Building Knowledge and Vocabulary
The Juicy Language of Text

Leadership I - Grades 6–8 - Day 4
PACIFIC COD

*Gadus macrocephalus*

Sometimes known as Alaska Cod, Gray Cod

**SUMMARY**

Pacific Cod is a relatively fast growing fish that can produce several hundred thousand eggs per year. It is commercially fished in two regions, the Gulf of Alaska and the Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands, and both populations have good abundance. The main fishing methods for Pacific Cod are bottom trawl, pot, longline, and jig gear. Management in Alaska uses a series of catch limits, observer counts, closures, and permits to limit the overall ecosystem effects of the Pacific Cod fishery. Concerns regarding seabird bycatch and food availability for Steller’s sea lions have been addressed by recent management that has changed gear requirements to reduce seabird catch, and implemented a series of closures to protect critical sea lion habitat. In January 2010, the Marine Stewardship Council certified all gear types in the Gulf of Alaska and the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands as sustainable fisheries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Final Score</th>
<th>Color</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life History</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>2.40 - 4.00</td>
<td>🐟</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abundance</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.60 - 2.39</td>
<td>🐟</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat Quality and Fishing Gear Impacts</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>0.00 - 1.59</td>
<td>🐟</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bycatch</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Final Score</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.30</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Color** 🐟
LIFE HISTORY

Core Points (only one selection allowed)

If a value for intrinsic rate of increase (‘r’) is known, assign the score below based on this value. If no r-value is available, assign the score below for the correct age at 50% maturity for females if specified, or for the correct value of growth rate (‘k’). If no estimates of r, age at 50% maturity, or k are available, assign the score below based on maximum age.

1.00 Intrinsic rate of increase <0.05; OR age at 50% maturity >10 years; OR growth rate <0.15; OR maximum age >30 years.

2.00 Intrinsic rate of increase = 0.05-0.15; OR age at 50% maturity = 5-10 years; OR a growth rate = 0.16–0.30; OR maximum age = 11-30 years.

Pacific Cod females reach 50% maturity in the Gulf of Alaska at 4.4 years, and in the eastern Bering Sea at 4.9 years (Stark 2007), however, the average age of recruitment to the fishery is seven years (Kruse et al. 2000). Sizes at 50% maturity are 50.3 cm for Gulf of Alaska Cod, and 58 cm for eastern Bering Sea Cod (Stark 2007; AFSC 2009). Growth rates vary depending on age, but on average k=0.22 in the Bering Sea and k=0.18 in the Gulf of Alaska (SAFE Reports, 2009) The maximum recorded age of Pacific Cod is 25 years (Munk, 2001), however in the Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands and Gulf of Alaska groundfish fisheries, the maximum age observed is 19 years.

3.00 Intrinsic rate of increase >0.16; OR age at 50% maturity = 1-5 years; OR growth rate >0.30; OR maximum age <11 years.

Points of Adjustment (multiple selections allowed)

-0.25 Species has special behaviors that make it especially vulnerable to fishing pressure (e.g., spawning aggregations; site fidelity; segregation by sex; migratory bottlenecks; unusual attraction to gear; etc.).

Pacific Cod form dense spawning aggregations between 40-290 m deep that make large catches possible (NMFS 2004; Shimada and Kimura 1994). Major aggregations occur between Unalaska and Unimak Islands, southwest of the Pribilof Islands, and near the Shumagin group in the western GOA (NMFS, 2004).

-0.25 Species has a strategy for sexual development that makes it especially vulnerable to fishing pressure (e.g., age at 50% maturity >20 years; sequential hermaphrodites; extremely low fecundity).

-0.25 Species has a small or restricted range (e.g., endemism; numerous evolutionarily significant units; restricted to one coastline; e.g., American lobster; striped bass; endemic reef fishes).
Species exhibits high natural population variability driven by broad-scale environmental change (e.g., El Nino; decadal oscillations).

Changing environmental conditions in the Pacific Ocean can impact Cod populations in many different ways by altering ocean productivity, food chains and the availability of food; changing the distribution and migratory patterns of adult fish, the timing and location of spawning, and larval transport patterns; and disrupting the development of eggs and larvae (NMFS 2004).

Species does not have special behaviors that increase ease or population consequences of capture OR has special behaviors that make it less vulnerable to fishing pressure (e.g., species is widely dispersed during spawning).

Species has a strategy for sexual development that makes it especially resilient to fishing pressure (e.g., age at 50% maturity <1 year; extremely high fecundity).

Pacific Cod is a highly fecund species that utilize external fertilization. Pacific Cod reach 50% maturity at about 4.5 years of age (Stark, 2007). Some studies have shown that sexually mature females can produce anywhere from 225,000 and 5 million eggs per year (Klovach et al., 1995).

Species is distributed over a very wide range (e.g., throughout an entire hemisphere or ocean basin; e.g., swordfish; tuna; Patagonian toothfish).

The Pacific Cod occurs in the north Pacific, from the Bering Sea south to Santa Monica, California in the east, and to the Sea of Japan in the west (NMFS, 2004; PSMFC 1998). This is considered a medium size range so no points were added.

Species does not exhibit high natural population variability driven by broad-scale environmental change (e.g., El Nino; decadal oscillations).

1.75 Points for Life History
ABUNDANCE

Core Points (only one selection allowed)

Compared to natural or un-fished level, the species population is:

1.00 Low: Abundance or biomass is <75% of BMSY or similar proxy (e.g., spawning potential ratio).

2.00 Medium: Abundance or biomass is 75-125% of BMSY or similar proxy; OR population is approaching or recovering from an overfished condition; OR adequate information on abundance or biomass is not available.

Populations in both the Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands and Gulf of Alaska remain above the threshold biomass levels defined by the North Pacific Council and are generally considered to be at healthy levels of abundance (NMFS, 2004). Although for 2010, female spawning biomass in the Bering Sea is approximately 345,000 t, which is slightly below the BMSY (B35%) of 360,000 t (Thompson, personal communication). The projected overfishing limit for 2010 is 205,000 t, and total allowable catch (TAC) for 2010 will be 168,780 t (msc.org). In the Gulf of Alaska, Cod age 3+ biomass for 2010 is estimated to be 701,000 t, with the 2010 spawning stock biomass estimated to be 118,000 t and BMSY (B35%) for the region estimated to be 102,000 t (NPFMC, 2009). The overfishing limit for 2010 for the Gulf of Alaska population is 94,100 t, and the TAC is set at 59,563 t (MSC 2010).

3.00 High: Abundance or biomass is >125% of BMSY or similar proxy.

Points of Adjustment (multiple selections allowed)

-0.25 The population is declining over a generational time scale (as indicated by biomass estimates or standardized CPUE).

-0.25 Age, size or sex distribution is skewed relative to the natural condition (e.g., truncated size/age structure or anomalous sex distribution).

-0.25 Species is listed as "overfished" OR species is listed as "depleted", "endangered", or "threatened" by recognized national or international bodies.

Pacific Cod populations in both the Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands and Gulf of Alaska are listed as 'not overfished' with 'no overfishing occurring,' and no population of Cod is considered to be approaching an overfished condition (NPFMC, 2009). No points were subtracted, since overfishing is not occurring.
Current levels of abundance are likely to jeopardize the availability of food for other species or cause substantial change in the structure of the associated food web.

In 2000, A Biological Opinion found that the North Pacific groundfish fisheries for pollock, Pacific Cod, and Atka mackerel are likely to jeopardize the continued existence of Steller sea lions (NMFS, 2004). As a result of this report, management measures creating large buffer zones around rookeries were enacted. The efforts to minimize impacts on Steller sea lions are sufficient, and no points were subtracted.

The population is increasing over a generational time scale (as indicated by biomass estimates or standardized CPUE).

Recruitment varies each year, but abundant spawning stock biomass suggests that if managers keep relative catch low, the population will increase over a generational time scale. More research needs to be done to determine if these assumptions are correct (NPFMC, 2009, NMFS, 2004), so no points were added.

Age, size or sex distribution is functionally normal.

Age, size and sex distributions are likely normal for Pacific Cod.

Species is close to virgin biomass.

Current levels of abundance provide adequate food for other predators or are not known to affect the structure of the associated food web.

2.25 Points for Abundance

HABITAT QUALITY AND FISHING GEAR IMPACTS

Core Points (only one selection allowed)

Select the option that most accurately describes the effect of the fishing method upon the habitat that it affects.

The fishing method causes great damage to physical and biogenic habitats (e.g., cyanide; blasting; bottom trawling; dredging).
2.00 The fishing method does moderate damage to physical and biogenic habitats (e.g., bottom gillnets; traps and pots; bottom longlines).

Most of the Pacific Cod catch is taken with bottom and pelagic trawls and longline gear (NMFS, 2004), but pot and jig gear are also used. In the Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands region, TAC (Total Allowable Catch) is allocated by gear type. Forty-seven percent is allocated to trawl fisheries, 51% is allocated to fixed gear fisheries (i.e., longline and pots), and 2% to jig fisheries. In the Gulf of Alaska region, there are no specific allocations by gear type (NMFS, 2004). Due to the presence of deep water corals, sponges, gorgonians and other organisms located in depths where fishing is occurring (~200m along continental shelf) a score of 2 was awarded for the potential damage caused to these sessile organisms.

3.00 The fishing method does little damage to physical or biogenic habitats (e.g., hand picking; hand raking; hook and line; pelagic long lines; mid-water trawl or gillnet; purse seines).

Points of Adjustment (multiple selections allowed)

-0.25 Habitat for this species is so compromised from non-fishery impacts that the ability of the habitat to support this species is substantially reduced (e.g., dams; pollution; coastal development).

-0.25 Critical habitat areas (e.g., spawning areas) for this species are not protected by management using time/area closures, marine reserves, etc.

-0.25 No efforts are being made to minimize damage from existing gear types OR new or modified gear is increasing habitat damage (e.g., fitting trawls with roller rigs or rockhopping gear; more robust gear for deep-sea fisheries).

-0.25 If gear impacts are substantial, resilience of affected habitats is very slow (e.g., deep water corals; rocky bottoms).

The use of trawling equipment damages deep-water corals, which are important habitats for many demersal fish (Witherell and Coon, 2000). Some corals are hundreds of years old and grow very slowly (<1cm/yr), making the damage to these organisms often irreparable (Andrews, et al. 2009). Points were not subtracted since the NPFMC has implemented management measures and closures to preserve delicate habitats such as deep-water corals.

+0.25 Habitat for this species remains robust and viable and is capable of supporting this species.
Critical habitat areas (e.g., spawning areas) for this species are protected by management using time/area closures, marine reserves, etc.

Rockhopper' trawl gear, which is known to severely impact rocky seafloor habitat, is used by many Cod vessels in the Gulf of Alaska (Alaska Marine Conservation Council, 2002). Fortunately, many deep water habitats are protected from bottom trawling because of their rocky or steep terrain. Areas where bottom trawling is used have reduced benthic diversity and damage to corals, sponges and gorgonians is widespread (Heifetz et al. 2009). Many areas containing known populations of sensitive organisms have been closed to specific gear types.

Gear innovations are being implemented over a majority of the fishing area to minimize damage from gear types OR no innovations necessary because gear effects are minimal.

If gear impacts are substantial, resilience of affected habitats is fast (e.g., mud or sandy bottoms) OR gear effects are minimal.

2.25 Points for Habitat Quality and Fishing Gear Impacts

MANAGEMENT

Core Points (only one selection allowed)

Select the option that most accurately describes the current management of the fisheries of this species.

1.00 Regulations are ineffective (e.g., illegal fishing or overfishing is occurring) OR the fishery is unregulated (i.e., no control rules are in effect).

2.00 Management measures are in place over a major portion over the species' range but implementation has not met conservation goals OR management measures are in place but have not been in place long enough to determine if they are likely to achieve conservation and sustainability goals.

3.00 Substantial management measures are in place over a large portion of the species range and have demonstrated success in achieving conservation and sustainability goals.

Effective management is in place in Alaska, where the vast majority of Pacific Cod is caught (NPFMC 1999; PSMFC 1999; NMFS 2004). Management measures include limited entry, seasonal catch quotas, closed areas and bycatch limits. The Marine
Stewardship Council has certified both the Gulf of Alaska and the Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands fisheries as sustainable (MSC 2010).

Points of Adjustment (multiple selections allowed)

-0.25 There is inadequate scientific monitoring of stock status, catch or fishing effort.

-0.25 Management does not explicitly address fishery effects on habitat, food webs, and ecosystems.

-0.25 This species is overfished and no recovery plan or an ineffective recovery plan is in place.

-0.25 Management has failed to reduce excess capacity in this fishery or implements subsidies that result in excess capacity in this fishery.

+0.25 There is adequate scientific monitoring, analysis and interpretation of stock status, catch and fishing effort.

Catches are monitored through logbook reports and fish receipts, supplemented with data collected from shoreside sampling and observer coverage. In Alaska, vessels equal to or greater than 125 feet in length must carry at least one NMFS-certified observer on 100% of their sea days, vessels between 60 and 125 feet in length must carry a NMFS-certified observer during at least 30% of their fishing days, and vessels less than 60 feet in length overall are not required to carry observers.

+0.25 Management explicitly and effectively addresses fishery effects on habitat, food webs, and ecosystems.

Closures and management measures have been put in place to protect Steller sea lion habitat, feeding areas and haulouts, essential fish habitat and other habitats of concern (NMFS, 2004; DiCosimo, 1999).

+0.25 This species is overfished and there is a recovery plan (including benchmarks, timetables and methods to evaluate success) in place that is showing signs of success OR recovery plan is not needed.

No recovery plan is needed. Pacific Cod are not overfished and overfishing is not occurring in the Gulf of Alaska and the Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands. Marine Stewardship Council has certified the BSAI and GOA fisheries as sustainable (MSC 2010).

+0.25 Management has taken action to control excess capacity or reduce subsidies that result in excess capacity OR no measures are necessary because fishery is not overcapitalized.

3.75 Points for Management
BYCATCH

Core Points (only one selection allowed)

Select the option that most accurately describes the current level of bycatch and the consequences that result from fishing this species. The term, "bycatch" used in this document excludes incidental catch of a species for which an adequate management framework exists. The terms, "endangered, threatened, or protected," used in this document refer to species status that is determined by national legislation such as the U.S. Endangered Species Act, the U.S. Marine Mammal Protection Act (or another nation's equivalent), the IUCN Red List, or a credible scientific body such as the American Fisheries Society.

1.00 Bycatch in this fishery is high (>100% of targeted landings), OR regularly includes a "threatened, endangered or protected species."

Although less than 10% of the total Pacific Cod catch is discarded (NPFMC SAFE, 2009), the longline fishery is known for catching endangered or threatened seabirds. Roughly 15,000 seabirds per year are killed by fishing gear used in the Pacific Cod fishery (NMFS, 2008). The majority of longline-killed seabirds are fulmars, but also includes a large number of albatrosses, gulls, shearwaters, and other species (NMFS, 2004). The fishery kills Laysan, black-foot, and short-tailed albatrosses, which are all on the IUCN Red List of threatened species. The only seabird affected by the Pacific Cod fishery that is listed as endangered by the US is the short tailed albatross although population impacts are unlikely given current growth in this population (Zador et al. 2008).

2.00 Bycatch in this fishery is moderate (10-99% of targeted landings) AND does not regularly include "threatened, endangered or protected species" OR level of bycatch is unknown.

3.00 Bycatch in this fishery is low (<10% of targeted landings) and does not regularly include "threatened, endangered or protected species."

Points of Adjustment (multiple selections allowed)

-0.25 Bycatch in this fishery is a contributing factor to the decline of "threatened, endangered, or protected species" and no effective measures are being taken to reduce it.

-0.25 Bycatch of targeted or non-targeted species (e.g., undersize individuals) in this fishery is high and no measures are being taken to reduce it.

-0.25 Bycatch of this species (e.g., undersize individuals) in other fisheries is high OR bycatch of this species in other fisheries inhibits its recovery, and no measures are being taken to reduce it.
The continued removal of the bycatch species contributes to its decline.

Measures taken over a major portion of the species range have been shown to reduce bycatch of "threatened, endangered, or protected species" or bycatch rates are no longer deemed to affect the abundance of the "protected" bycatch species OR no measures needed because fishery is highly selective (e.g., harpoon; spear).

As of 2004, revised seabird bycatch regulations have been in effect for the Alaska demersal longline fleet, requiring most vessels over 55 feet to use paired streamer lines, restricting offal discards, and requiring each vessel to have a seabird avoidance plan onboard. Smaller vessels [greater than 26 ft (7.9 m) LOA and less than or equal to 55 ft LOA] must use a single streamer line or, in limited instances, a buoy bag line (Seabird Avoidance Regulations, NOAA). Management efforts have been successful at reducing the amount of seabirds caught by this fishery.

There is bycatch of targeted (e.g., undersize individuals) or non-targeted species in this fishery and measures (e.g., gear modifications) have been implemented that have been shown to reduce bycatch over a large portion of the species range OR no measures are needed because fishery is highly selective (e.g., harpoon; spear).

North Pacific fisheries have implemented measures such as conservative catch quotas, mesh size restrictions, no trawl zones, etc. to reduce bycatch (NPFMC, 1999). Other regulations, such as gear and area/season restrictions, are also used to reduce bycatch (NMFS 2004).

Bycatch of this species in other fisheries is low OR bycatch of this species in other fisheries inhibits its recovery, but effective measures are being taken to reduce it over a large portion of the range.

The continued removal of the bycatch species in the targeted fishery has had or will likely have little or no impact on populations of the bycatch species OR there are no significant bycatch concerns because the fishery is highly selective (e.g., harpoon; spear).

1.50 Points for Bycatch
REFERENCES


Bycatch

http://sawfish.saveourseas.com/threats/overfishing#bycatch

Modern fishing vessels catch staggering amounts of unwanted fish and other marine life. It's estimated that anywhere from 8 to 25 percent of the total global catch is discarded, cast overboard either dead or dying. That's up to 27 million tonnes of fish thrown out each year -- the equivalent of 600 fully-laden Titanics. And the victims aren't just fish. Every year, an estimated 300,000 whales, dolphins and porpoises die entangled in fishing nets, along with thousands of critically-endangered sea turtles. Long-line fisheries also kill huge numbers of seabirds. Over 100,000 Albatrosses die this way every year, and many species are endangered as a result of bycatch.

All modern forms of commercial fishing produce bycatch, but shrimp trawling is by far the most destructive: it is responsible for a third of the world's bycatch, while producing only 2% of all seafood.

Shrimp (and many deep-sea fish) are caught using a fishing method called bottom trawling, which usually involves dragging a net between two trawl doors weighing several tons each across the ocean bed. This has a destructive impact on seabed communities, particularly on fragile deep water coral -- a vital part of the marine ecosystem that scientists are just beginning to understand. The effect of bottom trawling on the seafloor has been compared to forest clear-cutting, and the damage it causes can be seen from space. The UN Secretary General reported in 2006 that 95 percent of damage to seamount ecosystems worldwide is caused by deep sea bottom trawling.

Remedies
What can be done? The next few years will be pivotal for the oceans. If strong measures
are implemented now, much of the damage can still be reversed. In terms of what needs to happen, preventing overfishing is fairly straightforward: first and foremost, scientifically-determined limits on the number of fish caught must be established for individual fisheries, and these limits must be enforced. Second, fishing methods responsible for most bycatch must either be modified to make them less harmful, or made illegal. And third, key parts of the ecosystem, such as vulnerable spawning grounds and coral reefs, must be fully protected.

In practical terms, this means:

- Putting pressure on governments to limit fishing subsidies, estimated at tens of billions of dollars per year. Eliminating subsidies of this scale lowers the financial incentives to continuously expand fishing fleets far beyond sustainability.

- Establishing and expanding Marine Protected Areas (MPAs), areas of the ocean where natural resources are protected and fishing is either restricted or banned altogether (no-take areas). Presently, 1% of the oceans are MPAs. This number needs to be bigger if they are to help reverse the damage done by overfishing. The Save Our Seas Foundation has been actively involved in supporting MPAs through our projects in the Cocos (Keeling) Islands and the Maldives.

- Better monitoring and policing of the fish trade. Pirate fishing continues to grow in scope, and though illegal, fish caught in such operations often end up on our plates.

- Consumers choosing to buy sustainably-sourced seafood and avoiding threatened species. Overfishing is driven by global demand — lowering the demand will lower the damage.
SUDDEN DEATH on the High Seas

Longline Fishing: A Global Catastrophe for Seabirds
Twenty-three species of seabird are in danger of extinction largely because of mortality from longline fishing ... yet the problem can be solved easily and inexpensively.

The large, graceful albatross is perhaps the most venerated of seabirds. The inspiration behind Samuel Taylor Coleridge's classic poem “The Rime of the Ancient Mariner,” albatrosses have some of the longest wingspans of any birds, and spend much of their lives flying thousands of miles over the open ocean in search of food. However, with demand for large ocean fish at an all-time high, hundreds of thousands of albatrosses and other seabirds are being killed each year by the fleets of longline fishing vessels which now crisscross the world's oceans. The longliners set lines up to 60 miles long and may use up to 30,000 baited hooks on each set to catch tuna, swordfish, cod, halibut, Patagonian toothfish (Chilean sea bass), and other fish. While the longlines are being set behind the fishing boats, albatrosses and other seabirds grab the bait and become impaled on the barbed hooks, either caught by their bills, or hooked into their bodies or wings. Dragged under the surface, the birds are unable to free themselves and drown.

Data show that this mortality is having a significant impact on populations, with many species showing rapid recent declines. Scientists now fear that unless action is taken, many seabird species will become extinct.

Albatrosses are characterized by low reproductive rates, low natural annual mortality, long life spans, and delayed sexual maturity—traits that make populations extremely sensitive to changes in adult survival.

Longline fishing is considered the most recent and most serious global threat to albatrosses and other procellariiformes.
Seabird populations are being decimated by hundreds of millions of longline hooks...

For an albatross, finding a fishing boat in the open ocean is like finding a free buffet. With their large size, they quickly dominate the feeding frenzy, homing in on the largest morsels: often a squid or fish set on a longline hook. This “smash and grab” feeding ecology selects albatrosses as top victims of longline hooks.

The killing of seabirds in longline fisheries is a global problem from which the U.S. is not immune. In the North Pacific, U.S.-based and other longliners kill tens of thousands of seabirds each year. There are more than 2,500 vessels in the Alaskan longline fleet landing $300 million worth of fish annually and in excess of 140 vessels in Hawaii. In total, these fisheries set more than 210 million hooks each year in total.

Recent data, extrapolated from records kept by official fisheries observers aboard some vessels, show that on average, more than 20,000 seabirds die annually in the Alaskan longline fishery alone. From 1993 through 1999, at least 2,425 Black-footed Albatrosses, 6,721 Laysan Albatrosses, and 13 endangered Short-tailed Albatrosses were killed there. Thousands more fulmars, shearwaters, and other seabirds were also killed. The Alaskan halibut fishery of 1,800 vessels which sets more than 20 million hooks annually has no observers, so it is impossible to know how many more seabirds are killed by halibut vessels.

In the Hawaiian-based longline fishery, at least 8,325 Black-footed Albatrosses and 7,050 Laysan Albatrosses were killed from 1994 through 1999. These mortality figures do not include orphaned chicks that starve after their parents drown on a longline hook, or dead birds that fall into the sea as hooks are retrieved. Last year, the Black-footed Albatross was added to the IUCN-World Conservation Union list of species threatened with extinction: because of longline mortality.

The impact of longlines on seabirds is compounded by a range of other threats that are particular to birds that nest on isolated headlands and islands and forage across the open oceans. Introduced cats, rats, and other predators kill both chicks and adult seabirds at the nest, and may also eat eggs. Species that evolved in isolation have no defense against these ubiquitous predators.

The introduction of pigs, goats, cattle, and rabbits to some islands has also led to the destruction of habitat and seabird nesting burrows. Floating plastic is frequently mistaken for food by albatrosses, which can starve if their digestive tracts become blocked with used lighters, toothbrushes, and other flotsam. A recent study on Sand Island in the northwestern Hawaiian chain showed that 97% of Laysan Albatross chicks had ingested plastic, picked up by their parents and regurgitated as though it was food.

Seabirds also accidentally feed their chicks offal discarded by fishing vessels that still contains fishing hooks. Some species have been persecuted for food, and the Short-tailed Albatross came close to extinction as a result of large-scale slaughter for feathers. This combined onslaught has a cumulative effect that has been catastrophic for many species. The threat from longlining could be the final blow for some species unless action is taken now.
The albatross pictured above is already doomed, having snatched a bait attached to a weighted line that is beginning to sink. It will soon be pulled under the surface to drown.
Three albatross species occur regularly in the North Pacific. All are at serious risk from U.S.-based and other longliners.

**Black-footed Albatross**

This species has recently been classified as Threatened with extinction. This follows a 10% decrease in breeding pairs since 1992 on Midway and Laysan Islands and on French Frigate Shoals, where 77% of the species’ world population nests. Estimates suggest that mortality of this species is at least 2,130 birds per year in U.S.-based fisheries alone. A recent study states that up to 10% of the species’ breeding population is killed on longline hooks throughout the North Pacific each year. U.S. vessels represent a fraction of the total number of boats from many nations that fish in this species’ range. Vessels from these other nations rarely if ever have observers aboard, so these mortality figures are just the tip of the iceberg.

**Short-tailed Albatross**

This is one of the world’s most endangered seabird species with no more than 1,500 birds left of a population that once numbered in the millions. From 1887-1902, an estimated five million were slaughtered for the feather trade. In recent years, at least 13 have been killed in the U.S. Alaskan longline fishery. It is unknown how many have been killed by other fleets, but it is likely to be many more. Toroshima, the current major breeding island off the coast of Japan, is subject to volcanic activity presenting a further threat, although habitat enhancement at this key breeding site has led to a recent population increase. These birds wander the entire North Pacific where they are vulnerable to longline hooks. The species is Federally listed as Endangered.

**Laysan Albatross**

After making a slow recovery from feather trade persecution at the turn of the century, the breeding population of this species has decreased by an alarming 30% since 1992 on Midway and Laysan Islands where more than 90% of the world population nests. Longline mortality is believed to be the primary threat. The species has a similar range to the Black-footed Albatross, but is generally more numerous. They are commonly caught on longlines in the North Pacific, with more than 2,280 killed there by U.S. vessels alone each year. Given the recently released population data on this species, it also clearly qualifies as Threatened with extinction under IUCN-World Conservation Union criteria, although it is yet to be officially listed.
Worldwide, at least 64 seabird species are known to have been killed in longline fisheries. The 23 Threatened* species are shown in red.

Penguins, such as this Gentoo, are capable of diving deep enough to take longline bait even after the lines reach fishing depth. Fortunately, few have been affected so far.

Macaroni Penguin
Gentoo Penguin
Unidentified loon species
Wandering Albatross
Tristan Albatross
Antipodean Albatross
Southern Royal Albatross
Northern Royal Albatross
Amsterdam Albatross
Short-tailed Albatross
Waved Albatross
Laysan Albatross

Black-footed Albatross
Campbell Albatross
Black-browed Albatross
Buller’s Albatross
Salvin’s Albatross
Shy Albatross
Chatham Albatross
Atlantic Yellow-nosed Albatross
Indian Yellow-nosed Albatross
Grey-headed Albatross
Sooty Albatross
Light-mantled Sooty Albatross
Southern Giant Petrel
Northern Giant Petrel
Northern Fulmar
Antarctic Fulmar
Cape Petrel
Great-winged Petrel
Grey Petrel
White-chinned Petrel
Spectacled Petrel
Black Petrel
Westland Petrel
Cory’s Shearwater
Flesh-footed Shearwater
Greater Shearwater
Sooty Shearwater
Short-tailed Shearwater
Balearic Shearwater
Mediterranean Shearwater
Manx Shearwater
Wilson’s Storm Petrel
Great Cormorant
European Shag
Gannet
Cape Gannet
Australasian Gannet

Blue-footed Booby
Brown Booby
Great Skua
Subantarctic Skua
Audouin’s Gull
Yellow-legged Gull
Black-headed Gull
Mediterranean Gull
Herring Gull
Lesser Black-backed Gull
Great Black-backed Gull
Glaucous-winged Gull
Black-legged Kittiwake
Common Murre
Thick-billed Murre

Even the once abundant White-chinned Petrel, which is killed in the tens of thousands in southern ocean longline fisheries, has now been classified as Threatened with extinction because of longline mortality. Will it be the next Passenger Pigeon?

*Threatened means listed as Vulnerable, Endangered, or Critically Endangered, under IUCN-World Conservation Union criteria.
Will longlining cause the extinction of albatrosses?

16 of the world’s 21 albatross species are now considered Threatened with extinction under IUCN-World Conservation Union criteria. Longlines are the major continuing threat these species: Wandering, Antipodean, Tristan, Amsterdam, Northern Royal, Southern Royal, Waved, Short-tailed, Black-footed, Laysan, Black-browed, Campbell, Buller’s, Shy, Salvin’s, Chatham, Indian Yellow-nosed, Atlantic Yellow-nosed, Grey-headed, Sooty, Light-mantled Sooty.

The exact number of birds killed worldwide on longlines each year is unknown, but is certainly already in the hundreds of thousands. Yet, longline fishing is expanding rapidly around the world. For example, the Brazilian swordfish fleet which kills thousands of Threatened White-chinned, and also Spectacled Petrels, has increased five-fold in the past three years. Ninety percent of this swordfish is exported to the U.S.

From 1997 to 2000, estimates suggest that as many as 333,000 seabirds, including 67,000 albatrosses, were killed in the unregulated “pirate” Patagonian toothfish fishery in the southern oceans. These seabirds include several species Threatened with extinction. Patagonian toothfish is marketed in the U.S. as Chilean sea bass. Out of concern for its population, Whole Food Markets has withdrawn the fish from sale in its stores, although it is still commonly available from other retailers and many restaurants. Both seabirds and toothfish are in decline as a result of this fishery.

96% of the world population of the Black-footed Albatross breeds in the northwest Hawaiian Islands. The U.S. has a special responsibility for protecting this species, which was added to the international Threatened list in 2000 because of declines linked to longline mortality.
Worldwide, longline mortality is a major factor species. Some of the hardest hit victims from

Indian Yellow-nosed Albatross

The species has undergone a decline of at least 36% since 1984 at its main breeding site on Amsterdam Island, where approximately 28,000 pairs nest. Scientists believe that longline mortality is responsible for this decline. Up to 600 are killed each year in the western Australian longline fishery. Birds are also killed in the Patagonian toothfish (Chilean sea bass) fishery, and they come into contact with tuna longliners in subtropical waters where they are also killed.

Southern Giant Petrel (juvenile)

The world population has declined 18% from 38,000 pairs to 31,000 pairs over the last decade, probably due to longline mortality. A total of 2,000-4,000 were estimated as having been killed in the unregulated southern ocean Patagonian toothfish (Chilean sea bass) fishery between 1997 and 1998. Even at the lower estimate, the species cannot withstand this level of mortality for much longer.

\[
\text{With his cruel bow he laid full low}
\]
\[
\text{The harmless Albatross}
\]
\[
\text{SAMUEL TAYLOR COLERIDGE}
\]
in population declines for many threatened around the world include:

**Antipodean Albatross (juvenile)**

This species has a small world population of less than 12,000 breeding pairs. A survey on one of its key breeding islands indicated a 63% decline between 1973 and 1997. The species has been caught in significant numbers in the tuna longline fishery in New Zealand waters.

**Wandering Albatross and Spectacled Petrels**

The Wandering Albatross is in decline across most of its range because of long-lines. The southern bluefin tuna fishery alone may have accounted for an annual mortality of 2–3% of adults and 14–16% of immatures at South Georgia in the 1980s.

The Spectacled Petrel has a world population of a few thousand pairs at most. It is estimated that approximately 700 are being killed on long-lines each year, principally in waters off Brazil where this picture was taken.

See ABC’s website at www.abcbirds.org for more details on Threatened seabird populations and declines.
Bird-scaring or “tori” lines (tori meaning bird in Japanese) have been shown to virtually eliminate seabird mortality caused by longlines. They were first developed by Japanese bluefin tuna fishermen who recognized that keeping birds off bait was in their own economic interest, as leaving more bait for fish increases the chances of success. The tori lines are mounted on poles at the stern of the boat, and are connected to a floating buoy that is dragged behind the vessel. Colored streamers are attached to the lines, and these flap erratically in the wind above the area where the bait enters the water. When the longlines are properly weighted, they sink immediately behind the boat and the flapping streamers scare the birds away. By the time the baited hooks are beyond the streamer zone, they have already sunk below the depth where they can be reached by most seabirds.

In Hawaii, where lines are set at shallower depths than in Alaska, regulations are in place that require thawing the bait so it sinks more quickly, dyeing bait blue so it is less visible to birds, adding weights so the lines sink more quickly, setting lines at night when fewer birds are feeding, and strategically discharging offal during line setting, so that birds are attracted away from the boat’s stern where the lines are set (or not discharging offal at all, so fewer birds are attracted to the boat). These measures also have been shown to be effective means of reducing seabird mortality.

The use of bird-scaring lines and other avoidance measures, ensures that we can still enjoy seafood, knowing that no albatrosses or other sea birds have had to die to bring the catch to table. Japanese southern ocean tuna longliners setting 481 million hooks, killed an estimated 44,000 albatrosses annually in the early 1980s.
New study shows streamer lines virtually eliminate seabird mortality.

A rigorous two-year study by the University of Washington on various seabird avoidance measures aboard Alaskan longliners documented that paired streamer lines (costing $260 delivered), virtually eliminate all albatross and Northern Fulmar mortality. Other seabird mortality also is nearly eliminated. One southern bluefin tuna recently brought $173,600 at a Tokyo fish market—enough to provide bird-scaring lines for 667 vessels.

The study also finds that these bird-scaring lines, that form a flapping curtain over baited lines when they are set, have no effect on the catch of targeted fish, nor do they increase the catch of other non-target species. Neither do they pose a safety risk to fishermen. The study recommends that all Alaskan longliners be required to employ these paired streamer lines, and that all bottom fishing longliners around the globe also employ streamer lines when setting baited lines, as well as eliminate offal discharge over baited lines during setting. To view the full study, dated August 31, 2001, complete with details for the design of materials for paired streamer lines. See: http://www.wsg.washington.edu/pubs/seabirds/execsummary.pdf.

More than 500 paired streamer lines have been given to Alaskan longline vessels thanks to a grant program funded by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Additional grant funds are still available to outfit more vessels (see p. 13).
Seabird deaths on longlines: an international environmental problem where the U.S. can lead in eliminating seabird mortality with no negative impact on commercial fisheries.

In October 1996, spurred by increasing evidence of declines in albatross and other seabird populations, the IUCN-World Conservation Union (an inter-governmental organization of which the U.S. is a member), adopted a resolution urging nations to “adopt the goal of eliminating seabird by-catch within longline fisheries” and “implement seabird by-catch reduction measures immediately within longline fisheries.” The U.S. government supported this call for action. Previously, an international treaty, the Convention for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources, required all longliners fishing below 300 degrees South to use a bird-scaring line, set lines at night, add greater line weights, and strategically discharge offal. Subsequently, the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) adopted an International Plan of Action for Reducing Incidental Catch of Seabirds. The U.S. fully supported and voted for this international protocol. Unfortunately the protocol is voluntary, and the deadline for each longline nation to assess its fisheries for seabird mortality, and to prepare plans to minimize seabird deaths passed in February 2001, with only two nations (U.S. and Japan) submitting Plans. Most longlining nations have still not even assessed the extent of seabird mortality in their fisheries, and have done little if anything to avoid killing seabirds.

Furthermore, the U.S. Plan of Action is weak, listing no specific avoidance measures, and providing an additional two years for an assessment of the problem that is already well documented in all but the Alaskan halibut fishery (where observers are not yet required). Because the plan does not require observers to monitor seabird mortality aboard vessels, there seems to be little chance that the halibut fishery assessment will take place unless further action is taken. In fact, existing fishery regulations already provide better protection for seabirds than the Plan suggests, especially in Hawaii where specific avoidance measures are now required.

Congress and the U.S. National Marine Fisheries Service should act now to improve regulations and require that effective avoidance measures are employed by all U.S. longline vessels to protect seabirds. The two-year National Marine Fisheries Service-funded Alaskan study recommended required use of paired streamer lines on all Alaskan and global bottomfish vessels. The Administration should also call on other fishing nations to adopt effective National Plans of Action to avoid seabird mortality.

It is vital that the U.S. takes an active role in pressing for improved protection of albatrosses and other seabirds in the world’s longline fisheries. The survival of the great albatrosses depends on it.
The Monterey Bay Aquarium Seafood Watch program creates science-based recommendations that help consumers and businesses make ocean-friendly seafood choices. Carry this guide with you and share it with others to help spread the word.

### BEST CHOICES
- Abalone
- Arctic Char (farmed)
- Barramundi (US & Vietnam farmed)
- Bass (US hook and line, farmed)
- Catfish (US)
- Clams, Mussels & Oysters
- Cod: Pacific (AK)
- Crab: King, Snow & Tanner (AK)
- Lobster: Spiny (Mexico)
- Prawn: Freshwater (Canada & US)
- Prawn: Spot (AK & Canada)
- Rockfish (AK, CA, OR & WA)
- Sablefish/Black Cod (Canada farmed & AK)
- Salmon (AK & New Zealand)
- Sand dab (CA, OR & WA)
- Sardines: Pacific (Canada & US)
- Scallops (farmed)
- Shrimp (US farmed & AK)
- Tilapia (Canada, Ecuador & US)
- Trout: Rainbow (US farmed)
- Tuna: Albacore (Pacific troll, pole and line)
- Tuna: Skipjack (Pacific troll, pole and line)

### GOOD ALTERNATIVES
- Branzino (Mediterranean farmed)
- Cod: Pacific (Canada & US)
- Crab: Blue & Dungeness (US)
- Grouper: Black & Red (US)
- Halibut: Atlantic (farmed)
- Lobster: Bahamian & US
- Mahi Mahi (US troll & Ecuador)
- Monkfish (US)
- Octopus (Portugal & Spain, pot, trap)
- Pollock (Canada longline, gillnet & US)
- Salmon (Canada, CA, OR & WA wild)
- Scallops: Sea (wild)
- Shrimp: Canada & US (wild, Ecuador & Honduran farmed)
- Squid (Mexico & US)
- Swordfish (US)
- Tuna (China, Indonesia, Mexico & Taiwan)
- Tuna: Albacore (US longline)
- Tuna: Skipjack (free school, imported troll, pole and line, and US longline)
- Tuna: Yellowfin (free school, HI longline, and Pacific & Indian Ocean troll, pole and line)

### AVOID
- Abalone (China & Japan)
- Basa/Pangasius/Swai
- Cod: Atlantic (Canada, CA, OR & WA)
- Cod: Pacific (Japan & Russia)
- Crab (Russia)
- Halibut: Atlantic (wild)
- Lobster: Spiny (Belize, Brazil, Honduras & Nicaragua)
- Mahi Mahi (Costa Rica, Guatemala & Peru)
- Orange Roughy
- Pollock (Canada trawl)
- Salmon: Atlantic (farmed)
- Sardines: Atlantic (Mediterranean)
- Sharks
- Shrimp (imported)
- Squid (China, India & Thailand)
- Swordfish (imported longline)
- Tuna: Albacore (except US troll, pole and line, and longline)
- Tuna: Bluefin
- Tuna: Skipjack (imported purse seine)
- Tuna: Yellowfin (Atlantic troll, pole and line)

Start with Best Choices then check the other columns—your favorite seafood could be in more than one.

#### Best Choices
Buy first, they’re well managed and caught or farmed in ways that cause little harm to habitats or other wildlife.

#### Good Alternatives
Buy, but be aware there are concerns with how they’re caught or farmed.

#### Avoid
Take a pass on these for now, they’re overfished or caught or farmed in ways that harm other marine life or the environment.

Visit us online or download our app for a comprehensive list of our recommendations.
MAKING EVIDENCE-BASED CLAIMS

DEVELOPING CORE PROFICIENCIES
ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS / LITERACY UNIT

GRADE 7

California Commonwealth Club Address
Cesar Chavez
UNIT OUTLINE

PART 1: UNDERSTANDING EVIDENCE-BASED CLAIMS
- The teacher presents the purpose of the unit and explains the skill of making EBCs.
- Students independently read part of the text with a text-dependent question to guide them.
- Students follow along as they listen to the text being read aloud and discuss a series of text-dependent questions.
- The teacher models a critical reading and thinking process for forming EBCs about texts.

PART 2: MAKING EVIDENCE-BASED CLAIMS
- Students independently read part of the text and look for evidence to support a claim made by the teacher.
- Students follow along as they listen to the text being read aloud and discuss a series of text-dependent questions.
- In pairs, students look for evidence to support claims made by the teacher.
- The class discusses evidence in support of claims found by student pairs.
- In pairs, students make an EBC of their own and present it to the class.

PART 3: ORGANIZING EVIDENCE-BASED CLAIMS
- Students independently read part of the text and make an EBC.
- Students follow along as they listen to part of the text being read aloud.
- The teacher models organizing evidence to develop and explain claims using student EBCs.
- In pairs, students develop a claim with multiple points and organize supporting evidence.
- The class discusses the EBCs developed by student pairs.

PART 4: WRITING EVIDENCE-BASED CLAIMS
- Students independently review the text and develop an EBC.
- The teacher introduces and models writing EBCs using a claim from Part 3.
- In pairs, students write EBCs using one of their claims from Part 3.
- The class discusses the written EBCs of volunteer student pairs.
- The class discusses their new EBCs and students read aloud portions of the text.
- Students independently write EBCs.

PART 5: DEVELOPING EVIDENCE-BASED WRITING
- Students review the entire text and make a new EBC.
- The teacher analyzes volunteer student evidence-based writing from Part 4 and discusses developing global EBCs.
- Students discuss their new claims in pairs and then with the class.
- Students independently write a final evidence-based writing piece.
- The class discusses final evidence-based writing pieces of student volunteers.
PART 1

UNDERSTANDING EVIDENCE-BASED CLAIMS

“Living Under Savage Conditions”

OBJECTIVE:
Students learn the importance and elements of making evidence-based claims through a close reading of part of the text.

ACTIVITIES

1- INTRODUCTION TO UNIT
The teacher presents the purpose of the unit and explains the proficiency of making EBCs.

2- INDEPENDENT READING
Students independently read part of the text with a text-dependent question to guide them.

3- READ ALOUD AND CLASS DISCUSSION
Students follow along as they listen to the text being read aloud, and the teacher leads a discussion guided by a series of text-dependent questions.

4- MODEL FORMING EBCs
The teacher models a critical reading and thinking process for forming EBCs about texts.

ALIGNMENT TO CCSS

TARGETED STANDARD(S): RI.7.1
RI.7.1: Cite several pieces of textual evidence to support analysis of what the text says explicitly as well as inferences drawn from the text.

SUPPORTING STANDARD(S): RI.7.2    RI.7.3    SL.7.1
RI.7.2: Determine two or more central ideas in a text and analyze their development over the course of the text; provide an objective summary of the text.
RI.7.3: Analyze the interactions between individuals, events, and ideas in a text (e.g., how ideas influence individuals or events, or how individuals influence ideas or events).
SL.7.1: Engage effectively in a range of collaborative discussions (one-on-one, in groups, and teacher-led) with diverse partners on grade 7 topics, texts, and issues, building on others’ ideas and expressing their own clearly.
Thank you very much, Mr. Lee, Mrs. Black, ladies and gentlemen.

Twenty-one years ago, this last September, on a lonely stretch of railroad track paralleling U.S. Highway 101 near Salinas, 32 Bracero farm workers lost their lives in a tragic accident. The Braceros had been imported from Mexico to work on California farms.

They died when their bus, which was converted from a flatbed truck, drove in front of a freight train. Conversion of the bus had not been approved by any government agency. The driver had tunnel vision. Most of the bodies laid unidentified for days. No one, including the grower who employed the workers, even knew their names. Today, thousands of farm workers live under savage conditions, beneath trees and amid garbage and human excrement near tomato fields in San Diego County; tomato fields, which use the most modern farm technology. Vicious rats gnaw at them as they sleep. They walk miles to buy food at inflated prices and they carry in water from irrigation ditches.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>tunnel vision</th>
<th>savage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>defective sight in which objects not in the center field of vision cannot be properly seen</td>
<td>harsh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Child labor is still common in many farm areas. As much as 30 percent of Northern California's garlic harvesters are underage children. Kids as young as six years old have voted in states, conducted union elections, since they qualified as workers. Some 800,000 underage children work with their families harvesting crops across America. Babies born to migrant workers suffer 25 percent higher infant mortality rates than the rest of the population. Malnutrition among migrant workers' children is 10 times higher than the national rate. Farm workers' average life expectancy is still 49 years, compared to 73 years for the average American.

All my life, I have been driven by one dream, one goal, one vision: to overthrow a farm labor system in this nation that treats farm workers as if they were not important human beings. Farm workers are not agricultural implements; they are not beasts of burden to be used and discarded. That dream was born in my youth, it was nurtured in my early days of organizing. It has flourished. It has been attacked.

I'm not very different from anyone else who has ever tried to accomplish something with his life. My motivation comes from my personal life, from watching what my mother and father went through when I was growing up, from what we experienced as migrant workers in California. That dream, that vision grew from my own experience with racism, with hope, with a desire to be treated fairly, and to see my people treated as human beings and not as chattel. It grew from anger and rage, emotions I felt 40 years ago when people of my color were denied the right to see a movie or eat at a restaurant in many parts of California. It grew from the frustration and humiliation I felt as a boy who couldn't

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>migrant</th>
<th>mortality</th>
<th>implements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>moving from place to place in search of work</td>
<td>death</td>
<td>tools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>chattel</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>property or personal possession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
35 understand how the growers could abuse and exploit farm workers when there were so many of us and so few of them.

Later in the 50s, I experienced a different kind of exploitation. In San Jose, in Los Angeles and in other urban communities, we, the Mexican-American people, were dominated by a majority that was Anglo. I began to realize what other minority people had discovered; that the only answer, the only hope was in organizing. More of us had to become citizens, we had to register to vote, and people like me had to develop the skills it would take to organize, to educate, to help empower the Chicano people.

I spent many years before we founded the union learning how to work with people. We experienced some successes in voter registration, in politics, in battling racial discrimination -- successes in an era where Black Americans were just beginning to assert their civil rights and when political awareness among Hispanics was almost non-existent. But deep in my heart, I knew I could never be happy unless I tried organizing the farm workers. I didn't know if I would succeed, but I had to try.

All Hispanics, urban and rural, young and old, are connected to the farm workers' experience. We had all lived through the fields, or our parents had. We shared that common humiliation. How could we progress as a people even if we lived in the cities, while the farm workers, men and women of our color, were condemned to a life without pride? How could we progress as a people while the farm workers, who symbolized our history in this land, were denied self-respect? How could our people believe that their children could become lawyers and doctors and judges and business people while this shame, this injustice, was permitted to continue?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anglo</th>
<th>Chicano</th>
<th>union</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a white American not of Hispanic descent</td>
<td>an American of Mexican descent</td>
<td>an organization of workers formed to advance the interests of its members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>claim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Those who attack our union often say it's not really a union. It's something else, a social movement, a civil rights movement -- it's something dangerous. They're half right. The United Farm Workers is first and foremost a union, a union like any other, a union that either produces for its members on the bread-and-butter issues or doesn't survive. But the UFW has always been something more than a union, although it's never been dangerous, if you believe in the Bill of Rights. The UFW was the beginning. We attacked that historical source of shame and infamy that our people in this country lived with. We attacked that injustice, not by complaining, not by seeking handouts, not by becoming soldiers in the war on poverty; we organized!

Farm workers acknowledge we had allowed ourselves to become victims in a democratic society, a society where majority rules and collective bargaining are supposed to be more than academic theories and political rhetoric. And by addressing this historical problem, we created confidence and pride and hope in an entire people's ability to create the future. The UFW survival, its existence, were not in doubt in my mind when the time began to come.

After the union became visible, when Chicanos started entering college in greater numbers, when Hispanics began running for public office in greater numbers, when our people started asserting their rights on a broad range of issues and in many communities across this land. The union survival, its very existence, sent out a signal to all Hispanics that we were fighting for our dignity, that we were challenging and overcoming injustice, that we were empowering the least educated among us, the poorest among us. The message was clear. If it could happen in the fields, it could happen anywhere: in the cities,
in the courts, in the city councils, in the state legislatures. I didn’t really appreciate it at the time, but the coming of our union signaled the start of great changes among Hispanics that are only now beginning to be seen.

I’ve traveled through every part of this nation. I have met and spoken with thousands of Hispanics from every walk of life, from every social and economic class. And one thing I hear most often from Hispanics, regardless of age or position, and from many non-Hispanics as well, is that the farm workers gave them the hope that they could succeed and the inspiration to work for change.

From time to time, you will hear our opponents declare that the union is weak, that the union has no support, that the union has not grown fast enough. Our obituary has been written many times. How ironic it is that the same forces that argue so passionately that the union is not influential are the same forces that continue to fight us so hard.

The union’s power in agriculture has nothing to do with the number of farm workers on the union contract. It has nothing to do with the farm workers’ ability to contribute to democratic politicians. It doesn’t even have much to do with our ability to conduct successful boycotts. The very fact of our existence forces an entire industry, unionized and non-unionized, to spend millions of dollars year after year on increased wages, on improved working conditions, and on benefits for workers. If we were so weak and unsuccessful, why do the growers continue to fight us with such passion? Because as long as we continue to exist, farm workers will benefit from our existence, even if they
don’t work under union contract. It doesn’t really matter whether we have 100,000 or 500,000 members. In truth, hundreds of thousands of farm workers in California and in other states are better off today because of our work. And Hispanics across California and the nation who don’t work in agriculture are better off today because of what the farm workers taught people about organization, about pride and strength, about seizing control over their own lives.

Tens of thousands of children and grandchildren of farm workers and the children and grandchildren of poor Hispanics are moving out of the fields and out of the barrios and into the professions and into business and into politics, and that movement cannot be reversed. Our union will forever exist as an empowering force among Chicanos in the Southwest. That means our power and our influence will grow and not diminish.

Two major trends give us hope and encouragement. First, our union has returned to a tried and tested weapon in the farm workers non-violent arsenal: the boycott. After the Agricultural Labor Relations Act became law in California in 1975, we dismantled our boycott to work with the law. During the early and mid '70s millions of Americans supported our boycotts. After 1975, we redirected our efforts from the boycott to organizing and winning elections under the law. That law helped farm workers make progress in overcoming poverty and injustice.

At companies where farm workers are protected by union contracts, we have made progress in overcoming child labor, in overcoming miserable wages and working conditions, in overcoming sexual harassment of women workers, in overcoming

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>boycott</th>
<th>Agricultural Labor Relations Act</th>
<th>dismantle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>refusal by a group to buy goods or services to show support for a cause</td>
<td>law enacted by the state of California in 1975 to protect the right of farm workers to self-organize and negotiate the conditions of their employment</td>
<td>take apart</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
discrimination in employment, in overcoming dangerous pesticides, which poison our people and poison the food we all eat. Where we have organized these injustices soon passed in history, but under Republican Governor George Deukmejian, the law that guarantees our right to organize no longer protects farm workers; it doesn’t work anymore.

In 1982, corporate growers gave Deukmejian one million dollars to run for governor of California. Since he took office, Deukmejian has paid back his debt to the growers with the blood and sweat of California farm workers. Instead of enforcing the law as it was written against those who break it, Deukmejian invites growers who break the law to seek relief from governor’s appointees. What does all this mean for farm workers? It means that the right to vote in free elections is a sham. It means the right to talk freely about the union among your fellow workers on the job is a cruel hoax. It means that the right to be free from threats and intimidation by growers is an empty promise. It means that the right to sit down and negotiate with your employer as equals across the bargaining table and not as peons in the fields is a fraud. It means that thousands of farm workers, who are owed millions of dollars in back pay because their employers broke the law, are still waiting for their checks. It means that 36,000 farm workers, who voted to be represented by the United Farm Workers in free elections, are still waiting for contracts from growers who refuse to bargain in good faith. It means that for farm workers child labor will continue. It means that infant mortality will continue. It means that malnutrition among children will continue. It means the short life expectancy and the inhuman living and working conditions will continue.
Are these make-believe threats? Are they exaggerations? Ask the farm workers who are waiting for the money they lost because the growers broke the law. Ask the farm workers who are still waiting for growers to bargain in good faith and sign contracts. Ask the farm workers who have been fired from their jobs because they spoke out for the union. Ask the farm workers who have been threatened with physical violence because they support the UFW, and ask the family of Rene Lopez, the young farm worker from Fresno who was shot to death last year because he supported the union as he came out of a voting booth. Ask the farm workers who watch their children go hungry in this land of wealth and promise. Ask the farm workers who see their lives eaten away by poverty and suffering.

These tragic events force farm workers to declare a new international boycott of California grapes, except the three percent of grapes produced under union contract. That is why we are asking Americans, once again, to join the farm workers by boycotting California grapes. The newest Harris Poll revealed that 17 million Americans boycotted grapes. We are convinced that those people and that goodwill have not disappeared. That segment of the population which makes the boycotts work are the Hispanics, the Blacks, the other minorities, our friends in labor and the Church. But it is also an entire generation of young Americans who matured politically and socially in the '60s and the '70s, millions of people for whom boycotting grapes and other products became a socially accepted pattern of behavior. If you were young, Anglo and/or near campers during the late '60s and early '70s, chances are you supported farm workers.
15 years later, the men and women of that generation are alive and well. They are in their mid 30s and 40s. They are pursuing professional careers, their disposable incomes are relatively high, but they are still inclined to respond to an appeal from farm workers. The union’s mission still has meaning for them. Only today, we must translate the importance of a union for farm workers into the language of the 1980s. Instead of talking about the right to organize, we must talk about protection against sexual harassment in the fields. We must speak about the right to quality food and food that is safe to eat. I can tell you the new language is working, the 17 million are still there. They are responding not to picket lines and leafleting alone, but to the high-tech boycott of today, a boycott that uses computers and direct mail and advertising techniques, which has revolutionized business and politics in recent years. We have achieved more success with a boycott in the first 11 months of 1984 than we achieved in the last 14 years, since 1970.

The other trend that gives us hope is the monumental growth of Hispanic influence in this country. And what that means is increased population, increased social and economic clout and increased political influence. South of the Sacramento River, Hispanics now make up now more than 25 percent of the population. That figure will top 30 percent by the year 2000. There are now 1.1 million Spanish-surnamed registered voters in California. In 1975, there were 200 Hispanic elected officials at all levels of government. In 1984, there are over 400 elected judges, city council members, mayors, and legislators. In light of these trends, it’s absurd to believe or to suggest that we are going to go back in time as a union or as a people.
The growers often try to blame the union for their problems, to lay their sins off on us, sins for which they only have themselves to blame. The growers only have themselves to blame as they begin to reap the harvest of decades of environmental damage they have brought upon the land: the pesticides, the herbicides, the soil fumigants, the fertilizers, the salt deposits from thoughtless irrigation, the ravages of years of unrestrained poisoning of our soil and water. Thousands of acres of land in California have already been irrevocably damaged by this wanton abuse of nature. Thousands more will be lost unless growers understand that dumping more and more poison from the soil won’t solve their problems on the short or on the long term.

Health authorities in many San Joaquin Valley towns already warn young children and pregnant mothers not to drink the water, because of nitrates from fertilizers which has poisoned the ground water. The growers have only themselves to blame for an increasing demand by consumers for higher-quality food, food that isn’t tainted by toxics, food that doesn’t result from plant mutations or chemicals that produce red luscious-looking tomatoes that taste like alfalfa. The growers are making the same mistake American automakers made in the '60s and '70s when they refused to produce small economical cars and opened up the door to increased foreign competition.

Growers only have themselves to blame for increasing attacks on the publicly financed handouts and government welfare: water subsidies, mechanization research, huge subsidies for not growing crops. These special privileges came into being before the Supreme Court’s “one person, one vote” decision, at a time when rural lawmakers dominated the legislature and the Congress. Soon, those handouts could be in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>wanton</th>
<th>subsidies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>careless, undisciplined</td>
<td>money granted by the government</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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jeopardy as government searches for more revenue and as urban taxpayers take a closer look at front programs and who they really benefit. The growers only have themselves to blame for the humiliation they have brought upon succeeding waves of immigrant groups that have sweated and sacrificed for a hundred years to make this industry rich.

For generations, they have **subjugated** entire races of dark-skinned farm workers. These are the sins of growers, not the farm workers. We didn't poison the land. We didn't open the door to imported produce. We didn't covet billions of dollars in government handouts. We didn't abuse and exploit the people who work the land. Today the growers are like a punch-drunk old boxer who doesn't know he's past his prime. The times are changing; the political and social environment has changed. The chickens are coming home to roost, and the time to account for past sins is approaching.

I am told these days farm workers should be discouraged and pessimistic. The Republicans control the governor’s office and the White House. There is a conservative trend in the nation. Yet, we are filled with hope and encouragement. We have looked into the future and the future is ours. History and inevitability are on our side. The farm workers and their children and the Hispanics and their children are the future in California, and corporate growers are the past. Those politicians who ally themselves with the corporate growers and against farm workers and the Hispanics are in for a big surprise. They want to make their careers in politics; they want to hold power 20 and 30 years from now. But 20 and 30 years from now, in Modesto, in Salinas, in Fresno, in Bakersfield, in the Imperial Valley and in many of the great cities of California, those communities will be dominated by farm workers and not by growers, by the children and grandchildren of farm workers and not by the children and grandchildren of growers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>subjugate</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>to control; to make submissive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These trends are part of the forces of history which cannot be stopped. No person and no organization can resist them for very long; they are inevitable. Once social change begins it cannot be reversed. You cannot un-educate the person who has learned to read. You cannot humiliate the person who feels pride. You cannot oppress the people who are not afraid anymore. Our opponents must understand that it’s not just the union we have built -- unions like other institutions can come and go -- but we’re more than institutions. For nearly 20 years, our union has been on the cutting edge of a people's cause, and you cannot do away with an entire people and you cannot stamp out a people's cause. Regardless of what the future holds for the union, regardless of what the future holds for farm workers, our accomplishments cannot be undone. La causa, our cause, doesn't have to be experienced twice. The consciousness and pride that were raised by our union are alive and thriving inside millions of young Hispanics who will never work on a farm.

Like the other immigrant groups, the day will come when we win the economic and political rewards, which are in keeping with our numbers in society. The day will come when the politicians will do the right thing for our people out of political necessity and not out of charity or idealism. That day may not come this year. That day may not come during this decade, but it will come someday. And when that day comes, we shall see the fulfillment of that passage from the Book of Matthew in the New Testament: "The last shall be first, and the first shall be last." And on that day, our nation shall fulfill its creed, and that fulfillment shall enrich us all. Thank you very much.
PART 2

MAKING EVIDENCE-BASED CLAIMS

“We organized!”

OBJECTIVE:
Students develop the ability to make evidence-based claims through a close reading of the text.

ACTIVITIES

1- INDEPENDENT READING AND FINDING SUPPORTING EVIDENCE
Students independently read part of the text and use the Making EBC Tool to look for evidence to support a claim made by the teacher.

2- READ ALOUD AND CLASS DISCUSSION
Students follow along as they listen to the same part of the text being read aloud and discuss a series of text-dependent questions.

3- FIND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE IN PAIRS
In pairs, students use the Making EBC Tool to look for evidence to support additional claims about the text made by the teacher.

4- CLASS DISCUSSION OF EBCs
The class discusses evidence in support of claims found by student pairs.

5- FORMING EBCs IN PAIRS
In pairs, students use the Forming EBC Tool to make an evidence-based claim of their own and present it to the class.

ALIGNMENT TO CCSS

TARGETED STANDARD(S): RI.7.1
RI.7.1: Cite several pieces of textual evidence to support analysis of what the text says explicitly as well as inferences drawn from the text.

SUPPORTING STANDARD(S): RI.7.2 RI.7.3 SL.7.1
RI.7.2: Determine two or more central ideas in a text and analyze their development over the course of the text; provide an objective summary of the text.
RI.7.3: Analyze the interactions between individuals, events, and ideas in a text (e.g., how ideas influence individuals or events, or how individuals influence ideas or events).
SL.7.1: Engage effectively in a range of collaborative discussions (one-on-one, in groups, and teacher-led) with diverse partners on grade 7 topics, texts, and issues, building on others’ ideas and expressing their own clearly.
**ACTIVITY 1: INDEPENDENT READING AND FINDING SUPPORTING EVIDENCE**

Students independently read part of the text and use the Making EBC Tool to look for evidence to support a claim made by the teacher.

**INSTRUCTIONAL NOTES**

Students independently work on paragraphs 6-19 of Chavez’s Commonwealth Club Address. Depending on scheduling and student ability, students can be assigned to read and complete the tool for homework. Teachers should decide what works best for their students. It’s essential that students have opportunity to read the text independently. All students must develop the habit of perseverance in reading. Assigning the reading as homework potentially gives them more time with the text. Either way, it might be a good idea to provide some time at the beginning of class for students to read the section quietly by themselves. This ensures that all students have had at least some independent reading time.

Also depending on scheduling and student ability, some students might choose (or be encouraged) to read ahead. Instructional focus should follow the pacing outlined in the activities, but students will only benefit from reading and re-reading the text throughout the duration of the unit.

**ACTIVITY 2: READ ALOUD AND CLASS DISCUSSION**

Students follow along as they listen to the same part of the text being read aloud and discuss a series of text-dependent questions.

**INSTRUCTIONAL NOTES**

Students follow along as they listen to paragraphs 6-19 read aloud and discuss three text-dependent questions:

1. Beginning in paragraph 6, Chavez describes how to overcome the unfair treatment of farm workers. What solution does Chavez discover to the problem the farm workers faced?

2. Chavez introduces the United Farm Workers union in paragraph 9. What are some of the things the union did and how did it affect the Chicano society in general?

3. After a long description of the successes of the UFW, Chavez discusses Governor George Deukmejian. What effect does Chavez say that Governor George Deukmejian had on the farm worker’s movement?

Read the text aloud to the class while students follow along. Alternatively, students could be asked to read aloud to the class. Work through the text using the following three text-dependent questions.
ACTIVITY 2: READ ALOUD AND CLASS DISCUSSION (CONT’D)

INSTRUCTIONAL NOTES

1- Beginning in paragraph 6, Chavez describes how to overcome the unfair treatment of farm workers. What solution does Chavez discover to the problem the farm workers faced?

Organization, as a word, and as a concept, makes frequent appearances early in Chavez’s address, which serves as a build-up to the climactic moment when Chavez proclaims that organization was the farm workers’ response to exploitation by the farm owners: “We organized!” (64). Chavez suggests early in his address that organizing will play a role in the farm workers’ response to exploitation when he says that his dream of overthrowing the farm labor system was developed in his early days of organizing (P4). Chavez links his success with organizing the farm workers to the experience of learning how to use organization as a tool of empowerment for the community of Mexican American people in San Jose against the oppression by the non-Hispanic, Anglo majority: “I began to realize what other minority people had discovered: That the only answer—the only hope—was in organizing […] and people like me had to develop the skills it would take to organize, to educate, to help empower the Chicano people” (P6). Track how Chavez’s skill of organization developed, helping students identify the instances of when “organization” is used in the address before Chavez’s climatic exclamation in line 64. Discuss how the story of its development in Chavez’s life, as well as the repetition of the word, serve to lead up to and increase the memorability of one of Chavez’s most critical points, i.e., organization as the way for minorities to resist oppression.

2- Chavez introduces the United Farm Workers union in paragraph 9. What are some of the things the union did and how did it affect the Chicano society in general?

The United Farm Workers union, or UFW, had a positive effect on the Hispanic population in general. Chavez says that the very fact the union existed at all was a message to Hispanics everywhere that “we were challenging and overcoming injustice” (74-76). By ceasing to continue allowing themselves to be victims, Chavez asserts, the farm workers “created confidence and pride and hope in an entire people’s ability to create the future” (65-66, 68-70). Chavez enables the listener/reader to anticipate that this positive effect would be felt by Hispanic people at large in a slightly earlier portion of the text when he states that farm workers were symbolic reminders to the Hispanic people of their history in the United States: “All Hispanics—urban and rural, young and old—are connected to the farm worker’s experience […] We shared that common humiliation” (47-49). Guide students in connecting the positive effect the UFW had for Hispanics in general back to Chavez’s implicit reasoning for why it would have this effect, helping students trace the progression of Chavez’s thought with evidence from the text. Help students discuss the effect this has on the reader/listener, how it helps the reader/listener to (implicitly) make connections across different parts of the text, which prepares the reader/listener to understand (by drawing an inference) why non-farm working Hispanics also benefitted by the creation and existence of the UFW without Chavez explicitly repeating this information.
**ACTIVITY 2: READ ALOUD AND CLASS DISCUSSION (CONT’D)**

**INSTRUCTIONAL NOTES**

3- After a long description of the successes of the UFW, Chavez discusses Governor George Deukmejian. What effect does Chavez say that Governor George Deukmejian had on the farm worker’s movement?

Chavez describes how after 1975, the conditions of the farm workers dramatically improved under the passage of the Agricultural Labor Relations Act, which, Chavez says, “helped farm workers make progress in overcoming poverty and injustice […] in overcoming child labor, in overcoming miserable wages and working conditions, in overcoming sexual harassment of women worker” (114-121). The UFW, consequently, shifted its focus from using boycotts to further improve farm workers’ conditions to winning elections in the political arena. These improved working conditions for the farm workers, however, were undermined in 1982, when George Deukmejian was elected governor of California. According to Chavez, Deukmejian, instead of enforcing the law, invited farm owners who broke the law “to seek relief from the governor’s appointees” (128-129). Thus, because it was not enforced, the law that guaranteed the rights of farm workers to organize was rendered impotent and no longer protected farm workers (122-123). Guide students in tracking the cause and effect relationship of these events, i.e.: the passage of Agricultural Labor Relations Act => improved working conditions; election of Governor Deukmejian => undermining of Agricultural Labor Relations Act => loss of improved working conditions. Ask students to specifically identify how conditions worsened for the workers under Deukmejian’s governorship, including, for example, how workers lost protection from threats and intimidation by growers, how they were cheated out of back pay, and how child labor continued (P18). Help students understand the connection between these worsening conditions and the undermining of Chavez’s central strategy for minorities to resist exploitation —organization.

**ACTIVITY 3: FIND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE**

In pairs, students use the Making EBC Tool to look for evidence to support additional claims about the text made by the teacher.

**INSTRUCTIONAL NOTES**

Once the class has reached a solid understanding of the text, connect it to the skill of making claims and supporting them with evidence by presenting a few main claims. Pass out the tools and have students work in pairs to find evidence to support the claims.

Collect each student’s Making EBC Tool with the evidence they found for the first claim. These should be evaluated to get an assessment of where each student is in the skill development. Students should use their tools for their work in pairs—repeating the first claim and refining their evidence based on the read aloud and class discussion. Even though students are not finding the evidence independently, they should each fill in the tools to reinforce their acquisition of the logical structure among the ideas. Students should get into the habit of using quotation marks when recording direct quotes and including the line numbers of the evidence.

The instructional focus here is developing familiarity with claims about texts and the use of textual evidence to support them. Students should still not be expected to develop complete sentences to express supporting evidence. The pieces of evidence should be as focused as possible. The idea is for students to identify the precise points in the text that support the claim. This focus is lost if the pieces of evidence become too large. The tools are constructed to elicit a type of “pointing” at the evidence.

One approach for ensuring a close examination of claims and evidence is to provide erroneous claims that contradict textual evidence and ask students to find the places that disprove the claim. Students could then be asked to modify it to account for the evidence.
ACTIVITY 4: CLASS DISCUSSION OF EBCs

The class discusses evidence in support of claims found by student pairs.

INSTRUCTIONAL NOTES

After students have finished their work in pairs, regroup for a class discussion. Have pairs volunteer to present their evidence to the rest of the class. Discuss the evidence, evaluating how each piece supports the claims. Begin by modeling the evaluation, referring to the checklist, and then call on students to evaluate the evidence shared by the other pairs. They can offer their own evidence to expand the discussion. Carefully guide the exchanges, explicitly asking students to support their evaluations with reference to the text. These constructive discussions are essential for the skill development. Listening to and evaluating the evidence of others and providing text-based criticism expands students’ capacity to reason through the relationship between claims and evidence. Paying close attention to and providing instructional guidance on the student comments is as important to the process as evaluating the tools and creates a class culture of supporting all claims (including oral critiques) with evidence.

Using the Text-Centered Discussion Checklist is one way of talking about and supporting student participation in class and pair discussions, especially if students are already familiar with the TCD checklist from previous units. If not, time can be taken (if desired) to introduce them to some or all of the criteria of effective text-centered discussions.

ACTIVITY 5: FORMING EBCs IN PAIRS

In pairs, students use the Forming EBC Tool to make an evidence-based claim of their own and present it to the class.

INSTRUCTIONAL NOTES

Once the claims and evidence have been discussed, students return to the pairs and use the tool to make an evidence-based claim of their own. Pairs should make a single claim, but each student should fill in his or her own tool. Regroup and discuss the claims and evidence as a class. Pairs can use their tool to present their claims and evidence orally. Talk through the process modeled in the tool, including the nature of the details that stood out to students, the reasoning they used to group and relate them, and the claim they developed from the textual evidence. Draw upon the Forming EBC Handout and EBC Criteria Checklist I to help guide discussion.
INDEPENDENT READING ACTIVITY

Students read paragraphs 20-29 of the speech and use the Forming EBC Tool to make a claim and support it with evidence. This activity overlaps with the first activity of Part 3 and can be given as homework or done at the beginning of the next class.

ASSESSMENT OPPORTUNITIES

The Making EBC Tools should be evaluated to assess the development of the student’s grasp of the relationship between claims and textual evidence. They should show progress in the relevance and focus of the evidence. The Forming EBC Tools are students’ first attempts at making their own claims with the help of a peer. Basic claims are fine at this point. Use the EBC Criteria Checklist to structure the evaluation and feedback to students. Evaluation should focus on the validity and clarity of the claim and the relevance of the evidence. Recording the “thinking” part of the tool is important in order to strengthen the student’s reasoning skills as well as provide them with the academic vocabulary to talk about them.

Evidence should be in quotation marks and the reference recorded. Using quotation marks helps students make the distinction between quotes and paraphrases. It also helps them to eventually incorporate quotes properly into their writing. Recording references is critical not only for proper incorporation in writing, but also because it helps students return to text for re-evaluating evidence and making appropriate selections.

The Text-Centered Discussion Checklist can be used to evaluate student participation in discussions for formative and diagnostic information. Teachers and students can get a sense of areas where development in speaking and listening skills are needed.
**FINDING DETAILS**

I find interesting details that are related and that stand out to me from reading the text closely.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Detail 1 (Ref.: )</th>
<th>Detail 2 (Ref.: )</th>
<th>Detail 3 (Ref.: )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONNECTING THE DETAILS**

I re-read and think about the details, and explain the connections I find among them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What I think about detail 1:</th>
<th>What I think about detail 2:</th>
<th>What I think about detail 3:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How I connect the details:

**MAKING A CLAIM**

I state a conclusion that I have come to and can support with evidence from the text after reading and thinking about it closely.

My claim about the text:

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAIM:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLAIM:</th>
<th>Supporting Evidence</th>
<th>Supporting Evidence</th>
<th>Supporting Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Reference: )</td>
<td>(Reference: )</td>
<td>(Reference: )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Qualitative Features of Complex Text

- Subtle and frequent transitions
- Multiple/subtle themes and purposes
- Density of information
- Unfamiliar settings, topics, events
- Lack of repetition, overlap, or similarity of words and sentences
- Complex sentences
- Uncommon vocabulary
- Lack of words, sentences or paragraphs that pull the meaning together
- Longer paragraphs
- Any text structure which is less narrative
- A mix of text structures

Creating Text Dependent Questions

1. Identify the standards that are being addressed
2. Identify the core understandings and key ideas of the text
3. Target small but critical-to-understand passages
4. Target vocabulary and text structure
5. Tackle tough sections head-on: notice things that are confusing and ask questions about them
6. Create coherent sequences of text-dependent questions
7. Create the assessment
Syntax Definition (1818)

“Syntax is a word which comes from the Greek. It means, in that language, the joining of several things together; and, as used by grammarians, it means those principles and rules which teach us how to put words together so as to form sentences. It means, in short, sentence-making. Having been taught by the rules of Etymology what are the relationships of words, how words grow out of each other, how they are varied in their letters in order to correspond with the variation in the circumstances to which they apply. Syntax will teach you how to give all your words their proper situations or places, when you come to put them together into sentences.”

William Cobbett, A Grammar of the English Language in a Series of Letters: Intended for the Use of Schools and of Young Persons in General, but More Especially for the Use of Soldiers, Sailors, Apprentices, and Plough-Boys, 1818

My definition:
Using the “Juicy Sentence” to Help Students Access Complex Text

Chris Hayes

The juicy sentence is a strategy developed by Lily Wong Fillmore, specifically to address the needs of ELL’s and accessing complex text. But I have found it to be a useful tool for all students. The juicy sentence provides the opportunity for students to gain a deeper understanding of the text by breaking apart a complex sentence. Through this close look at the sentence, many aspects of language can be taught in context. Here is my version of how the juicy sentence can be used in a classroom:

- After engaging the students in a close read using an exemplar, a BAP lesson, a RAP lesson, or even a class read-aloud, I choose a sentence worthy of our time, which may include: vocabulary worth investigating further, complex structure, language features that match grade-level language standards, etc.
- I write the sentence on the board and ask the students to copy the sentence verbatim. Then the students are instructed to write what they think the sentence means. We then discuss the meaning of the sentence, which will usually lead to a deeper discussion of how that sentence relates to the story we had read. I also take this opportunity to discuss any vocabulary and the use of context clues to determine the meaning (other instructional opportunities may come up for vocabulary—word replacement, etc.)
- Then I have the students write about “anything else they notice” about the sentence. This is difficult at first, as they need some modeling as to what this means. This is when I really go into the language standards—circling verbs and discussing tense, circling words with affixes and discussing meanings, base words, etc., circling punctuation and discussing purpose, etc. ... The grade-level language standards really drive this learning.
- The last part I ask the students to do is to rewrite the sentence using the same structure as the author. For example, if the sentence uses quotations, the students will include the same quotations. If the sentence is a compound sentence, the students will write a compound sentence. The topic does not have to mimic the original sentence, and actually, I think it shows a deeper understanding when it doesn’t.

Here is an example from a fifth-grade story found in Houghton Mifflin Harcourt’s Katie’s Trunk: 

*My breath got caught somewhere midst my stomach and chest, and I could not get it back.*
This sentence gives the opportunity to discuss how it relates to the overall meaning of the story, to determine the meaning of *midst* using context clues, to teach about compound sentence structures, and verb endings. Another version of how to use a juicy sentence is described in the article found on this website:


After using the juicy sentence to examine syntax, you can take this instruction further. Judith Hochman uses kernel and complex sentences to expand students’ understanding of syntax in her book *Teaching Basic Writing Skills*. A kernel is a sentence broken into the smallest sentence possible (Volcanoes erupt). The complex sentence expands a kernel into a more detailed, complex sentence. You can begin this understanding by tearing the juicy sentence into a kernel and expanding it using the student’s own language. Then this learning can be connected to sentence expansion with the students’ personal writing. Hochman’s book also gives specific examples to kindergarten-sixth grade.

More information about Lily Wong Fillmore’s work can be found in this article:

## Multiple Choice Question Stems

**Aligned by Standard**

Extracted from the June 2014, August 2014, and January 2015 NYS Common Core Regents Exams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RI.2</th>
<th>RI.3</th>
<th>RI.4</th>
<th>RI.5</th>
<th>RI.6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Which statement from the text best summarizes the central idea?</td>
<td>The author’s anecdote about ___ serves to introduce a ___</td>
<td>The speaker repeats the word ___ throughout the ___ in order to ___</td>
<td>The primary purpose of lines ___ through ___ is to clarify the ___</td>
<td>The references to ___ in lines ___ through ___ contribute to the authors’ purpose by suggesting that ___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With which statement would the author of this text most likely agree?</td>
<td>How do lines ___ through ___ develop a claim?</td>
<td>What effect is created by the use of irony in line ___ and lines ___ through ___?</td>
<td>The authors reference to ___ is used to help clarify ___</td>
<td>The function of lines ___ through ___ is to ___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The central idea of the ___ paragraph focuses on the ___</td>
<td>The reference to ___ in lines ___ through ___ is used to emphasize the questioning of our ___</td>
<td>The authors attempt to engage the audience through the use of ___</td>
<td>The speaker’s use of [literary element] in lines ___ and ___ serves to represent the ___</td>
<td>Lines ___ through ___ establish a ___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With which statement would the authors most likely agree?</td>
<td>Which statement best clarifies the sentence in lines ___ through ___?</td>
<td>Which purpose is not referenced in the ___</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The description of ___ in lines ___ through ___ emphasizes the idea of ___.

The examples presented in lines ___ through ___ help the reader understand ___.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RL.2</th>
<th>RL.3</th>
<th>RL.4</th>
<th>RL.5</th>
<th>RL.6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The sentence ___ contributes to the central theme by...?</td>
<td>In this passage, the conversation between ___ and ___(lines ___ through ___) serves to ___</td>
<td>Lines ___ through ___ suggest that the ___ people</td>
<td>The comparison in lines ___ and ___ emphasizes the ___</td>
<td>The poet’s purpose in the poem can best be described as ___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As used on Line ( ) the phrase ___ means that things are ___</td>
<td>Which analysis is best supported by the details in lines ___ through ___ of the text?</td>
<td>Which word best describes the narrator’s tone ___</td>
<td>The author structures the text around references to ___</td>
<td>Why does &lt;character&gt; not “character thought/dialogue” in line ___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The primary function of lines ___ is to ___</td>
<td>The author’s description of the conversation between ___ and ___ in lines ___ through ___ serves mostly to ___</td>
<td>The reference to [character’s] “descriptive trait” and “descriptive trait” in line ___ reveals his/her ___</td>
<td>The narrator’s purpose &lt;in the first stanza&gt; is to ___</td>
<td>Lines ___ through ___ illustrate the narrator’s belief that ___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which quotation best reflects a central theme in the text?</td>
<td>The conversation with ___ (lines ___ through ___) leaves the narrator with a sense of ___</td>
<td>How do the words ...(line), “<em><strong>” (line), and “</strong></em>” (line) advance the author’s purpose ___</td>
<td>What is the effect of withholding ___</td>
<td>The author’s description of ___ stresses the ___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ___ references throughout the poem serve to ___</td>
<td>The narrator views “___” as ___(line) because the narrator wishes to ___</td>
<td>The prevailing tone of the poem is ___</td>
<td>What is most likely not a purpose of the repetition of the phrase “___”?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>