

**Teaching for Understanding Learning Plan  
STAGE 1 – DESIRED RESULTS**

*Grade Level:* AP English III

*Teacher's name* Fineran

**Unit Title:** Rhetorical Analysis

**Established Goals:** Students will analyze the strategies different authors use to create meaning and achieve a desired effect

*Students examine a variety of texts--including a speech and a memoir--in order to understand the moves an author makes and the different effects of these moves*

**Understandings:** *Students will understand ...*

- *How varied syntactical structures contribute to both aesthetic quality and overall effectiveness*
- *How diction affects meaning and reflects purpose*
- *How and why authors choose to organize information and provide certain details*
- *How to describe what a writer does, in addition to what a text says*

**Essential Questions:**

**How do writers and speakers create meaning?**

**How do choices affect aesthetic quality and overall impact?**

**How can we use language more effectively in our own writing?**

**Common Core Standards Mastered**

*RI.11.5. Analyze and evaluate the effectiveness of the structure an author uses in his or her exposition or argument, including whether the structure makes points clear, convincing, and engaging.*

*RI.11.6. Determine an author's point of view or purpose in a text in which the rhetoric is particularly effective, analyzing how style and content contribute to the power, persuasiveness, or beauty of the text.*

*W.11.2. Write informative/explanatory texts to examine and convey complex ideas and information clearly and accurately through the effective selection, organization, and analysis of content.*

*W.11.4. Produce clear and coherent writing in which the development, organization, and style are appropriate to task, purpose, and audience.*

**STAGE 2 – ASSESSMENT EVIDENCE**

**Formative Assessment:**

*Reading checks  
Small group and whole class discussions  
Annotations  
Think alouds*

**Summative Assessment:**

*AP-style Rhetorical Analysis Essay*

**STAGE 3 – LEARNING PLAN**

Class 1: Students receive background information and reading schedule for *Black Boy* (period 3) or *The Opposite of Fate* (period 6). Students read and discuss the initial pages for style and content; students will complete the chapter at home

Class 2: Students identify SOAPStone elements, then read and annotate short essay by Maxine Clair; Students pair up to make up to ten inferences about her life

Class 3: Students analyze the rhetorical analysis prompt and rubric to understand expectations, then discuss as a class the points and evidence that may apply

Class 4: Timed writing: Students write the AP-style Rhetorical Analysis essay on Maxine Clair's essay "Journeys"

(10/13) Class 5: Activator: Reading check quiz; Students get into groups of 3 to discuss the important elements in the outside reading, with these guiding questions:

(Period 3) What are the explicit and implicit lessons about language in the chapter?

How much of Richard's struggles are caused or exacerbated by Richard's attitude, personality, and decisions;

How much of his problems result from pressures or conditions outside and beyond his control?

Does his mother make the right decisions in the chapter (4 major ones)

(Period 6) What are the explicit and implicit lessons about language in the chapter?

How do the anecdotes connect to the book's title: *The Opposite of Fate*?

How do you respond to her ideas about the supernatural and/or spiritual aspects of her story?

(Students should consider these questions when reading the next chapter)

Class 6:

(10/16) Class 7: Activator: Reading check quiz; Small groups analyze the syntax and diction in selected passages to identify techniques employed as well the effects of those techniques

**Re-Teaching  
for students do not attain Proficient level in unit assessment**

*Students who do not attain Proficient level in writing will revise their papers according to feedback given individually and in conjunction with exemplars of strong responses.*

**Rubric to Guide and Assess Learning**

**Rhetorical Analysis Writing Assignment Scoring Guidelines**, developed for the *Teacher's Guide to Analysis, Argument, and Synthesis* by John Brassil, Sandra Coker, and Carl Glover for Peoples Education.

UPPER LEVEL

*Accomplished*

**9 (A+)** Meets the criteria for 8 and is *especially full or apt* in its analysis. The writing often demonstrates *particularly impressive control* of language.

**8 (A)** Through *responsive, thorough analysis* and *appropriate support*, the paper demonstrates *strong understanding* of the purpose and effect of rhetorical strategies. The writing demonstrates *stylistic maturity* by an effective command of sentence structure, diction, organization, and other elements of effective composition.

*Sufficient*

**7 (B+)** Meets the criteria for one scored 6 but is distinguished by more *thorough analysis* or a *more mature prose* style.

**6 (B)** Meets the demands of the assignment. The analysis is *generally sound* and indicates *sufficient understanding* of rhetorical features and tactics associated with assigned text. However, the explanation is more limited or less developed than seen in those papers earning higher scores. While the writing *may contain lapses in diction or syntax*, generally the prose is *clear and communicative*.

UNEVEN

**5 (C+)** A paper earning a score of 5 meets the demands of the assignment. However, the analysis is *inconsistent or limited*. While the writing *may contain lapses* in diction or syntax, it *usually conveys the writer's ideas*.

LOWER LEVEL

*Insufficient*

**4 (C)** Inadequately meets the demands of the assignment: the attempted analysis *may lack understanding, accuracy, substance, or specificity*. Development may be insufficient or marked by stray, piecemeal comments. While the writing generally conveys the writer's ideas it may demonstrate *immature, inconsistent control* of composition fundamentals

**3 (C-)** Meets the criteria for one scored 4 but demonstrates *less success* in meeting the demands of the assignment and *less control* of writing.

*Weak*

**2 (D-)** Demonstrates little success in meeting the demands of the assignment. Such a paper may *misunderstand the reading or substitute a simpler task such as offering generalizations, summarizing text, or merely listing devices*. The writing often demonstrates consistent weakness in composition fundamentals.

**1 (F)** A paper at this level meets the criteria for one scored 2 but is *especially simplistic or weak* in its analysis, *poorly developed*, or demonstrates *remarkable weakness* in composition fundamentals.