

Background: Healing with magnets is an idea that's been around for hundreds of years—since ancient times in some cultures (such as China and Greece). But recently, due to an increased interest in alternative medicine and news of some well-known athletes using magnetic therapy for pain relief, the interest in healing with magnets seems to be growing. Does this idea really work?

Modern electronic devices are found in every room of every home around the country. Most people carry one or more devices with them at all times. With all the radiation used by and produced by wired and wireless, is there any increased health risks associated with the living in the resulting electromagnetic fields (EMFs)?

Objective:

Support the opinion that magnets DO or DO NOT help heal the human body.

Procedure: Evaluate scientific studies and summarize findings. The studies must be from peer reviewed scientific journals published within the last five years.

Product:

An opinion paper, not more than one page in length (not including references)

Papers must be printed and submitted on or before the due date.

The Ideas to develop should include how magnets (supposedly) work to heal specifically or how EMF radiation (supposedly) harms people specifically.

The organization of the work should clearly support the opinion you have been assigned to support. The support for the opinion is most critical.

Evaluate the credibility of the sources. Determine if there might be potential flaws, or bias in the research before using it as a reference.

At the end of the paper (page 2) include at least 3 references cited in APA style. More on the conventions (format) can be found at the Purdue OWL site:

<http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/560/10/>

Grading

The attached Argumentative Instructional Writing Rubric will be used for assessment. At the top of each category are point values (1-4) will be doubled. 5 x 8 = 40 total Submissions must follow formatting outlined below on or before the posted due date:

Name / Course / Teacher / Date all listed single spaced at the top right

Title - Centered

Double spaced text with two spaces after a period

1 inch margins on all sides, Arial or Helvetica, 12 point font, printed black

3 ref = 3pts
Apa = 1pt
Title = 1pt

45

Background: Modern electronic devices are found in every room of every home around the country. Most people carry one or more devices with them at all times. With all the radiation used by and produced by wired and wireless, is there any increased health risks associated with the living in the resulting electromagnetic fields (EMFs)?

Objective:

Support the opinion that electromagnetic fields DO or DO NOT cause human illness.

Procedure: Evaluate scientific studies and summarize findings. The studies must be from peer reviewed scientific journals published within the last five years.

Product:

Papers of 1-2 pages, printed and submitted on or before the due date.

The organization of the work should clearly support the opinion you have been assigned to support. The support for the opinion is most critical.

Evaluate the credibility of the sources. Determine if there might be potential flaws, or bias in the research before using it as a reference.

Reference at least 3 sources cited in APA style. More on the conventions (format) can be found at the Purdue OWL site:

<http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/560/10/>

Grading

The attached Argumentative Instructional Writing Rubric will be used for assessment. At the top of each category are point values (1-4) will be doubled. 5 x 8 = 40 total
Submissions must follow formatting outlined below:

Name / Course / Teacher / Date all listed single spaced at the top right

Title – Centered

Double spaced text with two spaces after a period

1 inch margins on all sides, Arial or Helvetica, 12 point font, printed black

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|--|
| <p>Evidence</p> <p>Development: Elaboration of</p> | <p>The writer</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ develops and justifies claim(s) and counterclaim(s) fairly, thoroughly and insightfully ➤ supplies thorough and convincing support/evidence: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ facts ○ extended definitions ○ concrete details ○ quotations/other information ○ strong examples ➤ effectively uses a variety of elaborative techniques ➤ effectively uses evidence from sources that is smoothly integrated, comprehensive, relevant and concrete | <p>The writer</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ develops and justifies claim(s) and counterclaim(s) fairly and thoroughly ➤ supplies adequate relevant support/evidence: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ facts ○ extended definitions ○ concrete details ○ quotations/other information ○ strong examples ➤ adequately uses some elaborative techniques ➤ adequately uses some evidence from sources that is integrated, though citations may be general or imprecise | <p>The writer</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ develops claim(s) and counterclaim(s) fairly ➤ supplies some relevant support/evidence: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ facts ○ details ○ examples ○ quotations ○ examples ➤ uses weak or uneven elaborative techniques ➤ uses evidence from sources that is weakly integrated, and citations, if present, are uneven | <p>The writer</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ attempts to develop claim(s) and counterclaim(s) ➤ provides little or no relevant support/evidence: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ facts ○ details ○ examples ○ quotations ○ examples ➤ use little or no elaborative techniques ➤ uses little or no evidence from sources or evidence that is erroneous or irrelevant |
| <p>Language and Vocabulary</p> | <p>The writer</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ clearly and effectively expresses ideas, using precise words, phrases and clauses to manage the logic and clarity of the argument ➤ uses academic and domain-specific vocabulary that is clearly appropriate for the audience and purpose ➤ effectively establishes and maintains a formal style and objective tone | <p>The writer</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ adequately expresses ideas, employing a mix of precise with more general words, phrases and clauses to support the logic of the argument ➤ uses domain-specific vocabulary that is generally appropriate for the audience and purpose ➤ adequately establishes and maintains a formal style and objective tone | <p>The writer</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ unevenly expresses ideas, using simplistic words, phrases and clauses to support the logic of the argument ➤ uses domain-specific vocabulary that may at times be inappropriate for the audience and purpose ➤ partially establishes a formal style and objective tone | <p>The writer</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ expresses vague, unclear or confusing ideas, rarely using words, phrases and clauses that support the argument ➤ uses limited language or domain-specific vocabulary ➤ rarely establishes a formal style and objective tone |
| <p>Conventions</p> | <p>The writer</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ demonstrates a strong command of conventions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ demonstrates effective use of capitalization, punctuation, and spelling, with insignificant errors that need little or no editing ○ effectively demonstrates correct usage of hyphenation conventions ○ demonstrates few, if any, errors in usage and sentence formation | <p>The writer</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ demonstrates an adequate command of conventions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ demonstrates adequate use of capitalization, punctuation, and spelling, with few errors that need editing but do not distract from the argument ○ adequately demonstrates correct usage of hyphenation conventions ○ demonstrates some minor errors in usage and sentence formation that do not obscure meaning | <p>The writer</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ demonstrates a partial command of conventions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ demonstrates inconsistent use of capitalization, punctuation, and spelling, with errors that need editing to clarify the argument ○ sometimes demonstrates correct usage of hyphenation conventions ○ demonstrates frequent errors in usage and sentence formation that may obscure meaning | <p>The writer</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ demonstrates a lack of command of conventions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ demonstrates incorrect use of capitalization, punctuation, and spelling, with frequent and severe errors that need editing to convey the argument. ○ seldom demonstrates correct usage of hyphenation conventions ○ demonstrates frequent and severe errors in usage and sentence formation that often obscure meaning |

Source: Aligned to Next Generation West Virginia Content Standards and Objectives for English Language Arts and Literacy (Last Revised 11/1/2012)
Smarter Balanced Claim 2: Students can produce effective and well-grounded writing for a range of purposes and audiences.

ARGUMENTATIVE - Instructional Writing Rubric

| | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|---|--|
| | Exemplary – Exceeds Standard | Proficient – Meets Standard | Partial – Approaches Standard | Minimal – Begins Standard |
| Statement of Purpose/Focus | <p>The writer</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ effectively and consistently focuses on a clearly identified purpose and topic throughout ➤ effectively introduces precise, knowledgeable claim(s) ➤ effectively establishes the significance of the claim(s) ➤ clearly distinguishes the claim(s) from alternate or opposing claim(s) ➤ effectively anticipates the audience's point of view: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ knowledge level ○ concerns ○ values ○ possible biases relative to the claim | <p>The writer</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ adequately focuses on an identified purpose and topic ➤ adequately introduces precise, knowledgeable claim(s) ➤ adequately establishes the significance of the claim(s) ➤ distinguishes the claim(s) from alternate or opposing claim(s) ➤ adequately anticipates the audience's point of view: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ knowledge level ○ concerns ○ values ○ possible biases relative to the claim | <p>The writer</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ somewhat focuses on an identified purpose and topic ➤ introduces claim(s), but claim(s) may be unclear and unfocused ➤ partially establishes the significance of the claim(s) ➤ somewhat acknowledges the existence of alternate or opposing claim(s) ➤ somewhat anticipates the audience's point of view: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ knowledge level ○ concerns ○ values ○ possible biases relative to the claim | <p>The writer</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ shows a minimal focus on purpose and topic, and response may be very brief ➤ shows an attempt to introduce claim(s), but claim(s) may be confusing or ambiguous ➤ does not establish the significance of the claim(s) ➤ does not acknowledge the existence of alternate or opposing claim(s) ➤ shows a minimal consideration of the audience's point of view: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ knowledge level ○ concerns ○ values ○ possible biases relative to the claim |
| Organization | <p>The writer</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ uses a clear and effective organizational structure that effectively and logically sequences claims, counterclaims, reasons and evidence creating unity and completeness ➤ effectively and consistently uses a variety of transitional strategies (efficient and meaningful words, phrases and clauses, as well as varied syntax) to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ link major sections of the text ○ make strong connections among ideas ○ clarify relationships between <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ claims and reasons ▪ reasons and evidence ▪ claims and counterclaims ➤ provides an effective introduction ➤ provides a powerful conclusion that follows from and effectively supports the argument presented | <p>The writer</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ uses an evident organizational structure that adequately sequences claims, counterclaims, reasons and evidence creating a sense of completeness ➤ adequately uses transitional strategies (words, phrases and clauses, as well as varied syntax) with some variety to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ link major sections of the text ○ make adequate, if slightly inconsistent, connections among ideas ○ clarify relationships between <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ claims and reasons ▪ reasons and evidence ▪ claims and counterclaims ➤ provides an adequate introduction ➤ provides a conclusion that follows from and adequately supports the argument presented | <p>The writer</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ uses an inconsistent organizational structure that partially sequences claims, reasons and evidence with some evident flaws ➤ inconsistently uses basic transitional strategies (some words, phrases or clauses) with little variety to <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ link major sections of the text ○ make limited connections among ideas ➤ provides a limited introduction ➤ provides a conclusion that partially and weakly supports the argument presented | <p>The writer</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ uses little or no discernible organizational structure ➤ uses few or no transitional strategies (limited language structures) with frequent extraneous ideas that may intrude ➤ provides a minimal or no introduction ➤ does not provide a conclusion that supports the argument presented |