|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Original Version** | **Topic = ALL CAPS** |
| **Sources 2 and 3 defend and suppor**t the spread of Buddhism in China during first century C.E. source 2 **speaks of the many joys** of joining the Buddhist religion. However, the author, Zhi Dun, is ***of the upper class*** of China and ***as such, his testimony does not tell how lower classes felt***. Yet, ***in a time when Asian steppe nomads were invading northern China***, Zhi Dun ***could have easily targeted Buddhism*** as a means of foreign corruption, but he does not. **Source 3 counters the scrutiny of anti-Buddhists with logic.** However, Since the author is ***anonymous, his bias is difficult to pinpoint***, yet his role as a scholar certainly dictates a ***slight upper class bias***, as in Source 2. | **SOURCES 2 & 3** |
| 6 Sentences  123 Words |  |

**Original Paragraph’s Score-able Worth**

**Color-code the specific words that earn(ed) points.**

**Summarization** **Evidence** ***POV / Context***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **2** | **Sources - Address**   * **Understand** | 2 Addressed & Understood “**speaks of many joys**”  3 Addressed & Understood “**counters scrutiny ,,, w/ logic**” |
| **3** | **Evidence** | 2 None, “many joys” = too vague  3 “counter scrutiny w/ logic” = understanding, is it clearly specific to *only* Source #3? |
| ***4*** | ***POV / Context*** | 2 ***Zhi Dun’s limitations nicely qualified***  3 No. “Upper class bias” *about what topic?* |
| 5 | **Grouping (Topic Sentence)** | Yes, but … ¶ topic sentence is badly worded. (The thing “responding” = “the Sources” rather than “people defending & supporting Buddhism.”) Also, neither Source #2 nor #3 are “during the 1st century C.E.” |
| 6 | **Add’l Evid** | None attempted |

Now, revise that paragraph so that it earns more points per the EBQ Rubric without needing to be much (if any) longer. See the [sample](https://docs.google.com/a/egrps.org/document/d/15B4L7-da8dcumipVcUMybKC9L_Vy4ufIS0LvPSa34b8/edit) if you’re not sure how to do this.

**Rules**:

1. NO sentence can begin with the word “Doc” or “Source” (or even “In doc # …”)
2. The verb “says” is outlawed (same w/ “states, writes”) Be more specific than just copying “what” each doc/source “says.” Describe the tone/purpose/intended audience behind what each author “said.”

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **REVISED Version** | **Topic = ALL CAPS** |
| For a few centuries after arriving in China, Chinese defended and supported Buddhism. **Zhi Dun praised Buddism** as providing a path to **nirvana**, though ***as an upper class scholar who probably did not personally feel threatened by invading nomads, his testimony does not necessarily reflect the danger lower classes likely felt***. **(2)** Over time other scholars felt the need to create logical **“instruction manuals” for how to defend Buddhism** against illogical “**cause for suspicion**.” **(3)** However, since the author is a scholar, albeit anonymous, he ***might well share the same lack of real-world credibility*** as Zhi Dun. One would need a non-scholar’s impression of Buddhism to better compare how the average citizen responded to Buddhism’s promise of a better life. Both Zhi Dun and the Anonymous scholar faithfully and accurately reflected **Gautama’s original teaching**, that “**eliminating craving**” would “**Stop Sorrow**” **(1)** | CHINESE DEFENDED AND SUPPORTED BUDDHISM (FOR A FEW CENTURIES) |
| 6 Sentences 141 Words |  |

**REVISED Paragraph’s Score-able Worth**

**Color-code the specific words that earn(ed) points.**

**Summarization** **Evidence** ***POV / Context***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **2** | **Sources - Address**   * **Understand** | 2 Addressed & Understood **“Zhi Dun praised Buddhism”**  3 Addressed & Understood “**instruction manuals” for how to defend Buddhism**  1 Addressed & Understood “**Gautama’s original teaching**,” |
| **3** | **Evidence** | 2 “**nirvana**” = specifc to Zhi Dun  3 “**cause for suspicion**” more specific than “logic”  1 “**Stopping of sorrow**,” and “**craving**.” |
| ***4*** | ***POV / Context*** | 2 “***not reflect danger lower classes felt***.”  3 “***lack of real-world credibility***” |
| 5 | **Grouping (Topic Sentence)** | ¶ Topic = “defense & support of Buddhism.” |
| 6 | **Add’l Evid** | Non-scholar, to compare to elite scholars’ opinions. |