Curriculum Sample Template
Max. 8 Pages

Grade Level	11th Grade	**Content Area**	Writing
Course Title (grades 9-12 Only)	English 11B		
Expected Prior Knowledge *The knowledge/skills mastered earlier in the year foundational to the mastery of the required Standard in the current sample.*	• Students understand how to work in precision partnerships effectively. • Students have experience editing each other's work and having their own work edited by peers. • Students have produced opinion writing in which they write strong introductions, supply a variety of valid reasons, incorporate transitional words and phrases, and provide a summative, concluding paragraph. • Students are very familiar with pathos, logos, and ethos techniques in the art of persuasion. • Students can smoothly use some key transitional words/phrases throughout an essay to help make the reader's experience more cohesive and enjoyable.		
Alignment to Program of Instruction *Briefly outline methods of instruction found in this sequence of lessons that align to the Program of Instruction described in A.3.*	This unit is built on the framework of the SIOP Model and incorporates all 8 of the SIOP Model components. Sentence framing and precision partnering are instructional strategies which promote the use and mastery of academic language. Instructional technology is incorporated by teacher and students. The core curriculum is implemented with fidelity. This unit is also built around the culture of writing workshop. This system helps students across the campus to firmly understand the importance of each step of the process of writing: brainstorming, outlining, drafting, self-editing, peer-editing, revising, rewriting, and rubric reconciliation. Students will appreciate the value of being an active participant in a writing community that regularly collaborates, presents, critiques, and publishes written work.		
Standard Number and Description *List the Number* and the full description for the Required Standard or Science Performance Objective listed in section A.6.*	**Writing Standards (W)** Text Types and Purposes #1 - Write arguments to support claims in an analysis of substantive topics or texts, using valid reasoning and relevant and sufficient evidence. a. Introduce precise, knowledgeable claim(s), establish the significance of the claim(s), distinguish the claim(s) from alternate or opposing claims, and create an organization that logically sequences claim(s), counterclaims, reasons, and evidence. b. Develop claim(s) and counterclaims fairly and thoroughly, supplying the most relevant evidence for each while pointing out the strengths and limitations of both in a manner that anticipates the audience's knowledge level, concerns, values, and possible biases. c. Use words, phrases, and clauses as well as varied syntax to link the major sections of the text, create		

	cohesion, and clarify the relationships between claim(s) and reasons, between reasons and evidence, and between claim(s) and counterclaims. d. Establish and maintain a formal style and objective tone while attending to the norms and conventions of the discipline in which they are writing. e. Provide a concluding statement or section that follows from and supports the argument presented.
Materials/Resources Needed	• Chromebooks • SMART Board • Audio feed of Supreme Court oral argument • www.wallwisher.com • Written majority opinion

* ***Standard Number****: For English Language Arts (Reading and Writing), use Grade, Strand, Standard (e.g., 3.RI.2). For K-8 Math, use Grade, Domain, Standard (e.g., 6.EE.7). For HS Math, use Conceptual Category-Domain, Standard (e.g., A-REI.6). For Science, use Grade, Strand, Concept, PO (e.g., 4.1.3.1).*

Lesson (add as needed)	**Instructional Strategies**	**Student Activities**
1	1.Teacher has students research current members of the Supreme Court, including political affiliations, appointing president, and decision record. 2. Teacher assigns students to cooperative groups in which students create a mock Linked-In page for one of the Justices. Teacher facilitates presentation of all pages to the whole class and posts on the wall. As part of the page, students must list 'values' and 'biases' for their justice. 3.Teacher has students vote on a current, 1 hour Supreme Court oral argument to listen to as a whole group. 4. Teacher assigns LinkedIn groups to post oral argument ***predictions*** for the voted case for their Justice and explain the connection between their prediction and the biases/values identified on the LinkedIn profiles 5. Teacher challenges each group to decide how they could advise the attorneys to leverage the bias/value information to tailor an argument to their Justice.	1. Students research current members of the Supreme Court to learn about their personal/professional biases and values. 2. Students a mock LinkedIn page for one Justice in cooperative groups. Students present their work to the whole class and clearly share their Justice's 'values' and 'biases'. 3. Students vote for a current Supreme Court oral argument 4. Student groups make oral argument ***predictions*** for their assigned Justice for the selected case based on the values and biases uncovered for their Justice during research and LinkedIn profile development. 5. Students write strategy letters to the attorneys to advise them on how to leverage bias/value information to tailor arguments to three of the Justices. 6. While listening to the oral argument, students track counsel's reasons, counterarguments, and rebuttals as well as questions from the justices.
2	1. Teacher asks students, "What do you think you'll need to	1. Students contribute questions and answers to prior-

	know to follow the legal argument today?" Students will post their thoughts onto www.wallwisher.com. Teacher will allow the student conversation to organically unfold, then fill in any missed prior knowledge pieces crucial to following the argument. 2.Teacher plays the oral argument selected Day 1 for the whole class. 3. While listening, the teacher prompts students to track the reasons, counterarguments, and rebuttals of both counsel as well as questions from the Justices. 4. Teacher periodically pauses the recording to allow students to participate in intermittent summaries/discussions and ask clarifying questions. 5. Teacher facilitates a whole-class discussion about student responses to the experience. Teacher hones in on student evaluations of arguments.	knowledge discussion via www.wallwisher.com. 2. Students listed to the oral argument selected Day 1 by class consensus. 3. Students track the reasons, counterarguments, and rebuttals of counsel and questions from the Justices. 4. Students participate in intermittent discussions about argument summaries. Students ask clarifying questions. 5. Students write about their personal response to the oral argument. Students evaluate the performance of each attorney in making sound arguments, anticipating and refuting counterarguments, and designing responses that appeal to values/biases of each Justice.
3	1.Teacher presents a 'majority opinion' from the Supreme Court (from the Day 2 case, if possible) to the class and prompts students to read and analyze it in small groups. While reading, students will identify the Justices' analysis of the significance, logic, and relevance of each attorneys' overall argument. 2.Teacher asks students to evaluate the voice/tone of the majority opinion and provide examples from the writing that produce that effect. 3. Teacher offers contrasting Justice opinions who demonstrate varied syntax (in terms of incorporation of varied sentence lengths/complexities and usage of active verbs). Teacher prompts students to compare/contrast the writing styles of the Justices. 4. Teacher screens a Constitutional bit by John Stewart and prompts a class discussion: what about his tone/voice/syntax/delivery is more palatable to the populace?	1.Students read a Supreme Court majority opinion in small groups. Groups will summarize the Justices' analysis of the significance, logic, and relevance of each attorney's overall argument. 2.Students evaluate the voice/tone of the majority opinion and provide text-based examples to illustrate their assertion. 3. In pairs, compare/contrast syntax of two Justices. Identify specific text elements that lead to those conclusions. 4. View a satirical bit and identify what about its tone/voice/syntax/delivery is more palatable than reading a majority opinion? Why is there power in satire? Why is it dangerous? **Homework: Write the first draft of an essay that is either in support or opposition of the oral argument topic. Use the rubric to guide your efforts!**

	Powerful? Dangerous? **Assign Homework: Write the first draft of an essay that is either in support or opposition of the oral argument topic. Select relevant facts from credible sources!** *Note: teacher provides the opinion piece rubric.	
4	1.Teacher facilitates a writing workshop of the homework drafts, shares respondent expectations, and reviews the rubric. 2.Teacher ensures that writers get responses from five different students varying in skill sets. 3. Teacher returns collated peer responses to their authors and prompts students to review feedback and highlight ideas they can incorporate to improve their essay. **Assign Homework: Rewrite essay using peer feedback**	1. Students provide constructive, focused peer response to the essays of at least five peers that speak to the rubric and meet the respondent expectations set by the teacher. 2. Students review responses from their peers and highlight ideas that they will incorporate into their rewrites. **Homework: Rewrite essay using peer feedback**
5	1. Provide students with short research with source summaries tied to the prompt topic. Have students read and consider the research independently about the ethics of the 1st Amendment. 2. Provide the following **Prompt:** Using the research provided to you, select relevant facts from credible sources to write an essay that is either in support or opposition of protecting the free speech of a hate group (that does not **directly** incite violence). Be sure to use your rubric as a guide.	1. Write an essay independently that responds to the prompt provided.

Opinion Piece Rubric

Text Types and Purposes
#1 - Write arguments to support claims in an analysis of substantive topics or texts, using valid reasoning and relevant and sufficient evidence.
a. Introduce precise, **knowledgeable** claim(s), **establish the significance of the claim(s),** distinguish the claim(s) from alternate or opposing claims, and create an organization that logically sequences claim(s), counterclaims, reasons, and evidence.
b. Develop claim(s) and counterclaims fairly **and thoroughly**, supplying **the most relevant** evidence for each while pointing out the strengths and limitations of both in a manner that anticipates the audience's knowledge level, concerns, **values, and possible biases**.
c. Use words, phrases, and clauses **as well as varied syntax** to link the major sections of the text, create cohesion, and clarify the relationships between claim(s) and reasons, between reasons and evidence, and between claim(s) and counterclaims.
d. Establish and maintain a formal style and objective tone while attending to the norms and conventions of the discipline in which they are writing.
e. Provide a concluding statement or section that follows from and supports the argument presented.

Essential Student Question: Can you write a logically-organized opinion piece that provides reasons and evidence to support your point-of-view and refute counter-claims?

Introduces precise, knowledgeable claims and establish claim significance through reasons/evidence 1 2 3 4 5
1=limited reasons/evidence offered in disorganized fashion; 2=emerging reasons/evidence offered in a somewhat organized fashion; 3=offers sufficient reason/evidences in an organized fashion; 4= offers a variety of reasons/evidence in an organized fashion; 5=offers a wealth of reasons/evidence in an impeccably organized fashion.

Introduces opposing claims, distinguishes them from core claims 1 2 3 4 5
1=fails to introduce any opposing claims; 2=introduces minimal opposing claims; 3=introduces sufficient opposing claims and attempts to distinguish them; 4=introduces a variety of opposing claims and distinguishes them from core claims; 5=introduces a wealth of opposing claims and distinguishes them clearly from core claims

Supports claims with clear reasons and develops them fairly and thoroughly 1 2 3 4 5
1=claims lack clear reasons; 2; claims are introduced but not developed; 3=claims have support from some clear reasons and are developed from one perspective; 4=claims have support from a variety of clear reasons and are developed from both perspectives; 5=claims have support from a wealth of clear, thorough reasons and a balanced perspective is offered

Introduces key, stock counterclaims for the issue 1 2 3 4 5
1=fails to introduce any counterclaims; 2=introduces minimal counterclaims; 3=introduces sufficient counterclaims and attempts to distinguish them; 4=introduces a variety of counterclaims and distinguishes them from core claims; 5=introduces a wealth of counterclaims, develops them thoroughly, and distinguishes them clearly from core claims

Provides relevant, strategic rebuttal for counterclaims to address values and biases of audience 1 2 3 4 5
1=fails to rebut any counterclaims; 2=rebuts minimal counterclaims; 3=introduces sufficient rebuttals and tailors them to anticipated values/biases of reader; 4=introduces a variety of distinguished rebuttals and tailors them to anticipated values/biases of reader; 5=introduces a wealth of compelling rebuttals that would be persuasive to values and biases of opposition

Supports reasons with relevant evidence demonstrating topic understanding 1 2 3 4 5
1=evidence is not provided to support reasons; 2= some reasons are provided but the lack key evidence central to the topic; 3=some reasons are provided that include all key ideas central to the topic; 4= many reasons are provided that mostly demonstrate an understanding of the topic 5=many reasons are provided that demonstrate a prioritized, mastery of the topic

Selects information from sources that are credible 1 2 3 4 5
1=sources are not clearly provided for information; 2=several sources are provided for information and most are credible; 3=several sources are provided for information and all are credible; 4=multiple sources are provided for information and all sources are credible; 5=a wealth of balanced sources are provided for information and all are credible

Use of linking words/phrases/clauses to connect claims, counterclaims, refutation, and reasons 1 2
1=incorporates several linking words/phrases; 4=incorporates a broad variety of many effective linking words/phrases

SYNTAX: Use of active voice in all verbs 1 2
1=lapses into passive voice/be verbs in the essay; 4=maintains active voice throughout the essay

SYNTAX: Uses a blend of long, medium, and short sentence lengths and structures 1 2

1=limited range of sentence lengths and structural complexity; 2=functional range of sentence length and structural complexity

Establishes and maintains formal style 1 2 3 4

1=uses informal style; 2=style has a mix of formal and informal elements; 3=style is mostly formal; 4=style is exclusively formal and academic

Conclusion 1 2 3 4 5

1==attempted but not tightly connected to the body argument; 2= attempted and connects to the body argument; 3= flows seamlessly from the body argument; 4=contains creative, persuasive elements and flows easily from the body arguments; 5= contains creative, compelling call-to-action and flows effortlessly from the body arguments

Opinion Piece Scoring Guide:

Raw rubric points available: **50 points total**

Raw score_____X 2 = Final Score out of 100 points

The 100 points possible assessment will reflect the school's grading scale:

90 -100 = A – Mastery

80 – 89 = B - Mastery

70 – 79 = C – Needs Screening for Remediation

60 – 69 = D – Needs Remediation

0 – 59 = F – Needs Intensive Remediation