Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Philosophical Chairs Report $**

“She slang her pups last night,” said Slim. “Nine of ‘em. I drowned four of ‘em right off. She couldn’t feed that many” (Steinbeck 35)

“He’s all stiff with rheumatism. He ain’t no good to you, Candy. An’ he ain’t no good to himself. Why’n’t you shoot him, Candy?” (44).

Central Statement/Topic: Euthanasia is acceptable.

My original position

* Pro
* Con
* Undecided

How many times did I change my mind/seat? \_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Interesting points made by my peers:

E.O.1.1.b: **Use verbal** and nonverbal techniques **to communicate information**

E.O.1.1.c: **Define a position** and select evidence to **support that position**

E.O.1.1.e: **Use effective audience and oral delivery skills to persuade an audience**

E.O.1.1.a Initiate and **participate effectively in range of collaborative discussions** with diverse partners on grades 9-10 topics, texts, and issues, building on others’ ideas and expressing their own clearly and persuasively

E.o.1.2.b: **Follow the speaker’s arguments as they develop; take notes when appropriate**

E.O.1.2.e: **Evaluate arguments and evidence**

\*E.O.4.1.b: **Integrate information from different sources to form conclusions about an author’s assumptions, biases,** credibility, cultural and **social perspectives,** or **world views**

E.O.4.2.a: **Analyze** the purpose, question an issue, information, **points of view, implications and consequences, inferences, assumptions and concepts inherent in thinking**

E.O.4.2.b: **Assess strengths and weaknesses of their thinking and thinking of others by using criteria including relevance, clarity, accuracy, fairness,** significance, depth, breadth, **logic and precision**

**Philosophical Chairs Evaluation/Reflection**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

My ending position:

* Pro
* Con
* Undecided

How open-minded was I as I listened to other people talk?

* Mostly open-minded
* Partially open-minded
* Not very open-minded

Use the space below to explain why your position did or didn’t change and the reason for your thinking.

Think of our conversation about euthanasia, and our current reading *Of Mice and Men* by John Steinbeck, what do you think Steinbeck’s opinion of euthanasia was? Explain your answer using evidence (that you find yourself. Not the ones given at the beginning of the discussion!) from the text.
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In *Of Mice and Men*, by John Steinbeck, was it right for Slim to drown the puppies and for Carlson to kill Candy’s dog?

 **Yes No**

I believe it **was/ was not** okay for the dogs to be killed because

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
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\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Guidelines for Participation in Philosophical Chairs

1. Be sure you understand the central statement or topic before discussion begins.
2. Read the opening statement carefully.
3. Listen to the person who is speaking.
4. Understand the person’s point of view, seeking to understand his/her arguments even if you don’t agree.
5. Contribute your own thoughts, offering your reasons as succinctly as possible.
6. Respond to statements only, not to the person giving.
7. Change your mind about the statement as new information or reasoning is presented.
8. Move to the opposite side or to the undecided chairs as your thinking grows and changes.
9. Support the discussion by maintaining order and contributing constructive comments.
10. Summarize the main ideas presented on all sides.
11. Reflect on the experience during the closing activity.

**Optional Extension Activity for Philosophical Chairs Discussion**

E.O.2.2.e: Use flexible reading and note taking strategies to organize and make connections within and across informal texts

E.E.2.2.g: Delineate and evaluate the argument and specific claims in a text, assessing whether the reasoning is valid and the evidence is relevant and sufficient; identify false statements and fallacious reasoning

E.O.2.2.h: By the end of grade 9, read and comprehend literary nonfiction in the grades 9-10 complexity band proficiently…

E.O.3.2.a: Write arguments to support claims in an analysis of substantive topics or texts, using valid reasoning and relevant and sufficient evidence

 i: Introduce precise claim(s), distinguish the claim(s) from alternate or opposing claims, and create an organization that establishes clear relationships among claim(s, counter claims, reasons, and evidence

 iv: Use appropriate rhetorical appeals and genre to engage and guide the intended audience.

 v: Anticipate and address readers’ biases and expectations

 vi: Revise ideas and structure to improve depth of information and logic or organization

 vii. Establish and maintain a formal style and objective tone while attending to the norms and conventions of the discipline in which they are writing.

**Assignment:** Read the attached articles. While reading, identify strengths and weaknesses of the two individual’s arguments. Then, using this information, and the information from our Philosophical Chairs discussion, write a letter to the editor persuading readers to your side. You may want to review some examples of these in the *Durango Herald* or other newspapers online (*New York Times* and *Huffington Post* are some good ones!). These are due the Wednesday AFTER winter break (January 7, 2017). They should be typed, follow MLA formatting rules, and include at least 2 pieces of evidence/concrete details, though they will probably NOT follow the formal gourmet paragraph that we discussed and practiced in class.