

10.3.1

Lesson 6

Introduction

In this lesson, students closely reread a paragraph of *The Immortal Life of Henrietta Lacks* on page 130, in which Skloot makes several claims about immoral research. Students analyze the rest of the excerpt for evidence in support of Skloot's claims. This lesson focuses on identifying and delineating one of Skloot's claims, and evaluating how relevant and sufficient Skloot's evidence is in supporting the claim.

Students explore the paragraph on page 130 through the lens of identifying and delineating one of Skloot's claims. Next, students participate in guided practice to determine what qualifies as relevant and sufficient evidence to support a claim. The assessment in this lesson is the Lesson 6 Evidence Collection Tool that requires student groups to identify and evaluate evidence that Skloot uses in pages 127–136 to support her claim. Students participate in collaborative group discussion and synthesize their findings on the Lesson 6 Evidence Collection Tool. For homework, students preview the following lesson's text and annotate from "But Day didn't want to talk about Henrietta's life" to "I think I would have killed him myself" (pp. 164–169).

Standards

Assessed Standard(s)	
RI.9-10.8	Delineate and evaluate the argument and specific claims in a text, assessing whether the reasoning is valid and the evidence is relevant and sufficient; identify false statements and fallacious reasoning.
Addressed Standard(s)	
W.9-10.9.b	<p>Draw evidence from literary or informational texts to support analysis, reflection, and research.</p> <p>b. Apply <i>grades 9–10 Reading standards</i> to literary nonfiction (e.g., "Delineate and evaluate the argument and specific claims in a text, assessing whether the reasoning is valid and the evidence is relevant and sufficient; identify false statements and fallacious reasoning").</p>
SL.9-10.1	Initiate and participate effectively in a range of collaborative discussions (one-on-one, in groups, and teacher-led) with diverse partners on <i>grades 9–10 topics, texts, and issues</i> , building on others' ideas and expressing their own clearly and persuasively.

Assessment

Assessment(s)
<p>Student learning is assessed via a Quick Write at the end of the lesson. Students answer the following prompt, citing textual evidence to support analysis and inferences drawn from the text.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluate Skloot's claim in paragraph 4 on page 130, and determine whether the evidence in the rest of the excerpt is relevant and sufficient to support her claim. <p>① Students should write their Quick Write responses directly on the Lesson 6 Evidence Collection Tool.</p>
High Performance Response(s)
<p>A High Performance Response should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> See Model Lesson 6 Evidence Tool for High Performance Responses

Vocabulary

Vocabulary to provide directly (will not include extended instruction)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> inoculation (n.) – introduction of (the causative agent of disease) into the body of (a person or animal), in order to induce immunity immune system (n.) – a diffuse, complex network of interacting cells, cell products, and cell-forming tissues that protects the body from pathogens and other foreign substances, destroys infected and malignant cells, and removes cellular debris lymph nodes (n.) – any of the glandlike masses of tissue in the lymphatic vessels containing cells that become lymphocytes through which lymph passes to be filtered and cleaned refrain (n.) – a phrase or verse recurring at intervals in a song or poem diagnosis (n.) – the process of determining by examination the nature and circumstances of a diseased condition dissecting (v.) – cutting apart (an animal body, plant, etc.) to examine the structure, relation of parts, or the like ethical boundaries (n.) – the limits of accepted principles of right and wrong that govern the conduct of a profession civil courts (n.) – courts of law in which civil cases (private and civilian affairs) are tried and determined inalienable rights (n.) – that which is due to anyone by just claim, legal guarantees, moral principles, etc., and cannot be transferred to another without consent (e.g., rights of liberty or of

speech)

① Students were given these terms in 10.3.1 Lesson 5.

Vocabulary to teach (may include direct word work and/or questions)

- informed consent (n.) – a patient’s consent to a medical or surgical procedure or to participation in a clinical study after being properly advised of the relevant medical facts and the risks involved
- human experimentation (n.) – a test or procedure carried out on a person under controlled conditions to determine the validity of a theory or make a discovery

Lesson Agenda/Overview

Student-Facing Agenda	% of Lesson
Standards & Text: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standards: RI.9-10.8, SL.9-10.1, W.9-10.9.b • Text: <i>The Immortal Life of Henrietta Lacks</i>, pp. 127–136 	
Learning Sequence: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduction of Lesson Agenda 2. Homework Accountability 3. Identifying and Delineating Arguments 4. Evidence Collection Tool Small Group Activity 5. Quick Write 6. Closing 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 5% 2. 10% 3. 30% 4. 40% 5. 10% 6. 5%

Materials

- Copies of the Lesson 6 Evidence Collection Tool for each student
- Student copies of the Short Response Rubric and Checklist (refer to 10.3.1 Lesson 1)

Learning Sequence

How to Use the Learning Sequence	
Symbol	Type of Text & Interpretation of the Symbol
10%	Percentage indicates the percentage of lesson time each activity should take.
no	Plain text indicates teacher action.

symbol	Bold text indicates questions for the teacher to ask students.
	<i>Italicized text indicates a vocabulary word.</i>
▶	Indicates student action(s).
💬	Indicates possible student response(s) to teacher questions.
❗	Indicates instructional notes for the teacher.

Activity 1: Introduction of Lesson Agenda

5%

Begin by reviewing the agenda and assessed standard for this lesson: RI.9-10.8. Explain that in this lesson, students review argumentation, delineate an argument in Skloot's text by identifying claims, and learn about relevant and sufficient evidence. Students analyze a paragraph of *The Immortal Life of Henrietta Lacks* on page 130, with a focus on how Skloot supports her argument in pages 127–136 of the text.

- ▶ Students look at the agenda.

❗ Students were introduced to argumentation in Modules 9.4 and 10.2.

Activity 2: Homework Accountability

10%

Instruct students to Turn-and-Talk with a classmate and briefly share two inquiry questions they refined and selected for homework.

- ▶ Students Turn-and-Talk with a classmate, discussing their inquiry questions.

💬 Student responses may include:

- What are other important cases of human experimentation?
- What have been the benefits of human experimentation?

Instruct students to Turn-and-Talk with a classmate about the writing prompt they completed for homework (What conclusions can you draw between the representation of HeLa in this excerpt (“Illegal, Immoral, and Deplorable”) versus the representation of HeLa in “The HeLa Factory”?).

- ▶ Students Turn-and-Talk with a classmate, discussing their answer to the previous lesson's prompt.
- 💬 In “Illegal, Immoral, and Deplorable” doctors experimented on cancer patients using HeLa cells and caused “HeLa tumors” (p. 128). HeLa cells were used in dangerous ways on people. In “The HeLa Factory” HeLa cells are used for scientific discovery; in one case “to help stop polio” (p. 93) by being used to test a vaccine. This polio vaccine was developed using HeLa and “helped save the lives of millions of Americans” (p. 97).

Activity 3: Identifying and Delineating Arguments

30%

Instruct students to independently reread the paragraph on page 130 from “But Southam wasn’t their doctor, and he wasn’t withholding upsetting health information” to “to use the hospital’s patients for his research” (p. 130).

- ▶ Students independently reread the paragraph on page 130.

Explain to students that in this lesson they will identify and *delineate* Skloot’s claim in this paragraph. Explain to students that *delineating* means describing precisely in words, and to *delineate* an argument means “to trace or outline the argument’s central and supporting claims.” For example, in the text, Skloot makes a central claim that doctors and researchers opposed laws “regulating human experimentation” (p. 131). To *delineate* Skloot’s argument further would be to identify supporting claims, such as the doctors’ fear such laws would interfere with “the progress of science” (p. 131).

- ▶ Students follow along.

① Consider reminding students of their previous work with RI.9-10.8 in Module 10.2.

① The texts in this module do not support instruction around false statements or fallacious reasoning.

Instruct students to briefly Turn-and-Talk with a classmate and discuss what Skloot’s central claim (the main point of her argument) might be in this paragraph, citing evidence, before engaging in a whole-class discussion.

- ▶ Students Turn-and-Talk.

Lead a brief whole-class discussion of student responses.

💬 Student responses may include:

- Southam would have continued his experiments indefinitely: “Southam probably would have continued doing this for years” (p. 130).
- Southam lied and did not explain his experiments because patients may not have agreed: “The deception was for his benefit” (p. 130).

Explain to students that in order to determine Skloot’s central claim in this paragraph, the issue encompassing her claim also needs to be identified. Ask students to volunteer an answer to this question:

Based on the Surfacing Issues Tool and reading from the previous lesson, what is the issue?

- 💬 The issue is about informed consent because the “patients might have refused” (p. 130) if Southam hadn’t been “withholding information” (p. 130).

Display the claim and issue for students. Explain to students that in addition to determining the claims in an argument, another part of *delineating* an argument is evaluating the evidence used to support those

claims. It is important that the evidence used is both *relevant*, which means “related to the issue in an appropriate way,” and *sufficient*, which means “adequate for the purpose, or enough.” *Relevant* evidence is connected to the claim and *sufficient* evidence thoroughly reinforces the claims in an argument (central and/or supporting claims). One piece of powerful evidence may be *sufficient* to support a claim, or several pieces of evidence may be collectively *sufficient* to support a claim.

① Students have an opportunity to record the issue and claim on the Evidence Collection Tool later in this lesson.

① **Differentiation Consideration:** Consider reminding students that evidence supports claims and claims support a central claim within an argument.

► Students follow along.

Display Skloot’s claim and two examples of textual evidence:

Claim: Southam lied and did not explain his experiments because patients may not have agreed: “The deception was for his benefit” (p. 130).

1. “He chose the Ohio prison because its inmates had cooperated in several other studies without resistance” (p. 128).
2. “When Southam reported his results, the press hailed them as a tremendous breakthrough that could someday lead to a cancer vaccine” (p. 129).

① **Differentiation Consideration:** Consider reminding students that evidence refers to the topical and textual facts, events, and ideas from which the claims of an argument arise, and which are cited to support those claims.

Instruct students to briefly Turn-and-Talk with a classmate about which piece of evidence is more *relevant* to the claim, and how that evidence supports the claim.

► Students Turn-and-Talk.

Lead a brief whole-class discussion of student responses.

☞ The second piece of evidence is more relevant because it gives an example of how “the deception” (p. 130) benefited Southam.

Activity 4: Evidence Collection Tool Small Group Activity

40%

Display and distribute the Lesson 6 Evidence Collection Tool. Instruct students to form heterogeneous groups of 4–5 for this activity. Explain to students that they will use this tool to identify and evaluate evidence that Skloot uses in pages 127–136 of *The Immortal Life of Henrietta Lacks*, and assess whether the evidence is *relevant* and *sufficient* to support her claim. Instruct students to identify evidence in the excerpt, cite the page number, and evaluate if this evidence supports Skloot’s claim.

- ▶ Students form heterogeneous groups and examine the tool.

Instruct student groups to copy the issue and claim discussed in the previous activity on the appropriate portions of the Lesson 6 Evidence Collection Tool. Ask student groups to briefly discuss the following question before sharing out with the whole class:

Based on Skloot’s claim and the issue, what sort of evidence will be *relevant*?

- ▶ Student groups briefly discuss.

Lead a brief whole-class discussion of student responses.

💬 *Relevant* evidence will relate to the issue of informed consent as well as Southam’s experiments.

Remind students that as they are identifying evidence and rereading, they should think about the purpose of the activity: to identify and evaluate evidence Skloot uses in this excerpt to support her claim.

Display the first “Evidence” portion of the Model Lesson 6 Evidence Collection Tool for students. Ask student groups to record the modeled evidence, discuss briefly in their groups, and record the outcome of their discussion on their Lesson 6 Evidence Collection Tool. Ask students:

How does this evidence contribute to Skloot’s claim? Is it *relevant* and *sufficient*?

- ▶ Student groups briefly discuss and evaluate the evidence.
- 💬 Student responses may include:
 - This evidence contributes to Skloot’s claim because it explains the facts in the legal system Southam used to avoid telling his patients what he was doing.
 - This evidence directly addresses the issue of informed consent and includes Southam, which directly supports Skloot’s claim.

① **Differentiation Consideration:** If student groups struggle with evaluating the model piece of evidence, consider revising this activity by engaging in a modeled think-aloud and directing students to follow along with the modeling.

Remind students to discuss as a group the merits or faults of each piece of evidence identified in the text before recording their thoughts on their tool. Remind students this is a collaborative discussion as outlined in SL.9-10.1. Explain to students that after they have analyzed the evidence, they will synthesize their conclusions about Skloot’s claim on the second side of the Lesson 6 Evidence Collection Tool.

① Consider reminding students of the structure of collaborative discussion and skills inherent in the substandards of Standard SL.9-10.1, to which students were previously introduced.

Instruct student groups to begin. Circulate around the room as students work in their groups and answer any questions that arise.

- ▶ Student groups identify and evaluate evidence pertaining to Skloot’s claim.
- 🗨 See the Model Lesson 6 Evidence Collection Tool at the end of this lesson for sample student responses.

Activity 5: Quick Write

10%

Instruct students to respond briefly in writing on the second side of the Lesson 6 Evidence Collection Tool to the following prompt:

Evaluate Skloot’s claim in paragraph 4 on page 130, and determine whether the evidence in the rest of the excerpt is relevant and sufficient to support her claim.

Ask students to use this lesson’s vocabulary wherever possible in their written responses. Remind students to use the Short Response Rubric and Checklist to guide their written responses.

- ▶ Students listen and read the Quick Write prompt.

Transition to the independent Quick Write.

- ▶ Students independently answer the prompt using evidence from the text.
- 🗨 See the High Performance Responses on the Model Lesson 6 Evidence Collection Tool (side 2).

Collect the Model Lesson 6 Evidence Collection Tool for assessment purposes.

Activity 6: Closing

5%

Display and distribute the homework assignment. For homework, instruct students to preview the following lesson’s text and annotate for central idea (CI) from “But Day didn’t want to talk about Henrietta’s life” to “I think I would have killed him myself” (pp. 164–169). Direct students to box any unfamiliar words and look up their definitions. Instruct them to choose the definition that makes the most sense in the context, and write a brief definition above or near the word in the text.

- ▶ Students follow along.

- ① This focused annotation supports students’ engagement with W.9-10.9.b, which addresses the use of textual evidence in writing.

Homework

Preview the following lesson’s text and annotate for central idea (CI) from “But Day didn’t want to talk about Henrietta’s life” to “I think I would have killed him myself” (pp. 164–169). Box any unfamiliar words and look up their definitions. Choose the definition that makes the most sense in the context, and write a brief definition above or near the word in the text.

Lesson 6 Evidence Collection Tool (Side 1)

Name:		Class:		Date:	
Issue: Claim:					
Evidence			How does this evidence contribute to Skloot's claim (is this evidence relevant and sufficient)?		

Lesson 6 Evidence Collection Tool (Side 2)

Name:		Class:		Date:	
--------------	--	---------------	--	--------------	--

Directions: Now that you have gathered and evaluated evidence in the text and discussed how relevant and sufficient it is, evaluate Skloot's claim in a brief response to the following prompt:

Evaluate Skloot's claim in paragraph 4 on page 130, and determine whether the evidence in the rest of the excerpt is relevant and sufficient to support her claim.

Model Lesson 6 Evidence Collection Tool (Side 1)

Name:		Class:		Date:	
Issue: Informed Consent Claim: Southam lied and did not explain his experiments because patients may not have agreed, “The deception was for his benefit” (p. 130).					
Evidence		How does this evidence contribute to Skloot’s claim (is this evidence relevant and sufficient)?			
“Informed consent focused on what doctors were required” to “it might apply to research like Southam’s” (p. 132).		This evidence contributes to Skloot’s claim because it explains the facts in the legal system Southam used to avoid telling his patients what he was doing.			
“He [Southam] told them [patients] he was testing” to “nothing about injecting them with someone else’s malignant cells” (p. 128).		This evidence is extremely relevant because it is the first instance where Southam started his experiments and used HeLa. Not only does he not tell the patients about the malignant cells but he says it is something completely different.			
“soon after the end” to “was elected president of the American Association for Cancer Research” (p. 135).		Southam was promoted to a prestigious position because of his experiments. This is relevant because it shows how greatly he benefited from his experiments.			
“the patients in the study wouldn’t have been capable of giving informed consent” to “one had advanced Parkinson’s disease” (p. 133).		This supports Skloot’s claim because it shows that the experiments targeted those who could not fully understand what was happening to them. They were unable to comprehend informed consent and were extremely vulnerable.			
“Because of that ‘phobia and ignorance,’ Southam wrote, he didn’t tell patients” to “he didn’t want to cause any unnecessary fear” (p. 130).		This evidence is somewhat relevant because it presents Southam’s perspective and because Skloot uses his words “phobia and ignorance” (p. 130) to demonstrate that his reasoning was not as valid as looking out for the patient’s wellbeing.			

Model Lesson 6 Evidence Collection Tool (Side 2)

Name:		Class:		Date:	
--------------	--	---------------	--	--------------	--

Directions: Now that you have gathered and evaluated evidence in the text and discussed how relevant and sufficient it is, evaluate Skloot's claim in a brief response to the following prompt:

Evaluate Skloot's claim in paragraph 4 on page 130, and determine whether the evidence in the rest of the excerpt is relevant and sufficient to support her claim.

☞ A High Performance Response should:

- Delineate Skloot's claim in this portion of text (e.g., Identifying the examples of Southam's cancer research, the supporting evidence that suggests Southam benefited from the research, why Southam did not give informed consent, etc.).
- Evaluate Skloot's claim synthesizing the evidence gathered (e.g., It is clear that Southam lied to his patient because "he said nothing about injecting them with someone else's malignant cells" and, as a result of this research, was eventually elected as "president of the American Association for Cancer Research." This demonstrates that Southam directly benefited from the research, and may not have benefited in this way if he had told patients what was in the "saline solution.")
- Determine whether the evidence is relevant and sufficient to support Skloot's claim (e.g., Skloot gives a sufficient amount of evidence to support her claim that Southam lied for his own benefit: "When Southam reported his results the press hailed them as a tremendous breakthrough." Skloot also uses relevant examples, such as the Nazi doctors and the Nuremberg Trials, to develop the importance of "ethical boundaries" in the medical profession. Southam was testing on patients who "wouldn't have been capable of giving informed consent.")