11.3.2 | Lesson 5

Introduction

In this lesson, students learn how to evaluate an evidence-based argument. Students work to develop their ability to identify the necessary components of a compelling argument, systematically evaluate arguments, and assess the effectiveness of these arguments. This work prepares students to begin forming their own evidence-based arguments in 11.3.3.

Students begin the lesson by observing a teacher-led evaluation of a model argument using the Evidence-Based Arguments Checklist. Students then examine a number of evidence-based arguments in groups, assessing the logic and quality of each argument using the Evidence-Based Arguments Checklist. Student learning is assessed via completion of the Evidence-Based Arguments Checklist, which students submit along with their evaluation notes at the end of the lesson.

For homework, students continue to develop their examination of argument by applying the Evidence-Based Arguments Checklist to two additional sources.

Standards

Assessed Standard(s)	
CCRA.R.8	Delineate and evaluate the argument and specific claims in a text, including the validity of the reasoning as well as the relevance and sufficiency of the evidence.
W.11-12.8	Gather relevant information from multiple authoritative print and digital sources, using advanced searches effectively; assess the strengths and limitations of each source in terms of the task, purpose, and audience; integrate information into the text selectively to maintain the flow of ideas, avoiding plagiarism and overreliance on any one source and following a standard format for citation.
Addressed Standard(s)	
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.11-12.1	Initiate and participate effectively in a range of collaborative discussions (one-on-one, in groups, and teacher-led) with diverse partners on *grades 11-12 topics*, *texts, and issues*, building on others' ideas and expressing their own clearly and persuasively.

Assessment

Assessment(s)
Student learning is assessed via completion of the Evidence-Based Arguments Checklist, which students submit along with their evaluation notes at the end of the lesson.
• The Evidence-Based Arguments Checklist serves as the assessment for this lesson.
High Performance Response(s)
A High Performance Response should include:
• See the Model Evidence-Based Arguments Checklist.

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.*

*In their research and reading, students will encounter domain-specific vocabulary related to their individual research questions/problems. Students will track some of this vocabulary in their vocabulary journals when conducting independent searches during class and for homework.

Lesson Agenda/Overview

Student-Facing Agenda	% of Lesson
Standards & Text:	
• Standards: CCRA.R.8, W.11-12.8, W.11-12.7, SL.11-12.1	
• Model Source Texts: "When The U.N. Fails, We All Do" by Fareed Zakaria "Why Genocide?" by Fred Edwords (http://thehumanist.com, also available on http://novelnewyork.org/) "After Rwanda's Genocide" by The Editorial Board (http://www.nytimes.com/2014/04/09/opinion/after-rwandas-genocide.html, also available on http://novelnewyork.org/) "Bodies Count" by Aaron Rothstein (http://www.weeklystandard.com/) "The Only Way To Prevent Genocide" by Tod Lindberg (http://www.commentarymagazine.com/, also available on http://novelnewyork.org/)	
Learning Sequence:	
1. Introduction of Lesson Agenda	1. 5%
2. Homework Accountability	2. 10%
3. Compelling Arguments Discussion	3. 20%
4. Evidence-Based Arguments Checklist	4. 30%
5. Argument Evaluation Activity and Assessment	5. 30%
6. Closing	6. 5%

Materials

- Copies of the Evidence-Based Arguments Checklist for each student (at least four copies each)
- Research Portfolios (refer to 11.3.2 Lesson 1)
- Chart paper

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.
	Bold text indicates questions for the teacher to ask students.
	Italicized text indicates a vocabulary word.
▶	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 standards for this lesson: CCRA.R.8 and W. 11-12.8. In this lesson, students focus on developing an understanding of evidence-based arguments by first examining a model argument as a class, and then working in groups to complete an Evidence-Based Arguments Checklist. Students work collaboratively in groups to identify the components of a compelling argument. Students complete their Evidence-Based Arguments Checklist as the culmination of the group work in this lesson. This completed Evidence-Based Arguments Checklist serves as the assessment for this lesson.

- Students look at the agenda.

Activity 2: Homework Accountability   10%

Instruct students to talk in pairs about their homework from the previous lesson. (Annotate and take notes on your Taking Notes Tools for two sources identified in the Potential Sources Tool from 11.3.2 Lesson 3. Continue to record vocabulary from these preliminary searches in your vocabulary journal.) Instruct student pairs to discuss two details from the close reading of at least one source, and how the details address a selected inquiry question.

- Students discuss the details in one source and how they address a selected inquiry question.

- Circulate during the Turn-and-Talk to monitor students' discussions. Consider collecting homework to monitor students' research progress.

Lead a brief share out of students' discussions.

- Student responses will vary by individual research but may include:

  o In Source 1, the author mentions a number of events and positions that relate to the U.N.'s ability to handle crises, such as how the U.N. Oil-for-Food program was a "badly managed affair surrounded by corruption," but does not cite evidence for these specific statements. I need to do some deeper research in order to identify some of the evidence for these claims.

  o In Source 1, the author states "Rwanda was a failure at almost every level, but certainly it was a failure of the United Nations. But let us be clear what we mean by that. It was the major powers—the United States, Britain, France—that determined the exact nature of the peacekeeping mission." This perspective that the actions of the U.N. can be strongly influenced by several major global powers helped me realize that I need to do more investigation into the problems with and power structure of the UN including how it makes decisions.

Activity 3: Compelling Arguments Discussion   20%

Lead a discussion to develop the idea of *compelling* arguments for students. Remind students that an argument is a composition of precise claims about a topic, including relevant and sufficient evidence, and valid reasoning. To do a thorough evaluation of an argument, students must consider the objective strengths and weaknesses of the argument in order to develop their own perspective on an issue.

- Consider providing students with the following definitions: *compelling* means "having a powerful and irresistible effect, requiring acute admiration, attention, or respect," and *evaluate* means "to determine the worth or quality of a thing," in this instance, the strength and effectiveness of the arguments presented.

  - Students write the definitions of *compelling* and *evaluate* in a vocabulary journal.

Use the following questions to review the work completed in 11.3.1 on argument, central claims, and perspective.

What is perspective?

- How one understands an issue, including his/her relationship to and analysis of the issue.

What is a central claim?

- An author or speaker's main point about an issue in an argument.

- The central claim of an argument also may be called a thesis or a position (the author or speaker's stance). The central claim also may imply the author or speaker's point of view or purpose (RI.11-12.6).

How is an argument related to a central claim?

- Student responses should include:

  o A central claim is an author's main point or statement about an issue.

  o An argument is the text as a whole and it is composed of a series of precise claims supported by relevant and sufficient evidence and valid reasoning.

  o A person might use several supporting claims to defend his/her central claim.

What is valid reasoning?

- Valid reasoning is sound or logical relationships among ideas, including relationships among claims and relationships across evidence.

- **Differentiation Consideration:** If students struggle, consider providing definitions of each of the terms and leading a discussion on the differences apparent in the terms.

Explain to students that some of the sources they have identified in preliminary searches contain one or more central claims, and that the thorough evaluation of these central claims is important in determining the merit of the source and whether or not it can contribute to an understanding of the research topic/area of investigation. Guide students through the following questions to strengthen their understanding of arguments and how to evaluate them.

What makes an argument effective?

- Student responses should include:

  o Clearly stated claims.

  o Significant evidence that is relevant and sufficient to the argument's claims.

  o A strong line of reasoning.

What might make an argument ineffective?

- Student responses should include:
  o It uses a confusing structure.
  o The evidence is unrelated and does not support the argument.
  o The argument ignores other perspectives.
  o The argument does not include effective reasoning, so relationships are missing among the evidence, supporting claims, and central claim.

Activity 4: Evidence-Based Arguments Checklist   30%

Introduce students to the Evidence-Based Arguments Checklist. Explain that students will use this checklist to evaluate central claims, supporting claims, reasoning, and evidence in sources, so they understand the elements of a compelling argument.

- Students listen.

Lead students through an examination of the Evidence-Based Arguments Checklist, focusing on the various criteria present on the checklist. Explain to students that the Evidence-Based Arguments Checklist is composed of four major sections that serve to evaluate an argument.

- Content and Analysis
- Command of Evidence
- Coherence and Organization
- Control of Language and Conventions

Explain that these four sections are the support structure of the argument. As a strong central claim is supported by strong supporting claims, a strong argument is supported by a strong content and analysis, command of evidence, coherence and organization, and control of language and conventions.

- Students listen and follow along.

Using the criteria listed in the Evidence-Based Arguments Checklist, examine the model argument and complete the checklist by modeling for students.

Display the model source, "When The U.N. Fails, We All Do" by Fareed Zakaria from 11.3.2 Lesson 4. Instruct students to use the Evidence-Based Arguments Checklist to evaluate the argument in this model source.

- Students listen.

Explain to students that each section of the Evidence-Based Arguments Checklist consists of several smaller areas where students can indicate with a check mark if they find this item present in the argument. Next to this is a section where students should write additional notes on where they found this information in the text and how the author fulfills this section of the checklist.

- Students follow along on their Evidence-Based Arguments Checklist.

Explain that the purpose of completing the Evidence-Based Arguments Checklist is to identify the sections in which the argument succeeds in providing strong or weak examples of an evidence-based argument. By learning to identify effective components of an argument, students are able to strengthen their own work by searching for strong arguments in this unit and writing strong arguments in 11.3.3.

- Students listen.

Instruct students to examine the first section of the Evidence-Based Arguments Checklist: Content and Analysis. Explain to students that this section is further broken down into four subsections: Clarity and Relevance, Conformity to Sources, Understanding of the Issue, and Acknowledgement of Other Perspectives. The goal of these four subsections is to identify the strength of the author's content by examining their use of varied sources and clear claims, and identifying if they possess a deep and thorough understanding of the issue supported by broad research. Instruct students to follow along on their Evidence-Based Checklist.

- Students follow along.
- Clarity and Relevance

Examine this section with students. Explain that each subsection has a sentence that explains what an ideal example of this technique would look like. For example, a well-executed example of Clarity and Relevance "purposefully states a central claim that is linked to a clearly identified context (topic, problem, issue) that establishes its relevance." Instruct students that they can use this as a guideline and reference for examining a text.

Explain to students that in the model text, Zakaria presents the claim that major reform is needed in how the U.N. handles intervention in cases of genocide. Zakaria establishes the relevance of this claim by using the example of Rwanda and other cases of ineffective U.N. intervention. He also calls for a reevaluation of how these incidents are handled and how the major powers that comprise the U.N. failed to respond to genocide in Rwanda. These are important questions that are relevant to how the world functions today. Since both the claim and relevance are clearly presented, students should indicate the presence of Clarity and Relevance with a check mark.

Examine the Comments sections with students. Inform students that this section is where they need to explain their reasoning for their observations and provide evidence when necessary. Some arguments might require careful, close reading to evaluate whether or not they fulfill a category, so it is essential that students justify their evaluation in this section. The comment box provides students the opportunity to defend their decisions.

Model the Comments section for students by filling in the Comments box with a short statement that provides reasoning and examples that support the decision about whether or not this component is present in the text.

- Consider using the example above or the example from the model tool to show how to complete the Comments section of the tool.

  - Students follow along.

- Conformity to Sources

Explain that an argument that shows Conformity to Sources "presents a perspective that arises from ideas and evidence found in a range of diverse, credible, and significant sources." This section has two important meanings: the writer must present a perspective in the text, and must also provide a range of ideas and evidence that are different from one another, significant in their content, and credible. Instruct students that they can use this as a guideline and reference for examining a text.

- Remind students of the word *credible* from 11.3.2 Lesson 3 ("worthy of belief or confidence; trustworthy").

Inform students that Zakaria does not provide sources for his information in this article. Although it is possible that the perspective presented in this text is supported by credible evidence, it is impossible to determine the argument's credibility without examining the sources of this evidence. Because of this lack of cited evidence, the check box in the Conformity to Sources section should be left blank.

- The model source provided for this lesson lacks source citation for the presented evidence. Consider drawing student attention to this as a warning sign for potentially unreliable sources. Consider using this as an example for additional discussion about the vetting of sources if necessary.

Model the Comments section for students by filling in the Comments box with a short statement that provides reasoning and examples that support the decision about whether or not this component is present in the text.

- Consider using the example above or the example from the model tool to show how to complete the Comments section of the tool.

- • Students follow along.

- Understanding of the Issue

Examine the Understanding of the Issue section with students. Inform students that an argument that demonstrates Understanding of the Issue "presents a perspective based on a comprehensive understanding of the issue, and establishes a series of valid claims that emerge from reasoned analysis." Instruct students that they can use this as a guideline and reference for examining a text.

In the model text, Zakaria builds a series of valid claims that support one another and contribute to his central claim. He begins by establishing that the United Nations intervention was a failure in Rwanda. He then calls on the leading powers of the U.N. to account for their actions, and finally he examines the failure of the U.N. on a larger scale. The variety of claims shows that Zakaria has a comprehensive understanding of the issue and broad knowledge of the subject. Because Zakaria has presented a perspective based on a comprehensive understanding of the issue and established valid claims that emerge from reasoned analysis, a check mark should be made in Understanding of the Issue box.

Model the Comments section for students by filling in the Comments box with a short statement that provides reasoning and examples that support the decision about whether or not this component is present in the text.

- • Consider using the example above or the example from the model tool to show how to complete the Comments section of the tool.

  - • Students follow along.

- Acknowledgement of Other Perspectives

Examine this section with students. Explain that an argument that demonstrates Acknowledgement of Other Perspectives "recognizes opposing or alternate claims and distinguishes these claims from the stated perspective." This means that the author achieves two important goals: provides other claims in the argument and distinguishes these claims from each other and from the central claim of the argument.

Explain to students that in the model text, Zakaria does not clearly establish or acknowledge any opposing claims. Although he does mention the successes of the U.N. in Mozambique, East Timor, and El Salvador, he does not adequately explore this claim nor does he present it as a counterclaim to his central claim. Because of this lack of a significant counterclaim the check box in the Acknowledgement of Other Perspectives section should be left blank.

Model the Comments section for students by filling in the Comments box with a short statement that provides reasoning and examples that support the decision about whether or not this component is present in the text.

- Consider using the example above or the example from the model tool to show how to complete the Comments section of the tool.
  - Students follow along.

Using this format, continue modeling the Evidence-Based Arguments Checklist using the Model Evidence-Based Arguments Checklist at the end of this lesson.

- Students follow along.

- **Differentiation Consideration:** Consider using the end of this section as an opportunity to field questions about the Evidence-Based Arguments Checklist and check in with students to gauge understanding of the tool in preparation for the following activity.

Activity 5: Argument Evaluation Activity and Assessment   30%

Explain that students will now do an activity using the Evidence-Based Arguments Checklist. Students work in groups to evaluate at least two posted arguments by completing an Evidence-Based Arguments Checklist.

Post three to four model arguments around the classroom for students to examine.

- **Differentiation Consideration:** Consider finding alternative arguments that are better suited to students' individual research and evaluation skills.
- Consider posting arguments that contain varying levels of sophistication with regard to the Evidence-Based Arguments Checklist; consider including some arguments that fail to provide a command of evidence or sufficient analysis.

Explain that this activity develops students' understanding of how to evaluate arguments by asking them to work in groups to examine the posted arguments. Students examine the posted arguments and use the Evidence-Based Arguments Checklist to evaluate these arguments. In addition, students should provide textual evidence for their judgment by including where they found evidence of the arguments' strengths/weaknesses in the Comments section of the Evidence-Based Arguments Checklist.

- Students listen.

Create groups of four to five students. Each group will evaluate two posted arguments using the Evidence-Based Arguments Checklist. Each group should discuss the arguments and collaborate to discover the strengths and weaknesses of each argument.

Assign each group a posted argument to start with, and then instruct each group to move clockwise after the first half of this activity to examine the next model argument.

- Student groups complete the Evidence-Based Arguments Checklist for two posted arguments.

- Consider circulating during this activity to offer support and provide answers to any clarifying questions.

- Remind students that evaluating arguments is also part of the research aspect of W. 11-12.7.

- Consider reminding students of their previous work with standard SL.11-12.1, which requires that students participate in collaborative discussions, building on each other's ideas and expressing their own clearly and persuasively.

Each individual student should complete two Evidence-Based Argument Checklists—one for each of the two assigned arguments. Instruct students to turn them in at the end of the lesson.

- **Differentiation Consideration:** Depending on the skill level of the students, consider adjusting the number of argument evaluations required for this lesson assessment or assigning specific model arguments to specific groups.

Activity 6: Closing   5%

Display and distribute the homework assignment. For homework, instruct students to find two potential sources and evaluate the arguments in the sources using the Evidence-Based Arguments Checklist. Ask students to include detailed comments and textual evidence to support their choices in the Comments section of the Evidence-Based Arguments Checklist for each potential source.

- Students follow along.

- **Differentiation Consideration:** Some of the topics students are researching may yield complex or inaccessible texts. To address this concern, consider recommending that students make use of free databases accessible through http://novelnewyork.org/ such as Grolier, Gale, and ProQuest; these databases allow searches by subject/keyword and students may filter the searches so that only texts within certain Lexile ranges are returned. Consider collaborating with a librarian or media specialist to access these databases and create filtered searches that support students' reading levels.

Homework

Find two potential sources and evaluate the arguments in the sources by using the Evidence-Based Arguments Checklist. Include detailed comments and textual evidence to support your choices in the Comments section of the Evidence-Based Arguments Checklist for each potential source.

Evidence-Based Arguments Checklist

Name:		Class:		Date:	

Text:

Argument Sections	Section Components	☐	Comments
Content and Analysis	**Clarity and Relevance:** Purposefully states a central claim that is linked to a clearly identified context (topic, problem, issue) that establishes its relevance.	☐	
	Conformity to Sources: Presents a perspective that arises from ideas and evidence found in a range of diverse, credible, and significant sources.	☐	
	Understanding of the Issue: Presents a perspective based on a comprehensive understanding of the issue, and establishes a series of valid claims that emerge from reasoned analysis.	☐	
	Acknowledgement of Other Perspectives: Recognizes opposing or alternate claims and distinguishes these claims from the stated perspective.	☐	

Argument Sections	Section Components	☐	Comments
Command of Evidence	**Reasoning:** Links evidence and claims together logically in ways that lead to the conclusions expressed in the central claim.	☐	
	Use of Evidence: Supports the central claim and each supporting claim with valid inferences based on credible evidence.	☐	
	Thoroughness and Objectivity: Represents a comprehensive understanding of the issue where the argument's claims and supporting evidence fairly addresses relevant counterclaims and discusses conflicting evidence.	☐	
Coherence and Organization	**Relationship Among Parts:** Establishes clear and logical relationships between supporting claims and a central claim.	☐	
	Effectiveness of Structure: Adopts an organizational strategy, including an introduction and conclusion, which clearly and compellingly communicates the argument.	☐	

Argument Sections	Section Components	☐	Comments
Control of Language and Conventions	**Clarity of Communication:** Is communicated clearly and coherently. The writer's opinions are clearly distinguished from objective summaries and statements.	☐	
	Word Choice/ Vocabulary: Uses topic-specific terminology appropriately and precisely.	☐	
	Style/Voice: Maintains a formal and objective tone appropriate to the intended audience. The use of words, phrases, clauses, and varied syntax draws attention to key ideas and reinforces relationships among ideas.	☐	
	Responsible Use of Evidence: Cites evidence in a responsible manner that anticipates the audience's knowledge level, concerns, values, and possible biases. Quotes sufficient evidence exactly, or paraphrases accurately, referencing precisely where the evidence can be found.	☐	

Argument Sections	Section Components	☐	Comments
	Conventions of Writing: Illustrates consistent command of standard, grade-level-appropriate writing conventions.	☐	

From Evidence-Based Arguments Criteria Checklist, by Odell Education, www.odelleducation.com. Copyright (2012–2013) by Odell Education. Modified in partnership with permission under an Attribution-NonCommercial 3.0 Unported license: http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/.

Model Evidence-Based Arguments Checklist

Name:		Class:		Date:	

Text: "When The U.N. Fails, We All Do" by Fareed Zakaria

Argument Sections	Section Components	☐	Comments
Content and Analysis	**Clarity and Relevance:** Purposefully states a central claim that is linked to a clearly identified context (topic, problem, issue) that establishes its relevance.	☑	Zakaria presents a clear central claim: that the UN needs to improve the way it handles crises. He connects this claim clearly to the context of the genocide in Rwanda, and establishes its relevance by connecting it to other issues surrounding the U.N.'s role in global affairs.
	Conformity to Sources: Presents a perspective that arises from ideas and evidence found in a range of diverse, credible, and significant sources.	☐	Zakaria does not cite his sources, making it difficult to determine the diversity, credibility and significance of the sources.
	Understanding of the Issue: Presents a perspective based on a comprehensive understanding of the issue, and establishes a series of valid claims that emerge from reasoned analysis.	☑	Zakaria presents a clear perspective based on his comprehensive understanding of the situation in Rwanda and the role of the U.N. He establishes a series of claims around the U.N.'s failure to act that build upon each other and support his perspective.
	Acknowledgement of Other Perspectives: Recognizes opposing or alternate claims and distinguishes these claims from the stated perspective.	☐	The article does not provide a counterclaim. While Zakaria mentions several successes of the U.N., he does not develop these ideas in opposition to his central claim.

Argument Sections	Section Components	☐	Comments
Command of Evidence	**Reasoning:** Links evidence and claims together logically in ways that lead to the conclusions expressed in the central claim.	☑	Zakaria provides clear and coherent reasoning to link his evidence and claims, and clearly explains how they relate to the central claim.
	Use of Evidence: Supports the central claim and each supporting claim with valid inferences based on credible evidence.	☐	Zakaria provides valid inferences to support the central claim and each supporting claim. However, because Zakaria does not cite sources for his evidence, it is difficult to determine the credibility of the evidence.
	Thoroughness and Objectivity: Represents a comprehensive understanding of the issue where the argument's claims and supporting evidence fairly addresses relevant counterclaims and discusses conflicting evidence.	☐	Because Zakaria does not fairly address relevant counterclaims and conflicting evidence, the article cannot be considered thorough and objective. The article is also too short to address the entirety of the issue.
Coherence and Organization	**Relationship Among Parts:** Establishes clear and logical relationships between supporting claims and a central claim.	☑	Zakaria draws a clear and logical progression of ideas throughout the article. He starts by describing the genocide in Rwanda as a supporting claim, and then uses this to expand his scope and connect to his central claim about the entire U.N.
	Effectiveness of Structure: Adopts an organizational strategy, including an introduction and conclusion, which clearly and compellingly communicates the argument.	☑	Zakaria adopts an effective organizational structure. He begins with a strong opening that draws the reader in and finishes with a powerful conclusion that clearly and compellingly communicates his argument.

Argument Sections	Section Components	☐	Comments
Control of Language and Conventions	**Clarity of Communication:** Is communicated clearly and coherently. The writer's opinions are clearly distinguished from objective summaries and statements.	☑	The article communicates clearly and coherently. Zakaria is consistent in delivering his message and the information he provides is clearly separated from his own opinions. Sentences such as "They vetted every one of the 30,000 contracts that passed through the program" are clearly differentiated from the more opinionated sentences such as "If countries will not sanction a force robust enough to do the job, then the U.N. should have the courage to refuse the mission."
	Word Choice/ Vocabulary: Uses topic-specific terminology appropriately and precisely.	☑	Zakaria uses a strong blend of topic-appropriate language and precise language in articulating his argument.
	Style/Voice: Maintains a formal and objective tone appropriate to the intended audience. The use of words, phrases, clauses, and varied syntax draws attention to key ideas and reinforces relationships among ideas.	☑	Zakaria maintains a consistent formal tone throughout the entirety of the argument. In addition Zakaria varies his syntax, word choice, and sentence structure and effectively uses rhetorical questions to keep readers engaged and draw their attention to key ideas and points.
	Responsible Use of Evidence: Cites evidence in a responsible manner that anticipates the audience's knowledge level, concerns, values, and possible biases. Quotes sufficient evidence exactly, or paraphrases accurately, referencing precisely where the evidence can be found.	☐	Zakaria does not cite sources that provide sufficient evidence for his statements. He only provides one quote, from Paul Rusesabagina, at the end of the article, while the other evidence he provides lacks source citations.

Argument Sections	Section Components	☐	Comments
	Conventions of Writing: Illustrates consistent command of standard, grade-level-appropriate writing conventions.	☑	The writing in the article consistently adheres to the appropriate conventions.

From Evidence-Based Arguments Criteria Checklist, by Odell Education, www.odelleducation.com. Copyright (2012–2013) by Odell Education. Modified in partnership with permission under an Attribution-NonCommercial 3.0 Unported license: http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0