Sample Assignment #1
UC Berkeley, Spring 2014

For the third reading response, you will team up to diagram an argument using whysaurus.com.

This assignment will have two stages:

1) First, in groups, lay out the author's argument using the argument diagramming tools at whysaurus.com. What is the main argument that each author is making about planning (top point)? What are his or her sub-claims (supporting points)? What evidence does he or she provide to support his or her main claim (depending on your writer, you might have to think about different kinds of evidence that he or she might be deploying)? I leave it up to you to figure out how to apportion this work. This phase will be due on Wednesday, April 9th

2) Second, individually, go back and use the website's annotation tools to critique each component of the author's argument. Agree or disagree with and comment upon each claim and subclaim. Is this author persuasive? Does the evidence given support his or her main claim? If you disagree, why? What is your counterargument? This phase will be due Friday, April 11th.

Sample Assignment #2
UC Berkeley, Spring 2014

English R1B, Spring 2014

The Whysaurus drafting and peer-editing project

Due dates:
- **Monday, 4/14,** you must create a Whysaurus login and email Joshua Frankel (joshua@whysaurus.com), cc'ing me, with your profile names. He'll add you to our course's private area of the site.
- **Monday, 4/21**, a Whysaurus portal for your final paper must be up and ready for review
- **Wednsday, 4/23**, respond to two other students' Whysaurus portals, both in Whysaurus and in a separate document

Over the next week, you should be drafting your final paper. I recommend that you do a lot of writing today and over the weekend, working on building an argument based on your textual evidence, and then thinking about places where your argument could incorporate outside resources to be made stronger. If you find that you work well from an outline, creating the Whysaurus site for your project can function in this manner; if you find that you prefer writing first, to discover your ideas and argument, then you should draft your paper first and use the creation of your Whysaurus portal as a kind of "reverse-outline," testing out the structure of your argument. I recommend the latter, but do whatever works best for you!

Creating your Whysaurus portal:

1. Create a login, and email Josh and me with the profile name, by Monday.
2. Click   "Make a point."
   a. Your "Point title" should be something that generally captures the gist of your paper. It can be your paper title, or just something temporary.
   b. Your "additional text" box should include an approximation of your thesis.
3. Once   you've articulated your central point, click on it. Under "Why it's true," click "Add a supporting point."
   a. This "point title" will be the gist of your first body paragraph - the topic sentence. What is the main claim that this part of your argument will make?
   b. Use the "additional text" box to expand just a bit, or to actually write the topic sentence.
   c.
4. Under *this* point, click "Why it's true" and add additional supporting points: your textual evidence, or, if relevant, your evidence from an outside source.
5. At the top of this page you'll see the words "Supporting 1 Point;" click, and then return to your main point – your thesis point. Once under the umbrella of your thesis point, click "Add a supporting point" and repeat the above, now articulating and supporting the argumentative claim that you make in your second body paragraph.
6. Repeat, repeat, repeat, till the end of your paper!
7. Tell me the URL for your Point by Monday, 4/21.

Peer review portion of the project:

You'll receive a URL for each of your peer review partners, and your reviews of their work will happen both on the Whysaurus site, and in documents that you will give to me and your peers separately. These separate documents will provide explanations of your various Whysaurus evaluations.

In Whysaurus:

1. For your peer's main point, say whether you "agree" or "disagree" with it.
2. Evaluate the relevance of each of the points supporting the main point.
3. If you think of a particular weakness in the point, click "Add a Counter Point" and include as much detail as you can in your articulation of a possible counter-argument.
4. Then click, "see evidence" for the point.
    1. Evaluate relevance for each supporting point, here, and indicate whether you agree or disagree with the point.
    2. If you have an idea of additional evidence that might be relevant to your peer, "Add a Supporting Point."
5. Continue to do all of these things, drilling into different pieces of the argument, noting relevance of each piece of evidence, and agreeing or disagreeing.

In your separate document:

Please answer the following questions.

1. When you initially read the main thesis-point, before looking at the evidence, did you agree or disagree?
2. After looking at all the evidence, did you agree or disagree?
    1. Were you *persuaded* by the evidence? In other words, did your initial reaction to the point *change* after you encountered all the evidence?
3. Do you think that – as a general rule - the evidence offered is relevant to the main point?
4. Which points seem *most relevant* to you? Which seem *least*? Why?
5. Does the order of the points make sense to you? Would you advocate rearranging them at all?
6. Which points are especially well supported by the evidence offered?
7. For which points do you think more evidence is necessary?
8. Any additional bits of advice, or reactions, or musings!