BUILDING EVIDENCE-BASED ARGUMENTS

DEVELOPING CORE PROFICIENCIES
ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS / LITERACY UNIT

GRADE 7

"Doping can be that last 2 percent."

ODELL EDUCATION
www.odelleducation.com

EVIDENCE-BASED ARGUMENTATION

Literacy – the integrated abilities to read texts closely, to investigate ideas and deepen understanding through research, to make and evaluate evidence-based claims, and to communicate one's perspective in a reasoned way – is fundamental to participation in civic life. Thus, the importance of a literate citizenry was understood and expressed by Thomas Jefferson early in the life of our democratic nation. Today, students face the prospect of participating in a civic life that stretches beyond the boundaries of a single nation and has become increasingly contentious, characterized by entrenched polarization in response to complex issues. Citizens have access to a glut of information (some of which is nothing more than opinion passed off as fact) and are often bombarded by bombast rather than engaged in reasoned and civil debate.

Learning the skills and habits of mind associated with argumentation – how to conceive and communicate "arguments to support claims, using valid reasoning and sufficient evidence" [CCSS W1] as well as how to "delineate and evaluate the argument[s]" and "the validity of the reasoning and relevance and sufficiency of the evidence" presented by others [CCSS R8] – is therefore central to students' civic and academic lives. In order to participate in thoughtful, reasoned, and civil discussion around societal issues, they must learn: 1) to investigate and understand an issue 2) to develop an evidence-based perspective and position; 3) to evaluate and respond to the perspectives and positions of others; 4) to make, support, and link claims as premises in a logical chain of reasoning; and 5) to communicate a position so that others can understand and thoughtfully evaluate their thinking.

Thus, this unit, as the culminating set of instructional activities in the Core Proficiency series, focuses on aspects of argumentation involving evidence, reasoning, and logic, rather than on persuasive writing and speaking. It moves away from an "editorial" approach that asks students to form an opinion, take a stand, and convince others to agree. Instead, students are first expected to understand objectively a complex issue through exploratory inquiry and close reading of information on the topic, then study multiple perspectives on the issue before they establish their own position. From their reading and research, they are asked to craft an argumentative plan that explains and supports their position, acknowledges the perspectives and positions of others, and uses evidence gleaned through close reading and analysis to support their claims. Having developed a logical and well-supported chain of reasoning, they use an iterative process to develop an argumentative "essay" in the spirit in which Montaigne first used that word – as a progression of "attempts" to communicate their thinking and contribute to reasoned debate about the issue.

The unit's pedagogy and instructional sequence are based on the idea that students (and citizens) must develop a "mental model" of what effective – and reasoned – argumentation entails, to guide them in reading, evaluating, and communicating arguments around issues to which there are many more than two sides (i.e., most issues in our world today). The unit therefore focuses on learning about and applying concepts communicated through terminology such as issue, perspective, position, premise, evidence, and reasoning. Thus, the unit provides numerous opportunities to build students' academic vocabularies, while emphasizing close reading and research skills, critical thinking, evidence-based discussion, collaborative development, and an iterative approach to writing.

DEVELOPING CORE PROFICIENCIES SERIES

This unit is part of the Odell Education Literacy Instruction: Developing Core Proficiencies program, an integrated set of ELA units spanning grades 6-12. Funded by USNY Regents Research Fund, the program is comprised of a series of four units at each grade level that provide direct instruction on a set of literacy proficiencies at the heart of the CCSS.

Unit 1: Reading Closely for Textual Details
Unit 2: Making Evidence-Based Claims
Unit 3: Researching to Deepen Understanding
Unit 4: Building Evidence-Based Arguments

The Core Proficiencies units have been designed to be used in a variety of ways. They can be taught as short stand-alone units to introduce or develop key student proficiencies. Teachers can also integrate them into larger modules that build up to and around these proficiencies. Teachers can also apply the activity sequences and unit materials to different texts and topics. The materials have been intentionally designed for easy adaptation to new texts.

Unit materials available at
www.odelleducation.com

HOW THIS UNIT IS STRUCTURED

The unit activities are organized into five parts, each associated with a sequence of texts and writing activities. The parts build on each other and can each span a range of instructional time depending on scheduling and student ability.

Part 1 introduces students to the concept of evidence-based argumentation in the context of societal issues. Students read and write about a variety of informational texts to build an understanding of a particular issue.

Part 2 develops student ability to analyze arguments through direct instruction on a set of terms and close reading skills for delineating argumentation. Students read and analyze several arguments associated with the unit's issue.

Part 3 deepens students' abilities with arguments, moving them into evaluation. Students begin to synthesize their analysis and evaluation of other arguments into the development of their own position.

Part 4 focuses students on identifying and crafting the structure of their own arguments, including their sequence of claims and their supporting evidence.

Part 5 engages students in a collaborative, question-based process to develop and strengthen their argumentative essays. Students work with their teachers and peers to draft, revise and publish their own argumentative essay on the unit's issue.

HOW THIS UNIT TEACHES VOCABULARY

This unit draws on a variety of strategies for teaching academic and disciplinary vocabulary. The primary strategy is the way critical disciplinary vocabulary and concepts are built into the instruction. Students are taught words like "claims," "perspective," "position," "evidence," and "criteria" through their explicit use in activities. Students come to understand and use these words as they think about and evaluate their own analysis and that of their peers. The handouts and tools play a key role in this process. By the end of the unit, students will have developed deep conceptual knowledge of key vocabulary that they can transfer to a variety of academic and public contexts.

The texts and activities also provide many opportunities for academic vocabulary instruction. Many of the activities focus directly on analyzing the way authors use language and key words to develop ideas and achieve specific purposes.

The sequence of topical texts also builds vocabulary knowledge and connections, supporting both textual comprehension and vocabulary acquisition.

The argumentative essays students write at the end of the unit give them the opportunity to immediately use new academic and disciplinary vocabulary they have learned in their reading.

HOW THIS UNIT ALIGNS WITH CCSS FOR ELA/LITERACY

The instructional focus of this unit is on analyzing and writing evidence-based arguments with specific attention to argumentative perspective, position, claims, evidence and reasoning. Accordingly, the primary alignment of the unit – the targeted CCSS – are **RI.1**, **RI.8** and **W.1**, **W.2** and **W.9**.

The sequence of texts and specific instruction emphasize helping students analyze the way different authors' perspectives and points of view relate to their argumentation. Thus, **RI.6** and **RI.9** are also targeted standards.

In Parts 1-3, students write short pieces analyzing arguments on a societal issue. In Parts 4 and 5, direct instruction supports students in the organization, development, revision and production of a significant and original argumentative essay. As such, **W.4** and **W.5** become targeted standards.

As students develop these primary targeted reading and writing skills, they are also practicing, their abilities to engage in text-centered discussions. Thus, **SL.1** is also an emerging targeted CCSS as the unit progresses, and takes on a central role in the collaborative process students use in Part 5 for developing and strengthening their writing.

As students develop these primary targeted CCSS skill sets, they also practice and use related reading and writing skills from supporting CCSS. Analysis of texts focuses on interpreting key words and phrases (**RI.4**), determining central ideas (**RI.2**) and the way they interact over the course of a text (**RI.3**), as well as the way authors have structured their particular arguments (**R.5**). The sequence of texts engages students in the analysis of information presented in a variety of media and formats (**R.7**).

UNIT OUTLINE

PART 1: UNDERSTANDING THE NATURE OF AN ISSUE

- The teacher presents an overview of the unit and its societal issue.
- Students read and analyze a background text to develop an initial understanding of the issue.
- Students read and analyze a second background text to expand and deepen their understanding of the issue.
- Students develop text-dependent questions and use them to deepen their analysis.
- Students develop and write an evidence-based claim about the nature of the issue.

PART 2: ANALYZING ARGUMENTS

- The teacher introduces the concept of an argumentative position.
- The teacher leads an exploration of the elements of argumentation.
- Student teams read and delineate arguments.
- The teacher leads an exploration of the concept of perspective.
- Students analyze and compare perspectives in argumentative texts.
- As needed, students read and analyze additional arguments related to the unit's issue.
- Students write short essays analyzing an argument.

PART 3: EVALUATING ARGUMENTS AND DEVELOPING A POSITION

- Students evaluate arguments using objective criteria and their own developing perspective of the issue.
- Students clarify their own emerging perspective and establish a position on the issue.
- If needed, students conduct further research to help develop and support their position.
- Students identify and write about an argument that supports their position.
- Students identify and write about argument that opposes their position.

PART 4: ORGANIZING AN EVIDENCE-BASED ARGUMENT

- Students review their notes and analysis to find evidence to develop and support their position.
- The teacher discusses logical models for building an argument for students to consider.
- Students review and write a sequence of claims to use as premises in their argument.
- Students determine evidence to support their premises.
- Students review and revise their plans for writing with their peers.

PART 5: DEVELOPING AND STRENGTHENING WRITING THROUGH A COLLABORATIVE, QUESTION-BASED PROCESS

- Students learn and practice a collaborative, question-based approach to developing and improving writing, using criteria from the unit and guiding questions to begin the drafting and revision process.
- Students use the collaborative process to revise their writing with a focus on:
  - ◊ articulating their overall ideas with necessary information;
  - ◊ the unity of their initial drafts, coherence among their ideas and information, and logic of their organizational sequence;;
  - ◊ their selection, use, and integration of evidence;
  - ◊ the effectiveness of the connections and transitions they have made, and their use of transitional phrases;
  - ◊ the quality and variety of their sentences, the clarity of their vocabulary, and the impact of their word choices;
  - ◊ writing conventions;
  - ◊ producing a final quality product.

INITIAL DECISIONS TO BE MADE ABOUT THE UNIT'S CONTENT

The unit can be set in any of several content-based contexts. The teacher (and/or students) will need to make direction-setting decisions about which path to follow:

- *If the Building Evidence-Based Arguments unit follows students' previous work in a Researching to Deepen Understanding unit*, then the topic area and texts can be carried forward and students will use their research as the basis for developing a position and building an argument. In this case, any of Texts #2-10 from a Topic Repository (e.g., Technology) can be substituted for Texts in Part 1 of this unit, and either re-analyzed or used as a foundation for further research. The teacher or students will need to focus the research topic into one or more areas and develop a problem-based question. Students might then proceed to Parts 3-5 of this unit to develop their positions, organize their arguments, and produce their final written products – as both a culmination of their research and a demonstration of their skills in argumentation.

- *If the Building Evidence-Based Arguments unit is done on its own,* then teachers and students can use this unit to develop their skills of close reading, analysis of an issue, claim-making, and argumentation. Teachers and students may find it helpful to use some of the tools introduced in the *Researching to Deepen Understanding* unit to organize and archive their work on the various texts in this unit.

- *If the teacher (or students) intend to do the Building Evidence-Based Argument unit in the context of a different topic, issue, problem, or text set,* then texts relevant to that area of study can be substituted the Texts in this unit. In this case, the teacher or students will need to identify a central societal issue, pose a problem -based question, and frame text-specific questions for each of the new texts. They can then follow the sequence of instructional activities outlined here using the new topic and texts.

- *If students are expected to develop a research-based argument but have not yet done Researching to Deepen Understanding*, they might embark on the *Researching to Deepen Understanding* unit within their work in the argumentation unit, using activities from the Research Unit to deepen their understanding of the issue and analysis of arguments prior to developing their own positions and arguments in Parts 3-5. In this case, the unit will likely be much longer in duration.

It is highly recommended that students keep a portfolio of their work throughout the unit where they will keep all tools, group and class discussion notes, and written claims about the passages. This will greatly aid them in Part 4 where they take inventory of their work in the unit, the arguments developed in the texts, and their own synthesis of these arguments. Teachers and students may find it helpful to use some of the tools introduced in the *Researching to Deepen Understanding* unit to organize and archive their work on the various texts in this unit.

NOTE: While this unit is developmentally appropriate and aligned with the grade-level expectations of the CCSS, it does incorporate analysis of complex texts and the use of explicit academic concepts. It is recommended that it be taught with students who have been introduced to the concepts and have worked on their literacy proficiencies of reading closely for textual detail and making evidence-based claims. These proficiencies can be developed in students with the Units 1 and 2 of the Core Proficiencies Curriculum.

GRADE 7 ARGUMENTATION UNIT TEXT SETS

This chart lists the unit texts, organized by the "text sets" associated with the progression of instructional activities.

Additional texts for some of the sets are indicated with an AT.

As an Open Educational Resource, the unit employs texts that are accessible on the web for free without any login information, membership requirements or purchase. Because of the ever-changing nature of website addresses, links are not provided. Teachers and students can locate these texts through web searches using the information provided.

#	TITLE	AUTHOR	DATE	SOURCE/PUBLISHER
Text Set #1: Background Informational Texts				
1.1	What is a Performance-Enhancing Drug?	Luke Bauer	12/5/2013	Odell Education
1.2	Historical Timeline: History of Performance Enhancing Drugs in Sports	ProCon.org	8/8/2013	ProCon.org
1.3	Steroids	Kids Health	2013	Kids Health
Text Set #2: Additional Background Informational Texts				
2.1	How To Get Doping Out Of Sports	Jonathan Vaughters	8/11/2012	New York Times
2.2	Performance enhancing drugs outside of pro sports	Kyung Lah	8/5/2013	Anderson Cooper 360, CNN
2.3	Performance Enhancing Drugs: A Cheat Sheet	Katie Moisse	8/5/2013	ABC News
AT	The Future of Cheating in Sports	Christie Aschwanden	20012	Smithsonian Magazine
AT	Athlete Guide to the 2013 Prohibited List	US Anti-Doping Agency	2013	US Anti-Doping Agency
AT	The Beam in Your Eye	William Saletan	4/18/2005	Slate Magazine
Text Set #3: Political Cartoons				
3.1	Why the Use of Performance-Enhancing Drugs by Great Athletes Still Bothers Us	J. Gordon Hylton	NA	Marquette University Law School Blog
3.2	Cartoonists on Baseball and Steroids	John Cole	6/8/2013	Newsday
Text Set #4: Seminal Arguments				
4.1	Congressman Elijah E. Cummings Urges the National Basketball Association to adopt a Zero-Tolerance Drug Policy	Rep. Elijah E. Cummings	5/19/2005	Congressman Elijah E. Cummings House of Representatives site
4.2	Speech by Dr. Jacques Rogge President, International Olympic Committee to World Conference on Doping in Sport	Dr. Jacques Rogge	11/15/2007	Olympic International Committee
4.3	Why It's Time To Legalize Steroids In Professional Sports	Chris Smith	8/24/2012	Forbes
4.4	Confessions of a doper: Lance Armstrong's former teammate Jonathan Vaughters talks about why some athletes use steroids.	Jonathan Vaughters	4/11/2012	New York Times Upfront Magazine
Text Set #5: Additional Arguments				
5.1	No place in high school sports for performance-enhancing drugs	Roger Dearing	8/20/2013	The News Herald
5.2	Did Lance Armstrong Cheat? I Don't Care	LZ Granderson	2/19/2011	ESPN Commentary
5.3	Lance Armstrong Had Little Choice but to Dope	John Eustice	10/2/2012	Time Ideas
5.4	*There Are No Sound Moral Arguments Against Performance-Enhancing Drugs	Chuck Klosterman	10/12/2012	New York Times
AT	Legalize PEDs and we'll prosper, says ethicist	Adrian Proszenko	2/17/2013	The Sydney Morning Herald

PART 1

UNDERSTANDING THE NATURE OF AN ISSUE

"The use of enhancement 'substances' for sporting events dates back to the ancient Greeks and ancient Maya."

OBJECTIVE:	Students apply their close reading skills to understand a societal issue as a context for various perspectives, positions, and arguments.

MATERIALS:
Text Sets 1 and 2
Guiding Questions Handout
Forming EBC Tool
TCD Checklist
EBA Terms

ACTIVITIES

1- INTRODUCING THE UNIT
The teacher presents an overview of the unit and its societal issue.

2- EXPLORING THE ISSUE
Students read and analyze a background text to develop an initial understanding of the issue.

3- DEEPENING UNDERSTANDING OF THE ISSUE
Students read and analyze a second background text to expand and deepen their understanding of the issue.

4- QUESTIONING TO REFINE UNDERSTANDING
Students develop text-dependent questions and use them to refine their analysis.

5- WRITING AN EVIDENCE-BASED CLAIM ABOUT THE NATURE OF THE ISSUE
Students develop and write an evidence-based claim about the nature of the issue.

ALIGNMENT TO CCSS

TARGETED STANDARDS:
RI.7.1: Cite several pieces of textual evidence to support analysis of what the text says explicitly as well as inferences drawn from the text.
RI.7.2: Determine two or more central ideas in a text and analyze their development over the course of the text; provide an objective summary of the text.
RI.7.3: Analyze the interactions between individuals, events, and ideas in a text (e.g., how ideas influence individuals or events, or how individuals influence ideas or events).
W.7.2: Write informative/explanatory texts to examine a topic and convey ideas, concepts, and information through the selection, organization, and analysis of relevant content.

SUPPORTING STANDARDS:
SL.7.1: Engage effectively in a range of collaborative discussions (one-on-one, in groups, and teacher-led) with diverse partners on grade 7 topics, texts, and issues, building on others' ideas and expressing their own clearly.
RI.7.4: Determine the meaning of words and phrases as they are used in a text, including figurative, connotative, and technical meanings; analyze the impact of a specific word choice on meaning and tone.

ACTIVITY 1: INTRODUCING THE UNIT

The teacher presents an overview of the unit and its societal issue.

INSTRUCTIONAL NOTES

INTRODUCE ARGUMENTATION

Introduce the central purpose of the unit: to develop, practice, and apply the skills of argumentation in the context of a societal issue by:

1) Understanding the nature of a challenging *issue* for which there are various *perspectives* and *positions*.

2) Understanding and comparing *perspectives* and *arguments* on the issue.

3) Developing an evidence-based *position* on the issue.

4) Developing, sequencing and linking *claims* as *premises* in an evidence-based *argument* for one's position.

5) Supporting one's premises with logical *reasoning* and relevant *evidence*.

6) Developing an argumentative *essay* through a series of guided editorial processes.

Emphasize that in this unit, students will learn and think about a complex societal issue for which there are many explanations, perspectives, and opinions, not simply two sides of an argument. to be debated. Let them know that they will read and research to better understand the issue and various perspectives on it *before* they form a position of their own and develop an argument in support of that position. Explain that the unit will culminate in a collaborative process for developing and strengthening an argumentative essay that each student will write on the unit's societal issue.

- Establish a clear definition of the term *issue* in general. An issue can be defined *as an important aspect of human society for which there are many differing opinions on an appropriate course of action*. Brainstorming a list of societal issues might be helpful.
- Using examples from various fields and topical areas, discuss the general question: "*How do strategic thinkers discuss and understand challenging issues or problems?*" Brainstorm a list of approaches and skills used by experts who regularly have to propose and support responses to issues or problems.

PERFORMANCE ENHANCING DRUGS

The topic area and texts focus on the issues and controversies surrounding PEDs (Performance Enhancing Drugs) in both professional and non-professional sports. Doping, and policy related to both the legal and illegal use of drugs to increase performance in sports, is a complex topic with many perspectives and positions – not a simple "pro and con" arena for debate – which allows the teacher and students to approach and study the issue from many possible angles.

FORMULATE A PROBLEM-BASED QUESTION

Formulate a problem-based question from which students can begin their discussions, reading, and development of an argumentative position. Choose or develop a general, though still focused, question that causes students to think about the problem with many directions for argumentation, and that connects to students' backgrounds and interests. An example/option for a problem-based question is:

How should the world of sports approach performance-enhancing drugs?

TEXT-BASED QUESTION

If this question is selected, or a similar one developed, provide a little background to get students thinking; in this case, showing them the video on Mark McGwire's transformation from a skinny baseball player from the Oakland Athletics to the muscular player who years later broke Roger Maris' single-season homerun record. While this video is specific to baseball, it demonstrates the impact of performance-enhancing drugs on the body, which would be similar for athletes young and old in other sports. The video can be accessed by searching for "Mark McGwire's Changing Muscles" on YouTube.

ACTIVITY 1: INTRODUCING THE UNIT (CONT'D)

INSTRUCTIONAL NOTES (CONT'D)

The video on Mark McGwire also provides a first opportunity for close analysis, using a text-based question set such as:

What do the changes in McGwire's body suggest about the influence and effects of performance-enhancing drugs in sports?

Let students know that they will be returning to these questions often as they read texts related to performance-enhancing drugs. Emphasize that their task in this argumentation unit is not simply to answer them, but rather to use them as a stimulus for reading and discussion. Thinking about these question as they read, analyze, and discuss will eventually lead them to a perspective on the use of PEDs, and finally to a position about the use of PEDs from which they can build an evidence-based argument.

KWL

Teachers might choose to use an activity to help students access their prior knowledge of the subject while also making sure to be careful of erroneous prior conceptions of the topic (KWL, class brainstorm, image brainstorm, free write, etc.).

ACTIVITY 2: EXPLORING THE ISSUE

Students read and analyze a background text to develop an initial understanding of an issue.

INSTRUCTIONAL NOTES

READING

- Students read the text independently, annotating and making notes on how it relates to the unit's problem-based question.
- The teacher introduces one or more text-based questions to drive a closer reading of the text. Students then follow along as the text is presented to them.
- In reading teams, students discuss the text-based questions and search for relevant details, highlighting and annotating them in their text (and might use a *Forming EBC* tool to record their thinking).

WRITING CLAIMS

- The teacher models the development and writing of an explanatory claim that addresses something the text has presented about the unit's issue. The claim is explanatory not argumentative at this point.
- Students individually develop explanatory claims about the text's presentation of the issue (a *Forming EBC* tool can be used).
- In reading teams, students compare claims and the evidence they have found to derive and support them.

Students write a short claim-based synopsis of the text and the information it presents about the nature of the issue or problem, citing specific details and evidence to support their explanatory claim. [NOTE: Emphasize that at this point in the process, student claims should focus on interpreting what the text says about the nature of the issue, not on the validity of the text's perspective or position and *not* on articulating the student's own, still-developing position. Those sorts of claims will come later.]

ACTIVITY 2: EXPLORING THE ISSUE (CONT'D)

INSTRUCTIONAL NOTES (CONT'D)

NOTE ON TEXT SETS

Instruction in this unit links to a sequence of *text sets*. Each text set provides multiple entry points into the issue, giving teachers and students flexibility with respect to the time and depth with which they wish to explore the topic.

Teachers may choose to use the text sets in a variety of ways:

- Select one of the three texts for all students to read, analyze, and discuss. Provide links to the other two so that students can do additional reading if desired.
- Have all students read, analyze, and discuss all three texts (or two of the three) in a more extended instructional time sequence.
- Place students in "expert groups" and have them read and analyze one of the three texts. Then have students "jigsaw' into cross-text discussion groups to share and compare what they have learned from the text each has read. [Note: students might be grouped by reading level and assigned texts based on their complexity/difficulty.]

TEXT SET #1: TEXTUAL NOTES

Text Set I includes three texts that can be used to provide initial background information about PEDs in sports, the history of PEDs in sports, and information about the most used PEDs in sports.

TEXT 1.1: "WHAT ARE PERFORMANCE-ENHANCING DRUGS?"

Author: Luke Bauer; **Source/Publisher:** Odell Education; **Date**: December 5, 2013

Complexity Level: Measures at 910L.

Text Notes: This short background article defines a performance-enhancing drug, explains that they are not allowed in many sports, and asks a couple of questions surrounding the topic itself. It provides a glimpse into the history of this issue, which will prime readers for Text #2, a historical timeline. It concludes by describing the culture of sports and why some athletes turn to performance-enhancing drugs.

Sample Text-Dependent Questions (to drive closer reading and discussion):

1. How does the author describe performance-enhancing drugs?
2. What comparison is made between modern athletes and ancient Greek and Mayan athletes?
3. What "competitive environment" is being described that is responsible for increases in performance enhancing drug usage amongst athletes?

ACTIVITY 2: EXPLORING THE ISSUE (CONT'D)

TEXT SET #1: TEXTUAL NOTES

TEXT 1.2: "HISTORICAL TIMELINE: HISTORY OF PERFORMANCE ENHANCING DRUGS IN SPORTS"

Author/Source/Publisher: ProCon.org; **Date**: Last Updated August 8, 2013

Complexity Level: Complexity levels for the timeline entries vary. While the chunking and text features make them more accessible, some vocabulary will have to be defined.

Text Notes: This timeline is lengthy and, therefore, students do not need to read it in its entirety. By simply scrolling through it, students should gain knowledge that athletes have been using substances to enhance their athletic abilities for thousands of years and so this issue is not a new one, despite the media circus surrounding superstar athletes like Alex Rodriguez of the New York Yankees, Marion Jones of Olympic fame, and Lance Armstrong from cycling. Teachers might choose specific entries to have students focus on.

Sample Text-Dependent Questions (to drive closer reading and discussion):

1. In any year or era, what does the timeline's text say happened regarding performance-enhancing drugs? What might the impact of these events have been on people who lived during this time?
2. What evidence does this text provide that influences your understanding of the issue/problem of performance-enhancing drugs in the US?
3. What is the earliest documented usage of performance-enhancing substances in athletics? Where did the word "doping" come from?
4. In what sports have performance-enhancing drugs been used?
5. Which entries on the timeline indicate attempts to restrict the usage of performance enhancing drugs in sports?
6. What evidence does this text provide that influences your understanding of the issue/problem of performance-enhancing drugs in the US?

TEXT 1.3: "STEROIDS"

Author/Source/Publisher: Kids Health; **Date**: 2013

Complexity Level: This text measures 1200L, however, it is chunked into three sub-sections, which make it relatively easy for students to access. As in other texts in this unit, most of the difficult vocabulary pertains to the names of different performance-enhancing drugs. However, students do not need to know all the differences between them, just recognize that they are referencing PEDs. The important terminology like "performance-enhancing" can be taught directly when first encountered to support comprehension in subsequent texts.

Text Notes: This Kids Health article goes more in-depth on what steroids are and what they do to your body when taken. It also lists out many of the dangers of using steroids and concludes by starting a conversation about why using them might not be fair to other athletes. The Kids Health site also has an option for students to listen to the text if necessary.

Sample Text-Dependent Questions (to drive closer reading and discussion):

1. What are steroids?
2. In what forms can you put steroids into your body?
3. What reasons does the author provide for why "using steroids isn't playing fair?"
4. What evidence does this text provide that influences your understanding of the issue/problem of performance-enhancing drugs in the US?

ACTIVITY 3: DEEPENING UNDERSTANDING OF THE ISSUE

Students read and analyze a second background text to expand and deepen their understanding of the issue.

INSTRUCTIONAL NOTES

READING

- Students read the text independently, annotating and making notes on how it relates to the unit's problem-based question.
- The teacher introduces one or more text-based questions to drive a closer reading of the text. Students then follow along as the text is presented to them.
- In reading teams, students discuss the text-based questions and search for relevant details, highlighting and annotating them in their text (and might use a *Forming EBC* tool to record their thinking).

WRITING CLAIMS

- The teacher models the development and writing of an explanatory claim that addresses something the text has presented about the unit's issue. The claim is explanatory not argumentative at this point.
- Students individually develop explanatory claims about the text's presentation of the issue (a *Forming EBC* tool can be used).
- In reading teams, students compare claims and the evidence they have found to derive and support them.

Students write a short claim-based synopsis of the text and the information it presents about the nature of the issue or problem, citing specific details and evidence to support their explanatory claim. [NOTE: Emphasize that at this point in the process, student claims should focus on interpreting what the text says about the nature of the issue, not on the validity of the text's perspective or position and *not* on articulating the student's own, still-developing position. Those sorts of claims will come later.]

TEXT SET #2: TEXTUAL NOTES

Text Set #2 includes three texts that can be used to provide additional background information about performance-enhancing drugs in sports and why athletes and non-athletes choose to use them.

TEXT 2.1: "HOW TO GET DOPING OUT OF SPORTS"

Author: Jonathan Vaughters; **Source/Publisher:** The New York Times; **Date**: August 11, 2012

Complexity Level: This article, from The New York Times, measures 1010L and is very accessible for students in middle school.

Text Notes: This article is written by a former professional cyclist who chose to use performance-enhancing drugs. He describes the pressure he felt to "keep up" and how doping would allow him to become an elite cyclist. His remorse is now fueled by his desire to help keep sports clean and prevent a culture that legitimizes drugs.

Sample Text-Dependent Questions (to drive closer reading and discussion):

1. What textual details support Vaughters claim that, "Achieving childhood dreams is a hard road."?
2. What is the "2%" that Vaughters describes?
3. What does Vaughters mean by, "The answer is not to teach young athletes that giving up lifelong dreams is better than giving in to cheating. The answer is to never give them the option."?
4. What evidence does this text provide that influences your understanding of the issue/problem of performance-enhancing drugs in the US?

ACTIVITY 3: DEEPENING UNDERSTANDING OF THE ISSUE (CONT'D)

TEXT SET #2: TEXTUAL NOTES

TEXT 2.2: "PERFORMANCE-ENHANCING DRUGS OUTSIDE OF PRO SPORTS"

Author: Kyung Lah; **Source/Publisher:** Anderson Cooper 360: CNN; **Date**: August 5, 2013

Complexity Level: NA.

Text Notes: This is a video blog from Anderson Cooper 360. It details how other athletes, besides those in professional sports, are using performance-enhancing drugs. Specifically, some older adults are using them to keep themselves in top form, despite aging.

Sample Text-Dependent Questions (to drive closer reading and discussion):

1. What evidence from the video helps explain Jeffrey Life's statement, "I'm not against aging. I'm against getting old."?
2. What are the long terms costs to using Human Growth Hormone described by Dr. Tom Perls from Boston University?

TEXT 2.3: "PERFORMANCE-ENHANCING DRUGS: A CHEAT SHEET"

Author: Katie Moisse; **Source/Publisher:** ABC News; **Date**: August 5, 2013

Complexity Level: This text measures 1380L, however, it is chunked into twelve small sections, which make it relatively easy for students to access.

Text Notes: This ABC News report provides background information on the names and descriptions of many banned substances/drugs that are used by athletes. This basic information will help students become familiar with their names, how they work, and how often they are used. One goal of the background readings is for students to recognize the names of drugs when they encounter them in further reading so they can identify quickly and continue reading.

Sample Text-Dependent Questions (to drive closer reading and discussion):

1. For any of the drugs detailed in the sections of this article, how do they work, what are the health risks, and how often are they used by athletes?
2. What evidence is presented in this article that deepens your understanding of the issue surrounding performance-enhancing drugs in sports?
3. What evidence does this text provide that influences your understanding of the issue/problem of performance-enhancing drugs in the US?

ACTIVITY 4: QUESTIONING TO REFINE UNDERSTANDING

Students develop text-dependent questions and use them to find additional evidence and further refine their claims.

INSTRUCTIONAL NOTES

QUESTIONING TEXTS

Students now apply skills they have developed in a *Reading Closely for Textual Details* unit to frame their own, more focused questions about the issue and texts. They use these questions to drive a deeper reading of the previous texts, or of additional texts providing background and perspectives on the topic.

- Starting from the unit's problem-based question, students work in reading teams to develop a set of more focused, text-based questions to drive further inquiry into the issue. (Students can use the *Reading Closely for Details: Guiding Questions* handout to help them develop their questions.)
- Individually, students use these new questions to re-read one of the two background texts, find additional details, and further refine their explanatory claim.
- *If additional background information is necessary or desired*, students then use their question sets to drive close reading and analysis of one or more additional texts. (Note: Suggested texts are listed in the Instructional Notes or may be identified by the teacher or found by the students. Students might work in teams to become "experts" and develop explanatory claims about one or more of these additional texts, then "jigsaw" into new groups and share what they have learned. In this way, all students can become familiar with a wider range of background texts.)
- Students write or revise one or more explanatory claim(s) based on additional evidence they have found through further or deeper reading.

TEXTUAL NOTES

ADDITIONAL BACKGROUND TEXTS

To expand their understanding of the topic, students might be assigned any of the texts from Text Sets #1 and #2 that have not been read by the class. They might also access other sources found by the teacher (or by students themselves) or the additional source texts listed in the unit plan.

The three listed source texts provide additional, and different, information about performance-enhancing drugs in sports, and can be used to expand students' understanding and/or as independent reading/research assignments. "The Future of Cheating in Sports" is an article how genetically changing your body so it naturally produces performance-enhancing substance. "Athlete Guide to the 2013 Prohibited List" is basically organized like a rulebook and explains all of the banned substances that athletes are not legally allowed to take. Finally, "The Beam in your Eye" compares surgery like Lasik vision correction and Tommy John Elbow to performance-enhancing drugs and asks why one is legal and the other is not.

ACTIVITY 5: WRITING AN EBC ABOUT THE NATURE OF THE ISSUE

Students develop and write an evidence-based claim about the nature of the issue.

INSTRUCTIONAL NOTES

In the culminating activity for Part 1, students now develop a synthesis claim about the nature of the issue that they will expand and revise when drafting their final argument. Before they can take a position and make their case for a response, they must be able to use evidence to explain their understanding of the issue or problem.

- The teacher models the development of an evidence-based claim that synthesizes information from multiple sources and presents the writer's understanding the unit's issue.
- In reading teams, students go back to the background texts to find additional evidence/details that support this synthesis claim. (An *Organizing EBC* tool can be used).
- In reading teams, students review the explanatory claims they wrote about each text.
- In reading teams, students brainstorm alternative ways of viewing or understanding the problem, based on evidence from the background texts.
- Individually, students develop a multi-part claim that synthesizes how they have come (so far) to view and understand the nature of the issue and its components. (An *Organizing EBC* tool can be used).
- In reading teams, students compare their synthesis claims and the evidence that supports them.
- If teachers and students are familiar with the *Evidence-Based Claims Criteria Checklist* and the *Text-Centered Discussion Checklist* from work in previous units, students can use them as criteria for evaluating their claims and reflecting on their discussions and participation in their reading teams.
- As a class, return to the unit's problem-based question to consider revising it based on the emerging understanding of the issue.

ASSESSMENT OPPORTUNITIES

As a formative assessment, and a building block for their final argument, in Activity 5, students draft a written, multi-part claim that:

1. Synthesizes what they have learned about the nature of the unit's issue.
2. Presents their current way of understanding the issue and its components.
3. Cites evidence from multiple sources that explains and substantiates their perspective.
4. Represents their best thinking and clearest writing.

Teachers can use an *EBC Criteria Checklist* to evaluate student writing as well as each student's initial comprehension of the background texts and understanding of the issue.

PART 2

ANALYZING ARGUMENTS

"The drugs are illegal, they're harmful, and they're cheating."

OBJECTIVE:	Students delineate and analyze the position, premises, reasoning, evidence and perspective of arguments.

ACTIVITIES

MATERIALS:
Text Sets 3-5
Forming EBC Tool
Delineating Arguments Tool
Model Arguments
TCD Checklist
EBA Terms

1- UNDERSTANDING ARGUMENTATIVE POSITION
The teacher introduces the concept of an argumentative position through a discussion of the unit's issue.

2- IDENTIFYING ELEMENTS OF AN ARGUMENT
The teacher leads an exploration of the elements of argumentation in an everyday context.

3- DELINEATING ARGUMENTATION
Student teams read and delineate arguments.

4- UNDERSTANDING PERSPECTIVE
The teacher leads an exploration of the concept of perspective in an everyday context.

5- COMPARING PERSPECTIVES
Students analyze and compare perspectives in argumentative texts.

6- DELINEATING ADDITIONAL ARGUMENTS
As needed, students read and analyze additional arguments related to the unit's issue.

7 - WRITING TO ANALYZE ARGUMENTS
Students write short essays analyzing an argument.

ALIGNMENT TO CCSS

TARGETED STANDARDS:
RI.7.6: Determine an author's point of view or purpose in a text and analyze how the author distinguishes his or her position from that of others. **RI.7.8:** Trace and evaluate the argument and specific claims in a text, assessing whether the reasoning is sound and the evidence is relevant and sufficient to support the claims. **RI.7.9:** Analyze how two or more authors writing about the same topic shape their presentations of key information by emphasizing different evidence or advancing different interpretations of facts. **W.7.2:** Write informative/explanatory texts to examine a topic and convey ideas, concepts, and information through the selection, organization, and analysis of relevant content.

SUPPORTING STANDARDS:
RI.7.1: Cite several pieces of textual evidence to support analysis of what the text says explicitly as well as inferences drawn from the text. **RI.7.2:** Determine two or more central ideas in a text and analyze their development over the course of the text; provide an objective summary of the text. **RI.7.3:** Analyze the interactions between individuals, events, and ideas in a text (e.g., how ideas influence individuals or events, or how individuals influence ideas or events). **RI.7.4:** Determine the meaning of words and phrases as they are used in a text, including figurative, connotative, and technical meanings; analyze the impact of a specific word choice on meaning and tone. **SL.7.1:** Engage effectively in a range of collaborative discussions (one-on-one, in groups, and teacher-led) with diverse partners on grade 7 topics, texts, and issues, building on others' ideas and expressing their own clearly. **W.7.9:** Draw evidence from literary or informational texts to support analysis, reflection, and research.

ACTIVITY 1: UNDERSTANDING ARGUMENTATIVE POSITION

The teacher introduces the concept of an argumentative position through a discussion of the unit's issue.

INSTRUCTIONAL NOTES

In Part 2 discussion and instruction shifts from the previous focus on understanding the background and nature of the unit's issue to a focus on the various controversies, or differences of opinion, that have surrounded the issue historically and/or currently, and have led to various positions and arguments.

CLASS BRAINSTORM

- As a class, brainstorm a list of questions that highlight various points of controversy or debate within the issue. If applicable, this can be related to the initial prior-knowledge/KWL activity.
- *If performance-enhancing drugs have been used for thousands of years, why are we suddenly caring so much about their usage in sports?*

The questions might address the current realm for debate related to performance-enhancing drugs, e.g.:

- *How should the world of sports deal with performance-enhancing drugs?*

They can also examine aspects of the topic that are more peripheral to the central debate, but may still be very relevant, e.g.:

- *What policies should be in place high school students and those even younger?*

INTRODUCE CONCEPT OF POSITION

All questions, however, should be framed in a manner that suggests multiple ways of responding, that prepares students to examine various perspectives from which an answer could come as well as various positions that might be taken in response to the topic and question.

- Discuss with students how each of these questions can be responded to in various ways.
- Introduce the term *position*, which can be defined as *someone's stance on what to do or think about a clearly defined issue based on their perspective and understanding of it. When writing argumentative essays, one's position may be expressed as a thesis.*
- Discuss how the term relates to points of controversy in the issue.

CARTOON ANALYSIS

- Distribute Text Set #3, a set of political cartoons related to the unit's issue. Use one example to model how the cartoon can be seen as expressing a *position* on the issue.
- As a class discuss the various "positions" expressed in the cartoons. Discuss how argumentative essays develop arguments to support positions. Ask if students see the beginnings of any basic arguments to support the position in the visual details of the cartoons, and discuss the evidence they identify.

TEXT SET #3: TEXTUAL NOTES

TEXT 3.1: "WHY THE USE OF PERFORMANCE-ENHANCING DRUGS BY GREAT ATHLETES STILL BOTHERS US"

Author: J. Gordon Hylton; **Source/Publisher:** Marquette University Law School Blog; **Date**: NA

TEXT 3.2: "CARTOONISTS ON BASEBALL AND STEROIDS"

Authors: Several cartoonists' work are shown; **Source/Publisher:** Newsday; **Date**: August 6, 2013

Text Notes: The first site provided is a political cartoon from the Marquette University Law School Blog. The second is a site from Newsday that contains 19 political cartoons mostly related to baseball. The teacher (and/or students) can browse either or both of these sources and find cartoons that relate to the unit's focus, the problem-based question, and the set of debatable questions generated in Activity 1. Teachers are encouraged to conduct their own web searches in order to include the most current political cartoons, or cartoons appropriate for the specific classroom context.

ACTIVITY 1: UNDERSTANDING ARGUMENTATIVE POSITION (CONT'D)

TEXT SET #3: TEXTUAL NOTES

Once cartoons are selected, students should "read" them closely by visually scanning for key details and presentation techniques, considering also any text that may be presented with the cartoon. Ideally a cartoon set will provide examples that come from several different perspectives and take several different positions as they communicate political commentary through their imagery and words. Model how one can "read" a cartoon and its details to determine the point or commentary communicated by the cartoon, and thus determine its *position* (which may or may not be stated). Finally, model how a cartoon artist presents visual details as *evidence* that establishes and supports the cartoon's position.

Following this modeling and some guided practice, students might then work in teams with a cartoon set. The questioning and analysis sequence might begin with a general text question(s) from the *Reading Closely for Details: Guiding Questions* handout, such as:

Which key details stand out to me as I scan the cartoon/text? How are these details keys to understanding the cartoonist's/author's perspective? What does the cartoon/text seem to be saying about the topic – what is its commentary or position?

ACTIVITY 2: IDENTIFYING ELEMENTS OF ARGUMENTATION

The teacher introduces and the class explores the elements of argumentation in a familiar context.

INSTRUCTIONAL NOTES

INTRODUCE ARGUMENT TERMS

Once students have a good understanding of the concept of a *position* on an *issue* and the idea that positions are supported with argumentation, instruction can shift to the specific augmentative elements authors use to explain and defend their positions. The objective of this activity is for students to have a solid conceptual understanding of the elements of an argument and to be able to use a set of terms to identify and analyze them. The **terms for elements of argumentation used in this unit** are *issue*, *relationship to issue*, *perspective*, *position*, *implications*, *premise*, *reasoning*, *evidence*, and *chain of reasoning*. Teachers may have already worked with students using different nomenclature and might elect to use that terminology instead. For instance, some might call a *position* a *thesis* or a *premise* a *supporting claim*. This unit is based on a view that *claims* used in the context of *argumentation* are called *premises*. Whatever nomenclature a teacher chooses, it should be used consistently so students develop an understanding and facility with the terminology.

Introduce and describe how authors explain and defend their positions with a series of linked *premises (claims)*, developed through a chain of *reasoning*, and supported by *evidence*. When introducing these concepts, it is best to model and practice their use with topics from students' personal experiences and everyday life that do not require background information.

PRATICE USING ARGUMENTATION TERMS

A *Delineating Arguments* tool can be used as an instructional strategy.

For this activity focus on the terms *position*, *premise*, *evidence* and *reasoning*.

- Begin by showing students a basic model of the *Delineating Arguments* tool. NOTE: If using the *Delineating Arguments* tool, teachers can use one of the included models or develop their own that would work better with their students. Talk about each element and its relationship to the other elements as you read the model aloud.
- Have students identify alternative premises and evidence to defend the same position and the reasoning that would connect them.

ACTIVITY 2: IDENTIFYING ELEMENTS OF ARGUMENTATION (CONT'D)

INSTRUCTIONAL NOTES (CONT'D)

- In reading teams have students work with blank tools to develop a different position and argument on the "issue."
- Have reading teams present their positions and arguments explaining each element. As a class, discuss the way the reading teams applied each element.
- Encourage the students to use the vocabulary terms they have learned. Write the new vocabulary on the board so they can use the words as references for discussion.
- Once students have some facility with the elements, explain to students that they will be using the terminology to analyze and compare various arguments related to the unit's issue.

ACTIVITY 3: DELINEATING ARGUMENTS

Student teams read and delineate arguments.

INSTRUCTIONAL NOTES

Students next read and analyze Text 4.1, an accessible, foundational argument related to the unit's issue. Use text-dependent questions to help students attend to key details related to the argument's position, premises/claims, structure and reasoning, and supporting evidence. Emphasize that at this point students are reading to *delineate* and not yet *evaluate* the argument.

- Students first read the argument independently, considering general guiding questions such as: *"What is the author thinking and saying about the issue or problem?" [Guiding Questions Handout]*
- Introduce a set of text-based questions to drive a closer reading and analysis of the text's argument; then have students follow along as the text is read aloud/presented to them.
- In reading teams, students discuss the text-based questions and search for relevant details, highlighting and labeling their text where they identify the various elements of argumentation.
- Teachers/students might also choose to use a blank *Delineating Arguments* tool to structure and capture their delineation.
- Assign each team one or more of the elements of the argument (position, premises, reasoning, evidence) and have them prepare a short presentation for the class about what they have discovered through their analysis of the argument. Emphasize that each team will need to cite specific evidence from the text that supports their analysis.
- As a class delineate the article's argument by identifying its position, premises, reasoning, and evidence.
- Model the writing of a claim about ***how*** the author has presented and developed one element of the argument (e.g., its position). Then have students individually write a claim about the author's use of the element their team studied.

TEXT SET #4: TEXTUAL NOTES

TEXT 4.1: "CONGRESSMAN ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS URGES THE NATIONAL BASKETBALL ASSOCIATION TO ADOPT A ZERO-TOLERANCE DRUG POLICY"

Author: Rep. Elijah Cummings; **Source/Publisher:** Congressman Elijah E. Cummings House of Representatives site; **Date**: May 19, 2005

Complexity Level: This press release measures at 1330L, due mostly to some longer sentences. However, the text is short and is chunked into 1-2 sentence paragraphs, which makes for an easier read than the measure might suggest. In addition, this argument is clearly structured to communicate and substantiate a position

ACTIVITY 3: DELINEATING ARGUMENTS (CONT'D)

TEXT SET #4: TEXTUAL NOTES

through a set of linked and supported premises, which should make it an accessible argument to begin with for most students.

Text Notes: This Press Release from Representative Cummings is included as the first sample argument in the set because it represents a clear example of a deductively organized argument, where the *perspective* is clear from his first sentence, the *position* is communicated early in the text, and the argument is developed through a series of linked claims or *premises*, each of which is backed by *evidence*. Thus, the text should provide good initial practice (and modeling) for students as they study how arguments are constructed. Cummings supports his position throughout the release ultimately calling for the National Basketball Association to enact tougher rules to police the usage of performance-enhancing drugs.

Sample Text-Dependent Questions (to drive closer reading and discussion):

1. What does the first line of Cummings' release ("…steroid abuse in professional sports is no game.") imply about his view on performance-enhancing drugs?
2. Why does Cummings use Major League Baseball in his argument aimed at the National Basketball Association?
3. What evidence does Cummings use to support his claim that youth are receiving "destructive messages" about performance-enhancing drugs?
4. Which sentences – taken together – best communicate Cummings' position about performance-enhancing drugs in sports?
5. Cummings establishes a series of evidence-based premises in favor of his position. How does one of these premises relate to his overall argument, and what specific evidence does he provide to support the premise?
6. In the concluding paragraphs to his argument, Cummings says, "As the old adage goes, it is wrong to hope when you can have." Why does Cummings use this line?
7. What argumentative premises and evidence does this text provide that influence your understanding of performance-enhancing drugs in sports?
8. What evidence does this text provide that influences your understanding of the issue/problem of performance-enhancing drugs in the US?

ACTIVITY 4: UNDERSTANDING PERSPECTIVE

The teacher leads an exploration of the concept of perspective.

INSTRUCTIONAL NOTES

- Introduce the terms *relationship to issue* and *perspective* to the class. *Relationship to issue* can be defined in this context as a person's particular personal involvement with an issue, given his or her experience, education, occupation, socio-economic-geographical status, interests, or other characteristics. *Perspective* can be defined as how someone understands and views an issue based on his/her current relationship to it and analysis of the issue. Spend some time to explore the various meanings of perspective and how they might relate to how the term is used here.
- Compare the author's perspective to an iceberg, where the author's particular argument or position is clearly seen, but his or her personal relationship and perspective on the issue may or may not be

ACTIVITY 4: UNDERSTANDING PERSPECTIVE (CONT'D)

INSTRUCTIONAL NOTES (CONT'D)

explicitly revealed in the text. Without this perspective, however, the author's position would not be possible; the author's perspective influences how he or she approaches and ultimately defines an issue and eventually a particular position on it.

Revisit the everyday argumentative contexts that the class explored in Activity 2. Discuss the various perspectives of the actors in those situations. Discuss how the actors' personal relationship to the issue influences their perspective. And how their perspective influences their understanding of the issue and their position.

NOTE: Teachers might choose to BEGIN the exploration of perspective by having students refer back to this activity. Teachers could use a Socratic discussion model to lead students to an understanding of perspective by having them explore the various positions and the reasons why the various actors might hold those positions. After students have come to an initial understanding of perspective, teachers could then introduce the terms and their definitions.

ACTIVITY 5: COMPARING PERSPECTIVES

Students analyze and compare perspective in argumentative texts.

INSTRUCTIONAL NOTES

Students revisit Text #4.1 after developing an understanding of how perspective helps shape an author's position and argument.

- The teacher models a claim that analyzes how an author's position on the issue is directly influenced by his or her relationship to it. The teacher can use the argument from Activity 2 to model this claim.
- In reading teams, students write their own claims on how the perspective of Text #4.1's author influences his or her position on the issue.

The remaining texts in Text Set 4 present students with different perspectives, positions, and arguments for students to read and analyze. Students will use these texts to move from guided to independent practice of the close reading skills associated with analyzing an argument.

- Students first read the argument independently, considering general guiding questions such as: *"What is the author thinking and saying about the issue or problem?" "What do the author's language and approach suggest about his/her relationship to and perspective on the issue or problem?" "How does the author's relationship to the issue help shape his/her position?" [Guiding Questions Handout]*
- Introduce a set of text-based questions to drive a closer reading and analysis of the text's argument; then have students follow along as the text is read aloud/presented to them.
- In reading teams, students discuss the text-based questions and search for relevant details, highlighting and annotating them.
- Students might use a *Delineating Arguments* tool to delineate the author's argument.
- Discuss as a class the author's position, argument, and perspective.
- Model developing an evidence-based claim comparing how the authors have used one of the elements of argumentation differently, as influenced by their perspectives. Then have students individually develop their own comparative EBCs. Note: These evidence-based claims can be developed orally, on paper, or using an *Organizing EBC* tool.
- Teachers may also choose to discuss the various ways authors structure the logical reasoning of arguments.

ACTIVITY 5: COMPARING PERSPECTIVES (CONT'D)

TEXT SET #4: TEXTUAL NOTES

Texts 4.2 and 4.3 are two very different arguments about the issue of performance-enhancing drugs in sports, which take very different positions and come from very distinct perspectives (based a great deal on each author's personal relationship to the issue). Either, or both, can provide an interesting text for students to use in analyzing and comparing perspectives.

Text 4.4 also takes a definite perspective on the issue of performance-enhancing drugs and develop a strong position from that perspective. It can be used as alternatives to Texts 4.2 and 4.3, or as additional reading for students.

TEXT 4.2: SPEECH BY DR. JACQUES ROGGE PRESIDENT, INTERNATIONAL OLYMPIC COMMITTEE TO WORLD CONFERENCE ON DOPING IN SPORT

Author: Dr. Jacques Rogge; **Source/Publisher:** Olympic International Committee; **Date**: November 15, 2007

Complexity Level: 1220L. This text measures just above middle school complexity band, and is written in a direct, accessible style, but it also presents a nuanced and emergent argument, and may therefore prove to be challenging reading for some students. At this point in the text sequence, students will be supported by vocabulary and ideas they have learned from earlier texts and will transfer to this argument.

Text Notes: Dr. Jacques Rogge, President of the International Olympic Committee (IOC) presented this speech to the World Conference on doping in 2007. The organization of his argument is strong and one that students should spend time understanding because it is a common format for organizing speeches or written arguments. He starts by sharing the "why" or as he calls it "the importance of our efforts". He then moves into the successes of the IOC followed by the opportunities ahead and the challenges they face moving forward. He concludes by expressing his and the IOC's commitment to working together and continuing the battle.

The questioning and analysis sequence might begin with a general text question(s) from the *Reading Closely for Details: Guiding Questions* handout, such as:

What is the author's personal relationship to the topic? How does this influence the author's perspective?

Sample Text-Dependent Questions (to drive closer reading and discussion):

1. In paragraph 2, Rogge refers to an ongoing investigation into doping in Spain. What do Rogge's comments about it suggest is likely to be his perspective on performance-enhancing drugs in sports?
2. What do the final four lines of page 1 reveal about the organization of Rogge's speech and position?
3. In building support for his argument, Rogge claims that "The fight against doping involves however much more than elite sport alone." What other groups does Rogge use as support for his claim?
4. How is Rogge's line of reasoning and development of his argument different from the arguments of Cummings (Text IV.1)?
5. What argumentative claims and evidence does this text provide that influence your understanding of performance-enhancing drugs in sports?
6. What evidence does this text provide that influences your understanding of the issue/problem of performance-enhancing drugs in the US?

ACTIVITY 5: COMPARING PERSPECTIVES (CONT'D)

TEXT SET #4: TEXTUAL NOTES

TEXT 4.3: "WHY IT'S TIME TO LEGALIZE STEROIDS IN PROFESSIONAL SPORTS"

Author: Chris Smith; **Source/Publisher:** Forbes; **Date**: August 24, 2012

Complexity Level: The text measures at 1450L, and is a complex text for advanced 7th grade readers to use. There is some advanced vocabulary (illicit and scourge) that while not important to understand Smith's argument, could distract students.

Text Notes: In this Forbes article, staff writer Chris Smith states his argument that PEDs should be legalized in the title and first paragraph. He then uses the remainder of the article to explain the intent for why PEDs have been banned in sports, deflects counterpoints, and provides several examples to support his position on why PEDs should be legalized.

Students' questioning and analysis sequence might begin with a general text question(s) from the *Reading Closely for Details: Guiding Questions* handout, such as: *What is the author's personal relationship to the topic? How does this influence the author's perspective?*

Sample Text-Dependent Questions (to drive closer reading and discussion):

1. What is Smith's perspective on the problem of performance-enhancing drugs in sports, and how does his language convey that perspective?
2. While Smith makes a number of claims in his argument. Which claims does he support with evidence and which does he not?
3. Which details and evidence that Smith cites seem solid and convincing? Which ones seem more questionable?
4. Smith says, "The primary reason why performance enhancing drugs (PEDs) are outlawed in professional sports is that give users an unfair advantages over the rest of the field." How does this claim compare with ideas presented by Cummings and Rogge?
5. What argumentative claims and evidence does this text provide that influence your understanding of performance-enhancing drugs in sports?
6. What evidence does this text provide that influences your understanding of the issue/problem of performance-enhancing drugs in the US?

TEXT 4.4: "CONFESSIONS OF A DOPER: LANCE ARMSTRONG'S FORMER TEAMMATE JONATHAN VAUGHTERS TALKS ABOUT WHY SOME ATHLETES USE STEROIDS"

Author: Jonathan Vaughters; **Source/Publisher:** New York Times; **Date**: August 11, 2012

Complexity Level: Measures at 1010L.

Text Notes: This New York Times article was also used earlier as a background text for students to learn more about the topic of performance-enhancing drugs. It is returned to here because it provides a strong argument from a person with a different perspective, someone who used PEDs and felt the pressures of winning at all costs.

Sample Text-Dependent Questions (to drive closer reading and discussion):

1. What is Vaughter's perspective on the use of performance-enhancing drugs in sports, and how does his language convey that perspective?
2. What claims does Vaughters make about why athletes turn to performance-enhancing drugs?
3. What "message" is Vaughters referring to when he says, "If the message I was given had been different, but more important, if the reality of sport then had been different, perhaps I could have lived my dream without killing my soul."?

ACTIVITY 5: COMPARING PERSPECTIVES (CONT'D)

TEXTUAL NOTES

4. According to Vaughters, what are the perspectives and positions that athletes faced in the past compared to those that he hopes future athletes will face? Which sentence(s) in the speeches most clearly present those perspectives and positions?
5. How does the support used by Cummings, Rogge, and Smith for their arguments compare to Vaughters?
6. What argumentative claims and evidence do these texts provide that influence your understanding of performance-enhancing drugs in sports?
7. What evidence does this text provide that influences your understanding of the issue/problem of performance-enhancing drugs in the US?

ACTIVITY 6: DELINEATING ADDITIONAL ARGUMENTS

As needed, teachers may choose to have students read and delineate additional arguments related to the unit's issue.

INSTRUCTIONAL NOTES

To more fully understand the issue, students may need to explore additional arguments. Possibilities related to the unit's issue are listed in the text set, but teachers and students are also encouraged to find additional texts themselves. (NOTE: this is the point in the unit at which students might embark on further research, guided by the *Researching to Deepen Understanding* unit's activities and resources.)

For each argument read, students might complete a *Delineating Arguments* tool and write an evidence-based-claim about the author's perspective. To broaden the class's access to many arguments, students might work in "expert" teams focused on one or more of the arguments, then "jigsaw" to share their team's findings with students from other teams.

TEXT SET #5: TEXTUAL NOTES

TEXT SET 5 – ADDITIONAL ARGUMENTS:

Students should now be familiar with background information and some seminal arguments about performance-enhancing drugs in sports. They should now be prepared to examine the issues surrounding performance-enhancing drugs as they are currently being discussed, debated, and responded to. The unit's text set lists five examples of such arguments - current as of fall 2013, including articles that represent many perspectives on how the world of sports should deal with the problem of performance-enhancing drugs.

It is anticipated that as the issues and problems associated with performance-enhancing drugs in sports evolve, the nature of contemporary arguments and speeches will also change. Therefore, teachers and students are encouraged to look beyond the listed examples and search for more current texts that reflect what pundits, columnists, commentators, and the public are saying about immigration in the US at any given moment in current history.

ACTIVITY 7: WRITING TO ANALYZE ARGUMENTS

Students write short essays analyzing an argument.

INSTRUCTIONAL NOTES

Students use their notes, annotations, and tools to write short essays analyzing one of the arguments they have read thus far in the unit. In their essays, students:

- state the author's position
- identify the elements of the argument (premises, reasoning, evidence, perspective)
- make an evidence-based claim about how the author's perspective shapes the position and/or argumentation
- use evidence from the text to support their analysis.

ASSESSMENT OPPORTUNITIES

Part 2 presents many opportunities for formative assessment. The two most important proficiencies to assess here are a student's:

1. understanding of and facility with the concepts for analyzing arguments; and

2. ability to analyze and write about other authors' arguments

Teachers can use the tools, claims, and conversations from Activities 2 and 4 to assess emerging proficiency with the analytic concepts without the interference of additional reading comprehension loads. These activities have been designed for development and assessment of these core literacy proficiencies in all students (including ELL and students reading below grade level).

The claims and conversation from Activities 3, 5, and 6 add the opportunity to assess the proficiency in analyzing and writing about other arguments.

The short essay from Activity 7 provides a mid-unit formative assessment on both proficiencies and the ability to link and develop analysis across several paragraphs.

As a formative assessment of the text-centered discussions that have led to their claims, students might complete two *TDC Checklists*, one that rates their team's overall performance and one that represents a self-assessment of their own participation.

PART 3

EVALUATING ARGUMENTS AND DEVELOPING A POSITION

"At their best, sports can embody the virtues of teamwork, hard work, and integrity"

OBJECTIVE:	Students evaluate arguments, determine which arguments they find most compelling, and synthesize what they have learned so far to establish their own position.

ACTIVITIES

MATERIALS:
Text Sets 3-5
Forming EBC Tool
Delineating Arguments Tool
EBA Criteria Checklist
TCD Checklist
EBA Terms

1- EVALUATING ARGUMENTS
Students review and evaluate arguments using objective criteria and their own developing perspective of the issue.

2- DEVELOPING A POSITION
Students synthesize what they have learned about the issue and related arguments to clarify their own developing perspective and to establish a position for their own argument.

3- DEEPENING UNDERSTANDING
If needed, students conduct further research to help develop and support their position.

4- USING OTHERS' ARGUMENTS TO SUPPORT A POSITION
Students identify an argument that supports their position and write an evidence-based claim about why the argument is compelling or makes sense to them.

5- RESPONDING TO OPPOSING ARGUMENTS
Students identify an argument that opposes their position and write an evidence-based claim that either acknowledges the argument's position, points out its limitations, counters its premises, or refutes it as invalid, illogical, or unsupported.

ALIGNMENT TO CCSS

TARGETED STANDARDS:
RI.7.6: Determine an author's point of view or purpose in a text and analyze how the author distinguishes his or her position from that of others. **RI.7.8:** Trace and evaluate the argument and specific claims in a text, assessing whether the reasoning is sound and the evidence is relevant and sufficient to support the claims. **RI.7.9:** Analyze how two or more authors writing about the same topic shape their presentations of key information by emphasizing different evidence or advancing different interpretations of facts. **W.7.1:** Write arguments to support claims with clear reasons and relevant evidence. **W.7.2:** Write informative/explanatory texts to examine a topic and convey ideas, concepts, and information through the selection, organization, and analysis of relevant content.

SUPPORTING STANDARDS:
RI.7.1: Cite several pieces of textual evidence to support analysis of what the text says explicitly as well as inferences drawn from the text. **RI.7.2:** Determine two or more central ideas in a text and analyze their development over the course of the text; provide an objective summary of the text. **RI.7.3:** Analyze the interactions between individuals, events, and ideas in a text (e.g., how ideas influence individuals or events, or how individuals influence ideas or events). **RI.7.4:** Determine the meaning of words and phrases as they are used in a text, including figurative, connotative, and technical meanings; analyze the impact of a specific word choice on meaning and tone.
SL.7.1: Engage effectively in a range of collaborative discussions (one-on-one, in groups, and teacher-led) with diverse partners on grade 7 topics, texts, and issues, building on others' ideas and expressing their own clearly.
W.7.9: Draw evidence from literary or informational texts to support analysis, reflection, and research.

ACTIVITY 1: EVALUATING ARGUMENTS

Students review and evaluate arguments using objective criteria and their own developing perspective of the issue.

INSTRUCTIONAL NOTES

Having analyzed and compared the perspectives, positions, premises, and evidence for various arguments related to the unit's issue, students are ready to evaluate the logic and quality of various positions and arguments in order to determine which ones make sense to them.

MODEL EVALUATION

Introduce the *Evidence-Based Arguments Checklist* as a set of criteria for evaluating arguments. Focus on Sections I and II of the checklist for this activity ("Content and Analysis" and "Evidence and Reasoning"). Model how to use the checklist to review and evaluate an argument, using an example from Part 2 of the unit. Think aloud as you explain each of the seven criteria and how it applies to the argument. Model the use of textual evidence in your evaluation.

EVALUATE ARGUMENTS IN READING TEAMS

In reading teams, have students use Sections I and II of the checklist to evaluate another argument they have read thus far in the unit. Have each group share and discuss their evaluation with the class. Ask students to support their evaluations with textual evidence. The teacher may need to model how to lead a text-based discussion where students base their opinions off of the readings to either support or challenge a position.

DETERMINE COMPLELLING ARGUMENTS

Explain to students that evaluating an argument involves both an objective, criteria-based assessment of its strengths and weaknesses, and the consideration of one's own developing position about the issue. Discuss ways in which readers can determine if an argument is compelling.

In reading teams, students review and evaluate another argument previously read in the unit. Students use the criteria from the *Evidence-Based Arguments Checklist* to objectively rate (as a team) the argument. Students then discuss and compare their opinions about whether the argument is compelling and makes sense to them.

INDIVIDUALLY EVALUATE/SELECT COMPELLING ARGUMENTS

Individually, students review the arguments they have read in the unit and determine which they find most compelling. For these arguments, they also use the *Evidence-Based Arguments Checklist* to be certain that the arguments they favor are ones that meet the criteria for "Content and Analysis" and "Evidence and Reasoning."

A graphical representation strategy might be useful for reviewing, evaluating, and determining compelling arguments. Such strategies could be done at the student level, where graphs might arrange and represent the various arguments based on students' perspectives and positions. The class could do this as a whole, posting arguments on the board or around the room, to represent the range of positions.

ACTIVITY 2: DEVELOPING A PERSPECTIVE AND POSITION

Students synthesize what they have learned about the issue and related arguments to clarify their own developing perspective and to establish a position for their own argument.

INSTRUCTIONAL NOTES

- Return to the unit's problem-based question and the set of debatable questions that students have previously brainstormed and discussed (This could be part of the class KWL). Have students suggest and discuss various ways of responding to those questions, given what they now know about the unit's issue. Ask students to indicate to which perspective they are currently leaning, and how their thinking is leading them to a position.
- Have students review the evidence-based claims they wrote at the end of Part 1. Have them revise their initial claims based on their current

ACTIVITY 2: DEVELOPING A PERSPECTIVE AND POSITION (CONT'D)

INSTRUCTIONAL NOTES (CONT'D)

understanding of the issue. They should include new evidence from arguments they encountered in Part 2.

- In reading teams, students review and discuss their EBCs.
- Once students have discussed their EBCs about the nature of the problem with their reading teams, have each student independently write a short paragraph stating a position they want to take on the issue and for which they want to development a supporting argument.
- Students return to their reading teams to review each other's positions using the Clarity and Relevance criteria from section 1 (Content and Analysis) from the *Evidence-Based Arguments Criteria Checklist*.

ACTIVITY 3: DEEPENING UNDERSTANDING

If needed, students conduct further research to help develop and support their position.

INSTRUCTIONAL NOTES

At this point, students will hopefully have sufficient background information/knowledge and evidence to develop an argument related to their position. If not – and especially if they have ventured into an area related to but also somewhat divergent from the focus of texts in the unit – they may need to do additional reading or research. Activities, materials, and resources from the *Researching to Deepen Understanding* unit may be helpful here. One approach articulated in that unit that is relevant here is the idea of "framing" inquiry with a set of questions that need to be investigated. Before conducting additional research, students could identify inquiry paths they feel they still need to explore to develop their argument. This will help them effectively "frame" their research for better efficiency and success.

Unread texts from the text sets and/or additional suggested texts can be used in this research.

ACTIVITY 4: USING OTHERS' ARGUMENTS TO SUPPORT A POSITION

Students identify an argument that supports their position and write an evidence-based claim about why the argument is compelling and makes sense to them.

INSTRUCTIONAL NOTES

In developing and supporting their chosen positions, students will need to reference others' arguments related to the unit's issue, and to use those arguments as evidence to support their own. Here students will write a claim that establishes a supporting argument's position and also explains its relevance to their own position.

- Students individually select one or more arguments to use as "building blocks" for their own argument. This is likely to be an argument(s) that they have previously evaluated and found to be sound as well as compelling for them.
- Students write a multi-part evidence-based claim – or adapt a previously written claim about the argument – that establishes what the argument's position is and why that argument makes sense and is relevant to their own position, citing specific evidence from the argument that they will use to support their own argument. Students should be encouraged to incorporate the perspective and position they drafted in Activity 2.

ACTIVITY 5: RESPONDING TO OPPOSING ARGUMENTS

Students identify an argument that opposes their position and write an evidence-based claim that either acknowledges the argument's position, points out its limitations, counters its premises, or refutes it as invalid, illogical, or unsupported.

INSTRUCTIONAL NOTES

In developing their own positions and arguments, students must also acknowledge opposing viewpoints and arguments. This could be addressed by writing a "counterargument" – expressing why they think the opposed perspective and position is "wrong." However, students should also learn that there are many ways to respond to a divergent or opposing argument. Discuss with students how including and addressing opposing arguments within their writing bolsters their credibility as authors as they demonstrate a fuller comprehension of the issue and are able to refute other's positions objectively.

- Explain and model the various ways that one might respond to an argument that emanates from a different perspective and position:
    1. By acknowledging the argument's position and the quality of its reasoning, but explaining why one has not found it relevant or compelling.
    2. By noting the limitations of the argument, especially as it applies to one's own position and response.
    3. By countering one or more of the argument's premises, offering opposing evidence that calls the claims into question.
    4. By pointing out the argument's poor reasoning or lack of valid evidence, analyzing and evaluating it as invalid, illogical, or specious.
    5. Other approaches, based on the nature of the argument itself.
- If desired, the teacher can introduce argumentative fallacies such as a straw man, ad hominem, and red herrings, noting that these techniques should be avoided in academic argumentation.
- In reading teams, students discuss an opposing argument and determine ways in which they might respond to it.
- Students individually select an argument that they want/need to respond to, and determine which of the strategies is best suited to the argument they will counter and their own positions/arguments.
- Students write a multi-part evidence-based claim – or adapt a previously written claim about the argument – that establishes what the argument's position is and then counters that argument using one of the modeled strategies, citing specific evidence from the argument to support their evaluation and response to it.

ASSESSMENT OPPORTUNITIES

As formative assessments and building blocks for their final argument, students have now revised their evidence-based claim about the nature of the issue based on their developing perspective. In a paragraph, they have also expressed a position they wish to take on the issue, and they have written two multi-part claims that:

1. Present analyses and evaluations of two arguments related to the unit's issue.
2. Establish the relevance of one argument's position and evidence to their own argument.
3. Respond to a divergent or opposing argument in an appropriate and strategic way.
4. Cite evidence from both texts to support their analyses and evaluations.
5. Represent their best thinking and clearest writing.

These pieces should be evaluated for students' understanding of the issue, the clarity and relevance of the perspective and position, and their analysis of textual evidence.

Student evaluations of the various arguments using the *EBA Checklist* should be evaluated for their conceptual understanding and the validity of analysis.

PART 4

ORGANIZING AN EVIDENCE-BASED ARGUMENT

"This is about more than safeguarding fair play – it's about saving lives."

OBJECTIVE:	Students establish and sequence evidence-based claims as premises for a coherent, logical argument around a position related to the unit's issue.

ACTIVITIES

MATERIALS:
Forming EBC Tool
Organizing EBC Tool
Delineating Arguments Tool
TCD Checklist
EBA Terms

1- IDENTIFYING SUPPORTING EVIDENCE
Students review their notes, tools, and previously written claims to determine what they will use as evidence to develop and support their position.

2- DETERMINING A LOGICAL APPROACH
The teacher explains various logical models for building an argument, and students determine which approach best fits their position and the argument they intend to write.

3- DEVELOPING AND SEQUENCING CLAIMS AS PREMISES OF THE ARGUMENT
Students review the claims they have previously written (and potentially develop new claims) to determine how they will use them as premises to develop their argument. Students determine a potential sequence for their premises and plan a chain of reasoning for their argument.

4- ORGANIZING EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT CLAIMS
Students list and sequence their claims/premises and then organize and cite sources for the evidence they will use to explain and support each of their premises.

5- REVIEWING A PLAN FOR WRITING AN ARGUMENT
Students review and revise their plans to ensure that they are clear, relevant, coherent, strategically sequenced, well-reasoned, and sufficiently supported by evidence.

ALIGNMENT TO CCSS

TARGETED STANDARDS:
W.7.1: Write arguments to support claims with clear reasons and relevant evidence.
W.7.5: With some guidance and support from peers and adults, develop and strengthen writing as needed by planning, revising, editing, rewriting, or trying a new approach, focusing on how well purpose and audience have been addressed.
W.7.9: Draw evidence from literary or informational texts to support analysis, reflection, and research.

SUPPORTING STANDARDS:
RI.7.1: Cite several pieces of textual evidence to support analysis of what the text says explicitly as well as inferences drawn from the text.
SL.7.1: Engage effectively in a range of collaborative discussions (one-on-one, in groups, and teacher-led) with diverse partners on grade 7 topics, texts, and issues, building on others' ideas and expressing their own clearly.

ACTIVITY 1: IDENTIFYING SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

Students review their notes, tools, and previously written claims to determine what they will use as evidence to develop and support their position.

INSTRUCTIONAL NOTES

Having established their perspectives and positions related to the issue, students now inventory what they have learned and what they can use to establish, develop, and support their positions.

- Students gather all their previous reading notes, tools, and short writing pieces for review (NOTE: If students have previously maintained a working file or portfolio, this will be much easier.)
- Students review their notes and materials, sorting out what is relevant to their position and what is not.
- Students determine if what they have is sufficient, or if they need to do any additional reading or research.

ACTIVITY 2: DETERMINING A LOGICAL APPROACH

The teacher reviews various logical models for building an argument, and students determine which approach best fits their position and the argument they intend to write.

INSTRUCTIONAL NOTES

Present to students, through explanation and examples, an overview of the various ways that arguments can be constructed and organized, referring back to texts read in the unit and/or bringing in additional examples. (NOTE: The range and sophistication of models presented will depend on the age and readiness of students.)

- Teachers might use the Delineating Arguments tool to help explain the various argumentative models and structures authors employ to strengthen their arguments.
- In Part 2, students have discussed and written claims and paragraphs comparing the perspectives and elements of two or more arguments they have analyzed. Students might return to these samples to see how the arguments might serve as a model for their own writing.
- Based on what they now understand about logical approaches and lines of reasoning, students initially determine how they want to approach the organization of their own argument, based both on its nature and their own processes of thinking and writing.

ACTIVITY 3: DEVELOPING AND SEQUENCING CLAIMS AS PREMISES OF THE ARGUMENT

Students review the claims they have previously written (and potentially develop new claims) to determine how they will use them as premises to develop their position. Students determine a potential sequence for their premises and plan a chain of reasoning for their argument.

INSTRUCTIONAL NOTES

- Review with students that premises are a series of claims that need to be backed up by evidence and that lead to the position. Claims become premises in the context of developing an argument, that defend/support/prove a position.
- Students return to and review the claims they have written in the unit, thinking about their relationship to their emerging plan for their argument. Students determine what they can use and how they will adapt each written claim so that it fits coherently into their argument.
- Through review and discussion in reading teams, students determine what they still need to establish in order to develop and prove their argument. Based on peer feedback, they identify additional claims they will need to write, and evidence they will use to support those claims.
- Based on their logical approach and line of reasoning, students organize their claims into a tentative sequence of premises for their argument and record them on an Organizing Evidence-Based Argument tool or a Delineating Arguments tool.

ACTIVITY 4: ORGANIZING EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT CLAIMS

Students list and sequence their claims/premises and then organize and cite sources for the evidence they will use to explain and support each of their premises.

INSTRUCTIONAL NOTES

- Model the use of an *Organizing Evidence-Based Argument* tool or a *Delineating Arguments* tool for a teacher-developed argument related to the unit's issue or problem.
- In reading teams, have students identify evidence that might be used to support the teacher-developed argument and its claims.
- Students individually organize evidence and cite sources on an *Organizing Evidence-Based Argument* tool or a *Delineating Arguments* tool for each of the premises (claims) they will use in their argument.
- Students determine patterns in their evidence and categorize them under their chosen premises, or create new premises to account for evidence.

ACTIVITY 5: REVIEWING A PLAN FOR WRITING AN ARGUMENT

Students review and revise their plans to ensure that they are clear, relevant, coherent, strategically sequenced, well-reasoned, and sufficiently supported by evidence.

INSTRUCTIONAL NOTES

- In reading teams, students individually "talk through" their organizational plans, using specific vocabulary and their *Organizing Evidence-Based Argument* tool or *Delineating Arguments* tool to explain:
  - ◊ Their statement of the issue;
  - ◊ Their chosen perspective and position;
  - ◊ Their logical approach and line of reasoning;
  - ◊ Each of their premises (by reading their claim statements); and
  - ◊ The evidence they will use to support their claims and substantiate their argument.
- Students use the *Evidence-Based Arguments Checklist* to discuss and peer review each other's organizational plans. Students should focus on the following criteria:
- "Clarity and Relevance" under section I (Content and Analysis)
- "Reasoning" and "Use of Evidence" under section II (Evidence and Reasoning)
- "Relationships Among Parts" criteria under section III (Coherence and Organization).
- Students adjust, revise, or further develop their plans based on criterion-based peer feedback and self-reflection.

ASSESSMENT OPPORTUNITIES

Students submit their *Organizing Evidence-Based Argument* tools or *Delineating Arguments* tools to the teacher for formative assessment and criterion-based review and feedback before beginning to write their final arguments in Part 5.

As a formative assessment of the discussions in Part 4, students complete two *TCD Checklists*, one that rates their team's overall performance and one that represents a self-assessment of their own participation.

PART 5

DEVELOPING AND STRENGTHENING ARGUMENTATIVE WRITING

***"What do I know?"* - Michel de Montaigne, French essayist (1533-1592); first to label his writing an "essay"**

"For students, writing is a key means of asserting and defending claims, showing what they know about a subject, and conveying what they have experienced, imagined, thought, and felt."
[CCSS ELA/Literacy Standards, p. 41]

OBJECTIVE:	Students use a collaborative process to develop and strengthen their writing in which they use clear criteria and their close reading skills in text-centered discussions about their emerging drafts.

ACTIVITIES

MATERIALS:
Evidence-Based Writing Rubric
Connecting Ideas Handout
Organizing EBC Tool
EBA Criteria Checklist
TCD Checklist
EBA Terms

1- STRENGTHENING WRITING COLLABORATIVELY: PRINCIPLES AND PROCESSES
Students learn and practice a collaborative, question-based approach to developing and improving writing, using criteria from the unit and guiding questions to begin the drafting and revision process.

2- FOCUS ON CONTENT: INFORMATION AND IDEAS
Students write, discuss, and revise with a focus on articulating their overall ideas with necessary information.

3- FOCUS ON ORGANIZATION: UNITY, COHERENCE, AND LOGICAL SEQUENCE
Students write, discuss, and revise with a focus on the unity of their initial drafts, coherence among their ideas and information, and logic of their organizational sequence.

4 - FOCUS ON SUPPORT: INTEGRATING AND CITING EVIDENCE
Students write, discuss, and revise with a focus on their selection, use, and integration of evidence.

5- FOCUS ON LINKAGES: CONNECTIONS AND TRANSITIONS
Students write, discuss, and revise with a focus on the effectiveness of the connections and transitions they have made, and their use of transitional phrases.

6- FOCUS ON LANGUAGE: CLARITY AND IMPACT
Students write, discuss, and revise with a focus on the quality and variety of their sentences, the clarity of their vocabulary, and the impact of their word choices.

7- FOCUS ON CONVENTIONS: PUNCTUTATION, GRAMMAR, AND SPELLING
Students write, discuss, and revise with a focus on the targeted aspect(s) of writing conventions.

8- FOCUS ON PUBLICATION: FINAL EDITING AND FORMATTING
Students write, discuss, and revise with a focus on producing a final quality product.

ALIGNMENT TO CCSS

TARGETED STANDARDS:
W.7.1: Write arguments to support claims with clear reasons and relevant evidence. **W.7.4:** Produce clear and coherent writing in which the development, organization, and style are appropriate to task, purpose, and audience. **W.7.5:** With some guidance and support from peers and adults, develop and strengthen writing as needed by planning, revising, editing, rewriting, or trying a new approach, focusing on how well purpose and audience have been addressed. **W.7.9:** Draw evidence from literary or informational texts to support analysis, reflection, and research.
SL.7.1: Engage effectively in a range of collaborative discussions (one-on-one, in groups, and teacher-led) with diverse partners on grade 7 topics, texts, and issues, building on others' ideas and expressing their own clearly.

SUPPORTING STANDARDS:
RI.7.1: Cite several pieces of textual evidence to support analysis of what the text says explicitly as well as inferences drawn from the text.
RI.7.5: Analyze the structure an author uses to organize a text, including how the major sections contribute to the whole and to the development of the ideas. **RI.7.6**: Determine an author's point of view or purpose in a text and analyze how the author distinguishes his or her position from that of others. **RI.7.8**: Trace and evaluate the argument and specific claims in a text, assessing whether the reasoning is sound and the evidence is relevant and sufficient to support the claims.

A COLLABORATIVE, QUESTION-BASED APPROACH TO STRENGTHENING WRITING
PRINCIPLES AND PROCESSES

The Core Proficiencies collaborative, question-based approach for developing and strengthening writing is grounded in the French roots of the word "essay" – a term that can guide the way we go about writing as much as designate what we are expected to produce. "Essayer," in French, means to "attempt" or "try." As a verb, it actually means the same thing in English. To "essay" is therefore to try, or attempt. So, when we talk about an "essay" (i.e. paper, composition, etc.), we are actually talking about writing "an attempt."

This influences how we think about what we are asking students to do, and what we ourselves are doing when writing. We can see the piece of writing we are developing as never finished. This is not to say that we do not need to present an unpolished and refined work, but that ideas, theories, information, and our own understanding and perspective of the issues constantly change and evolve. An essay then is an ongoing attempt to clearly communicate something we are thinking about. That idea could result in an argument, an explanation, a narrative, a description, a speech, etc. The motivation, purpose, and audience can change; however, our attempt to gain and present a clear understanding of a specific subject never changes. We may not get there, but we work to get progressively closer, viewing writing, thinking and understanding of a particular topic as a continual work in progress.

If a paper (or idea) is never fully finished, if it is just the next step, then writing an "essay" benefits greatly from a collaborative, question-based process. To think of an "essay" as a process rather than a product suggests that conversation, contemplation, consideration, and revision are all part of the "attempts" to get one's thinking down on paper so that others can understand and respond to it.

The Core Proficiencies approach to developing and strengthening writing recognizes the iterative nature of an "essay," while also acknowledging the need to ground the writing process in clear criteria in order to produce a final, polished product. There are many such processes that have been well described in the literature on writing, and many teachers have their own, favored approach to teaching what has become known as "the writing process." If so, teachers are encouraged to follow what works for them and their students – adding what makes sense from the approaches and activities described here.

LEARNING PRINCIPLES

Central to the Core Proficiencies approach to facilitating the development of student writing are the following working principles:

- **Independence:** Students need to discover and adopt personally effective writing processes to develop their own essays, to become reflective and independent writers who persevere and grow through their attempts, rather than learning and following "*the* writing process" in a rote and mechanical way. Thus, the Core Proficiencies approach to writing and revising is iterative, flexible, and student-driven.
- **Collaboration:** Becoming an independent writer also entails learning to seek and use constructive feedback from others – peers, teachers, audience members – which implies that students develop and value the skills of thoughtful collaboration. Thus, the Core Proficiencies writing classroom relies on text-centered discussions of students' essays.

- **Clear Criteria:** Clear, commonly understood criteria that describe the essential characteristics of a desired writing product can help students both understand what they are trying to accomplish and participate in focused, criterion-based reviews of their own and their peers' writing. Thus the criteria that drive reflection and conversation in a Core Proficiencies writing classroom focus on critical characteristics of a piece of writing (e.g., the nature of a central claim and its support within an argument) rather than merely on mechanical issues (e.g., the number of sources used to support the argument, or the number of spelling errors).

- **Guiding Questions:** In addition to being based in clear criteria, student processes for developing and reviewing their writing should call on their evolving skills as readers, using guiding and text-based questions to promote "close reading" of their developing drafts. Thus, in a Core Proficiencies writing classroom, students are expected to frame text-based "review questions" before asking a teacher or peer to read an emerging draft.

- **Evidence:** Whether driven by criteria or questions, student conversations and reflections about their writing should be based on specific textual evidence, which they or their reviewers cite when they are discussing both the strengths of a piece of writing and the areas in which it might be improved. Thus, the review process in a Core Proficiencies writing classroom involves making evidence-based "claims" about a piece of writing.

LEARNING PROCESSES

To make these principles come alive, learning activities in a Core Proficiencies writing classroom are designed and sequenced to provide time and support for the "essay" process. Each stage of the process therefore includes the following components:

- **Teacher Modeling:** Each writing activity includes a teacher demonstration lesson, in which the teacher focuses on and models a specific aspect of writing, specific criteria and guiding question(s), and/or an approach to writing/reviewing that will be emphasized in that phase of the process.

- **Guided and Supported Writing:** The bulk of classroom time is dedicated for students to "essay" – to free-write, experiment, draft, revise, and/or polish their writing, depending on where they are in the process, and guided by what has been introduced and modeled in the demonstration lesson.

- **Text-Centered Discussion:** As students write, they are also engaged in ongoing discussions about their writing – sometimes in formal or informal sessions with the teacher, sometimes in structured peer reviews, and sometimes in more spontaneous conversations with a partner. At the center of all discussions are the fundamental principles of: 1) using Guiding or Text-based Questions to examine the writing; 2) applying Clear Criteria when determining and discussing its strengths and weaknesses; and 3) citing Specific Evidence in response to questions and/or in support of claims about the writing.

- **Read Alouds:** Periodically, students have opportunities to publicly share their emerging writing, reading segments to the class (or a small group), and using questions, criteria, and evidence to discuss what they are noticing (and working on) in their own writing.

As practiced in conjunction with a Core Proficiency unit, such as *Developing Evidence- Based Arguments*, the process is sequenced as a series of "attempts" that are intended to produce a specific written product (an argument, explanation, or narrative) that also represents evidence of a student's reading and research skills.

LEARNING PROGRESSION

Thus the approach emphasizes criteria that describe an effective final product and the skills it should demonstrate, questions that are intended to improve the product, and the use of the process to progressively revise and refine a piece of writing. As such, the process moves like a camera lens through an iterative, progressively more focused sequence of activities, including:

1. A broad scanning of the landscape in the initial stages of the "essay" – turning thinking into writing and/or writing one's way to thinking.
2. An initial, wide-angle view/review of the "big picture" – the thinking behind the writing and the ideas and information it presents (with the idea that until the thinking is clear and well-developed, other revisions are premature).
3. A still broad but somewhat more focused emphasis on organizing, re-organizing, and/or re-sequencing into a logical progression of thinking.
4. A more zoomed-in look at the use and integration of supporting evidence, either through references, quotations, or paraphrasing.
5. A focus on linking ideas – on connecting and transitioning among sentences and paragraphs.
6. Attention to how ideas are expressed – to the writer's choices regarding sentence structure/variety and language use.
7. A final zoom-in for editing and proofing, with an emphasis on particular language conventions and formatting issues related to the specific writing product.
8. A framing of the finished product so that it effectively communicates for its specified audience and purpose.

Teachers and students can follow this entire progression of writing activities, or chose to emphasize those that are most appropriate for a particular writing assignment and/or a group of students.

Recommended Resource: One of the finest and most helpful resources to support writers as they work to develop and strengthen their writing, and teachers as they facilitate the learning process, is John R. Trimble's *Writing with Style: Conversations on the Art of Writing* [Longman, 2010; ISBN-13: 978-0205028801]. Trimble begins by discussing the critical importance of "Thinking Well" and of both "selling and serving" one's reader, and moves from there to concrete tips about writing, revision, and editing. Trimble's central premise is that effective writers "have accepted the grim reality that nine tenths of all writing is rewriting…" [p.9]. Trimble's ideas will occasionally be referenced in the unit's activity sequence, and can provide a valuable supplement to the brief discussions of effective writing presented here. Here are his "four essentials" [p.6]:

1. Have something to say that's worth a reader's attention.
2. Be sold on its validity and importance yourself so you can pitch it with conviction.
3. Furnish strong arguments that are well supported with concrete proof.
4. Use confident language – vigorous verbs, strong nouns, and assertive phrasing.

ACTIVITY 1: STRENGTHENING WRITING COLLABORATIVELY- PRINCIPLES AND PROCESSES

Students learn and practice a collaborative, question-based approach to developing and improving writing, using criteria from the unit and guiding questions to begin the drafting and revision process.

INSTRUCTIONAL NOTES

"I speak to the paper, as I speak to the first person I meet." – Montaigne

In this first activity, students learn about the collaborative, question-based approach to developing and improving writing, and initially practice that approach in the context of "talking out" a first draft. Establishing the culture and routines that accompany this approach will take some time, if they have not previously been part of students' writing classroom experiences. Thus each of the activities in the sequence address the four components described earlier (Modeling, Guided Writing, Text-Centered Discussion, Read Aloud), following the format and model established in this first activity set. As students experience each phase of the activity, explain the purpose and focus of each of these components as students begin work to develop and strengthen their writing.

Teacher Modeling: Because students may begin their first draft from different places of readiness and resources, model (or at least discuss) several possible approaches to drafting, i.e.:

- Working from Previous Thinking and Planning: In Part IV, Activity 5, students have used the tools to frame and review an initial plan for their argument that included: their written EBC about the nature of the problem, their position, their logical approach and line of reasoning, the premises/claims that formed the building blocks of their argument, and the evidence they might use to substantiate those claims. Students will also have completed a series of tools and written claims about various arguments they have read. Model how one might use these materials to talk out a first draft as guided and organized by these resources and this emerging plan or outline. [Note: this approach may work best for students who know what they want to argue, have been able to plan a structure for their argument, and/or are most comfortable writing from a pre-existing plan.]
- Working from a Previously Written Paragraph(s): Throughout Parts I-IV, students will have composed paragraphs which present and support claims about the nature of the problem and various arguments written in response to it. One or more of these paragraphs may be a starting point around which to build their argument. Using either a teacher or student example paragraph, model how one can take an existing draft paragraph and either write from it or expand it to produce a more fleshed-out, multi-point argument. [Note: this approach may work best for students who are very happy with something they have already written, or who have trouble getting started and putting words to paper but are more comfortable moving forward once they are started.]
- Writing to Discover or Clarify Thinking: Some students may have moved through Parts I-IV with many thoughts in their head about the topic and what they have been reading, but may still be unclear about exactly what position they want to take or how they might argue for it. For these students, model how a less formal "free-write" around the topic – and various questions or ideas that have arisen during the unit - might help them get their thinking out on paper and then discuss it with others. Emphasize that they are "writing their way" to an emergent understanding and sense of direction. [Note: this approach may work best for students who are still uncertain how they feel about the topic/problem or who have difficulty writing a "thesis" and developing an outline prior to writing.]

No matter what approach to drafting students follow, remind them that they are trying to (in Montaigne's words) "Speak to the paper," to work out their thinking so that other's can examine it – and to follow Trimble's essential advice to "Have something to say that's worth a reader's attention."

Guided and Supported Writing: In this first phase of the writing process, students should focus on less formal, more fluid writing, trying first to get their ideas out on paper so that they and others can examine them. Students should be given adequate time and opportunity to write in class, and be expected to produce something "on demand" that can be reviewed by others. They may be taking very different

INSTRUCTIONAL NOTES (CONT'D)

approaches to talking out their first drafts, but should be able to explain to others what they are doing and why.

- Guiding Question: Present students with a general question to think about as they begin to talk out their initial drafts, and model how that question might relate to any of the three approaches to talking out a draft. Use a question that prompts reflection, such as:

  What do I know and think about this topic/problem

  How can I help others understand my thinking?

Text-Centered Discussion: As students write, they may also begin to "check in" informally with others - both the teacher and peers.

- Initially, they might simply communicate what their approach to generating a first draft is, and why.
- As their drafts begin to emerge, conversations can be organized by the Guiding Questions: *What do I know and think about this topic/problem? What am I doing to help others understand my thinking?*
- When most students have gotten a first draft out on paper, organize them into review pairs for their first, modeled "close reading" session. For this reading, students will use a familiar process, to examine their partner's emerging argument a first time. For this session, explain and model the following guidelines:
  - ◊ Reading partners initially listen to each draft as it is read aloud by the writer.
  - ◊ Partners then exchange papers with no additional discussion of what they have written.
  - ◊ Readers analyze the draft, looking especially for textual evidence that expresses the writer's understanding of the *issue*, *perspective*, and *position*. Readers do not evaluate or make suggestions for improvement at this stage.
  - ◊ Readers share their analyses with writers, striving to be non-evaluative and *specific, constructive,* and *text-based* in their observations. (Model observations that either meet or do not meet these criteria for a good response, which will become even more important in later activities.)
  - ◊ Writers practice avoiding "yes, but…" responses when receiving feedback – whereby they need to: 1) listen fully to what their reader has observed; 2) wait momentarily before responding verbally; 3) avoid explanations/ justifications for what they have done in their writing (e.g., "yes, but I explained my position here…"); and 4) frame instead an informal, text-based question to further probe their reading partner's observations. This is the routine they will be using throughout all text-centered reviews, and should be modeled and practiced here.
- Based on their partners' observations and responses to text-based questions, writers determine what they want to continue to work on as they revisit their initial drafts, and return to in-class writing, to the "essay" process.
- Throughout the process, circulate in the room and ask students to share their observations, questions, and reflections with you. Provide feedback and guidance where necessary.

Read Alouds: In this initial activity, these occur informally, in pairs, at the start of text-centered discussions.

ACTIVITY 2: FOCUS ON CONTENT-INFORMATION AND IDEAS

The teacher models a demonstration lesson that focuses on content and the unit's criteria for information and ideas. Students write, discuss, and revise with a focus on articulating their overall ideas with necessary information.

INSTRUCTIONAL NOTES

"The most fruitful and natural exercise for our minds is, in my opinion, conversation." – Montaigne

In this classroom writing activity (and all subsequent activity sequences), the same general process and procedures are followed – in this case to support students as they continue to initially draft, or re-draft, an argument that will eventually serve as their final product and summative assessment in the unit. In Activity 1, students have focused on getting their ideas and information on paper, and listening as a reader analyzes what their draft communicates about their understanding, perspective, and position. Students will begin this activity with a new, criteria- and question-based, text-centered discussion that more formally helps them examine and think about the content of their emerging drafts.

Remind them that they will be engaged in thoughtful conversations, to Montaigne "the most fruitful and natural exercise of our minds," and that they will be using those conversations to address Trimble's second essential for an effective written argument, to "Be sold on its validity and importance yourself so you can pitch it with conviction."

Teacher Modeling: The demonstration lesson focuses on the unit's criteria for Content and Analysis, and how to use those criteria to develop and strengthen a piece of writing. Begin the demonstration lesson by clarifying what the overall writing task is, what the final product will be, and a general timeline for generating, improving, and finalizing that product. Review the *Evidence-Based Arguments Criteria Checklist* to clarify that students' final products will be analyzed and evaluated in terms of a set of criteria that describe:

I. Content and Analysis
II. Evidence and Reasoning
III. Coherence and Organization
IV. Control of Language and Conventions

- Introduce a general Guiding Review Question related to the overall content of the writing, and the criteria, i.e.: *What is the writer's central position, and how does it reflect an understanding of the problem?*
- Provide students with a draft paragraph that represents a skeletal or emerging argument (either teacher-developed or taken from an anonymous student) and read the paragraph aloud.
- In review teams, have students re-read the draft paragraph in light of the general Guiding Question. Student teams then share text-based responses to the question with the class, as if the teacher is the paragraph's author.
- Focus students' attention on the three criteria for Content and Analysis: Clarity and Relevance; Understanding of the Issue; and Acknowledgement of Other Perspectives. Explain/model/discuss what each of these criteria cause one to think about, based on previous work in this and other Core Proficiency units.
- Read closely and study the specific language of one of the *Evidence-Based Arguments Checklist* Criteria such as:

> **Clarity and Relevance:** Purposefully states a precise position that is linked to a clearly identified context (topic, problem, issue) that establishes its relevance.

- Model/discuss what specific language in the criterion statement might mean within an argument, e.g., what does it mean to "purposefully state a precise position," that "is linked to a clearly identified context," and that "establishes its relevance."
- With the review criterion as a focus, frame one or more text-based question(s) that you might pose to a reviewer who was going to give you specific feedback about the draft paragraph.
    - ◊ Text-based Review Question(s): *Is my position "purposefully stated"? In sentences 3-5, what helps you as a reader understand its relationship to "an identified context"? What might I add (or revise) to help establish the relevance of my position?*
- Students (individually or in review teams) now read the paragraph closely, considering the text-based review questions and generating a reviewer's response.

ACTIVITY 2: FOCUS ON CONTENT-INFORMATION AND IDEAS (CONT'D)

INSTRUCTIONAL NOTES (CONT'D)

- Discuss how a text-based response to a draft piece of writing is a kind of "claim" that the reviewer makes based on the criteria, question(s), and specific textual evidence.
- Model how you might frame a claim-based response if you were a reviewer of the draft paragraph, emphasizing:
  - ◊ A *specific* response that emphasizes both a strength of the paragraph and a potential improvement.
  - ◊ A *constructive* and respectful articulation of the response.
  - ◊ *Text-based evidence* in the paragraph that has led to and supports your response.
- Guided by this model, students articulate and share their text-based responses and constructive reviewer claims, as if their partners were now the writer of the draft paragraph. Have several students volunteer to present their responses to the whole class, and discuss how the responses are (or are not) *specific, constructive, and text-based*.
- Model the writer's behaviors introduced and practiced in Activity 1: 1) listen fully to what readers have observed; 2) wait momentarily before responding verbally; 3) avoid explanations/justifications for what you as a writer have tried to do (no "yes, but…" responses); and 4) frame instead additional informal, text-based questions to further probe your readers' observations.
- Discuss what you might do as a writer after considering the responses you have gotten to your text-based review questions.

Text-Centered Discussion: Before continuing the drafting process, students will engage in their first criterion- and question-based review. This initial review team conference is structured and facilitated by the teacher based on the modeling and practice just completed with the draft paragraph. Discussions follow this protocol:

1. Each discussion begins with the general Guiding Review Question and the Criteria being focused upon.
2. The student whose work is being reviewed then poses a specific Text-based Review Question to guide the reading and review. Reviewers can probe this question to clarify what specifically the writer "wants to know" about his or her draft.
3. The close reading and review of the draft (or section of draft) then focuses on discussing specific responses to the question, making and sharing reviewers' claims, and citing specific Textual Evidence from the draft as support for claims about the writing's overall strengths in terms of ideas and content, and about possible areas for improvement of its thinking and the explanation of that thinking.

- With a reading partner, students engage in and practice this protocol using their emerging draft arguments previously analyzed in Activity 1. Students first frame and share their specific Text-based Review Question. Reading partners read and review the draft, using the question to drive their close reading and search for specific textual evidence. In response to the question, reviewers then share observations and (potentially, if students are ready to do so) suggestions for improvement.
- Writers practice exhibiting the behaviors of a constructive text-centered discussion: 1) listen fully to what their reader has observed; 2) wait momentarily before responding verbally; 3) avoid explanations/justifications for what they have done in their writing (e.g., "yes, but I explained my position here…"); and 4) frame instead an additional, text-based question(s) to further probe their reading partner's observations.

Guided and Supported Writing: Students will be working to further develop and strengthen their initial draft of their final product, focusing on the overall criteria for Content and Analysis and the feedback they have gotten from reviewers.

- Based on constructive feedback from their readers, students frame a direction and strategy for what they want to work on to improve the Content and Analysis of their arguments.

ACTIVITY 2: FOCUS ON CONTENT-INFORMATION AND IDEAS (CONT'D)

INSTRUCTIONAL NOTES (CONT'D)

- Students work on all or parts of their writing in light of this direction and strategy.

- Informal conferences – either with the teacher or other students – can occur throughout this writing time, with check-ins about what the writer is working on and how it is going.

Read Alouds: Periodically, students might share emerging sections of their drafts, talking about what they are working on in terms of questions and criteria. As some students complete their initial drafts, they might simply read what they have so that students who are not yet finished get a chance to hear what a completed and strengthened first draft might sound like.

ACTIVITY 3: FOCUS ON ORGANIZATION-UNITY, COHERENCE, AND LOGICAL SEQUENCE

The teacher models a demonstration lesson that focuses on organizing ideas and the unit's criteria for organization within the specified writing genre. Students write, discuss, and revise with a focus on the unity of their initial drafts, coherence among their ideas and information, and logic of their organizational sequence.

INSTRUCTIONAL NOTES

"He who establishes his argument by noise and command, shows that his reason is weak." - Montaigne

This activity in the sequence emphasizes issues related to the overall line of reasoning, organization, and unity of the argument. Criteria to be considered in developing and strengthening the writing are drawn from Section III (Coherence and Organization) of the *Evidence-Based Arguments Criteria Checklist*. The learning activity sequence includes the four components of the Core Proficiencies model, as explained and guided in Activities 1 and 2. For this activity, the Text-centered Review Discussions may occur either before or during the Guided Writing phase.

Teacher Modeling: The demonstration lesson focuses on the unit's criteria for Coherence and Organization (Section III of the *Evidence-Based Arguments Criteria Checklist*) and also a criterion from Section II, Command of Evidence. Begin the lesson with a close reading and discussion of the overall descriptor for Coherence and Organization: "*An EBA organizes supported premises in a unified and logical way that clearly expresses the validity of the position.*"

- To examine the unity, coherence and logic of an argument's line of reasoning, students can benefit from studying their writing drafts in a "skeletal" form. Model how they might do this with either a teacher-developed or anonymous student draft (or even a text from the unit's reading). With a highlighter, shade the key sentences of the argument – those that establish its position and each of the premises presented in support of that position – often, but not always, the "topic" sentences. [Alternately, you might just extract these sentences into a separate document or use *Delineating Arguments* or *Organizing EBC* tools.]

- Read the skeletal sentences aloud, with students following. Present students with the Guiding Question and focal criteria (see below). Ask them to re-read the skeletal text and offer observations directly connected to the question and criteria, and to specific evidence from the draft. Based on these observations, model how you might determine a strategy for re-thinking or revising the draft's organization, and a specific text-based review question to guide your work in developing and strengthening the draft - and your readers' review of that draft.

Text-Centered Discussion: Text-centered review discussions will likely happen at the start of the writing/revising phase of the activity, and again, less formally, with both the teacher and peers, during writing time. Students should begin by "extracting" their skeletal argument (either through highlighting or cutting and

ACTIVITY 3: FOCUS ON ORGANIZATION- UNITY, COHERENCE, AND LOGICAL SEQUENCE (CONT'D)

INSTRUCTIONAL NOTES (CONT'D)

pasting) so that readers can focus on the line of reasoning. Before asking a reader to review a draft, students should formulate their own text-based review questions to direct close reading and evidence-based feedback.

- **Guiding Question:** *What is the organizational pattern (line of reasoning) used by the writer in this argument?*
- **Criteria:** Focus reading, review, and writing on any or all of these criteria from the *Evidence-Based Arguments Criteria Checklist*.

Reasoning: Links evidence and claims/premises together logically in ways that lead to the conclusions expressed in the position.
Relationships among Parts: Establishes clear and logical relationships among the position, claims/ premises and supporting evidence.
Effectiveness of Structure: Adopts an organizational strategy, including an introduction and conclusion, which clearly and compellingly communicates the argument.

- **Example Text-based Review Question(s):** *Does my chain of reasoning make sense as a way of demonstrating my position? Is it unified into a coherent argument? How might I rethink, re-sequence, or reorganize my four premises to improve the clarity or logic of my argument?*

Guided and Supported Writing: Students will be working to improve the overall line of reasoning and organization of their draft arguments. This may entail re-sequencing their premises, adding additional premises, deleting sections that take the argument off course, or adopting a different organizational plan. In classroom conferences, remind them to focus less at this point on specific issues of expression or conventions, and more on their overall line of thinking from introduction to conclusion.

Read Alouds: Periodically, students might read their skeletal arguments aloud and share what they are doing (have done) to improve organization and their line of reasoning.

ACTIVITY 4: FOCUS ON SUPPORT- INTEGRATING AND CITING EVIDENCE

The teacher models a demonstration lesson that focuses on supporting ideas and the unit's criteria for using and citing evidence. Students write, discuss, and revise with a focus on their selection, use, and integration of evidence.

INSTRUCTIONAL NOTES

"I quote others only to better express myself." – Montaigne

Teacher Modeling: The demonstration lesson focuses on the unit's criteria for use of supporting evidence (Section II. Command of Evidence) and also a criterion related to Coherence and Organization. Begin the lesson with a close reading and discussion of the overall descriptor for Command of Evidence:
An EBA is supported by sufficient evidence and developed through valid reasoning.

Remind students that supporting evidence may be integrated into an argument through references to other texts or information, citing of data, direct quotations, or paraphrasing. Emphasize also Trimble's reminder that "strong arguments" require "concrete proof" and Montaigne's suggestion that we "quote others only to better express" ourselves – that we do not merely insert quotations, but rather select and use them thoughtfully to develop or support our own ideas.

ACTIVITY 4: FOCUS ON SUPPORT-INTEGRATING AND CITING EVIDENCE (CONT'D)

INSTRUCTIONAL NOTES (CONT'D)

Select a single draft paragraph (one with a highlighted premise from Activity 3) to use in modeling. With a second color highlighter (or with underlining or a symbol system), annotate the paragraph to indicate the evidence that is presented to support the premise. Have students read the paragraph, using the Guiding Question to make observations about the use of evidence. Introduce one or more of the criteria and discuss how you might use those criteria to review and rethink the use of evidence in the paragraph, including discussing where evidence might need to be reconsidered that may not be relevant or credible and/or where new evidence might be added to better support the premise's claim.

Text-Centered Discussion: As in the demonstration lesson, students might begin reviewing and revising a single paragraph of their drafts, to develop their thinking and practice their skills. The writing phase of the activity might begin with a short text-centered discussion using the Guiding Question and one or more criteria to get a sense of issues in the paragraph's use of evidence. Based on this first review, students frame a specific text-based review question and set a direction for revision. As students revise paragraphs, they can discuss with the teacher and peers, using the text-based review question to guide close reading, discussion, and feedback.

Guiding Question: *What sort of evidence has the writer used to support the premise/claim? (Data? References? Quotations? Paraphrasing?)*

Criteria: Focus reading, review, and writing on any or all of these criteria from the *Evidence-Based Arguments Criteria Checklist.*

- **Example Text-based Review Question(s):** *Is my evidence clearly presented? Relevant? Credible? Sufficient? How might I better integrate the evidence in sentences 4 and 5 with the overall discussion? Should I quote or paraphrase?*

Guided and Supported Writing: Students will be working to strengthen their use of evidence, which may entail rethinking the evidence itself, inserting new evidence, or reconsidering how they have presented and integrated the evidence into their paragraphs. The guided writing process will be iterative, with students potentially working through several cycles with a single paragraph, then moving on to other sections of their drafts.

Read Alouds: Periodically, students might share single paragraphs they are working on, reading them aloud and then discussing what they have come to think about their use and integration of supporting evidence.

Use of Evidence: Supports each claim/premise with valid inferences based on credible evidence.
Thoroughness and Objectivity: Represents a comprehensive understanding of the issue where the argument's claims/premises and supporting evidence fairly addresses relevant counterclaims and discusses conflicting evidence. *(addressing counterclaims is not a CCSS requirement at 6th grade)*
Relationships among Parts: Establishes clear and logical relationships among the position, claims/premises and supporting evidence.
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 paraphrase accurately, referencing precisely where the evidence can be found.

ACTIVITY 5: FOCUS ON LINKAGES-CONNECTIONS AND TRANSITIONS

The teacher models a demonstration lesson that focuses on linkages among ideas, sentences and paragraphs. Students write, discuss, and revise with a focus on the effectiveness of the connections and transitions they have made, and their use of transitional phrases.

INSTRUCTIONAL NOTES

"There are no truths, only moments of clarity passing for answers." – Montaigne

Introduce the idea of connections and transitions. A basic criteria can be whether a reader can read from sentence to sentence and paragraph to paragraph without running into a disconcerting bump or jump in the flow of the writing.

The *Connecting Ideas* handout can be used to focus students on specific transitional words and ways to link ideas through syntax (e.g., using parallel structure).

Teacher Modeling: The demonstration lesson focuses on making effective linkages among sentences and paragraphs. Once the overall organizational pattern of the argument has been strengthened in Activity 3 and its integration of evidence has been worked on in Activity 4, students may be ready to focus more specifically on making smooth connections and transitions.

Select several examples from anonymous students that could use improvement in their linking of ideas – first a single paragraph (to focus on sentence connections) and then multi-paragraph (to focus on paragraph transitions). Read the drafts aloud and have students listen for places where they get lost or detect a jump or bump in flow (you might have students stand up or raise their hands to indicate when they detect an uncomfortable linkage). Using the *Connecting Ideas* handout, introduce/review the ways word and syntax can be used to repair "bumps in the road" and "build bridges among ideas." Have students suggest ways to improve the example drafts.

Text-Centered Discussion: Students will read/review each others' drafts looking for places where they detect a jump, bump, or unclear linkage. They might use a symbol system to indicate such places on the draft.

- **Guiding Question:** *Where might a reader get lost, feel an uncomfortable jump in the flow of the writing, or misunderstand the linkage among ideas?*
- **Criteria:** Focus reading, review, and writing on criteria related to connections and transitions among ideas (identified by the teacher).
- **Example Text-based Review Question(s):** *In paragraph 3, I want to link several pieces of evidence from different sources; how might I better indicate their connections? Between paragraphs 4 and 5, I transition from a supporting premise to a counterargument; how might I make a better transition to indicate this shift in reasoning?*

Guided and Supported Writing: Students will be doing "close reading" and "close writing" to work on specific spots in their drafts where the linkages are unclear or need strengthening. They will likely benefit from ongoing conferencing, so that they are aware of readers' experiences with their draft.

Read Alouds: Periodically, students might read and share two, linked paragraphs they have revised to improve either the connections among sentences or the transitions among paragraphs.

ACTIVITY 6: FOCUS ON LANGUAGE-CLARITY AND IMPACT

The teacher models a demonstration lesson that focuses on language and the unit's criteria for expression and word choice. Students write, discuss, and revise with a focus on the quality and variety of their sentences, the clarity of their vocabulary, and the impact of their word choices.

INSTRUCTIONAL NOTES

"No-one is exempt from speaking nonsense – the only misfortune is to do it solemnly." – Montaigne

Teacher Modeling: The demonstration lesson(s) focus on the unit's criteria for Control of Language, with a goal that students will work to make their writing both clear and confident. Students will work on sentence structure and word choice with demonstration lessons tailored to the specific demands of the writing assignment, issues related to its audience, and/or their particular needs as writers. Some possible areas for teacher modeling and student workshop focus are:

Clarity of syntax and diction: Model how a reader can detect unclear sentences and imprecise or confusing word choices, what John Trimble delightfully refers to as "mumbo jumbo – grunts of the mind." Using an example paragraph, demonstrate how a writer might revise its sentences in response to various detected problems of clarity to, in Trimble's words, "Phrase your thoughts clearly so you're easy to follow." [p. 8] Model how student writers might frame text-based questions for their readers to respond to in text-centered review discussions.

Impact of language: Model how language use – word choices, descriptive and figurative language – can strongly influence the impact of an argument on its reader. Emphasize that a writer makes choices about how to express ideas, and that those choices should reflect what Trimble refers to as "confident language." Focus, for example, on "vigorous verbs," modeling how students might highlight all the verbs in one or more of their paragraphs (a short grammar review may be necessary!) and then study, with a reader, how those verbs either contribute to or detract from the impact and confidence of the writing. Model also, how this criterion of "vigor" in verb choices might be used in students' text-centered review discussions.

Tone: Model the importance of achieving the right tone in an argument by first returning to several of the texts read in the unit, to discuss the tone (and thus perspective) established by their language choices. Be clear about the appropriate tone for the intended writing product, while also emphasizing that trying to "lecture" one's audience in an argument rarely works. Reference Trimble's suggestion about how to "serve your reader's needs": "Talk to them in a warm, open manner instead of pontificating to them like a know-it-all." [p. 8] Have students classify arguments they have read as to whether they, as readers, have felt "talked to" or "pontificated to," in preparation for students' text-centered review discussions that focus on this distinction.

Text-Centered Discussion:

- **Guiding Question:** The general Guiding Question(s) will be determined by the focus of the demonstration lesson(s) and the review, i.e.: *How easy is it to follow the writer's thinking? Where do you get lost?"* Or *"In what ways does the writer use 'confident language' to present the argument?"* Or *"In what ways does the author express the argument in an effective, conversational tone?"*
- **Criteria:** Focus reading, review, and writing on any of the issues discussed in the modeling section, and/or either or both of these criteria from the *Evidence-Based Arguments Criteria Checklist.*

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 an intended audience. The use of words, phrases, clauses, and varied syntax draws attention to key ideas and reinforces relationships among ideas.

ACTIVITY 6: FOCUS ON LANGUAGE-CLARITY AND IMPACT (CONT'D)

INSTRUCTIONAL NOTES (CONT'D)

- **Example Text-based Review Question(s):** *In what specific places does a reader feel confused by the writing? In my final paragraph, how confidently and vigorously do I express my ideas and thus bring my argument to a forceful conclusion?*

Guided and Supported Writing: Students will work to improve specific sentence structure and word choice issues focused on in demonstration lessons and text-centered discussions. Writing time might be divided into several phases, to progressively look at a specific issue (e.g., clarity) before moving to others. Writing and text-centered discussion might thus occur in an ongoing cycle, depending on how many aspects of expression are to be addressed.

Read Alouds: Students will benefit from reading sections of their draft aloud, to a partner or the class, throughout the process, listening (as they read) for places in which they detect such things as lack of clarity, lack of confidence, and/or pontification.

ACTIVITY 7: FOCUS ON CONVENTIONS-PUNCTUTATION, GRAMMAR, AND SPELLING

The teacher models a demonstration lesson that focuses on one or more pertinent aspects of writing conventions and the unit's criteria. Students write, discuss, and revise with a focus on the targeted aspect(s) of writing conventions.

INSTRUCTIONAL NOTES

"The greater part of the world's troubles are due to questions of grammar." – Montaigne

Teacher Modeling: The demonstration lesson(s) should focus on whatever aspects of writing conventions seem appropriate, based on: 1) the nature of the written product, and issues that typically arise; 2) students' past writing, and areas in which they have demonstrated a need to improve; 3) aspects of grammar, punctuation, or spelling that have recently been the focus of direct instruction and guided practice. Deciding which of many issues to emphasize is left up to the teacher. However, it is recommended that only a few issues be the focus of any writing cycle, so that students can really concentrate on them instead of being overwhelmed by too many "corrections" that they need to make.

Text-Centered Discussion:

Guiding Question: Based on whatever issues in grammar, punctuation, spelling, etc. are emphasized in demonstration lessons and editing processes.

Criteria: Focus reading, review, and writing on criteria specific to the targeted aspect of grammar, punctuation, or spelling, and overall to this criterion from the *Evidence-Based Arguments Criteria Checklist.*

> **Conventions of Writing:** Illustrates consistent command of standard, grade-level-appropriate writing conventions.

Example Text-based Review Question(s): Will be based on whatever issues in grammar, punctuation, spelling, etc. are emphasized in demonstration lessons and editing processes.

Guided and Supported Writing: Based on whatever issues in grammar, punctuation, spelling, etc. are emphasized in demonstration lessons and editing processes.

Read Alouds: When working on punctuation, students can benefit from read alouds in which they consciously read the indicated punctuation, i.e., pause based on the "road signs" indicated by various punctuation marks. This can help students detect place where additional punctuation may be needed, or where punctuation creates confusion.

ACTIVITY 8: FOCUS ON PUBLICATION-FINAL EDITING AND FORMATTING

The teacher models a demonstration lesson that focuses on final editing and formatting and the unit's criteria for final writing products. Students write, discuss, and revise with a focus on producing a final quality product appropriate for their audience and purpose.

INSTRUCTIONAL NOTES

"There is no conversation more boring than the one where everybody agrees." - Montaigne

"*I put forward formless and unresolved notions, as do those who publish doubtful questions to debate in the schools, not to establish the truth but to seek it."* – Montaigne

Teacher Modeling: The demonstration lesson focuses on issues to address, and ways to achieve a quality product, when formatting a final draft for "publication" and use with an identified audience. Decisions about what to focus on are left to the teacher, based on the nature of the assignment and the opportunities to use technology to enhance the argument through graphics and document formatting.

Guided and Supported Writing: Students will finalize their written product. This may occur in class, in a computer lab, or outside of school, depending on circumstances.

Text-Centered Discussion: When/if review discussions occur, they should focus on both the correctness and impact of the final written format.

Read Alouds: Students will have spent significant time reading, thinking, and writing to produce their final written argument. A strong way to culminate and celebrate this work is through some sort of public or technology-based presentation: speeches/readings for community members, an in-class symposium on the issue, presentations to other students, or some form of argument-supported debate. The decision of how to best finish the unit in a meaningful way is left to the teacher.

ASSESSMENT OPPORTUNITIES

Students submit their revised essays ready for publication. Teachers can evaluate the essays using the *Evidence-Based Arguments Criteria Checklist*. The *Evidence-Based Writing Rubric* can also provide guidance on proficiency levels demonstrated by various elements of the essay.

Teachers can also evaluate each student's participation in the collaborative writing activities in a variety of ways beginning with the *Text-Centered Discussion Checklist*. They also might collect student revision questions, various drafts illustrating their revisions, as well as feedback on their peers' essay drafts.