

Close Reading and Complex Text

ELA I

Grade 9–12

Day 3

Table of Contents

Objectives: Self-Assessment	3
President Barack Obama’s Nobel Lecture: A Just and Lasting Peace	4
Text Complexity: Qualitative Measures Rubric: INFORMATIONAL TEXT	10
Syntax Definition (1818)	11
Juicy Sentence Slides	12
Let’s Try One	13
Language Progressive Skills, by Grade	14
Juicy Sentence Instruction: Your Turn	15
Juicy Sentence Instruction: Sample Mini-Lesson Script	16
The Difference in Rigor and Alignment	19
Scaffold for Close Reading: Acceptance-Speech TDQs	20
Developing A Series of Text-Based Scaffolding Questions	23

Objectives: Self-Assessment

DAY 3 OBJECTIVES SELF-ASSESSMENT	Pre-Day 3 Session	Post-Day 3 Session
	1= Not Yet 2= Unsure 3= I Believe So, with Some Practice 4= Absolutely, Yes	1= Not Yet 2= Unsure 3= I Believe So, with Some Practice 4= Absolutely, Yes
I am comfortable using my understanding of the intersection of language equity and learners to make instructional decisions.		
I can explain how text-complexity analysis impacts instructional focus.		
I can apply the Juicy Sentence protocol to scaffold student understanding of text.		
I can develop scaffolding questions aligned to a standard.		

President Barack Obama’s Nobel Lecture: A Just and Lasting Peace

By Barack Obama 2009

Barack Obama served as the 44th President of the United States from 2009 to 2017. In 2009, Obama was also awarded the Nobel Peace Prize for his work strengthening international relations. In his acceptance speech, Obama discusses the relationship between war and peace. As you read, take notes on how Obama thinks the world can work toward peace.

Your Majesties, Your Royal Highnesses, distinguished members of the Norwegian Nobel Committee, citizens of America, and citizens of the world:

I receive this honor with deep gratitude and great humility. It is an award that speaks to our highest aspirations — that for all the cruelty and hardship of our world, we are not mere prisoners of fate. Our actions matter, and can bend history in the direction of justice.

And yet I would be remiss if I did not acknowledge the considerable controversy that your generous decision has generated. In part, this is because I am at the beginning, and not the end, of my labors on the world stage. Compared to some of the giants of history who've received this prize — Schweitzer and King; Marshall and Mandela — my accomplishments are slight. And then there are the men and women around the world who have been jailed and beaten in the pursuit of justice; those who toil in humanitarian organizations to relieve suffering; the unrecognized millions whose quiet acts of courage and compassion inspire even the most hardened cynics. I cannot argue with those who find these men and women — some known, some obscure to all but those they help — to be far more deserving of this honor than I.

But perhaps the most profound issue surrounding my receipt of this prize is the fact that I am the Commander-in-Chief of the military of a nation in the midst of two wars. One of these wars is winding down. The other is a conflict that America did not seek; one in which we are joined by 42 other countries — including Norway — in an effort to defend ourselves and all nations from further attacks.

Still, we are at war, and I'm responsible for the deployment of thousands of young Americans to battle in a distant land. Some will kill, and some will be killed. And so I come here with an acute sense of the costs of armed conflict — filled with difficult questions about the relationship between war and peace, and our effort to replace one with the other.

Now these questions are not new. War, in one form or another, appeared with the first man. At the dawn of history, its morality was not questioned; it was simply a fact, like drought or disease — the manner in which tribes and then civilizations sought power and settled their differences.

And over time, as codes of law sought to control violence within groups, so did philosophers and clerics and statesmen seek to regulate the destructive power of war. The concept of a “just war” emerged, suggesting that war is justified only when certain conditions were met: if it is waged as a last resort or in self-defense; if the force used is proportional; and if, whenever possible, civilians are spared from violence.

Of course, we know that for most of history, this concept of “just war” was rarely observed. The capacity of human beings to think up new ways to kill one another proved inexhaustible, as did our capacity to exempt from mercy those who look different or pray to a different God. Wars between armies gave way to wars between nations — total wars in which the distinction between combatant and civilian became blurred. In the span of 30 years, such carnage would twice engulf this continent. And while it's hard to conceive of a cause more just than the defeat of the Third Reich and the Axis powers, World War II was a conflict in which the total number of civilians who died exceeded the number of soldiers who perished.

In the wake of such destruction, and with the advent of the nuclear age, it became clear to victor and vanquished alike that the world needed institutions to prevent another world war. And so, a quarter century after the United States Senate rejected the League of Nations — an idea for which Woodrow Wilson received this prize — America led the

world in constructing an architecture to keep the peace: a Marshall Plan and a United Nations, mechanisms to govern the waging of war, treaties to protect human rights, prevent genocide, restrict the most dangerous weapons.

In many ways, these efforts succeeded. Yes, terrible wars have been fought, and atrocities committed. But there has been no Third World War. The Cold War ended with jubilant crowds dismantling a wall. Commerce has stitched much of the world together. Billions have been lifted from poverty. The ideals of liberty and self-determination, equality and the rule of law have haltingly advanced. We are the heirs of the fortitude and foresight of generations past, and it is a legacy for which my own country is rightfully proud.

And yet, a decade into a new century, this old architecture is buckling under the weight of new threats. The world may no longer shudder at the prospect of war between two nuclear superpowers, but proliferation may increase the risk of catastrophe. Terrorism has long been a tactic, but modern technology allows a few small men with outsized rage to murder innocents on a horrific scale.

Moreover, wars between nations have increasingly given way to wars within nations. The resurgence of ethnic or sectarian conflicts; the growth of secessionist movements, insurgencies, and failed states — all these things have increasingly trapped civilians in unending chaos. In today's wars, many more civilians are killed than soldiers; the seeds of future conflict are sown, economies are wrecked, civil societies torn asunder, refugees amassed, children scarred.

I do not bring with me today a definitive solution to the problems of war. What I do know is that meeting these challenges will require the same vision, hard work, and persistence of those men and women who acted so boldly decades ago. And it will require us to think in new ways about the notions of just war and the imperatives of a just peace.

We must begin by acknowledging the hard truth: We will not eradicate violent conflict in our lifetimes. There will be times when nations — acting individually or in concert — will find the use of force not only necessary but morally justified.

I make this statement mindful of what Martin Luther King Jr. said in this same ceremony years ago: “Violence never brings permanent peace. It solves no social problem: it merely creates new and more complicated ones.” As someone who stands here as a direct consequence of Dr. King's life work, I am living testimony to the moral force of non-violence. I know there's nothing weak — nothing passive — nothing naïve — in the creed and lives of Gandhi and King.

But as a head of state sworn to protect and defend my nation, I cannot be guided by their examples alone. I face the world as it is, and cannot stand idle in the face of threats to the American people. For make no mistake: Evil does exist in the world. A non-violent movement could not have halted Hitler's armies. Negotiations cannot convince al Qaeda's leaders to lay down their arms. To say that force may sometimes be necessary is not a call to cynicism — it is a recognition of history; the imperfections of man and the limits of reason.

I raise this point, I begin with this point because in many countries there is a deep ambivalence about military action today, no matter what the cause. And at times, this is joined by a reflexive suspicion of America, the world's sole military superpower.

But the world must remember that it was not simply international institutions — not just treaties and declarations — that brought stability to a post-World War II world. Whatever mistakes we have made, the plain fact is this: The United States of America has helped underwrite global security for more than six decades with the blood of our citizens and the strength of our arms. The service and sacrifice of our men and women in uniform has promoted peace and prosperity from Germany to Korea, and enabled democracy to take hold in places like the Balkans. We have borne this burden not because we seek to impose our will. We have done so out of enlightened self-interest — because we seek a better future for our children and grandchildren, and we believe that their lives will be better if others' children and grandchildren can live in freedom and prosperity.

So yes, the instruments of war do have a role to play in preserving the peace. And yet this truth must coexist with another — that no matter how justified, war promises human tragedy. The soldier's courage and sacrifice is full of glory, expressing devotion to country, to cause, to comrades in arms. But war itself is never glorious, and we must never trumpet it as such.

So part of our challenge is reconciling these two seemingly irreconcilable truths — that war is sometimes necessary, and war at some level is an expression of human folly. Concretely, we must direct our effort to the task that President Kennedy called for long ago. “Let us focus,” he said, “on a more practical, more attainable peace, based not on a sudden revolution in human nature but on a gradual evolution in human institutions.” A gradual evolution of human institutions. What might this evolution look like? What might these practical steps be?

To begin with, I believe that all nations — strong and weak alike — must adhere to standards that govern the use of force. I — like any head of state — reserve the right to act unilaterally if necessary to defend my nation. Nevertheless, I am convinced that adhering to standards, international standards, strengthens those who do, and isolates and weakens those who don't.

The world rallied around America after the 9/11 attacks, and continues to support our efforts in Afghanistan, because of the horror of those senseless attacks and the recognized principle of self- defense. Likewise, the world recognized the need to confront Saddam Hussein when he invaded Kuwait — a consensus that sent a clear message to all about the cost of aggression.

Furthermore, America — in fact, no nation — can insist that others follow the rules of the road if we refuse to follow them ourselves. For when we don't, our actions appear arbitrary and undercut the legitimacy of future interventions, no matter how justified.

And this becomes particularly important when the purpose of military action extends beyond self- defense or the defense of one nation against an aggressor. More and more, we all confront difficult questions about how to prevent the slaughter of civilians by their own government, or to stop a civil war whose violence and suffering can engulf an entire region.

I believe that force can be justified on humanitarian grounds, as it was in the Balkans, or in other places that have been scarred by war. Inaction tears at our conscience and can lead to more costly intervention later. That's why all responsible nations must embrace the role that militaries with a clear mandate can play to keep the peace.

America's commitment to global security will never waver. But in a world in which threats are more diffuse, and missions more complex, America cannot act alone. America alone cannot secure the peace. This is true in Afghanistan. This is true in failed states like Somalia, where terrorism and piracy is joined by famine and human suffering. And sadly, it will continue to be true in unstable regions for years to come.

The leaders and soldiers of NATO countries, and other friends and allies, demonstrate this truth through the capacity and courage they've shown in Afghanistan. But in many countries, there is a disconnect between the efforts of those who serve and the ambivalence of the broader public. I understand why war is not popular, but I also know this: The belief that peace is desirable is rarely enough to achieve it. Peace requires responsibility. Peace entails sacrifice. That's why NATO continues to be indispensable. That's why we must strengthen U.N. and regional peacekeeping, and not leave the task to a few countries. That's why we honor those who return home from peacekeeping and training abroad to Oslo and Rome; to Ottawa and Sydney; to Dhaka and Kigali — we honor them not as makers of war, but of wagers — but as wagers of peace.

Let me make one final point about the use of force. Even as we make difficult decisions about going to war, we must also think clearly about how we fight it. The Nobel Committee recognized this truth in awarding its first prize for peace to Henry Dunant — the founder of the Red Cross, and a driving force behind the Geneva Conventions.

Where force is necessary, we have a moral and strategic interest in binding ourselves to certain rules of conduct. And even as we confront a vicious adversary that abides by no rules, I believe the United States of America must remain a standard bearer in the conduct of war. That is what makes us different from those whom we fight. That is a source of our strength. That is why I prohibited torture. That is why I ordered the prison at Guantanamo Bay closed. And that is why I have reaffirmed America's commitment to abide by the Geneva Conventions. We lose ourselves when we compromise the very ideals that we fight to defend. And we honor — we honor those ideals by upholding them not when it's easy, but when it is hard.

I have spoken at some length to the question that must weigh on our minds and our hearts as we choose to wage war. But let me now turn to our effort to avoid such tragic choices, and speak of three ways that we can build a just and lasting peace.

First, in dealing with those nations that break rules and laws, I believe that we must develop alternatives to violence that are tough enough to actually change behavior — for if we want a lasting peace, then the words of the international community must mean something. Those regimes that break the rules must be held accountable. Sanctions must be met with increased pressure — and such pressure exists only when the world stands together as one.

One urgent example is the effort to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons, and to seek a world without them. In the middle of the last century, nations agreed to be bound by a treaty whose bargain is clear: All will have access to peaceful nuclear power; those without nuclear weapons will forsake them; and those with nuclear weapons will work towards disarmament. I am committed to upholding this treaty. It is a centerpiece of my foreign policy. And I'm working with President Medvedev to reduce America and Russia's nuclear stockpiles.

But it is also incumbent upon all of us to insist that nations like Iran and North Korea do not game the system. Those who claim to respect international law cannot avert their eyes when those laws are flouted. Those who care for their own security cannot ignore the danger of an arms race in the Middle East or East Asia. Those who seek peace cannot stand idly by as nations arm themselves for nuclear war.

The same principle applies to those who violate international laws by brutalizing their own people. When there is genocide in Darfur, systematic rape in Congo, repression in Burma — there must be consequences. Yes, there will be engagement; yes, there will be diplomacy — but there must be consequences when those things fail. And the closer we stand together, the less likely we will be faced with the choice between armed intervention and complicity in oppression.

This brings me to a second point — the nature of the peace that we seek. For peace is not merely the absence of visible conflict. Only a just peace based on the inherent rights and dignity of every individual can truly be lasting.

It was this insight that drove drafters of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights after the Second World War. In the wake of devastation, they recognized that if human rights are not protected, peace is a hollow promise.

And yet too often, these words are ignored. For some countries, the failure to uphold human rights is excused by the false suggestion that these are somehow Western principles, foreign to local cultures or stages of a nation's development. And within America, there has long been a tension between those who describe themselves as realists or idealists — a tension that suggests a stark choice between the narrow pursuit of interests or an endless campaign to impose our values around the world.

I reject these choices. I believe that peace is unstable where citizens are denied the right to speak freely or worship as they please; choose their own leaders or assemble without fear. Pent-up grievances fester, and the suppression of tribal and religious identity can lead to violence. We also know that the opposite is true. Only when Europe became free did it finally find peace. America has never fought a war against a democracy, and our closest friends are governments that protect the rights of their citizens. No matter how callously defined, neither America's interests — nor the world's — are served by the denial of human aspirations.

So even as we respect the unique culture and traditions of different countries, America will always be a voice for those aspirations that are universal. We will bear witness to the quiet dignity of reformers like Aung Sang Suu Kyi; to the bravery of Zimbabweans who cast their ballots in the face of beatings; to the hundreds of thousands who have marched silently through the streets of Iran. It is telling that the leaders of these governments fear the aspirations of their own people more than the power of any other nation. And it is the responsibility of all free people and free nations to make clear that these movements — these movements of hope and history — they have us on their side.

Let me also say this: The promotion of human rights cannot be about exhortation alone. At times, it must be coupled with painstaking diplomacy. I know that engagement with repressive regimes lacks the satisfying purity of indignation. But I also know that sanctions without outreach — condemnation without discussion — can carry forward only a crippling status quo. No repressive regime can move down a new path unless it has the choice of an open door.

In light of the Cultural Revolution's horrors, Nixon's meeting with Mao appeared inexcusable — and yet it surely helped set China on a path where millions of its citizens have been lifted from poverty and connected to open societies. Pope John Paul's engagement with Poland created space not just for the Catholic Church, but for labor leaders like Lech Walesa. Ronald Reagan's efforts on arms control and embrace of perestroika not only improved relations with the Soviet Union, but empowered dissidents throughout Eastern Europe. There's no simple formula here. But we must try as best we can to balance isolation and engagement, pressure and incentives, so that human rights and dignity are advanced over time.

Third, a just peace includes not only civil and political rights — it must encompass economic security and opportunity. For true peace is not just freedom from fear, but freedom from want.

It is undoubtedly true that development rarely takes root without security; it is also true that security does not exist where human beings do not have access to enough food, or clean water, or the medicine and shelter they need to survive. It does not exist where children can't aspire to a decent education or a job that supports a family. The absence of hope can rot a society from within.

And that's why helping farmers feed their own people — or nations educate their children and care for the sick — is not mere charity. It's also why the world must come together to confront climate change. There is little scientific dispute that if we do nothing, we will face more drought, more famine, more mass displacement — all of which will fuel more conflict for decades. For this reason, it is not merely scientists and environmental activists who call for swift and forceful action — it's military leaders in my own country and others who understand our common security hangs in the balance.

Agreements among nations. Strong institutions. Support for human rights. Investments in development. All these are vital ingredients in bringing about the evolution that President Kennedy spoke about. And yet, I do not believe that we will have the will, the determination, the staying power, to complete this work without something more — and that's the continued expansion of our moral imagination; an insistence that there's something irreducible that we all share.

As the world grows smaller, you might think it would be easier for human beings to recognize how similar we are; to understand that we're all basically seeking the same things; that we all hope for the chance to live out our lives with some measure of happiness and fulfillment for ourselves and our families.

And yet somehow, given the dizzying pace of globalization, the cultural leveling of modernity, it perhaps comes as no surprise that people fear the loss of what they cherish in their particular identities — their race, their tribe, and perhaps most powerfully their religion. In some places, this fear has led to conflict. At times, it even feels like we're moving backwards. We see it in the Middle East, as the conflict between Arabs and Jews seems to harden. We see it in nations that are torn asunder by tribal lines.

And most dangerously, we see it in the way that religion is used to justify the murder of innocents by those who have distorted and defiled the great religion of Islam, and who attacked my country from Afghanistan. These extremists are not the first to kill in the name of God; the cruelties of the Crusades are amply recorded. But they remind us that no Holy War can ever be a just war. For if you truly believe that you are carrying out divine will, then there is no need for restraint — no need to spare the pregnant mother, or the medic, or the Red Cross worker, or even a person of one's own faith. Such a warped view of religion is not just incompatible with the concept of peace, but I believe it's incompatible with the very purpose of faith — for the one rule that lies at the heart of every major religion is that we do unto others as we would have them do unto us.

Adhering to this law of love has always been the core struggle of human nature. For we are fallible. We make mistakes, and fall victim to the temptations of pride, and power, and sometimes evil. Even those of us with the best of intentions will at times fail to right the wrongs before us.

But we do not have to think that human nature is perfect for us to still believe that the human condition can be perfected. We do not have to live in an idealized world to still reach for those ideals that will make it a better place. The non-violence practiced by men like Gandhi and King may not have been practical or possible in every circumstance, but the love that they preached — their fundamental faith in human progress — that must always be the North Star that guides us on our journey.

For if we lose that faith — if we dismiss it as silly or naïve; if we divorce it from the decisions that we make on issues of war and peace — then we lose what's best about humanity. We lose our sense of possibility. We lose our moral compass.

Like generations have before us, we must reject that future. As Dr. King said at this occasion so many years ago, “I refuse to accept despair as the final response to the ambiguities of history. I refuse to accept the idea that the 'isness' of man's present condition makes him morally incapable of reaching up for the eternal 'oughtness' that forever confronts him.”

Let us reach for the world that ought to be — that spark of the divine that still stirs within each of our souls.

Somewhere today, in the here and now, in the world as it is, a soldier sees he's outgunned, but stands firm to keep the peace. Somewhere today, in this world, a young protestor awaits the brutality of her government, but has the courage to march on. Somewhere today, a mother facing punishing poverty still takes the time to teach her child, scrapes together what few coins she has to send that child to school — because she believes that a cruel world still has a place for that child's dreams.

Let us live by their example. We can acknowledge that oppression will always be with us, and still strive for justice. We can admit the intractability of depravation, and still strive for dignity. Clear-eyed, we can understand that there will be war, and still strive for peace. We can do that — for that is the story of human progress; that's the hope of all the world; and at this moment of challenge, that must be our work here on Earth.

Thank you very much.

Copyright © The Nobel Foundation (2009)

Text Complexity: Qualitative Measures Rubric: INFORMATIONAL TEXT

Title of Text:

Text Author:

	<i>Exceedingly Complex</i>	<i>Very Complex</i>	<i>Moderately Complex</i>	<i>Slightly Complex</i>
<i>TEXT STRUCTURE</i>	<p>Organization: Connections between an extensive range of ideas, processes or events are deep, intricate and often ambiguous; organization is intricate or discipline-specific</p> <p>Text Features: If used, are essential in understanding content</p> <p>Use of Graphics: If used, intricate, extensive graphics, tables, charts, etc., are extensive are integral to making meaning of the text; may provide information not otherwise conveyed in the text</p>	<p>Organization: Connections between an expanded range of ideas, processes or events are often implicit or subtle; organization may contain multiple pathways or exhibit some discipline specific traits</p> <p>Text Features: If used, directly enhance the reader’s understanding of content</p> <p>Use of Graphics: If used, graphics, tables, charts, etc. support or are integral to understanding the text</p>	<p>Organization: Connections between some ideas or events are implicit or subtle; organization is evident and generally sequential or chronological</p> <p>Text Features: If used, enhance the reader’s understanding of content</p> <p>Use of Graphics: If used, graphic, pictures, tables, and charts, etc. are mostly supplementary to understanding the text</p>	<p>Organization: Connections between ideas, processes or events are explicit and clear; organization of text is chronological, sequential or easy to predict</p> <p>Text Features: If used, help the reader navigate and understand content but are not essential to understanding content.</p> <p>Use of Graphics: If used, graphic, pictures, tables, and charts, etc. are simple and unnecessary to understanding the text but they may support and assist readers in understanding the written text</p>
<i>LANGUAGE FEATURES</i>	<p>Conventionality: Dense and complex; contains considerable abstract, ironic, and/or figurative language</p> <p>Vocabulary: Complex, generally unfamiliar, archaic, subject-specific, or overly academic language; may be ambiguous or purposefully misleading</p> <p>Sentence Structure: Mainly complex sentences with several subordinate clauses or phrases and transition words; sentences often contains multiple concepts</p>	<p>Conventionality: Fairly complex; contains some abstract, ironic, and/or figurative language</p> <p>Vocabulary: Fairly complex language that is sometimes unfamiliar, archaic, subject-specific, or overly academic</p> <p>Sentence Structure: Many complex sentences with several subordinate phrases or clauses and transition words</p>	<p>Conventionality: Largely explicit and easy to understand with some occasions for more complex meaning</p> <p>Vocabulary: Mostly contemporary, familiar, conversational; rarely overly academic</p> <p>Sentence Structure: Primarily simple and compound sentences, with some complex constructions</p>	<p>Conventionality: Explicit, literal, straightforward, easy to understand</p> <p>Vocabulary: Contemporary, familiar, conversational language</p> <p>Sentence Structure: Mainly simple sentences</p>
<i>PURPOSE</i>	<p>Purpose: Subtle and intricate, difficult to determine; includes many theoretical or abstract elements</p>	<p>Purpose: Implicit or subtle but fairly easy to infer; more theoretical or abstract than concrete</p>	<p>Purpose: Implied but easy to identify based upon context or source</p>	<p>Purpose: Explicitly stated, clear, concrete, narrowly focused</p>
<i>KNOWLEDGE DEMANDS</i>	<p>Subject Matter Knowledge: Relies on extensive levels of discipline-specific or theoretical knowledge; includes a range of challenging abstract concepts</p> <p>Intertextuality: Many references or allusions to other texts or outside ideas, theories, etc.</p>	<p>Subject Matter Knowledge: Relies on moderate levels of discipline-specific or theoretical knowledge; includes a mix of recognizable ideas and challenging abstract concepts</p> <p>Intertextuality: Some references or allusions to other texts or outside ideas, theories, etc.</p>	<p>Subject Matter Knowledge: Relies on common practical knowledge and some discipline-specific content knowledge; includes a mix of simple and more complicated, abstract ideas</p> <p>Intertextuality: Few references or allusions to other texts or outside ideas, theories, etc.</p>	<p>Subject Matter Knowledge: Relies on everyday, practical knowledge; includes simple, concrete ideas</p> <p>Intertextuality: No references or allusions to other texts, or outside ideas, theories, etc.</p>

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:

Juicy Sentence Slides

JUICY SENTENCES

Juicy Sentences: What Are They?

Juicy Sentences are sentences:

- Within a complex text that are critical to understanding of the text.
- That may have unusual or confusing syntax.
- That are worth unpacking as a class.
- That can serve as a teachable moment supported by Language and Reading standards.
- That model strong writing for students to emulate.

JUICY SENTENCES

How Do We Select Them?

Select a Juicy Sentence using the following four considerations:

- Sentence Meaning: How important is this sentence to overall understanding of the text?
- Sentence Language: Is there important academic vocabulary or language in the sentence?
- Sentence Structure: What is important about the structure of the sentence in terms of alignment to a Language standard?
- Sentence Writing: How can this link directly to the kinds of writing my students are working on?

JUICY SENTENCES

What Is the Process?

The sentence is read aloud.

 **AMPLIFY** language

Students rewrite or paraphrase the sentence.

Teacher checks paraphrasing with class.

Students write what the sentence means.

Teacher checks student understanding of meaning.

Students write what they notice about the sentence.

 **ATTEND** to the language of the standards

Teacher provides direct instruction on specific grammar or language.

Students write a new sentence using the structure.

Teacher reviews sentences for evidence of understanding.

Let's Try One

At the dawn of history, its morality was not questioned; it was simply a fact, like drought or diseases — the manner in which tribes and then civilizations sought power and settled their differences.

Copy the sentence.

What does this sentence mean?

Write other things that you notice.

Write a new sentence mimicking the author's structure.

Language Progressive Skills, by Grade

Language Progressive Skills, by Grade

The following skills, marked with an asterisk (*) in Language standards 1–3, are particularly likely to require continued attention in higher grades as they are applied to increasingly sophisticated writing and speaking.

Standard	Grade(s)										
	3	4	5	6	7	8	9–10	11–12			
L.3.1f. Ensure subject-verb and pronoun-antecedent agreement.	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
L.3.3a. Choose words and phrases for effect.	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
L.4.1f. Produce complete sentences, recognizing and correcting in appropriate fragments and run-ons.		*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
L.4.1g. Correctly use frequently confused words (e.g., to/too/two; there/their).		*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
L.4.3a. Choose words and phrases to convey ideas precisely.*		*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
L.4.3b. Choose punctuation for effect.		*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
L.5.1d. Recognize and correct inappropriate shifts in verb tense.			*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
L.5.2a. Use punctuation to separate items in a series. [†]			*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
L.6.1c. Recognize and correct inappropriate shifts in pronoun number and person.											
L.6.1d. Recognize and correct vague pronouns (i.e., ones with unclear or ambiguous antecedents).											
L.6.1e. Recognize variations from standard English in their own and others' writing and speaking, and identify and use strategies to improve expression in conventional language.											
L.6.2a. Use punctuation (commas, parentheses, dashes) to set off nonrestrictive/parenthetical elements.											
L.6.3a. Vary sentence patterns for meaning, reader/listener interest, and style. [‡]											
L.6.3b. Maintain consistency in style and tone.											
L.7.1c. Place phrases and clauses within a sentence, recognizing and correcting misplaced and dangling modifiers.											
L.7.3a. Choose language that expresses ideas precisely and concisely, recognizing and eliminating wordiness and redundancy.											
L.8.1d. Recognize and correct inappropriate shifts in verb voice and mood.											
L.9–10.1a. Use parallel structure.											

*Subsumed by L.7.3a

†Subsumed by L.9–10.1a

‡Subsumed by L.11–12.3a

Juicy Sentence Instruction: Your Turn

5 minutes at your tables:

1. As a table, select a sentence from the text critical to its meaning that highlights an area of complexity identified in the complexity analysis.
2. Identify what you would provide a mini-lesson on based on areas of complexity.
3. Identify the standard to which your mini-lesson would align (see handout for ideas).
4. Practice with your group how you would deliver instruction around this sentence.
5. You will have a chance to either co-present or individually present your lesson with another group.
6. Ensure you have your own copy of notes.

45 minutes with new groups:

1. Count off by 4.
2. Write down your number.
3. Relocate with all of the other individuals in the room who share your number.
4. Take 5 minutes to copy your sentence onto a piece of chart paper. You will likely have a partner who shares your number AND sentence. If so, you will co-teach.
5. Each individual/pair who share a sentence will instruct for 10 minutes using Juicy Sentence protocol with the rest of the group as student-participants. (see packet handout: Implementing the Protocol)
6. At the end of each 10-minute session, participants can jot down feedback (what went well, even better if) to hand to peers after everyone has gone.

Juicy Sentence Instruction: Sample Mini-Lesson Script

Step 1: Introducing the Sentence

Step 1: Understand the Rationale:

Juicy sentences are best taught organically and in the context of a complex text to support the students' understanding of the text. Other sentences from the read-aloud may also be appropriate for juicy sentence work, depending on previous grammar learned, what students need to master or practice, or another standard that needs to be introduced. Students guide the learning within and across the juicy sentence lessons.

Write the following sentence on chart paper, chalkboard, or whiteboard posted in a location visible to all students.

Example: At the dawn of history, its morality was not questioned; it was simply a fact, like drought or disease— the manner in which tribes and then civilizations sought power and settled their differences.

Read the sentence to the students, then read it again chorally *with* the students.

It is sometimes helpful to point out the sentences before this sentence to emphasize context and address

pronouns.

Example: These questions are not new. War, in the form of another appeared with the first man. What questions? "These" questions are described in the previous sentence.

Direct students to copy the sentence. This will draw their attention to each of the details of the sentence (capitals, punctuation, spelling, etc.)

Step 2: Determining the Meaning

Direct students to write what they think the sentence means. Having students focus on the meaning of the sentence before they focus on the grammar supports the idea of reading to understand first.

Why Copy the Sentence?

Copying complex sentences pushes students into the specificity of the work. Copying the sentence correctly is often a challenge, when it comes to truly complex sentences. Students need to focus on the grammatical elements that they will use in their final sentences. It also transitions them into the next two phases: making meaning and identifying what is different or stand-out about the sentence.

Scaffolding options:

- If necessary, use the sentence stem: *I think this sentence means _____*. Discuss meanings with class.
- **Paraphrase** the sentence: This is an optional step and can be used as a scaffold to making meaning from the sentence. If students can paraphrase accurately, then they will likely understand the meaning of the sentence.

Example: Call on several students to discuss and get a group consensus about the meaning.

If needed, guide students with supporting questions to help them determine that the sentence is about war existing from the beginning of time.

- Ask, "What does 'at the dawn of history' mean?" and, "How do you know?"
- Ask, "What does 'mortality' mean?" "And what's being referred to?" Have students go back into the text and reread the previous sentence. [War]

- Ask, “What does ‘drought and disease’ mean?”
- Then Obama says, “it was simply a fact, like drought or disease” What is he comparing? After the discussion has elicited an appropriate meaning, write a model of what the sentence means on the juicy sentence chart paper, chalkboard, or whiteboard.
- Encourage the students to use synonyms rather than just restating the sentence (i.e., Life and death happens and is accepted, it’s how people got power and resolved their problems).

Step 3: Recording Notices

Direct students to record unusual language usage and grammatical elements that they notice in the sentence. When juicy sentences are introduced, students may struggle with noticing grammatical elements. Support the “noticings” by modeling a few until the students are more comfortable with the expectations. It is okay to allow students to struggle a bit the first time to establish the expectation of independent work and to determine the knowledge base of the students.

Language equity: Have the students turn and talk with a partner about the meaning of the sentence and the grammatical elements they noticed. Consider asking students to focus on unfamiliar words.

Example: Some students may struggle with the noun “morality.” It may benefit students to point this word out and discuss how it is used in the sentence.

- Ask: “Obama says ‘morality was not questioned’; who did not question?” Point out to the students that this is passive voice. Obama does not say: “No one questioned morality.” Why did he make this choice?

Step 4: Identifying and Discussing Grammatical Elements: A Mini-Lesson in Context

This sentence provides the opportunity to focus on the passive voice used by Obama throughout the speech which is considered grammatically incorrect in many places but used by choice.

Example:

Use of passive voice as an intentional rhetorical device in the sentence: “its morality was not questioned” and throughout the speech:

- *Some will be killed.*
- *Civilians will be spared from violence.*
- *Just war was rarely observed.*
- *Wars have been fought.*
- *Billions have been lifted.*
- *More civilians are killed than soldiers.*

Step 4: Understand the Rationale:
 Make sure the sentence you select has elements of grammatical complexity with which students are expected to be proficient at this grade level OR elements that you have noticed, through student writing trends, need additional focus. Use the sentence as an opportunity to provide a mini-lesson.

Share with students:

Passive voice as that thing established writers warn aspiring writers to avoid.

How does the passive voice work? Grammatically, the passive voice is a sentence in which a noun is acted upon rather than acting. The passive voice is a way of constructing a sentence so that the object of the action is cast as the subject. This construction often allows politicians to acknowledge wrongdoing without explicitly assigning blame for that wrongdoing.

This method of sentence construction de-emphasizes the actor and highlights the object, and it's this quality that rhetors often like to take advantage of.

"Mistakes were made" is commonly used in politics. What mistakes? Who made them? We don't know, and it's all because of a simple manipulation of sentence structure. It is a calculated way to avoid saying, "I made mistakes."

Throughout history, there have been many times politicians used passive voice to deflect blame.

Remind students of the context of this speech, accepting the Nobel Peace Prize, diplomacy, global leaders. Ask students why one would decide to use passive voice so consistently in a speech? Is this the time and place for Obama to award blame throughout his speech? Authors use language intentionally, including passive voice. Ask students if they can think of times when not blaming would be inappropriate.

Step 5: Directing students to craft a sentence using the subject of the mini-lesson and the structure of the sample sentence.

This allows you to ascertain student proficiency with implementing the learning from the mini-lesson as a formative assessment, and also provides students practice with constructing complex sentences. This is the most critical portion, where students demonstrate their growing ability to write like they read, with academic language and correct punctuation when using compound and complex sentences.

Extension:

Have students write a sentence in passive voice where they don't want to blame someone for something uncomfortable. Then have them rewrite the sentence in active voice. Partner and discuss the impact of each.

The Difference in Rigor and Alignment

Using Reading Standard 4, what is the difference in alignment and rigor between the questions in each column?

<p>Central Question: After Atticus’s speech to the court in Chapter 21, how do both the jury and the black community take a stand?</p>	<p>Central Question: How does the language Atticus uses in his speech to the court demonstrate his entrenchment and struggle with living in a racist society and his own privilege?</p>
<p>Scaffolds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• How is this case literally about black and white?• How is this case black and white, figuratively speaking?• Describe the irony of Atticus’s statement.• What do Atticus’s words mean without irony?• Atticus is speaking with irony here. What do his words really mean?	<p>Scaffolds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• What is the code to which Atticus refers? What is the evidence of her offense?• What is the lie to which Atticus refers, and what evidence does he use to dispute it?• How does Atticus use the terms “black” and “white” to advance his argument?• In what ways does his language place him in the 1930s? Has this argument changed?

Scaffold for Close Reading: Acceptance-Speech TDQs

As you answer the questions, consider the extent to which:

- the questions scaffold students toward the ability to answer the central question.
- your understanding of the text and question changes when you do the student work before providing instruction.

Central Question:

Based on your understanding of the meaning of words and phrases as Obama uses them in his Nobel Acceptance Speech, analyze how his word choice has a cumulative impact on the meaning and tone of the lecture.

Scaffolding Questions:

What does “just” mean as it is used in Obama’s explanation of the concept of a “just war?”

Compare the tone of paragraph 10 to paragraph 11 and 12. How does Obama’s use of language in each of these paragraphs impact his message and tone?

In paragraph 13, Obama talks about the need “to think in new ways about the notions of just war and the imperatives of a just peace.” Using the context of the text, define the following terms (no need for full sentences).

What is a notion?

What is an imperative?

What is a “just war?”

What is a “just peace”

How might the imperatives of a “just peace” align to the goals stated in paragraph 9 and go beyond the notions of a “just war?”

How is the language of these two terms used to convey a shift in tone in the speech?

In paragraph 16, Obama states, “To say that force may sometimes be necessary is not a call to cynicism – it is a recognition of history; the imperfections of man and the limits of reason.” What does “cynicism” mean in this context? What choice is Obama justifying in this statement?

What two truths does Obama refer to as needing to “coexist?” What does the choice of language highlight about these two truths?

How does Obama further develop an understanding of the concept of a “just peace” in paragraphs 36 and 37?

In paragraph 43, Obama states that “For true peace is not just freedom from fear, but freedom from want.” How does this statement relate to his statement in the following paragraph that “The absence of hope can rot a society from within.”? How does his use of language impact the tone and message?

What does Obama refer to as “the North Star that guides us on our journey.” What journey is he referring to in this statement?

Obama uses a quote from Dr. King to explain the future that he calls upon the reader to reject. What is the future that Obama and King call upon us to reject? How are the words “isness” and “oughtness” used to deliver this message? What other words add to the impact of this message?

What persuasive language technique does Obama use to conclude his speech in the last paragraph? What impact does it have on the tone and message he wants to leave the audience with at the conclusion?

Developing A Series of Text-Based Scaffolding Questions

Task:

- Circle your assigned question (or mark it to make sure you don't forget).
- With your table, identify the standard that your question aligns to.
- As a table (or two groups at a table), craft three or four text-based questions that **scaffold** students for success in answering the central question—*without giving the answer away*.
- Post these questions on chart paper beneath the central question.
- Select a member from the table to share out.

Questions:

1. What is the central idea of Obama's Nobel Acceptance Speech? Cite specific details to show how his central idea is developed and refined over the course of the text. How do those details develop or refine his central idea?
2. Delineate and evaluate Obama's argument and specific claims about a just and lasting peace. Cite evidence he provides to support his claims and evaluate it for relevance and sufficiency to assess the validity of his claims.
3. Analyze, providing specific details, how Obama uses references to Dr. King's speeches to develop and refine his own ideas in this speech.
4. What is Obama's point of view about mankind's potential to improve the human condition? Cite specific examples of how he uses rhetoric in his speech to advance this point of view.
5. Obama states, "The absence of hope can rot a society from within." Using details from the speech, explain what Obama means by this statement. How does this statement, and his elaboration on the meaning of this statement, impact tone in the second half of his speech?
6. Explain how Obama introduces, develops and draws connections, throughout the course of this speech, between the concept of "just" and the relationship between war and peace.

Self- and group evaluation:

To what extent do the questions...
... address the text by attending to its particular structure, concepts, ideas, events, and details?
... require students to use evidence from the text to demonstrate understanding of the text?
... require students to use evidence from the text to support their ideas about the text?
... attend to the words (academic vocabulary), phrases, and sentences within the text?

