

### Lesson #3: Synthesizing Information from Various Sources

Duration: 1 day

**Learning Targets: Students will:**

1. synthesize and analyze the significance of corroborating and contradictory evidence from multiple sources when forming an argument in response to the research question, “Should New York continue to use the ‘Stop and Frisk’ policy as a way to reduce crime in Manhattan?”

**Materials Needed / Pre-Lesson Prep: (When reading this lesson, it’s helpful to have the materials in front of you for reference.)**

- Copies of [Source #1](#) and [Source #2](#)
- Links to video sources: [Source #3](#) and [Source #4](#)
- [Packet titled “Intro to Research Unit: Examining the ‘Stop and Frisk’ Policy in New York”](#)
- [Teacher sample of completed “Intro to Research Unit” packet](#)

Task and Steps	Description of Task
<p><b>Do Now/Warm Up</b></p>	<p><b>Posted on Board:</b> A couple of days ago, you were asked to consider what you would need to know in order to believe that a cheating rumor about your boyfriend or girlfriend was false. Today, put yourself in the position of the friend who thinks he or she saw your significant other cheating. Below is the information you have. Using that information, make a decision about whether or not to tell your friend and then explain how you arrived at your choice:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the person you saw kissing someone other than your friend looks a lot like your friend’s significant other, but you were far away and looking at the scene from a weird angle</li> <li>• the place in which you saw the two people kissing is a place where your friend’s significant other often hangs out.</li> <li>• up until this point, you had no reason to believe that your friend’s significant other would be cheating on him or her. They have always seemed like the “perfect couple.”</li> <li>• you used to date the friend of your friend’s significant other and he/she cheated on you when you least expected it.</li> <li>• you haven’t spoken to anyone else about this yet, so you don’t know what other people might know or not know about this supposed cheating scandal.</li> </ul> <p><b>Do Now Share Out/Review:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Students first turn to a partner and share whether or not they would tell and why.</li> <li>2. Teacher writes a t-chart on the board, labeling one side “Would Tell” and the other, “Would NOT Tell”. Teacher asks students to share aloud with the class whether or not they agreed with their partners and what each person had to say. As the students share, the teacher writes the reasons provided under the appropriate column.</li> <li>3. Students should be taking down the notes from their Do Now share out as the class engages in this exercise.</li> <li>4. Once all ideas have been shared and recorded on the board, the teacher explains to the class that with this exercise, they have been doing what we call “synthesizing corroborating and contradictory evidence” in order to form an argument. The teacher explains and labels that all of the information within each column corroborates or reinforces one argument while the information across columns points toward contradictory or opposing arguments.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Task #1: Synthesizing corroborating and contradictory evidence</b></p>	<p><b>Introduction to assignment:</b> Teacher explains:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. As the teacher hands out the <a href="#">“Corroborating and Contradictory Evidence-Stop and Frisk”</a> worksheet, the teacher explains that the Do Now exercise is meant to get us thinking about our next steps with how we need to look at our evidence from the 4 sources on “Stop and Frisk”.</li> </ol>

<p>from 4 sources on the New York “Stop and Frisk” research question</p>	<p>2. The teacher has the class read aloud the definitions for corroborating and contradictory evidence at the top of the page.</p> <p><b>Teacher reviews the day’s learning target:</b> Students will synthesize and analyze the significance of corroborating and contradictory evidence from multiple sources when forming an argument in response to the research question, “Should New York continue to use the ‘Stop and Frisk’ policy as a way to reduce crime in Manhattan?”</p> <p><b>Direct Instruction and Modeling:</b> Teacher explains and models through use of a “think aloud” the following steps while students copy the teacher’s notes the handout (see the <a href="#">teacher sample</a> for ways you can model this step):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Beginning with corroborating evidence: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Identify two pieces of evidence from the <i>same</i> source that seem to strengthen each other.</li> <li>b. Circle each piece of evidence and draw a line between them. Mark a (+) next to the line.</li> <li>c. Identify two pieces of evidence from <i>two different</i> sources that seem to strengthen each other.</li> <li>d. Circle each piece of evidence and draw a line between them. Mark a (+) next to the line.</li> <li>e. Explain that corroborating evidence can be found within the same source and across multiple sources.</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. With contradictory evidence: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Identify two pieces of evidence from the <i>same</i> source that seem to oppose, weaken, or contradict each other.</li> <li>b. Circle each piece of evidence and draw a line between them. Mark a (-) next to the line.</li> <li>c. Identify two pieces of evidence from <i>two different</i> sources that seem to oppose, weaken, or contradict each other.</li> <li>d. Circle each piece of evidence and draw a line between them. Mark a (-) next to the line.</li> <li>e. Explain that contradictory evidence can be found within the same source and across multiple sources.</li> </ol> </li> </ol> <p><b>Guided Practice:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. After modeling the above steps, have students pair up. One person takes corroborating evidence and the other takes contradictory. They each have to identify and label 5 more examples before sharing with each other.</li> <li>2. To share out with the class, start on one side of the room and have each pair give an example of corroborating evidence until there are no more examples to give. Then, the next pair gives an example of contradictory evidence until there are no more examples to give.</li> <li>3. Students add to their notes as the class shares out.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Task #2:</b> Analyzing the significance of corroborating and contradictory evidence</p>	<p><b>Direct Instruction and Modeling:</b> Teacher explains and models through use of a “think aloud” the following steps while students copy the teacher’s notes the handout (see the <a href="#">teacher sample</a> for ways you can model this step):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Select the best example of corroborating evidence that you labeled in the 4 column table.</li> <li>2. Using the analytical sentence frame at the bottom of the worksheet, paraphrase each piece of evidence and complete the sentence by explaining the significance of the corroborating evidence to our research question.</li> <li>3. Repeat steps 1 and 2 but for contradictory evidence, using the separate analytical sentence frame to explain their significance.</li> </ol> <p><b>Guided/Independent Practice:</b> Alone or in pairs, have students practice analyzing the significance of examples of corroborating and contradictory evidence. Have students choose two more examples of each to use to complete the analytical sentence frames.</p>
<p><b>Review Learning Target, Close Out, and Set up Transition to Next Steps</b></p>	<p>The teacher reviews the learning target from this lesson and explains how these steps have set the class up for the next lessons. At this point, part 1 of the research unit is complete. Students have developed the skills they will need when doing their own research. In the coming lessons, the class will form groups based on research topics of interest and begin finding their own online sources to examine and analyze.</p>

