

8-2011

Debating the Truth

Lisa Shay
Trinity University

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.trinity.edu/educ_understandings



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Repository Citation

Shay, Lisa, "Debating the Truth" (2011). *Understanding by Design: Complete Collection*. 173.
http://digitalcommons.trinity.edu/educ_understandings/173

This Instructional Material is brought to you for free and open access by the Understanding by Design at Digital Commons @ Trinity. For more information about this unie, please contact the author(s): . For information about the series, including permissions, please contact the administrator: jcostanz@trinity.edu.

UNDERSTANDING BY DESIGN

Unit Cover Page

Unit Title: Debating the Truth

Grade Level: 8th

Subject/Topic Area(s): Reading/Advanced Contemporary Literacy

Designed By: Lisa Shay

Time Frame: 6 weeks

School District: North East Independent School District

School: Jackson Middle School

School Address and Phone: 4538 Vance Jackson, San Antonio, TX 78230
(210) 442-0550

Brief Summary of Unit (Including curricular context and unit goals):

Students will spend six weeks discovering the value of opposing viewpoints on different current event topics. Students will learn to conduct a debate following the Middle School Public Debate Program model. Students will first research a variety of topics in teams of three, finding both the pros and cons of the topic. Students must be able to form arguments, find fallacies in both research and arguments refute and eventually debate their peers. The unit guides students through the debate process allowing for practice on each of the process stages. As the performance assessment pieces, students will conduct a debate using knowledge gained from the unit, in order to compete against a team of peers on the same topic.

Debating the Truth UbD 2.0

Stage 1 – Desired Results		
<p>Established Goals (e.g., standards)</p> <p>8.22 Research/Research Plan.</p> <p>8.23 Research/Gathering Sources.</p> <p>8.24 Research/Synthesizing Information.</p> <p>8.25 Research/Organizing and Presenting Ideas.</p> <p>8.27 Listening and Speaking/Speaking.</p>	Transfer	
	<p><i>Students will independently use their learning to...</i></p> <p>Research the pros and cons of a current event topic in order to write a case and resolution to debate the issue in a competition style (MSPDP) with their peers.</p>	
	Meaning	
	<p>Understandings <i>Students will understand that...</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A debate is a values discussion based on logic. • There are many different fallacies that can be found within an argument. • The multiple aspects of a debate case. • Author’s bias and ethos (credibility) are crucial in evaluation of an argument. 	<p>Essential Questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why should opposing views be heard? • Why does the search for truth endure? • How should one go about discovering truth? • What obstacles might one have to overcome in the search for truth? • Are there any truths that can be considered universal (or absolute)?
Acquisition		
<p>Knowledge <i>Students will know...</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical aspects of a debate; values discussion based on logic • Debate vocabulary terms • Rhetorical devices such as ethos, pathos and logos as applied to research and arguments 	<p>Skills <i>Students will be able to...</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify fallacies within an argument • Create refutations for arguments using the 4-step model • Write briefs based on research of varying debate topics • Writing convincing arguments for and against topics using A-R-E model • Evaluate evidence based on author’s bias and credibility • Create flow notes during debate/argument 	

M	Civil Tongue” http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/10/10/AR2009101002366.html	
A	Day Two: Pre-Assessment Table talk response to Essential Questions. Pre-test on debate terms and format; including a review of previous study on Rhetoric (ethos, pathos, logos)	
A	Day Three and Four: Persuasion and Fallacies Direct instruction through Powerpoint on persuasion and fallacies. Students take Cornell notes.	Vocabulary Terms Identifying Fallacies
M	Find The Fallacy- practice finding faulty arguments in real world examples (i.e. letters to the editor, etc). Students in pairs read short excerpt and highlight faulty arguments, defining the type of fallacy located, combine with another pair to check answers and rotate stations to new text example.	
A	Day Five: Introduction to Debate Concept Attainment- Examples and Non-examples of Debate. Debate vocabulary terms, definitions and practice with use. Marzano’s 6 step vocabulary (proposition, opposition, rebuttal, refutation, fallacies, assertion, reasoning, evidence, bias, argument, claim, controversial, etc.)	Debate Vocabulary Terms Identifying Debate Terms
A/M	Day Six: Introduction to Debate Cont. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modeling and identifying debate terms in videos of debate. Stopping video clips to at first model recognizing debate terms and then stopping to conduct a think-pair-share where students practice identifying debate terms. 2008 Presidential Town Hall Debate and student debates on NFL website. http://www.nflonline.org/CoachingResources/VideoAudio 	
A	Day Seven: Consumers of Arguments “In democratic societies, argument is critical to politics. Citizens or their elected representatives argue all the time about how to best make policy that represents the interests of the people. These conditions mean that those who do not know how to make effective arguments are often left behind or left out, because they cannot advocate on behalf of their interests or the interests of their family, co-workers, or other groups to which they might belong. If you learn how to argue effectively and persuasively, you will be able to overcome these obstacles and become a participating citizen in the global culture of argument.” (Meany/Shuster, 2)	Identifying A-R-E argumentation

M	<p>Argument non-example- Monty Python clip http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=teMlv3ripSM</p> <p>Define argumentation: A-R-E introduction. Practice identifying Assertion, Reason and Evidence. Smart Board game with Assertion, Reason and Evidence swirls. Students see an example of one of three terms. They must decide which of the three the example represents. Students take turns coming to the smart board to sort example.</p>	elements
A	<p>Homework- create 2 assertions to insert into classroom Assertion Jar. These assertions will be randomly drawn by classmates to refute (to be taught in Day 12). Don't make assertions too difficult to argue against, for example you wouldn't want to assert "the sky is blue".</p>	
M	<p>Day Eight, Nine, Ten: A-R-E identification and Creation Students will make connection between argumentation and advertisements. Each advertisement should have a A-R-E. Guided practice with advertisement as a class identifying parts of print ad or commercial as A-R-E. Students will then practice in pairs analyzing advertisement using ARE strategy.</p>	Write Assertions, Reasons and Evidence for debate topics
M	<p>Students practice creating own A-R-E's on varying debate topics, filling in for missing part of argument. Homework- create an A-R-E on topic of your choice.</p>	
A	<p>Letter to the Editor- students are to read a letter to the editor and complete worksheet that asks them to identify three A-R-E's in the letter. In addition, they will review main idea, summary and ethos. Use local newspaper editions.</p>	Debate format and style
A	<p>Day Eleven: Introduction to Debate Style Introduction into MSPDP model debate through powerpoint of order and construction. Students take Cornell notes. View video of full debate. Stopping to review terms and identify A-R-E.</p>	Essential Question reflection
M	<p>Day Twelve: Refutation Direct instruction of 4-step refutation process. Students continue Cornell Notes.</p>	Creating refutations
M	<p>Quick write: "Why should opposing views be heard?"</p> <p>Practice refutation by playing "I disagree" game and</p>	Create flow notes

A	practice refuting simple statements. Use Assertion Jar to draw random assertions and practice refuting.	
M	Day Twelve: Flow Notes Demonstration and student examples of Flow Notes. This is the note taking form students will use to keep track of the argument during the debate. This is a crucial skill for students to learn.	
M	Students will view sample debate, pausing often to model flow notes, continue debate with guided practice writing notes and eventually independent practice.	
M	Assertion Jar- practice refuting	
M	Day Thirteen: Deconstructing the Topic Topic drawing- defining words used in topic to help with research. Students will work in teams of three with partner group of three to reach conclusions about topic and word meaning in topic stems. Practice this with several different topic stems.	
A	Assertion Jar- practice refuting	Finding fallacies
M	Day Fourteen and Fifteen: Introduction to Research Introduction to Research; parts of the research brief (key terms, sources, facts, arguments for and arguments against). Refresher on “wading the web” and source citation.	Create research briefs
M	http://webquest.sdsu.edu/searching/fournets.htm Issue Analysis Sheet of topic- exploring what students already know and questions they need to ask to find opposing viewpoints.	Debate Quiz
M	Evaluating Evidence- using knowledge of fallacies to judge research, checking for ethos of author.	Flow Notes Evaluation
A	Assertion Jar- practice refuting	
M	Day Sixteen: Practice with Research Analysis of research style text, practicing annotation, and pro/con note taking in order to produce research briefs. Practice in pairs and then individually.	
M	Day Seventeen: Assessment Quiz on Debate process and vocabulary.	
M	Flow Notes evaluation- using film with argumentation	

A	<p>such as <u>12 Angry Men</u> students will use flow notes to follow discourse. This will be evaluated to make sure students are prepared for simulation.</p>	
M	<p>Day Eighteen: Simulation Guided simulation with prepared research, walking through steps of debate with script, outside audience practices taking flow notes on scripted debate.</p>	Self reflection
M	<p>Day Nineteen: Debate Rubric Introduction to debate rubric, how students will be individually graded and scored as a team. Model with simulated debate, videos of debate scoring peers on modified rubric.</p>	Research Briefs
M	<p>Day Twenty: Reflection Self-assessment of debate simulation and goal setting after simulation.</p>	
M	<p>Assertion Jar- practice refuting</p>	
T	<p>Day Twenty One-Twenty Five: Research In groups of three, students will divide research of topics in order to produce research briefs. Briefs will be one-page summaries of research found on the pros and cons of each topic. Brief includes: terms, sources, pros, cons and discussion questions.</p>	
M	<p>Day Twenty Six-Twenty Nine: Debates Students will debate in groups of three. At time of debate, topic is drawn along with each team’s side of argument. Process is as follows: First Proposition Constructive= 5mins First Opposition Constructive= 5 mins Second Proposition Constructive= 5 mins Second Opposition Constructive= 5mins Opposition Rebuttal= 3mins Proposition Rebuttal= 3mins Points of Information- made me made during middle three minutes of each constructive, if granted by speaker</p>	Self-assessment and reflection
M	<p>Day Thirty: Debrief Students will debrief first debates. Self assess on rubric. Written reflection and response to essential questions. How can we build on this to continue in study of debate, research and public speaking?</p>	

Debating the Truth

You are about to embark on an exciting education experience. You will work in teams of three to uncover the truth about a variety of debate topics. Topics are selected to provide a range of debates on personal, educational, social, political, economic, and cultural issues. Two teams will be paired together to represent the proposition and oppositional sides of a topic. Each team will consist of three people and three speeches. Points will be earned individually and individual points will be added up per team to declare an overall winner of the debate. Speakers may enter the debate with a research brief on each topic and will be allowed to use briefs throughout debate.

Step 1: Deconstruct the Topics

Step 2: Research the pros and cons of each topic. Write research brief using model shown. Brief must include: key terms, sources, facts, arguments for and against, and discussion questions. Your team may divide up the research as you see fit.

Step 3: Debate. Topic and side of argument will be drawn on day of debate. Speaking order is as follows:

First Proposition Constructive= 5mins

First Opposition Constructive= 5 mins

Second Proposition Constructive= 5 mins

Second Opposition Constructive= 5mins

Opposition Rebuttal= 3mins

Proposition Rebuttal= 3mins

Points of Information- made me made during middle three minutes of each constructive, if granted by speaker

Step 4: Judge's feedback through the debate ballot. Self-rubric and reflection.

Remember: Good debates are debates where there is an abundance of *clash* between arguments and opposing sides. It is not enough for debaters to simply deliver impassioned speeches about their side of a motion. Debaters must also directly refute the arguments made by the other side and show why the balance of arguments means that their side wins. (Meany/Shuster, 3)

Adapted from Middle School Public Debate Program Copyright © 1985-2010 John Meany and Kate Shuster.

In good debates, arguments grow through the process of extension – debaters answer the objections from the other side and use those objections as springboards to flesh out their side’s position.

(Meany/Shuster, 4)

SAMPLE MIDDLE SCHOOL PUBLIC DEBATE PROGRAM BALLOT

ROUND#: _____ **LOCATION:** _____

JUDGE’S NAME: _____

******Judges will rank debaters on a scale of 59-100 points.******

Proposition Team:	Points	Opposition Team:	Points
1st:		1st:	
2nd:		2nd:	
Rebuttal:		Rebuttal:	

IN MY OPINION, THE TEAM THAT WON THE DEBATE WAS THE

THE SPACE BELOW IS USED TO INDICATE YOUR REASON FOR DECISION AND TO PROVIDE HELPFUL COMMENTS TO THE DEBATERS.

Score	Description	Argumentation	Refutation	Structure	Presentation
59-Below	This is rare for a debater to receive. They must demonstrate a complete lack of knowledge of debate, the process and topics. This score is reserved for debaters who are mean-spirited, disruptive or uncooperative. A mocking of the honor in debate.				
60-69	Nervous and anxious debater. Lack of mastery for any of the core values of debate or argumentation.	Does not use A-R-E format. Little to no evidence is used by speaker. Lack of integration of issues from teammates.	The speaker is not able to clash or refute the arguments of the opposing team. More likely to repeat previous ideas then develop their own.	There is little organization to the speech. The speaker is hard to follow and doesn't use logos. Uses little of their speaking time.	Speaker lacks clarity, doesn't make eye contact, and/or inappropriate volume. Speaker doesn't attempt POI or heckling. Speaks for less than half the time.
70-79	Speaker is competent and does some things well while making several errors. A good speech where speaker knows his/her role and tries to accomplish it.	Speaker follows the A-R-E model, but some arguments lack strong reasoning or many don't have strong evidence. Develops some of the major issues within the topic, but lacks depth or originality.	Speaker spends too much time repeating same ideas as opposed to developing new ones. Not able to articulate 4 step refutation process in debate.	Organizing and generally effective. Not consistently able to stick to points of speech and struggles to integrate oppositions arguments.	Speaks clearly making more consistent eye contact and uses some gestures. Attempts 1-2 POIs and attempts to heckle either good or bad. Speaks for majority of time allotted.
80-89	Solid, above average performance. Speaker is comfortable with format, confident and prepared. Some inconsistencies in performance, but prove to be minor distractions.	Makes effective arguments throughout speech. Uses A-R-E format, more often than not providing evidence. Correctly uses POIs and heckling although not more than twice.	Speaker maintains team's position, using thoughtful examples and analysis. Only able to reply to some of opposition's arguments. Able to use 4 step refutation process somewhat consistently.	Effective in own arguments difficulty integrating counter positions into speech. Organized so that audience members are able to take accurate flow notes.	Speaks in an engaging manner only slightly entertaining or persuasive. Shows confidence and credibility. May be ineffective, unclear or confusing 1-2 times in speech.
90-94	A well above average speech from a eloquent debater. Effective model for new debaters to emulate.	Establishes clear positions that demand sophisticated reply. Consistently uses all aspects of A-R-E with varied types of evidence.	Consistently uses 4 step refutation model and advanced refutation skills. Able to counter opposition's arguments with skill.	Logical organization that make it easy to follow. Strong intro and conclusion. Able to integrate own and opposition positions into speech.	Animated speaker with clear and convincing delivery. Persuasive and credible. Strong use of POIs. Not easily distracted by other team.
95-100	Brilliant debater who delivers highly successful speech in all aspects.	Makes powerful arguments planned and on the spot. Uses substantial evidence that is detailed and well analyzed to support case.	Understands how arguments interrelate. Finds fallacies in opponents arguments and exploits them.	Persuasive introduction and conclusion, sophisticated and easy to follow. Seamlessly integrates arguments of both sides into one persuasive speech.	A persuasive presentation that effectively uses rhetorical devices, humor and vocal inflection to add depth to speech. Clever use of POIs and heckling. .