|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FOCUS** | **CONTENT**  **and DEVELOPMENT** | **ORGANIZATION** | **STYLE** | **CONVENTIONS** |
| **10** | This essay tackles the topic in an innovative way--with a clear sense of audience and purpose--and has a clear argument | Each section of the essay develops the argument with logical arguments and specific, conclusive evidence which has been interpreted and clearly related to the writer's point. Paper contains supportive evidence from the original Podcast and a minimum of two other sources. | There is appropriate and effective organization, and the structure is carefully planned. | The style is energetic and precise, the sentence structure is varied, and the words are carefully chosen.  The writer has a clear idea of his or her role/position and audience. | There is evidence of careful editing since the essay contains few grammatical and/or mechanical errors and, if necessary, is correctly documented using MLA format. |
| **8** | Like the "A" paper, it has a clear argument and organizational strategy, but the argument may not be as interesting or insightful. | Each paragraph provides unified, coherent, and developed support for its thesis, but the support may not be uniformly conclusive and convincing.  Paper contains some supportive evidence from the original Podcast and a minimum of two other sources. | While the essay takes some "risks" and attempts complex strategies of development, there may be weaknesses in organizational strategy or its execution. | The style shows thought and promise, the sentence structure is somewhat varied, and the word choice is common to grade level.  The writer has a clear idea of his or her role/position and audience. | The essay shows evidence of editing since there are relatively few grammatical and/or mechanical errors.  If necessary, it properly documents sources. |
| **7** | The essay has an argument and organizational plan which demonstrates thought on the writer's part and awareness of audience, but the argument may be too general. | Paragraphs contribute to unified and coherent support, but the evidence may be predictable, may not be thoroughly interpreted, or may not be clearly related to the writer's point.  Paper contains minimal supportive evidence from the original Podcast and a minimum of two other sources. | Though there is an organizational plan which demonstrate thought on the writer's part, the paragraphs may be uneven in development and transition. | The style is basic and unsophisticated, the sentence structure is simple, and the word choice is limited.  The writer has a minimal idea of his or her role/position and audience. | Though the student has done some editing, grammatical and mechanical errors may still exist. If necessary, it adequately documents sources. |
| **6** | The essay may have a general or implied thesis, but the idea may be too broad, vague, or obvious.  Awareness of audience may not be evident. | Evidence may be too general, missing, not interpreted, irrelevant to the thesis, or inappropriately repetitive  Paper contains minimal supportive evidence from the original Podcast and a minimum of tw0 other sources. | The organizational plan may be inappropriate or inconsistently carried out. | The style may be compromised by repetitive or flawed sentence patterns and/or inappropriate diction and confusing syntax.  The writer has a vague idea of his or her role/position and audience. | Grammatical and mechanical errors may interfere with readability and indicate a less-than-adequate attempt at editing or unfamiliarity with some aspects of Standard Written English. The essay may fail to responsibly document borrowed material. |
| **5** | The essay may be an attempt to meet the requirements of the assignment, but it may have no apparent thesis or a self-contradictory one, or the essay's point is so general or obvious as to suggest little thinking-through of the topic. | The essay may lack development; evidence may be inappropriate and/or off-topic or may consist of generalizations, faulty assumptions, or errors of fact.  Paper contains no supportive evidence from the original Podcast and a minimum of two other sources. | The essay may display little or no apparent sense of organization. | The style suggests serious difficulties with fluency, which may be revealed in short, simple sentences and ineffective diction.  The writer has no idea of his or her role/position and audience. | Grammatical/mechanical errors may interfere with reader comprehension or indicate problems with basic literacy or a lack of understanding of Standard English usage. The essay may fail to responsibly document borrowed material. |

***SERIAL* PODCAST, ARGUMENTATIVE ESSAY**

What do you think happened on that day in January? Who do you think committed the murder: Adnan? Jay? Don? someone else Hae knew? a random stranger? When (opportunity), why (motive), and how (means), do you think they did it? Be sure to start with a thesis that somebody might argue against, then support your theory with facts from the podcast and your own independent research. Anticipate the possible counter-arguments and address those opposing views with reasonable answers that include factual evidence. Ultimately, if you were on the jury, how would you vote?

**Your essay must meet the following criteria:**

* be a minimum of 1,000 words long
* all drafts must be typed/word processed
* follow MLA format for style (double-spaced, 1” margins, 12 pt. Times New Roman font)
* have a proper MLA heading and a centered title
* follow the mechanics, usage, and grammar of standard written English
* ROUGH DRAFT due April 20th and FINAL DRAFT due April 27
* Both drafts should be submitted to google classroom
* When using facts from the podcast or outside research, you must have in-text citations.

**Paragraph 1:** Introduction/attention grabber. Summarize the details of Hae Min Lee’s murder. State your thesis about who committed the murder.

**Paragraph 2:** Explain your suspect’s motive. What reason (s) did your suspect have to kill Hae? How did you arrive at this conclusion? What counter-argument could be argued to disprove your theory? How would you discredit this counter-argument? Include specific details to explain your reasoning. Refer to factual evidence or testimony included in the podcast or that you discovered through your own research, not just your own opinion.

**Paragraph 3:** Explain how your suspect had the opportunity to kill Hae. How did your suspect manage to create the circumstances in which it was possible to kill Hae (i.e. how did this person get her alone and in a vulnerable position)? How did you arrive at this conclusion? What counter-argument could be argued to disprove your theory? How would you discredit this counter-argument? Include specific details to explain your reasoning. Refer to factual evidence or testimony included in the podcast or that you discovered through your own research, not just your own opinion.

**Paragraph 4:** Explain the means by which your subject was able to kill Hae. The autopsy revealed that Hae was manually strangled, but how did your suspect manage this? Is it reasonable to suggest that your suspect would have been able to strangle Hae? How did you arrive at this conclusion? What counter-argument could be argued to disprove your theory? How would you discredit this counter-argument? Include specific details to explain your reasoning. Refer to factual evidence or testimony included in the podcast or that you discovered through your own research, not just your own opinion.

**Paragraph 5:** Sum up your argument. Consider how you might judge your argument if you were on the jury. How would you vote: to convict or acquit? Explain why you think there is or isn’t reasonable doubt to convict your suspect, or anyone else for that matter. End with a call to action: what should happen next to bring justice for Hae and/or Adnan Sayed?