

**11.3.3****Lesson 2**

## Introduction

In this lesson, students continue to plan for their research-based argument papers by completing the Outline Tool introduced in 11.3.3 Lesson 1. Using the Outline Tool, students develop a counterclaim in opposition to their central claim developed in 11.3.3 Lesson 1. Students address the strengths and limitations of their central claims by developing supporting claims for the counterclaim. Student learning in this lesson is assessed via the counterclaims portion of the Outline Tool.

For homework, students conduct a search for another source to gather stronger or more relevant evidence for their counterclaim on the Outline Tool, and analyze how this evidence provides additional support for the counterclaim on the Additional Evidence Tool.

## Standards

Assessed Standard(s)	
W.11-12.5	Develop and strengthen writing as needed by planning, revising, editing, rewriting, or trying a new approach, focusing on addressing what is most significant for a specific purpose and audience.
W.11-12.9	Draw evidence from literary or informational texts to support analysis, reflection, and research.
Addressed Standard(s)	
W.11-12.1.b	Write arguments to support claims in an analysis of substantive topics or texts, using valid reasoning and relevant and sufficient evidence. Explore and inquire into areas of interest to formulate an argument. b. Develop claim(s) and counterclaims fairly and thoroughly, supplying the most relevant evidence for each while pointing out the strengths and limitations of both in a manner that anticipates the audience's knowledge level, concerns, values, and possible biases.
W.11-12.7	Conduct short as well as more sustained research projects to answer a question (including a self-generated question) or solve a problem; narrow or broaden the inquiry when appropriate; synthesize multiple sources on the subject, demonstrating understanding of the subject under investigation.
SL.11-12.4	Present information, findings, and supporting evidence, conveying a clear and distinct perspective, such that listeners can follow the line of reasoning, alternative or opposing perspectives are addressed, and the organization, development, substance, and style are appropriate to purpose, audience, and a range of formal and informal tasks.

## Assessment

File: 11.3.3 Lesson 2 Date: 9/12/14 Classroom Use: Starting 9/2014

© 2014 Public Consulting Group. This work is licensed under a

Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 Unported License

### Assessment(s)

Student learning in this lesson is assessed via the counterclaims portion of the Outline Tool.

- This assessment will be evaluated using the annotated Evidence-Based Claims Criteria Checklist at the end of this lesson.

### High Performance Response(s)

A High Performance Response should:

- Include a counterclaim to the central claim as well as supporting claims for the counterclaim (e.g., counterclaim: Some critics believe boosting the power and resources of the international community would endanger the sovereignty of the United States and its allies; supporting claim: The Responsibility to Protect (R2P) framework could create conflict for the United States and our allies or be used as an excuse for military action by our enemies).
- Provide evidence for the supporting claims (e.g., “A broader legal definition could also be a double-edged sword, making things worse for Western democracies who value human rights. In a U.N. Human Rights Council meeting in 2009, Libya and Iran both accused Israel of committing genocide in the Gaza Strip, while Yemen’s representative referred to Israel’s military response to Gaza rocket fire as the ‘Gaza Holocaust’” (Rothstein).).
- Include analysis and limitations of the evidence for the supporting claims (e.g., Adapting R2P could make things worse by potentially broadening the definition of genocide, as was the case with Libya and Iran accusing Israel of genocide in Gaza. However, a limitation of this counterclaim is that with no clear and agreed upon threshold of intervention, the alternative would be to sit by and wait for the ICC or other international tribunals to step in. However, we know that this takes time—precious time—and can cost too many lives.).
- See the Model Outline Tool and the annotated Evidence-Based Claims Criteria Checklist at the end of this lesson.

## Vocabulary

**Vocabulary to provide directly (will not include extended instruction)**

- None.\*

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

- None.\*

**Additional vocabulary to support English Language Learners (to provide directly)**

- None.\*

\* Students should use their vocabulary journals to incorporate domain-specific vocabulary from Unit 11.3.2 into their research paper, as well as to record process-oriented vocabulary defined in the lesson.

## Lesson Agenda/Overview

Student-Facing Agenda	% of Lesson
<b>Standards:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Standards: W.11-12.5, W.11-12.9, W.11-12.1.b, W.11-12.7, SL.11-12.4</li> </ul>	
<b>Learning Sequence:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Introduction of Lesson Agenda</li> <li>2. Homework Accountability</li> <li>3. Developing Counterclaims</li> <li>4. Strengths and Limitations</li> <li>5. Outline Tool and Assessment</li> <li>6. Closing</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 5%</li> <li>2. 15%</li> <li>3. 25%</li> <li>4. 15%</li> <li>5. 35%</li> <li>6. 5%</li> </ol>

## Materials

- Student copies of the Outline Tool (refer to 11.3.3 Lesson 1)
- Student copies of the Additional Evidence Tool (refer to 11.3.3 Lesson 1)
- Student copies of Evidence-Based Claims Criteria Checklist (refer to 11.3.2 Lesson 11)
- Student Research Portfolios (refer to 11.3.2 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 symbol	Plain text indicates teacher action.
	<b>Bold text indicates questions for the teacher to ask students.</b>
	<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 introducing the agenda and the assessed standards for this lesson: W.11-12.5 and W.11-12.9. Explain that in this lesson students are integrating additional evidence into their outline, developing counterclaims, and completing the Outline Tool.

- Students look at the agenda.

### Activity 2: Homework Accountability

15%

Instruct students to take out their Additional Evidence Tools from 11.3.3 Lesson 1's homework assignment. (Search for another source to gather stronger or more relevant evidence for a supporting claim on your outline, and analyze how this evidence provides additional support for your claim. Record the evidence and analysis on the Additional Evidence Tool.)

Instruct students to talk in pairs and discuss the resource and evidence they found and recorded on the Additional Evidence Tool.

- Students form pairs and discuss the homework from the previous lesson.
- Student responses vary based on the individual research and outline.
- Consider posting the Model Additional Evidence Tool as a reminder of an exemplar response.

Return the previous lesson's assessment, the Outline Tool, to students. Instruct students to revise a claim on their Outline Tool, incorporating the additional evidence they found for homework.

- Students revise the Outline Tool.

### Activity 3: Developing Counterclaims

**25%**

Direct students to the counterclaims portion of the Outline Tool. Explain to students that in this lesson, they develop both a counterclaim to their central claim and supporting claims for the counterclaim.

- Remind students that they developed counterclaims in the previous unit, 11.3.2 Lesson 12. Consider reviewing standard W.11-12.1.b and using the Forming Counterclaims Tool from 11.3.2 Lesson 12 to support student understanding in this lesson.
- Students follow along.

Explain to students that in order to present a balanced perspective in the research-based argument paper, it is necessary to develop fairly a counterclaim to an existing central claim. Incorporating a strong counterclaim in the research-based argument paper demonstrates to the audience that the writer has addressed opposing or divergent perspectives.

Display the model central claim and counterclaim portions of the Model Outline Tool. Instruct students to briefly Turn-and-Talk in pairs to discuss the following question about the relationship between the claim and counterclaim.

**What is the view of the counterclaim? How does it refute the central claim?**

- The counterclaim is that some critics believe boosting the power and resources of the international community would endanger the sovereignty of the United States and its allies. This counterclaim is opposed to the idea in the central claim that the international community should have power and resources to prevent future genocides using military intervention and prosecution of those who commit genocide.

Lead a brief whole-class discussion on student responses.

---

Instruct students to form pairs to review their central claims on the Outline Tool and form a counterclaim to their central claim. Remind students to refer to their Research Portfolios if necessary because over the course of their research, they have encountered opposing perspectives concerning their issues. Remind students that if they have several counterclaims to consider, they should think about which counterclaim would provide a more interesting or compelling exploration of the topic.

- Consider directing students back to the model example to explain that a counterclaim about the sovereignty of the United States being impacted is compelling because many people are opposed to outside forces intervening in their own country. Additionally, boosting the power of the international community means potentially putting international concerns ahead of American interests, a principle many people might oppose.
- Student pairs review their Research Portfolios and develop counterclaims on their Outline Tools.
- Student responses vary based on individual research. See the Model Outline Tool for a potential counterclaim.

Explain to students that presenting a counterclaim fairly means developing supporting claims and providing evidence as they would when developing a central claim.

- Students listen.

Display the following supporting claims for students.

- Model Counterclaim: Some critics believe boosting the power and resources of the international community would endanger the sovereignty of the United States and its allies.
- Claim: The R2P framework could create conflict for the United States and our allies, or be used as an excuse for military action by our enemies.
- Claim: The international community currently has too little power and too few resources to do an effective job protecting other countries from genocide.
- Claim: A framework like R2P infringes on the United States' right to act as a sovereign nation.

Ask student pairs to discuss the following question:

**Which of the claims best supports the counterclaim and why? Which supporting claim does not effectively support the counterclaim and why?**

- Consider reminding students that developing a chain of reasoning to support the counterclaim is the same as the exercise in 11.3.3 Lesson 1 in which they developed a chain of reasoning to support their central claim.
- Student responses should include:
  - The first claim is strong because it supports the counterclaim and is supported by examples. It poses a specific outcome based on allocating greater power to an international force. It is developed fairly because it shows how many countries could be affected negatively.

- The counterclaim says that bolstering resources would be bad for sovereignty. The second claim directly refutes the counterclaim and therefore undermines it.
- The third claim is strong because it includes relevant evidence and supports the counterclaim: the United States would be forced to engage in conflicts it does not want to if the events in those countries rise to the level of those defined in R2P.
- Consider instructing students to review their Evidence-Based Claims Criteria Checklist in order to provide more scaffolding to determine if the claim and counterclaim are well developed.
- Encourage students to keep in mind the Module Performance Assessment as they practice the skills of SL.11-12.4, addressing alternate or opposing perspectives. Remind students that they will present their research orally at the end of the module and this activity provides an opportunity to begin preparing for the assessment presentation.

Remind students that their claims in support of the counterclaim should use evidence from their Research Portfolios, and demonstrate reasoning. Explain to students that developing supporting claims for the counterclaim is part of the lesson assessment.

- Students follow along.

## Activity 4: Strengths and Limitations

**15%**

Explain to students that as they develop their counterclaims they are also assessing the strengths and limitations of the counterclaim in relation to their own central claims. While it is important to use the counterclaim to demonstrate an opposing perspective, ultimately, the paper's central claim is what is argued for and the counterclaim must be refuted. This demonstrates to the audience or reader that the central claim of the paper is the strongest perspective concerning the issue.

Explain to students that as they develop the supporting claims for the counterclaim, they are questioning their original central claim. In the Reasoning portion of the Outline Tool for the supporting claims of the counterclaim, instruct students to consider how this evidence is limited compared to the evidence they have for their supporting claims for their central claim.

Display and discuss a model supporting claim for the counterclaim from the Model Outline Tool:

- The model supporting claim is: A framework like R2P infringes on the United States' right to act as a sovereign nation.
- The evidence supporting this claim is: "As for the objections, the main concern has been (and remains) that the United States, by embracing R2P, will subject itself to the whims of the 'international community' on whether and when to intervene in fulfillment of the



protection function. Thus, Steven Groves of the Heritage Foundation has expressed alarm that ‘the United States would cede control—any control—of its armed forces to the caprice of the world community without the consent of the American people.’ In the extreme case, in this view, the U.S. might incur a legal obligation to go to war whether it wants to or not” (Lindberg).

- Provide reasoning to connect the evidence to the claim: The evidence provides expert opinion about how the United States would have less control over how its armed forces would be used if R2P were enacted. Under a framework like R2P, the United States may be compelled to engage in international conflict in which it does not want to get involved.
- Explain how the evidence is limited in relation to the central claim: A limitation is that this hypothetical should not outweigh our (and the world’s) responsibility to ensure the global safety of mankind.

Inform students that pointing out the limitations of the counterclaim’s evidence is like finding flaws or weaknesses in the evidence. It is important to do this thinking on the Outline Tool so students can easily integrate it into the paper in subsequent lessons.

- Students listen and follow along with the modeling.
- Consider reminding students of the definition of *limitations* (“real or imaginary points beyond which a person or thing cannot go”), which was introduced in 11.3.2 Lesson 12.

## Activity 5: Outline Tool and Assessment

**35%**

Explain to students the Outline Tool is the lesson assessment. Students are assessed on the counterclaim as well as the supporting claims, evidence, and reasoning for the counterclaim. Instruct students to record the supporting claims for the counterclaim on the Supporting Claim portion of the Outline Tool, the evidence on the Evidence portion of the Outline Tool, and the reasoning on the Reasoning portion of the Outline Tool. Remind students that when completing the Reasoning portion of the Outline Tool they should explain how the evidence supports the counterclaim and how the evidence is limited.

Inform students that the Evidence-Based Claims Criteria Checklist guides the evaluation of this assessment, and that students should refer to their checklists while completing their Outline Tools.

- Consider reminding students of the research writing skills inherent in W.11-12.7.
  - Students complete the following portions of the Outline Tool: Counterclaim, Supporting Claims (for the counterclaim), Evidence, and Reasoning.

Distribute the Additional Evidence Tool and instruct students to record their counterclaims on their Additional Evidence Tools.

- Students turn in their Outline Tools after recording their counterclaims on their Additional Evidence Tools.

## Activity 6: Closing

5%

Display and distribute the homework assignment. For homework, instruct students to search for another source to gather stronger or more relevant evidence for a counterclaim on their outline, and analyze how this evidence provides additional support for their counterclaim. Instruct students to record their evidence and analysis on the Additional Evidence Tool.

- Students follow along.

## Homework

For homework, search for another source to gather stronger or more relevant evidence for a counterclaim on your outline, and analyze how this evidence provides additional support for your counterclaim. Record the evidence and analysis on the Additional Evidence Tool.

## Model Outline Tool

<b>Name</b> :		<b>Class</b> :		<b>Date</b> :	
------------------	--	-------------------	--	------------------	--

**Directions:** Organize your claims on the Outline Tool below. State the significance of each claim, and then provide compelling and relevant evidence and reasoning to support each claim. Finally, provide a strong counterclaim that challenges your central claim. Include supporting claims, evidence, and limitations of the counterclaim.

[Introduction]

**Problem-Based Question:** How can genocide be prevented?

**Central Claim:** The international community needs to be unified in the fight against genocide and needs to ensure that they have the power and resources to prevent future genocides.

[Body] **Supporting Claim:** In order to prevent genocide effectively, the scope of the definition needs to be comprehensive and adopted by all countries.

**Significance of Supporting Claim:**

If the international community is to be involved in preventing genocide, all countries must agree on what constitutes genocide, or the international community may rush in too soon. A strong, common definition will help with early detection and prevention.

**Evidence:**

“Certain aspects of the drafting history of the Convention have figured in subsequent interpretation of some of its provisions. For example, the definition of genocide set out in article II is a much-reduced version of the text [from the first version]. The Sixth Committee voted to exclude cultural genocide from the scope of the Convention, although it subsequently agreed to an exception to this general rule, allowing “forcible transfer of children from one group to another” as a punishable act ... References to these debates have bolstered judicial decisions that essentially exclude ‘ethnic cleansing’ from the scope of the definition.” (Schabas)

**Reasoning:** *How does the evidence support your claim?*

This evidence shows that there were difficulties with achieving consensus on defining the term genocide in its early years. Lack of a common definition would make it difficult for the international community to agree on when to intervene in and prevent genocides.

**Supporting Claim:** International tribunals need to be empowered to respond to and prevent genocide in its early stages, as well as to punish groups and leaders who commit genocide.

**Significance of Supporting Claim:**

It is important to make the case that international courts have been effective in punishing those who commit genocide because that is the current mandate of the United Nations Security Council and the International Criminal Court. This supporting claim shows the need for preventative action through military intervention in cases of genocide, which leads into the following claim.

**Evidence:**

“That such legal actions can prove effective is demonstrated not only by the media publicity generated worldwide but by a recent track record of prosecutorial success. For example, Jean Kambanda was sentenced to life imprisonment for genocide and related crimes committed while he was prime minister of Rwanda in 1994.” (“After Rwanda’s Genocide”)

**Reasoning:** *How does the evidence support your claim?*

The trial of Kambanda shows that international tribunals can be effective at prosecuting genocide. The ICC was responsible for this prosecution, as well as over 70 cases of genocide-related crimes.

**Supporting Claim:** In order to prevent genocide, a combat task force needs to be assembled and ready in order to stop genocide in its early stages.

**Significance of Supporting Claim:** This claim is important to the central claim because it shows one way in which international agencies can come together—through a combat task force—to prevent and punish genocide.

**Evidence:**

“[Stage] 8. PERSECUTION: Victims are identified and separated out because of their ethnic or religious identity. Death lists are drawn up. In state sponsored genocide, members of victim groups may be forced to wear identifying symbols. Their property is often expropriated. Sometimes they are even segregated into ghettos, deported into concentration camps, or confined to a famine-struck region and starved. Genocidal massacres begin. They are acts of genocide because they intentionally destroy part of a group. At this stage, a Genocide Emergency must be declared. If the political will of the great powers, regional alliances, or the U.N. Security Council can be mobilized, armed international intervention should be prepared, or heavy assistance provided to the victim group to prepare for its self-defense. Humanitarian assistance should be organized by the U.N. and private relief groups for the inevitable tide of refugees to come.” (Stanton)

**Reasoning:** *How does the evidence support your claim?*

In this excerpt, Stanton points out clear signs that genocide is underway and indicates what should be done at that point to stop it. If the international community becomes aware of some of these actions occurring, it is time to ready their military response.

**Supporting Claim:** The Responsibility to Protect should outweigh individual countries' interests.

**Significance of Supporting Claim:**

The Responsibility to Protect (R2P) is a principle founded on the belief that the international community is responsible for the wellbeing and safety of mankind. R2P makes clear when to intervene in the affairs of sovereign nations. Any international force that might intervene in prosecuting or preventing genocide should use this as a guiding principle.

**Evidence:**

"But in 2001, Canada's International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty issued a report entitled The Responsibility to Protect. It takes the position that, when two criteria are met, there isn't merely a right to intervene but a responsibility to do so. The criteria offered are:

- A. Large-scale loss of life, actual or apprehended, with genocidal intent or not, which is the product either of deliberate state action, or state neglect or inability to act, or a failed state situation; or
- B. Large-scale "ethnic cleansing," actual or apprehended, whether carried out by killing, forced expulsion, acts of terror or rape." (Edwards)

**Reasoning:** *How does the evidence support your claim?*

R2P is a way for the international community to identify negligence, outright aggression, or failure of the government to protect one's population without worrying about interfering in the sovereign rights of the nation.

**Counterclaim (to the central claim):**

Some critics believe boosting the power and resources of the international community would endanger the sovereignty of the United States and its allies.

**Supporting Claim (for the counterclaim):**

A framework like R2P infringes on the United States' right to act as a sovereign nation.

<p><b><u>Evidence:</u></b></p> <p>"As for the objections, the main concern has been (and remains) that the United States, by embracing R2P, will subject itself to the whims of the 'international community' on whether and when to intervene in fulfillment of the protection function. Thus Steven Groves of the Heritage Foundation has expressed alarm that 'the United States would cede control—any control—of its armed forces to the caprice of the world community without the consent of the American people.' In the extreme case, in this view, the U.S. might incur a legal obligation to go to war whether it wants to or not." (Lindberg)</p>	<p><b><u>Reasoning: <i>How does this evidence support the counterclaim?</i></u></b></p> <p>Under a framework like R2P, the United States may be compelled to engage in international conflict in which it does not want to get involved.</p> <p><b><u>Limitation(s):</u></b> A limitation is that this hypothetical should not outweigh our (and the world's) responsibility to ensure the global safety of mankind.</p>
<p><b><u>Supporting Claim (for the counterclaim):</u></b></p> <p>The framework could create conflict for the United States and our allies or be used as an excuse for military action by our enemies.</p>	
<p><b><u>Evidence:</u></b></p> <p>"A broader legal definition could also be a double-edged sword, making things worse for Western democracies who value human rights. In a U.N. Human Rights Council meeting in 2009, Libya and Iran both accused Israel of committing genocide in the Gaza Strip, while Yemen's representative referred to Israel's military response to Gaza rocket fire as the 'Gaza Holocaust.'" (Rothstein)</p>	<p><b><u>Reasoning: <i>How does this evidence support the counterclaim?</i></u></b></p> <p>Adapting R2P could make things worse by potentially broadening the definition of genocide, as was the case with Libya and Iran accusing Israel of genocide in Gaza.</p> <p><b><u>Limitation(s):</u></b> A limitation of this counterclaim is that with no clear and agreed upon threshold of intervention, the alternative would be to sit by and wait for the ICC or other international tribunals to step in. However, we know that this takes time—precious time—and can cost too many lives.</p>
<p><b>[Conclusion]</b></p> <p><b>Restate Central Claim:</b> The international community needs to be unified in the fight against genocide and needs to ensure that they have the power and resources to prevent future genocides.</p>	

From Outline Tool, by Odell Education, [www.odelleducation.com](http://www.odelleducation.com). Copyright (2012-2013) by Odell Education. Adapted with permission under an Attribution-NonCommercial 3.0 Unported license: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/>.

## Model Additional Evidence Tool

<b>Name</b> :		<b>Class</b> :		<b>Date</b> :	
------------------	--	-------------------	--	------------------	--

**Directions:** Choose one supporting claim from your Outline Tool that requires stronger or more relevant evidence. Record the source, the new evidence, and why the evidence provides additional support for your claim.

**Counterclaim:** Some critics believe boosting the power and resources of the international community would endanger the sovereignty of the United States and its allies.

**Source:** “The Only Way to Prevent Genocide” Tod Lindberg, *Commentary*

**Evidence:**

“Breakthrough though it was, one unintended consequence of the Genocide Convention has been a serious problem. The definition of genocide is good as far as it goes, and the prevention mandate seems to allow latitude for timely action against would-be perpetrators. But whether ‘genocide’ as defined in the treaty is actually occurring or about to occur is a complicated question both epistemologically and legally. For if you act to prevent genocide and succeed, there is no genocide—and so you cannot prove you have prevented one. Moreover, those you act against can claim you have violated their sovereign rights, and the argument will carry weight.” (Lindberg)

**Reasoning:** *How does the evidence provide additional support for your counterclaim? What are the limitations of the evidence?*

This source provides additional evidence for the counterclaim because it suggests that a broader definition makes the window of when to act wider, and more open to disagreements about when to act. There are cases when genocide is imminent, and these supersede the sovereign rights of the nation. However, the question of what is imminent is open to interpretation.

**Limitation(s):** However, a limitation of this counterclaim is that with no clear and agreed upon threshold of intervention, the alternative would be to sit by and wait for the ICC or other international tribunals to step in. However, we know that this takes time—precious time—and can cost too many lives.

From Additional Evidence Tool, by Odell Education, [www.odelleducation.com](http://www.odelleducation.com). Copyright (2012-2013) by Odell Education. Adapted with permission under an Attribution-NonCommercial 3.0 Unported license: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/>.

**File:** 11.3.3 Lesson 2 **Date:** 9/12/14 **Classroom Use:** Starting 9/2014

© 2014 Public Consulting Group. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 Unported License





EVIDENCE-BASED CLAIMS CRITERIA CHECKLIST		✓	COMMENTS
<b>I. CONTENT AND ANALYSIS</b> <i>An EBC is a clearly stated inference that arises from reading texts closely.</i>	<b>Clarity of the Claim:</b> States a conclusion that you have come to after reading and that you want others to think about.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	This counterclaim represents an alternate conclusion from the central claim.
	<b>Conformity to the Text:</b> Is based upon and linked to the ideas and details you have read.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	This counterclaim is supported by evidence from research.
	<b>Understanding of the Topic:</b> Demonstrates knowledge of and sound thinking about a text or topic that matters to you and others.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	There are supporting claims for this counterclaim and the synthesis of evidence demonstrates sound thinking.
<b>II. COMMAND OF EVIDENCE</b> <i>An EBC is supported by specific textual evidence and developed through valid reasoning.</i>	<b>Reasoning :</b> All parts of the claim are supported by specific evidence you can point to in the text(s).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	There is specific evidence to support the counterclaim.
	<b>Use and Integration of Evidence:</b> Uses direct quotations and examples from the text(s) to explain and prove its conclusion.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Evidence is used from research and is explained well to support the counterclaim.
	<b>Thoroughness and Objectivity:</b> Is explained thoroughly and distinguishes your claim from other possible positions.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	This counterclaim distinguishes an alternate perspective from the central claim and from other possible counterclaims.
<b>III. COHERENCE AND ORGANIZATION</b> <i>An EBC and its support are coherently organized into a unified explanation.</i>	<b>Relationship to Context:</b> States where your claim is coming from and why you think it is important.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	This counterclaim presents a clear alternate perspective and is developed fairly.
	<b>Relationships among Parts:</b> Groups and presents supporting evidence in a clear way that helps others understand your claim.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	This counterclaim has supporting claims to provide additional coherence and clarity.
	<b>Relationship to Other Claims:</b> Can be linked with other claims to make an argument.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Is linked as an alternate perspective to the central claim and also has supporting claims.
<b>IV. CONTROL OF LANGUAGE AND CONVENTIONS</b> <i>An EBC is communicated clearly and precisely, with responsible use/ citation of supporting evidence.</i>	<b>Clarity of Communication:</b> Is clearly and precisely stated, so that others understand your thinking.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	This counterclaim is clear and does not have any errors.
	<b>Responsible Use of Evidence:</b> Quotes from the text accurately.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The quotes are accurate and referenced correctly.