**1 Course Description**  
Aims at developing the use of logic and reasoning in argumentation. A properly documented critical paper is required. Prerequisite: [ENL](javascript:popup('ARP','222');) 105 or ENL 110 or placement.

**2** **Student Learning Outcomes**

Upon successful completion of this course, and as a result of the activities and study in this course, the students should be able to accomplish the following:

* To convince audiences by using objective, researched evidencing techniques.
* To give an educated opinion when discussing contemporary issues.
* To use sound thinking when expressing an opinion.
* To read and write critically.
* To identify issues, claims, arguments, counter-arguments, and types of evidence.
* To create, interpret, and evaluate arguments.
* To spot fallacies (errors in reasoning) in arguments.
* To develop argumentative essays of 1200-1500 words.
* To develop a well-researched critical paper of 3000-5000 words using the APA style of documentation.
* To use computer/Internet technology to access and retrieve necessary information in the various stages of research and writing.
* To prepare and participate in class debates on current or recurring issues

**3. Teaching Methodology and Techniques**

* In order for students to fully master the skills of argumentation covered in this course, students will be participating in discussions in the form of textual analysis, class discussions and structured debates on current and recurring issues.
* Students will be expected to write frequently, culminating in the writing of a final argumentative paper. A first draft of the final paper must be submitted at least one week prior to the due date.
* Students are expected to participate dynamically in all class activities. ENL 213, of all courses offered at university level, is among those which demand the most in-class participation in the form of discussions framed by the sound exchange of claims, reasons, evidence and refutation..
* Instructors of this course will use a variety of learner-centered activities, including pair and group work. Instructors will facilitate student learning through favorizing an interactive environment. A small amount of whole class instruction is carried out; the bulk of the instruction is based on cooperative work.
* Home assignments will be given and they form an important part of the learning process.
* It is imperative that readings be done before the class sessions.

**4. Required Text Book/s**

Ramage, J. D., Bean, J. C. & Johnson, J. (2010). *Writing Arguments: A Rhetoric with Readings*, *8th edition.* New York: Pearson

*Rihani Reading Pack: Selections* (to be acquired from the Bookstore)

Nukui, C. (2007). *Critical Thinking*. Reading: Garnet Publishing Ltd.

For students placed in this course without taking ENL 110:

Manning, A. & A. O’Cain (2007). *Research and Referencing*. Garnet Publishing Ltd.

**5. Resources Available to Students**

* + - Library Resources: NDU Library is open to students to help you in all your research and class work. Qualified personnel are available to help you.
    - Writing Center: The Writing Center provides assistance to all students who wish to discuss their writing with a trained consultant. The Center is located in HA 114. An appointment is required.
    - Blackboard (bb) Software: If you are not familiar with the Blackboard system, it is recommended to attend a training session at the University Computer Services in order to know how to use the Blackboard system to enrich the academic communication with your instructor and your colleagues

**6. Grading and Evaluation**

**Tasks Assessment**

**Active Class Participation & preparation 05%**

**Quizzes (2) 05%**

**Essays (2) (done in class—best 2 out of 3) 5+10%**

**Tests (2) 20%**

**Visual Argument Presentation 05%**

**Argumentative Term Paper 15%**

**Class Debate 10%**

**Final Exam (common to all sections) 25%**

**Total 100%**

* The Term Paper in 100 and 200 courses is 8 pages long:

(1 title page, 4-6 body pages, and 1 reference page)

**NOTE: Attached to the syllabus is a set of rubrics used to evaluate written work.**

**Argumentative Term Paper evaluation criteria are also included.**

**Writing Across the Curriculum**

**NDU** considers that knowledge of a subject is both oral and written. Mastering the knowledge of a certain course means acquiring the ability to write on subjects related to that subject matter. Writing a research/term paper requires the appropriate command of language skills, proper terminology, and correct use of quotations, footnotes, and references, regardless of the course and topic.

**7. Course Schedule**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Date** | **Day** | **%** | **Time** | **Important Dates** | **Assignment** |
| **Feb. 13** |  | **M** |  | **Orientation Sessions for New Students - Attendance Obligatory** |  |
| **Feb. 14-15** | **T – W** |  | **8:00-12:30/1:30-4:00** | **Registration Period** |  |
| **WEEK 1 Feb. 17-24**  Feb. 17 | **F-F**  F |  | 7:30a.m. | Classes begin | **Introduction to the course**: class policies, objectives and learning outcomes, and instructor/student expectations.  **Arguments: An introduction**, Ch. 1: Definition and features of an argument.  **Reading assignment**: instructor’s choice. |
| Feb 17-27 | F-M |  |  | **Application for Sibling Grant** |
| **Feb. 21** | **T** |  | **8:00-12:30/1:30-4:00** | **Late Registration**  **(Classes are in session)** |
| Feb. 23 | Th |  | **8:00-12:30**  **1:30-4:00** | **Drop and Add**  **(Classes are in session)** |
| Feb. 24 | F |  |  |  |
| **WEEK 2 Feb. 27-Mar. 2**  Feb. 27 | **M-F**  M |  |  |  | **Argument as inquiry, Ch. 2:** Believer/doubter analysis; the rhetorical context (ethos, pathos, logos); argument genres.  **Class practice** in micro-themes.  **Informal fallacies**: Overview, Appendix 1  **Critical Thinking**, Unit 1  **Reading Assignment**: instructor’s choice. |
| Feb. 28 | T |  |  |  |
| Feb. 29 | W |  |  |  |
| Mar. 1 | Th |  |  |  |
| Mar. 2 | F |  |  |  |
| **WEEK 3 Mar. 5-9**  Mar. 5 | **M-F**  M |  |  |  | **The Core of an Argument, Ch. 3**  The classical argument: Structure and planning.  **Types of claim**, Ch. 10: class exercises on forming issue questions that will lead to simple categorical claims.  **Informal fallacies**: overgeneralization and stereotyping.  **Quiz 1 (10-15’ in class**): tests student’s ability to handle texts objectively (as believers) before passing judgment.  **Writing assignment**: Analysis of a text as a “doubter”—students may choose their own texts to analyze.  **Critical Thinking**, Unit 2  **Reading assignment**: instructor’s choice |
| Mar. 6 | T |  |  |  |
| Mar. 7 | W |  |  |  |
| Mar. 8 | Th | 2.5% |  |  |
| Mar. 9 | F |  |  |  |
| **WEEK 4 Mar. 12-16**  Mar. 12 | **M-F**  M |  |  |  | **The Core of an Argument, Ch 3**.: Claims supported by reasons. Class activities to focus on actual writing sessions. Students can critique each others’ work.  **Definitional claim, Ch. 11**: class exercises on forming issue questions that will lead to definitional claims.  Logical fallacies: begging the question, part of the whole  **Essay 1** (30’ in class) 10%: Students should be able to present a claim with one reason (an enthymeme) and give evidence supporting the reason.  **Reading assignment**: Instructor’s choice |
| Mar. 13 | T |  |  |  |
| Mar. 14 | W |  |  |  |
| Mar. 15 | Th | 10% |  |  |
| Mar. 16 | F |  |  |  |
| **WEEK 5 Mar. 19-23**  Mar. 19 | **M-F**  M |  |  |  | **The Logical Structure of Arguments, Ch. 4**: Overview “logos”; Toulmin’s model; identification of the audience.  **Class practice**: identifying the warrant and presenting grounds and backing as different bodies of evidence.  **Causal Claim, Ch. 12**: class exercises on forming issue questions that will lead to cause/consequence claims.  **Logical fallacies**: non sequitur, post hoc  **Critical Thinking**, Unit 3  **Reading assignment**: instructor’s choice |
| Mar. 20 | T |  |  |  |
| Mar. 21 | W |  |  |  |
| Mar. 22 | Th |  |  |  |
| Mar. 23 | F |  |  | Open House Main Campus |
| **March 25** | S |  |  | **Feast of the Annunciation: Holiday**  **Easter Mass** |  |
| **WEEK 6 Mar. 26-30**  Mar. 26 | M |  |  |  | **Using Evidence, Ch. 5:** The STAR criteria for evaluating evidence; types of evidence.  **Resemblance claim, Ch. 13:** class exercises on forming issue questions that will lead to resemblance claims.  **Logical fallacies**: false analogy  **Term paper**: students should start choosing their topics. Topics must be approved by the instructor.  **Critical Thinking**, Unit 4  **Reading assignment**: instructor’s choice |
| Mar. 27 | T |  |  |  |
| Mar. 28 | W |  |  |  |
| Mar. 29 | Th |  |  |  |
| Mar. 30 | F |  |  |  |
| **WEEK 7 Apr. 2-4**  Apr. 2 | **M-W**  M |  |  |  | **Class work on the first 5 weeks, using texts for analysis, discussion of evidence used, forming arguments based on Toulmin’s model.**  **Test 1**: Evaluation of a given text on the structure of an argument following the Toulmin model and evaluation of evidence. |
| Apr. 3 | T | **10%** |  |  |
| Apr. 4 | W |  | **9:00 p.m.** | **Easter vacation begins.** |
| **WEEK 8 Apr. 17-20**  Apr. 16 | **T-F**  M |  | **9:00 p.m.** | **Easter vacation ends.** |  |
| Apr. 17 | T |  | **7:30 a.m.** | **Classes resume.** | **Using Evidence, Ch. 5**: Gathering evidence  **Evaluation claim, Ch. 14**: class exercises on forming issue questions that will lead to evaluation claims.  **Logical fallacies**: loaded labels  **Term papers**: students should by now have formed their main claim and outlined their argument after initial research  **Reading assignment**: instructor’s choice |
| Apr. 18 | W |  |  |  |
| Apr. 19 | Th |  |  |  |
| Apr. 20 | F |  |  |  |
| **WEEK 9 Apr. 23-27**  Apr. 23 | **M-F**  M |  |  |  | **The Researched Argument, Ch. 16 & 17:** finding and evaluating sources; using, citing and documenting sources. Students who need more time to be familiar with this area are to be referred to the Writing Center for tutoring.  **Proposal claim, Ch. 15**: class exercises on forming issue questions that will lead to proposal claims.  **Logical fallacies**: appeals to pity, popularity, stirring symbols, ignorance  **Quiz 2**: should concentrate on research, evidence and documentation.  **Critical thinking**, Unit 5  **Reading assignment**: instructor’s choice |
| Apr. 24 | T |  | 4:00 p.m. | Deadline for Fall Semester 2011 Incomplete grades |
| Apr. 25 | W |  |  |  |
| Apr. 26 | Th | **2.5%** |  |  |
| Apr. 27 | F |  |  |  |
| **WEEK 10 Apr. 30-May 4**  Apr. 30 | **M-F**  M |  |  |  | **Moving your audience, Ch. 6:** the application of ethos, pathos, logos and kairos.  **Hybrid arguments, Ch 10**: arguments using two or more different types of claim  **Logical fallacies**: red herring, false authority, ad hominem  **Critical thinking**, Unit 6  **Reading assignment**: instructor’s choice  **Term Paper**: students will hand in their paper draft to be checked and approved by instructor. |
| Apr. 30-June 12 | M-T |  |  | Application for work study grant |
| **May 1** | **T** |  |  | **Labor Day: Holiday** |
| May 2 | W |  |  |  |
| May 2-16 | W-W |  | **8:00a.m.-4:00p.m.** | **Advising period for summer and fall 2011** |
| May 3 | Th |  |  |  |
| May 4 | F |  |  |  |
| **WEEK 11 May 7-11**  May 7 | **M-F**  M |  |  |  | **Responding to objections and alternative views, Ch. 7:** understanding the opposing view; using various strategies of rebuttal. Introducing the Rogerian argument: instructors can use extra material from *Perspectives on Argument, 5th ed., Ch 9)*  **Logical fallacies:** poisoning the well, strawman, false dilemma, slippery slope  **Test 2:** Analysis of a text by applying the STAR criteria in evaluating evidence, by identifying various types of evidence, and by examining the ethos, pathos, logos, and kairos of the text.  **Reading assignment**: instructor’s choice |
| May 8 | T |  |  |  |
| May 9 | W |  |  |  |
| May 10 | Th | **10%** |  |  |
| **May 11** | **F** |  |  | **Founders’ Day—Main Campus (Classes are not in session.)** |  |
| **WEEK 12 May 14-18**  May 14 | **M-F**  M |  |  |  | **Visual arguments, Ch. 9**: Student class presentations explaining an argument through a visual. Evaluations of these presentations can be used as bonus.  **Logical fallacies**: further work on the various types of the logical fallacies in Appendix 1.  **Assignment**: Students will present to class a visual (picture, ad, cartoon, etc.) explaining the issue claimed by the visual and the techniques used. |
| May 15 | T |  |  |  |
| May 16 | W |  |  |  |
| May 17 | Th |  |  |  |
| May 18 | F |  |  |  |
| **WEEK 13 May 21-25**  May 21 | **M-F**  M |  |  |  | **Hybrid arguments, Ch. 10:** practice on how and where to use the different types of claims effectively.  **Essay 2 (30’ in class) 10%:** students will write a 250-300-word essay arguing an issue, using the Rogerian model of argumentation  **Term paper:** the final draft is due for evaluation. |
| May 22 | T | **10%** |  |  |
| May 23 | W | **15%** |  |  |
| May 24 | Th |  |  |  |
| May 25 | F |  |  |  |
| **WEEK 14 May 28-June 1**  May 28 | **M-F**  M |  |  |  | **Analysis of argumentative techniques**: students will analyze texts in class assigned by instructors  **Logical fallacies**: further work on the various types of the logical fallacies in Appendix 1. A possible short quiz can be given as a way to improve students’ grades.  **Term paper:** will be returned to students with evaluative notes. |
| May 29 | T |  |  |  |
| May 30 | W |  |  |  |
| May 31 | Th |  |  |  |
| June 1 | F |  |  |  |
| **WEEK 15 June 4-8**  June 4 | **M-F**  M |  |  |  | **Class work**: writing argumentative essays using a combination of techniques and logic. A graded essay can be writte in class to improve students’ grades if the instructor feels the need for that and if the time allows.  **Class debates**: Groups will debate issues in class |
| June 5 | T |  |  |  |
| June 6 | W |  |  | W classes do not meet;  F classes meet |
| June 7 | Th | **10%** |  |  |
| June 8 | F |  |  |  |
| **WEEK 16 June 11-15**  June 11 | **M-F**  M |  |  |  | **Class debates**  **General revision for the final exam** |
| June 12 | T |  | 4:00 p.m. | Deadline for officially withdrawing from a course |
| June 13 | W |  |  |  |
| June 14 | Th |  |  | End of classes |
| June 15 | F |  |  | Reading day |  |
| **June 16-26** | **Sat.-T** |  |  | **Final Examination Period** |  |
| June 20 | W |  |  | Reading Day |  |

**8. Recommended Readings:**Andrews, R., ed. (1992). *Rebirth of rhetoric: essays in language, culture and education.* London: Routledge. Shelfmark: 808.042 R292

Cohen, M. R. & Nagel, E. (1993). *An introduction to logic* (2nd ed.). Indianapolis, Ind.: Hackett Publ. Co. Shelfmark: 160. C678i2

Corbett, E. P. J. (1990). *Classical rhetoric for the modern student* (3rd.ed.). New York: Oxford University Press. Shelfmark: 808. C7894c

Damer, T. E. (2009). *Attacking faulty reasoning: A practical guide to fallacy-free arguments* (6th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth. Shelfmark: 165. D157a6

Eemeren, F. H. van, Grootendorst R., & Henkemans, A. F. S. (2002).*Argumentation: Analysis, evaluation, presentation.*Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. Shelfmark: 2002 808. E2697a

Fahnestock, J. & Secor, M. (1990). *A rhetoric of argument* (2nd ed.). Boston: McGraw-Hill. Shelfmark: 808.042 F157r2

Freeley, A. J. (1996). *Argumentation and debate: Critical thinking for reasoned decision making* (9th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Pub. Co. Shelfmark: 808.53 F854a9

Lannon, J. (1992). *The writing process: A concise rhetoric* (4th ed.). New York: HarperCollins.

Morris Engel, S. (1982). *With good reason: An introduction to informal fallacies* (2nd ed.). New York: St. Martin's Press. Shelfmark: 165. E573w2

Richards, J. H. (1995). *Debating by doing: Developing effective debating skill.*  Lincolnwood, Ill.: National Textbook Co. Shelfmark: 808.53 R516d

Vesterman, W. (2006). *Reading and writing short arguments* (5th ed.). Boston: McGraw-Hill. Shelfmark: 808.0427 R2871r5

Wood, N. V. (2007). *Perspectives on argument* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Pearson/Prentice Hall, Shelfmark: 808.042 W877p5

Zender, K. & Morris, L. (1981). *Persuasive writing: A college reader.* New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich. Shelfmark: 808.0427 P467

**9. Course Policies**

There are no make-ups for missed tests or for the final examination. Failure to sit for a scheduled test and/or final exam will result in an F on the test/exam. A student may be excused in exceptional cases and upon the discretion of the English, Translation, and Education Department, and only if the student presents a valid documented excuse (from the SAO in case of illness) to the chairperson of the department within 72 hours of the scheduled exam date.

While understanding that we all are busy with school, work, and family, your decision to register for this course is an indication that you have made it a high priority. Thus, extensions of assignment due dates are given only in extreme situations (death of a close family member, hospitalization, etc.) and require documentation on your part. Otherwise, due dates are fixed and non-negotiable. All assignments should be submitted on or before the assigned due date. Assignments past the due date will not be accepted for full credit. Examples of unreasonable extensions for an assignment include frequent computer malfunctions, outside class-work, or job responsibilities that inhibit meeting the required deadlines. If you anticipate missing a deadline on an assignment, you should send an e-mail to your instructor before the deadline. Unexcused assignments submitted after the due date may be returned ungraded or assigned a lower evaluation. Whether an extension is allowed will be at the instructor's discretion.

Assignments: All work must be typewritten (unless otherwise specified) and submitted in a professional manner. The instructor reserves the right to return, for resubmission, any work that is not neat, legibly, and professionally submitted

Mobile phones should be turned off and out of sight (i.e. not face-up on the desk but preferably inside purses, backpacks, briefcases, etc. or face down on the desk). Phones may not be answered.

Students must attend class with the required material (i.e. original textbook, notebook, pens, etc.).

Once in class, students are expected to remain in class for the entire period.

English must be the only language spoken in class at all times.

Special needs: Any student who feels s/he may need an accommodation due to a disability should contact the instructor privately to discuss those specific needs.

Students must check their NDU email daily as this is the means used by the instructor to communicate. Students will receive notice via NDU email when the instructor posts announcements on the course's Blackboard.

**10. Policies & Procedures**

**NDU's Attendance Policy**

Student should attend all classes and laboratory sessions on time. A pattern of absences, whether authorized or not, and even below the maximum number (specified below), may alter one's grade substantially. The SAO alone authorizes absences. No absence absolves a student from the responsibility of acting upon the material presented during his/her absence. The maximum number absences for classes that meet on MWF is six; the maximum number for classes that meet on TTh and in the summer is four, (or two hours per credit course). Any student whose absences exceed the maximum limits shall automatically fail the course unless the student withdraws.

**Office Hours**: All instructors at NDU are available for office hours during the week. Please note the office hour that your instructor has dedicated to this course to make an appointment. Just dropping by may not ensure that the professor has set aside time to assist you. Office hours may be used ideally to ask for guidance on an assignment or to ask questions concerning a subject that you were not clear on during class time.

**NDU's Academic Integrity Policy**

Students are expected and encouraged to be honest and to maintain the highest standards of academic integrity in their academic work and assignments at the University. They shall refrain from any academic dishonesty or misconduct including; but not limited to:

* + Plagiarism; that is, the presentation of someone else's ideas, words or artistic, scientific, or technical work as one's own creation. Also, paraphrasing, summarizing, as well as well as direct quotations are considered as plagiarism, if the original source is not properly cited.
  + Cheating.
  + Assisting in cheating.
  + Substituting a student in the taking of an examination.
  + Substituting examination booklets.
  + Submitting the same work for more than one course and the like. o Submitting papers written by others.
  + Receiving or providing unauthorized help or assistance in any academic work or assignment. Intentional violation of program and degree requirements and regulation as established by the University.
  + Dishonest reporting of computational, statistical, experimental, research, results, or the like.

## System of Grades

The University uses the following system of grades. This system consists of letter grades with their corresponding numerical ranges (*i.e.* percentage equivalent, and the 4.0 point maximum).

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade** | **Description** | **Quality Point Value** | **Percentage Equivalent** |
| *A+* | Outstanding | 4.0 | 97-100 |
| *A* | Excellent | 4.0 | 93 - 96 |
| *A-* | Very Good | 3.7 | 89 - 92 |
| *B+* | Good | 3.3 | 85 - 88 |
| *B* | Good | 3.0 | 80 - 84 |
| *B-* | Good | 2.7 | 77 - 79 |
| *C+* | Satisfactory | 2.3 | 73 - 76 |
| *C* | Satisfactory | 2.0 | 70 - 72 |
| *C*- | Passing | 1.7 | 66 - 69 |
| *D+* | Passing | 1.3 | 63 - 65 |
| *D* | Lowest Passing | 1.0 | 60 - 62 |
| *F* | Failure | 0.0 | 0 - 59 |
| *UW* | Unofficial Withdrawal | 0.0  The grade “*UW”* is assigned by the instructor when a registered student has never attended a class or has ceased attending and has not submitted an official course withdrawal request to the Office of the Registrar. This grade is computed as an *F* grade in the grade-point average. | |

**DETE**

**WRITING RUBRICS**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| AREA | **Excellent to Very Good**  **25-22** | **Good to Average**  **21-18** | **Fair to Poor**  **17-11** | **Very Poor**  **10-5** |
| CONTENT | * Demonstrates knowledge of subject * Provides substantive material * Is relevant to assigned topic * Presents quality details * Presents fresh and original ideas * Presents accurate details that go beyond the obvious | * Demonstrates some knowledge of subject * Presents an adequate range of information * Is mostly relevant but lacks substantive details * Presents limited development of thesis/main idea | * Shows limited knowledge of subject * Is of little substance * Presents inadequate development of thesis * Lacks originality * Presents mundane details | * Does not show knowledge of subject * Is non-substantive * Is non pertinent * Is not enough to evaluate * Has no relation to assigned topic |
| ORGANIZATION | * Clearly shows proper organization of ideas * Develops topic using IBC\* * Uses effective connectors between paragraphs and sentences * Shows a clear logical ordering of ideas\*\* | * Main ideas stand out but organization is unclear * Presents limited development of introduction/ conclusion | * Presents confused or disconnected ideas * Lacks logical sequencing | * Does not communicate * Lacks organization * Is not enough to evaluate |
| SENTENCE STRUCTURE | * Uses variety of sentences‡ * Uses subordinators and coordinators effectively * Has very few grammatical errors‡‡ | * Shows some inconsistency in sentence structure * Has several grammatical errors‡‡ * Meaning is not obscured | * Shows major problems in sentence structure * Frequent grammatical errors‡‡ * Meaning is sometimes obscured | * Shows lacks of mastery of sentence construction rules * Meaning is confused or obscured * Is dominated by grammatical errors‡‡ * Is not enough to evaluate |
| VOCABULARY AND MECHANICS | * Demonstrates mastery of conventions† * Is presented in clear handwriting or typing, spacing, etc. * Uses advanced vocabulary and idiomatic expressions | * Has occasional errors† * Has some problems in clear presentation * Demonstrates ability to use adequate vocabulary and idiomatic expressions | * Frequent mechanical errors‡ * Poor handwriting * Meaning is confused or obscured because of poor use of vocabulary | * No mastery of conventions‡ * Is dominated by errors * Illegible handwriting * Is not enough to evaluate |

\* Introduction, body, conclusion

\*\* chronological, causal, definitional, comparison, descriptive, narrative, or combinations

‡ simple, compound and complex structures

‡‡ such as S-V agreement, tense, number, word order, articles, pronouns, prepositions, fragments, run-ons, comma splices, etc.

† spelling, punctuation and capitalization

*Compiled from suggestions submitted by A. Vanloan and H. Oueijan*

*Argument Paper*

Name:

Date:

Score:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Levels of Achievement** | | | |
|  | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** |
| **Introduction, thesis, and conclusion**  **(x 10)** | Intro captures attention with an attention grabber and provides context for the paper; issue is explained including needed background; thesis is a specific, well-developed debatable claim  **9-10** | Intro fails to capture attention with an attention grabber and provides insufficient context for the paper; issue is insufficiently explained including needed background; thesis is weak as a specific, well-developed debatable claim  **7-8** | Intro does not capture attention, does not provide sufficient context; issue is insufficient as a developed debatable claim; background is insufficient  **5-6** | Intro provides no background about topic; does not capture attention; thesis is not explicit or not present; no background is provided  **1-4** |
| **Conclusion (x10)** | Summarize argument, make a strong impression, describe implications, either end with a call for action or relate topic to a larger context of issues.  **9-10** | Conclusion fails to summarize argument, make a strong impression, describe implications, either end with a call for action or relate topic to a larger context of issues.  **7-8** | Conclusion makes insufficient reference to thesis  **5-6** | Conclusion does not refer to thesis and does not add to cohesion of paper  **1-4** |
| **Argument development**  **(x 30)** | Each reason is identifiable, reasonable, and sound; every point is supported by persuasive evidence  **27-30** | Either each reason is not easily identifiable OR not supported by sufficient evidence  **21-26** | Argument is barely reasonable and identifiable; few points are supported by evidence and examples  **15-20** | Argument is not identifiable and insufficiently supported  **1-14** |
| **Opposing views (x10)** | Summary of opposing views is fair and complete  **9-10** | Summary of opposing views is insufficiently fair or complete  **7-8** | Summary of opposing views is either not fair OR not complete  **5-6** | There is no clear and complete summary of opposing views  **1-4** |
| **Response to opposing views (x20)** | Refutation/rebuttal to opposing views; weaknesses pointed out; concession to some validity/strengths made  **18-20** | Refutation/rebuttal to opposing views insufficient; weaknesses insufficiently pointed out; insufficient concession to some validity/strengths made  **14-17** | Refutation/rebuttal to opposing views not established OR weaknesses not pointed out OR concession to some validity/strengths made not made  **10-13** | Lacking in: Refutation/rebuttal to opposing views; weaknesses pointed out; concession to some validity/strengths made  **1-9** |
| **Argument structure and organization**  **(x 10)** | Argument points and opposing views logically structured and sequenced with transitions and cohesive devices used when needed  **9-10** | Argument points and opposing views could be better structured with transitions and cohesive devices  **7-8** | Argument points and opposing views not logically structured in most of paper; infrequent or inappropriate use of transitions and cohesive devices  **5-6** | Argument points and opposing views seem to be out of order and haphazard; no transitions or cohesive devices are used  **1-4** |
| **Use of sources**  **(x5)** | Quotations and paraphrases are well integrated and excellently analyzed; at least 3 sources are cited  **5** | Either quotations and paraphrases are not sufficiently integrated and analyzed OR an insufficient number of sources is cited  **4** | Quotations and paraphrases are used either too much or too little without explicit link to the paper; too few sources are used  **3** | Quotations and paraphrases are inaccurately or inappropriately used  **1-2** |
| **Language**  **use & mechanics**  **(x5)** | Superior editing; APA style is correctly followed  **5** | Good editing; APA style is followed with few errors  **4** | Careless editing; many errors in APA style  **3** | No editing; APA style is unrecognizable  **1-2** |
| **Total possible** | **91-100** | **71-83** | **51-63** | **8-43** |

*Adapted from http://dana.ucc.nau.edu/~nct9/extended\_arg\_rubric.doc*