

	<b>Enduring Understandings</b> (Students will understand that...)	<b>Learning Objectives</b> (Students will be skilled at...)	<b>Essential Knowledge</b> (Students will know that...)
<b>Big Idea 1: Question &amp; Explore</b>	EU 1.1 Personal interest and intellectual curiosity lead to investigation of topics or issues that may or may not be clearly defined. A good question explores the complexity of an issue or topic. Further inquiry can lead to an interesting conclusion, resolution, or solution. Sometimes this inquiry leads to research and unexpected paths.	LO 1.1A: Identifying and contextualizing a problem or issue.  LO 1.1B: Posing complex questions and seeking out answers that reflect multiple, divergent, or contradictory perspectives.	EK 1.1A1: Examining the perspectives and ideas of others often leads to questions for further investigation. Inquiry begins with narrowing scope of interest, identifying a problem or issue and its origins within that scope, and situating the problem or issue in a larger context.  EK 1.1B1: Strong research questions are open-ended and lead to an examination, taking into account the complexity of a problem or issue.  EK 1.1B2: The inquiry process allows one to draw upon curiosity and imagination to engage with ideas or explore approaches to complex issues.
	EU 1.2: New knowledge builds on prior knowledge. Strengthening understanding of a concept or issue requires questioning existing knowledge, using what is known to discover what is not known, and connecting new knowledge to prior knowledge.	LO 1.2A: Retrieving, questioning, organizing, and using prior knowledge about a topic.	EK 1.2A1: Understanding comes not only through collection of information but also from a variety of other factors (e.g., experience, external sources, culture, assumptions).  EK 1.2A2: A variety of tools (e.g., brainstorming, concept mapping, prewriting exercises) can be used to illustrate, organize, and connect ideas.  EK 1.2A3: Research confirms or challenges one's existing understandings, assumptions, beliefs, and/or knowledge.

<p>EU 1.3: The investigative process is aided by the effective organization, management, and selection of sources and information. Using appropriate technologies and tools helps the researcher become more efficient, productive, and credible.</p>	<p>LO 1.3A: Accessing information using effective strategies.</p> <p>LO 1.3B: Using technology to access and manage information.</p> <p>LO 1.3C: Evaluating the relevance and credibility of information from sources and data.</p>	<p>EK 1.3A1: Information used to address a problem may come from various secondary sources (e.g., articles, other studies, analyses, reports) and/or primary sources (e.g., original texts and works or personally collected data such as from experiments, surveys, questionnaires, interviews).</p> <p>EK 1.3B1: Online databases (e.g., EBSCO, ProQuest, JSTOR, Google Scholar) and libraries catalog and house secondary and some primary sources.</p> <p>EK 1.3B2: Advanced search tools, Boolean logic, and key words allow researchers to refine, focus, and/or limit their searches based on a variety of factors (e.g., date, peer-review status, type of publication).</p> <p>EK 1.3C1: The scope and purpose of research and the credibility of sources determine the validity and reliability of the conclusion(s).</p> <p>EK 1.3C2: Credibility of an argument is established through the use of sources and data that are valid (relevant) and reliable (current, authoritative).</p>	
<p>EU 1.4: There are multiple ways to investigate problems and issues. The question asked determines the kind of inquiry.</p>	<p>LO 1.4A: Identifying alternatives for approaching a problem.</p>	<p>EK 1.4A1: The way the problem is posed, situated, framed, or contextualized will guide the inquiry process and influence the way solutions are valued.</p>	
<p><b>Big Idea 2: Understand &amp; Analyze Arguments</b></p>	<p>EU 2.1: Authors express their perspectives and arguments through their works. The first step in</p>	<p>LO 2.1A: Employing appropriate reading strategies and reading critically for a specific purpose.</p>	<p>EK 2.1A1: Reading critically means reading closely to identify the main idea, tone, assumptions, context, perspective, line of reasoning, and evidence used.</p>

	<p>evaluating an author's perspective or argument is to comprehend it. Such comprehension requires reading and thinking critically.</p>	<p>LO 2.1B: Summarizing and explaining the main idea and the line of reasoning, and identifying the supporting details of an argument, while avoiding generalizations and oversimplification.</p>	<p>EK 2.1A2: Strategies active readers use to preview and prioritize a written text include skimming, scanning, rereading, and questioning.</p> <p>EK 2.1A3: Strategies active readers use to make meaning from texts include annotating, note-taking, highlighting, and reading aloud.</p> <p>EK 2.1A4: Perspectives are shared through written, spoken, visual, or performance texts. A perspective includes the writer's attitude/ tone regarding the subject and is expressed through an argument.</p> <p>EK 2.1B1: The main idea of an argument is often stated in the thesis statement, claim, or conclusion, or implied throughout a work.</p> <p>EK 2.1B2: Authors use a line of reasoning to support their arguments. The line of reasoning is composed of one or more claims justified through evidence.</p> <p>EK 2.1B3: A lack of understanding of the complexities of an argument (tone, implications, limitations, nuance, context) can lead to oversimplification and/or generalization.</p>
	<p>EU 2.2: Authors choose evidence to shape and support their arguments. Readers evaluate the line of reasoning and evidence to determine to what extent they believe or accept an argument.</p>	<p>LO 2.2A: Identifying, explaining, and analyzing the logic and line of reasoning of an argument.</p>	<p>EK 2.2A1: An argument's context(time and purpose) and situation (relation to the other related arguments) inform its interpretation.</p> <p>EK 2.2A2: An argument's line of reasoning is organized based on the argument's purpose (e.g., to show causality, to define, to propose a solution).</p> <p>EK 2.2A3: Inductive reasoning uses specific observations and/or data points to identify trends, make generalizations, and draw conclusions. Deductive reasoning uses broad facts</p>

	<p>LO 2.2B: Describing and analyzing the relevance and credibility of evidence used to support an argument, taking context into consideration.</p> <p>LO 2.2C: Evaluating the validity of an argument.</p>	<p>or generalizations to generate additional, more specific conclusions about a phenomenon.</p> <p>EK 2.2B1: Writers use qualitative and/or quantitative evidence (e.g., facts, data, rants, observations, predictions, explanations, opinions) to support their claims.</p> <p>EK 2.2B2: Authors strategically include evidence to support their claims.</p> <p>EK 2.2B3: Writers appeal to (or possibly manipulate) readers through a variety of strategies and techniques (e.g., language, authority, qualifiers, fallacies, emphasis).</p> <p>EK 2.2B4: Evidence may be used to identify and explain relationships (comparative, causal, or correlational) and/or patterns and trends.</p> <p>EK 2.2B5: Credibility is compromised when authors fail to acknowledge and/or consider the limitations of their conclusions, opposing views or perspectives, and/or their own biases.</p> <p>EK 2.2C1: An argument is valid when there is logical alignment between the line of reasoning and the conclusion.</p>
<p>EU 2.3: Arguments have implications.</p>	<p>LO 2.3A: Connecting an argument to broader issues by examining the implications of the author's claim.</p> <p>LO 2.3B: Evaluating potential resolutions, conclusions, or solutions to problems or issues in an argument.</p>	<p>EK 2.3A1: The implications and consequences of arguments may be intended or unintended.</p> <p>EK 2.3B1: Arguments are significant and have readi-world impact because they can influence behaviour (eg., call one to action, suggest logical next steps)</p>

<p><b>Big Idea 3: Evaluate Multiple Perspectives</b></p>	<p>EU 3.1: Different perspectives often lead to competing and alternate arguments. The complexity of an issue emerges when people bring these differing, multiple perspectives to the conversation about it.</p>	<p>LO 3.1A: Identifying and interpreting multiple perspectives on or arguments about an issue.</p>	<p>EK 3.1A1: An individual's perspective is influenced by his or her background (e.g., experiences, culture, education), assumptions, and world view, as well as by external sources.</p> <p>EK 3.1A2: Perspectives are not always oppositional; they may be concurring, alternating, or competing.</p>
	<p>EU 3.2: Not all arguments are equal; some arguments are more credible/valid than others. Through evaluating others' arguments, personal arguments can be situated within a larger conversation.</p>	<p>LO 3.2A: Evaluating objections, implications, and limitations of alternate, opposing, or competing perspectives or arguments.</p>	<p>EK 3.2A1: Critical thinkers are aware that some arguments may appeal to emotions, core values, personal biases and assumptions, and logic for the purpose of manipulation.</p> <p>EK 3.2A2: When evaluating multiple perspectives or arguments, consideration must be given to how personal biases and assumptions influence a reader's judgment.</p>
<p><b>Big Idea 4: Synthesize Ideas</b></p>	<p>EU 4.1: People express their ideas, points of view, perspectives, and conclusions through arguments. Crafting an argument requires a clear line of reasoning, considering audience, purpose, and context.</p>	<p>LO 4.1A: Formulating a complex and well-reasoned argument.</p>	<p>EK 4.1A1: Arguments use reason and evidence to convey a perspective, point of view, or some version of the truth that is stated or implied in the thesis and/or conclusion.</p> <p>EK 4.1A2: Arguments are supported and unified by carefully chosen and connected claims, reasons, and evidence.</p> <p>EK 4.1A3: Qualifiers place limits on how far a claim may be carried. Effective arguments acknowledge these limits, increasing credibility by reducing generalization or oversimplification.</p>

			<p>EK 4.1A4: An argument may acknowledge other arguments and/or respond to them with counterarguments (e.g., via concession, refutation, and/or rebuttal).</p> <p>EK 4.1A5: The line of reasoning is a clear, logical, sequential path leading the audience through the reasons toward the conclusion.</p> <p>EK 4.1A6: The logic and reasoning of an argument may be deductive (claim followed by evidence) or inductive (evidence leads to a conclusion).</p> <p>EK 4.1A7: A line of reasoning is organized based on the argument's purpose (e.g., to show causality, to evaluate, to define, to propose a solution).</p> <p>EK 4.1A8: Claims and supporting evidence are arranged (e.g., spatially, chronologically, order of importance) to convey reasoning and relationship (e.g., comparative, causal, correlational).</p> <p>EK 4.1A9: The same argument may be organized, arranged, or supported in multiple ways depending on audience and context.</p>
	<p>EU 4.2: Evidence is strategically selected to support a line of reasoning that appeals to or influences others.</p>	<p>LO 4.2A: Interpreting, using, and synthesizing qualitative and/or quantitative data/information from various perspectives and sources (e.g., primary, secondary, print, nonprint) to develop and support an argument.</p>	<p>EK 4.2A1: Evidence can be collected from print and nonprint sources (e.g., libraries, museums, archives), experts, or data gathered in the field (e.g., interviews, questionnaires, observations).</p> <p>EK 4.2A2: Compelling evidence is used to support the claims and reasoning of an argument. Evidence should be sufficient, typical, relevant, current, and credible to support the conclusion.</p>

	<p>LO 4.2B: Providing insightful and cogent commentary that links evidence with claims.</p> <p>LO 4.2C: Attributing knowledge and ideas accurately and ethically, using an appropriate citation style.</p>	<p>EK 4.2A3: Evidence is chosen based on purpose (e.g., to align an argument with authority; to define a concept, illustrate a process, or clarify a statement; to set a mood; to provide an example; to amplify or qualify a point).</p> <p>EK 4.2A4: Evidence is strategically included or excluded to appeal to or influence a particular audience.</p> <p>EK 4.2B1: Commentary connects the chosen evidence to the claim through interpretation or inference, identifying patterns, describing trends, and/or explaining relationships (e.g., comparative, causal, correlational).</p> <p>EK 4.2C1: Plagiarism is a serious offense that occurs when a person presents another's ideas or words as his or her own. Plagiarism may be avoided by acknowledging sources thoroughly and accurately.</p> <p>EK 4.2C2: Source material should be introduced, integrated, or embedded into the text of an argument.</p> <p>EK 4.2C3: Quoted and paraphrased material must be properly attributed, credited, and cited following a style manual. Quoting is using the exact words of others; paraphrasing is restating an idea in your own words.</p> <p>EK 4.2C4: Academic disciplines use specific style guides for citing and attributing sources (e.g., APA, MLA, Chicago, AMA).</p>
<p>EU 4.3: Achievement of new understandings involves the careful consideration of existing knowledge, imagination, innovation, and risk</p>	<p>LO 4.3A: Extending an idea, question, process, or product to innovate or create new understandings.</p>	<p>EK 4.3A1: Innovative solutions and arguments identify and challenge assumptions, acknowledge the importance of content, imagine and explore alternatives, and engage in reflective skepticism.</p>

	taking and incorporates personally generated evidence.		
	EK 4.3A1: Innovative solutions and arguments identify and challenge assumptions, acknowledge the importance of content, imagine and explore alternatives, and engage in reflective skepticism.	LO 4.4A: Offering resolutions, conclusions, and/or solutions based on evidence while considering consequences and implications.	EK 4.4A1: When proposing a solution, the advantages and disadvantages of the options and alternatives should be weighed against the goal within its context.
<b>Big Idea 5: Team, Transform, and Transmit</b>	EU 5.1: How an argument is presented affects how people interpret or react to it.	LO 5.1A: Working both as an individual and with a team to plan, produce, and present a cohesive argument, considering audience, context, and purpose, and using appropriate media (e.g., essay, poster, presentation, documentary, research report/thesis).	<p>EK 5.1A1: An argument may include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Introduction: engage the audience by providing background and/or context</li> <li>▶ Claim: convey the main idea of an argument</li> <li>▶ Reasons, evidence, and commentary: provide support for the argument</li> <li>▶ Concession, refutation, and rebuttal: acknowledge and/or respond to opposing arguments</li> <li>▶ Conclusion: reinforce points, offer additional analysis, possible implications for the future, tie back to the introduction               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ References</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>EK 5.1A2: Coherence is achieved when the elements and ideas in an argument flow logically and smoothly. Transitions are used to move the audience from one element or idea to another by illustrating the relationship between the elements or ideas.</p> <p>EK 5.1A3: Effective organizational and design elements (e.g., headings, layout, illustrations, pull quotes, captions,</p>



		<p>LO 5.1B: Communicating an argument in an evidence-based written essay adhering to established conventions of grammar usage, style, and mechanics.</p> <p>LO 5.1C: Communicating an argument in an engaging oral presentation using appropriate media, incorporating effective techniques of design and delivery.</p>	<p>lists) may aid in audience engagement and understanding by calling attention to important information and/or creating emotional responses in the audience. Ineffective use or overuse of these elements disrupts audience engagement and understanding.</p> <p>EK 5.1A4: Data and other information can be presented graphically (e.g., infographics, graphs, tables, models) to aid audience understanding and interpretation.</p> <p>EK 5.1B1: A writer or speaker expresses tone or attitude about a topic through word choice, sentence structure, and imagery.</p> <p>EK 5.1B2: Effective sentences create variety, emphasis, and interest through structure, agreement of elements, placement of modifiers, and consistency of tense.</p> <p>EK 5.1B3: Precision in word choice reduces confusion, wordiness, and redundancy.</p> <p>EK 5.1B4: Spelling and grammar errors detract from credibility.</p> <p>EK 5.1C1: Speakers vary elements of delivery (e.g., volume, tempo, movement, eye contact, vocal variety, energy) to emphasize information, convey tone, and engage their audience.</p>
	<p>EU 5.2: Teams are most effective when they draw on the diverse perspectives, skills, and backgrounds of team members to address</p>	<p>LO 5.2A: Providing individual contributions to overall collaborative effort.</p> <p>LO 5.2B: Fostering constructive team climate, resolving conflicts, and facilitating the contributions of all team members to address complex, open-ended problems.</p>	<p>EK 5.2A1: Knowing and communicating one's strengths and challenges to a group allows one's contributions to be more effective.</p> <p>EK 5.2B1: Teams are built around tasks. Low-risk teambuilding activities and simulations enhance a team's performance.</p>

<p>complex, open-ended problems.</p>		<p>EK 5.2B2: Teams function at their best when they understand the diversity of their social-cultural perspectives, talents, and skills.</p> <p>EK 5.2B3: Teams function at their best when they practice effective interpersonal communication, consensus building, conflict resolution, and negotiation.</p> <p>EK 5.2B4: Effective teams consider the use of online collaborative tools.</p>
<p>EU 5.3: Reflection increases learning, self-awareness, and personal growth through the slowing down of thinking processes to identify and evaluate personal conclusions and their implications.</p>	<p>LO 5.3A: Reflecting on and revising their own writing, thinking, and/or processes.</p> <p>LO 5.3B: Reflecting on personal contributions to overall collaborative effort.</p>	<p>EK 5.3A1: Reflection is an ongoing and recursive process in inquiry, often leading to changes in understanding. Strategies for reflection may include journal writing, self-questioning, and/or guided contemplation.</p> <p>EK 5.3B1: Learning requires practice through an iterative process of thinking/rethinking, vision/revision, and writing/rewriting.</p> <p>EK 5.3B2: Reflective contributors acknowledge the impact of their actions on the outcome of the group's efforts, noting the reasons for such actions, assumptions made, and whether or not such actions and assumptions hindered or helped the achievement of the group's goals.</p>