

Name:

Members of Your Group:

Structured Academic Controversy

ISSUE: The U.S. Should Not Use Nuclear Energy as a Main Source of Energy to Reduce Carbon Emissions and Curb Climate Change

Side A: *The U.S. should NOT use nuclear energy as a main source of energy to reduce carbon emissions and curb climate change.*

Side B: *The U.S. should increase the use of nuclear energy to reduce carbon emissions and curb climate change.*

Please check off each step as you complete each step below.

Partners Prepare

Find evidence to support your side of the argument, then determine key points to argue to support your position

- Develop questions/wonderings/connections with your partner
- Incorporate evidence to support your position and organize your points and evidence below (connect your points to your text evidence). You may find more than 3 pieces of evidence if you feel that would support your position better.
- Please use the organizer below to take detailed notes towards your consensus building

Our Position (circle):

Side A: *The U.S. should NOT use nuclear energy as a main source of energy to reduce carbon emissions and curb climate change.*

Side B: *The U.S. should increase the use of nuclear energy to reduce carbon emissions and curb climate change.*

Other Side's Position:

Key points to argue: (You must have at least 3)

Questions/wonderings/connections:

<p><u>Our Evidence 1</u> (name of article/specific quote/what evidence shows...):</p>	<p><u>Take Notes on Other Sides' Evidence 1</u> (what are they saying? What questions do you have?):</p>
<p><u>Our Evidence 2</u> (name of article/specific quote/what evidence shows...):</p>	<p><u>Take Notes on Other Sides' Evidence 2</u> (what are they saying? What questions do you have?):</p>
<p><u>Our Evidence 3</u> (name of article/specific quote/what evidence shows...):</p>	<p><u>Take Notes on Other Side's Evidence 3</u> (what are they saying? What questions do you have?):</p>
<p>Key points made by the <u>other side</u> and reactions to and/or questions for the other side:</p>	

Position Presentations

Listen actively and do not interrupt the other side as they represent their position.

Take notes as you listen to the other position and check off each step as you complete them.

- Side A presents their position/key points using supporting evidence from the texts.
- Side B restates what Side A's has said (don't refute; just restate the points of their argument "*It sounds like you're saying...*") and asks clarifying questions ("*What did you mean when you said...what do you think about...*")
- Side B presents their position using supporting evidence from the texts and asks clarifying questions

- Side A restates what Side B has said (don't refute; just restate the points of their argument "It sounds like you're saying...").
- Both teams discuss/evaluate/ask questions about the other team's arguments ("*These are the strong points...(but)I agree/disagree with this...because...*")
- Each team determines and shares what they believe to be BOTH the strongest and weakest arguments made by their counterpart
- Develop a consensus that includes ideas/arguments/evidence from BOTH sides; combine ideas

Consensus-Building: *The U.S. Should NOT use nuclear energy as a main source of energy to reduce carbon emissions and curb climate change.*

- Abandon roles and discuss freely: What are the larger connected issues underlying this controversy? Where do the different sides connect and differ?

Nuclear energy is very risky, many people may get hurt. Instead we should use renewable energy instead. Renewable is better than nuclear, nuclear is better than fossil.

- Build consensus regarding the question (clarify where your differences lie)
- Use at least 3 pieces of supporting evidence in your consensus
- Combine both sides' ideas and write your detailed consensus on the next page

Develop your detailed and specific consensus...

--

Self Reflection:

How are you feeling about the process and why?
What went well for you through this process?
Did you find anything challenging about this process? If so, what and why?
How did you feel as you developed your consensus and why?
Is there anything you would do differently next time? If so, what and why?
Is there anything that changed, challenged, or confirmed your thinking about nuclear energy as you went through this process?
What connections can you make between what you learned during this process and our unit concepts of POWER, INTERCONNECTEDNESS, and RESPONSIBILITY?

