evidence that challenged the most convenient explanation.
- I used only brief necessary quotations and attributed them appropriately.
- I kept summary, interpretation and the source author's expression clearly separate.

### Originality and Responsible Use

Original independent resource. This reading, discussion and original writing aid was written specifically for asset BOOK-20-02-10. It does not reproduce a book passage, manual, official form, commercial question bank, branded training plan, broadcast, photograph, logo, artwork, map, proprietary diagram or third-party worksheet. Any user-added quotation, image, question or source material remains the user's responsibility and may require attribution or permission.

Educational use only. Verify current facts, rules, competition requirements, local regulations, health and safety conditions with authoritative sources and a suitably qualified person where consequences matter. This workbook does not grant approval, certification, legal rights or permission to use third-party material.