

# Practice: Module 6 Practice Argument Outlining, Conceptual Peer Review, and Post-Activity Reflection

## Introduction

For this activity, students will be doing a guided practice with the skills for argumentation that are foundational for *The College Board's* official Task 2 Individual Written Argument and Presentation and the End-of-course Exam Part B. Students will only utilize the sample provided stimulus materials for these outline responses at this time. However, it is worth noting that Task 2 asks students to pursue topics and additional research in areas of their own inquiry related to topics derived from the intersection of the stimulus materials.

Teachers may decide to assign this activity to students individually or choose to have students complete arguments in small groups. Peer reviews (conceptual only) assigned after submitting the initial outlining activity should be completed individually.

## Student Directions

Read, annotate, analyze, and consider the module materials for this activity:

- *For Thematic Discussion:*
  - Selections from Albert Camus' *The Myth of Sisyphus*
  - article, "Why Neuroscientists Say, 'Boredom Is Good For Your Brain's Health'" published by *Forbes* (2020)
  - TEDx lecture, "The 4 superpowers of design" (2017)
- *Additional Challenge Selections:*
  - Selections from Søren Kierkegaard's *Either/Or* (from "The Rotation Method")

Module materials may be discussed in a full-class forum prior to beginning this activity, and you may utilize your preparation and discussion notes. As a class, students will brainstorm and select a sample central claim based on a theme derived from the intersection of the provided materials.

## Argument Outlining

Students will collect evidence in support of the sample claim selected as a class.

Students *must* use at *minimum* two of the stimulus sources, but can also draw evidence from other credible, authoritative sources of information within their own knowledge (e.g., concepts explored in other class subjects, other texts students have read, events or ideas from history, and so on).

Once students have sufficient evidence, they should begin to utilize the Toulmin Method template to organize the basis of an argument in support of their central claim. Students must also recognize that greater claims may require sub-claims, meaning each sub-claim should be numbered, and evidence, warrants, etc., must be provided for *each* sub-claim. It is worth noting that if students *were* to continue to the writing phase (they will not do so for this practice activity), each sub-claim would likely be its own paragraph in the body of students' papers.

### *Conceptual Peer Review*

After submissions have been received, students will individually complete a conceptual peer review, focusing on the information provided in support of the claim. Students will provide quick comments, making a note of *each* of the following:

- Rate the strength of the provided evidence on a scale of 1 (weak) to 5 (undeniable). Does the evidence do a good job of supporting the central and/or sub-claims given? What other evidence could be provided that could further strengthen this argument?
- Rate the quality of provided warrants and backing (reasoning) on a scale of 1 (weak) to 5 (irrefutable). Does the reasoning fill in the necessary gaps in the evidence? Does it make the logical connections between the claim and the provided evidence? What reasoning could be further provided, or definition be given, that could strengthen the reasoning of this argument?
- Without rating, discuss the argument's provided qualifiers. Do those qualifiers that are acknowledged provide clear awareness of the limitations of the original argument? Is there a glaring omission that could damage this argument's credibility and/or authority? Provide other examples of qualifiers that could/should be addressed by the author.
- Finally, on a scale of 1 (trivial) to 5 (genuine and acknowledged), does this argument bring awareness to legitimate counter-arguments, and does it do a thorough and convincing job of refuting them? What other counters could potentially be problematic for this argument? What additional evidence or reasoning could be provided to refute the counters relevant to the argument?

### *Post-Activity Reflection*

Once students have submitted their templates, completed the peer review, and received and reviewed the feedback provided to them by the exercise, they will complete a reflection of around 250 words, addressing the following questions:

- First, provide a quick outline of your thought process for completing the argument outline. What did you read, outline, or collect in terms of evidence, and how did you organize and justify it using the template?
- What important knowledge and skills did you aim to practice in this activity?
- With what aspect of your argument outline are you most satisfied? What areas do you think could be made better in your own estimation?
- What areas of the peer review feedback surprised you most and/or least?
- How can you apply feedback (from your own reflection and from your reviewer) to the next argument activity, Task 2, and the End-of-course Exam where you will need these skills in the future?

**For submission: students will submit templates by uploading their own copy of the editable pdf provided below. Students will then provide peer review feedback to the peer review feedback tab. They can submit their reflections by either typing them in the comment box provided or may upload a second document attachment.**