

## CO301(L) – LESSON PLAN: UNIT 1; WEEK 4

### Preparation/Homework (for student & teacher)

#### Teacher:

1. Read “Using Toulmin’s Model of Argumentation” by J. Karbach; make slide outlining 6 components of Toulmin.
2. Read and review the article for analysis of Toulmin Method: “Elderly Lawmakers Won’t Step Aside, Prompting New Debate Over Age Limits” by John McCormick (available as a linked pdf below this lesson plan).
3. Make a slide outlining a Toulmin-based analysis of McCormick’s article, they are: (1) **Claim:** Debate over age limits is a popular topic; (2): perhaps there should be age limits for lawmakers. elderly lawmakers (2) **Grounds:** stats on age ranges heavily increasing over the decades (graphs on p. 3 & p. 5 of pdf are helpful here), statistics are found throughout the article as well as examples of popular politicians. (3) **Warrant** (implicit, implied – not explicitly stated): Older lawmakers do not serve in Washington as well as younger healthier public servants would. (4) **Backing** (additional support for the warrant): other positions regularly impose mandatory/expected retirement ages, average age of CEO (5): **Qualifier:** there is no universal expected number and everyone ages differently (p. 4) (6) **Rebuttal:** at the end former Senator Judd Gregg: “it takes so long to figure out the federal government” quote (p. 6). Clarify for students this article is clear and organized well – sometimes components are harder to spot.

#### Student:

1. Read “Using Toulmin’s Model of Argumentation” by J. Karbach; identify 6 components of a Toulmin analysis.
2. Read and review the article for analysis of Toulmin Method: “Elderly Lawmakers Won’t Step Aside, Prompting New Debate Over Age Limits” by John McCormick (available as a linked pdf below this lesson plan). Annotate the article highlighting components of Toulmin (start with claim, grounds and warrant). Is the warrant implied or explicit in McCormick’s work? Why? Was McCormick’s argument an effective representation under a Toulmin analysis? Why?

### Lesson Objectives

1. Identify the components of Toulmin model of argument.
2. Analyze how grounds (evidence) can work with claims on legal issues and those who create it.
3. Examine what type of audience would be served by a Toulmin-based argument vs. Rogerian approach
4. Think of values of Rogerian and Toulmin and potential combination of both (e.g. mediation vs. trial)

### Journal (beginning of class) &/or Discussion Prompt (prior to class)

1. In a Toulmin-based analysis, why would you choose an explicit warrant over an implied one? Vice versa? What audiences would be well-served by a Toulmin-based approach? Should Toulmin ever be avoided? Why?
2. We discussed Rogerian argument last week and Toulmin last class? Are there times you would use Rogerian over Toulmin? How could a Rogerian approach specific help you in a legal case? How could Toulmin? Is there ever a way you can imagine them being combined? If so, when and how?

### Activity in Class/Discussion

1. **Discussion (30 minutes):** Ask students and record the 6 components of Toulmin on the board; define each. Ask what components are essential for Toulmin and what are optional (**essential** claim, warrant, grounds). Apply Toulmin to McCormick article together. Careful that the claim and warrant don’t overlap (easy to do with implied warrants). Ask how well McCormick did meeting all the Toulmin requirements and why.
2. **Small Group Discussion and Student-Led Class Discussion (20 minutes):** divide class into 4 groups. Ask students to consider the following legal (writing) scenarios – mediation agreement in a divorce case, an opening statement in a jury trial in a criminal case, delivery an oral argument (on an appeal arguing to the Court for one side or the other) and in a politician’s campaign speech to voters. Where would Toulmin be particularly helpful and why? What about Rogerian? Be specific. Now, go through each scenario again and think how, if possible, you could use the other method, even in a small way to also persuade/inform your audience. Have each group report back on one type of legal scenario to the class.

### Connection to Course Objectives

1. Students articulate specific legal disciplines and connect and apply rhetorical theory and principles
2. Students identify what audiences are best served by different approaches to argument

### Reflections (draft notes below)