# Letter to MLA Kent Hehr

Kent Hehr (kenthehr.ca) is a lawyer, community leader, and Member of the Legislative Assembly of Alberta for Calgary-Buffalo. He is known for his work in breaking down barriers of gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation, language, disability, and political leaning, as well as his commitment to education. In this unit, we’ve discussed how stories (in contrast to history or philosophy, including political platforms) have power to make us better people through helping us imagine the world differently and connect with characters on a personal level. Perhaps a story would help Mr. Hehr in his pursuit of fairness and equality for all Albertans.

Choose **one** of the stories or films we’ve studied (it **cannot** be the story you used for your Character Design):

* “Lysandra’s Poem” by Budge Wilson
* “The Ninny” by Anton Chekov
* “The Scarlet Ibis” by James Hurst
* *Taxi Libre* by Kaveh Nabatian
* *Howl’s Moving Castle* by Hayao Miyazaki

Consider how the story/film explores injustice and power relations based on age, ability, gender, wealth, social class, and other factors. Questions you might ask of the text include:

* How do characters from different classes, genders, ages, abilities, etc. interact or conflict?
* What values does it reinforce?
* What values does it subvert?
* Whom does it benefit if the work or effort is accepted/successful/believed, etc.?
* What conflict can be seen between the values the work champions and those it portrays?
* What social positions do the characters represent?

**Write a letter to Mr. Hehr that persuades him to use or avoid using that story/film in his work in the community, and explains the reasons why with specific reference to the text.**

Your thesis should answer the question of *why* the story could be used (or *why* it couldn’t be used) to support Mr. Hehr in his mission. You do not need to advise Mr. Hehr in *how* he could or should use it.Letter to MLA Kent Hehr - Rubric

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Thought and Understanding | | |
| **Excellent** | Ideas are insightful and carefully considered, demonstrating a comprehension of subtle distinctions in the literary text(s) and the topic. Literary interpretations are perceptive and illuminating. | **10** |
| **Proficient** | Ideas are thoughtful and considered, demonstrating a competent comprehension of the literary text(s) and the topic. Literary interpretations are revealing and  sensible. | **8** |
| **Satisfactory** | Ideas are relevant and straightforward, demonstrating a generalized comprehension of the literary text(s) and the topic. Literary interpretations are general but plausible. | **6** |
| **Limited** | Ideas are superficial or oversimplified, demonstrating a weak comprehension of the literary text(s) and the topic. Literary interpretations are incomplete and/or  literal. | **4** |
| **Poor** | Ideas are largely absent or irrelevant, and/or do not develop the topic. Little comprehension of the literary text(s) is demonstrated. | **2** |
| Supporting Evidence | | |
| **Excellent** | Support is precise and astutely chosen to reinforce the student’s ideas in a convincing way. A valid connection to the student’s ideas is efficiently maintained. | **10** |
| **Proficient** | Support is specific and well chosen to reinforce the student’s ideas in a persuasive way. A sound connection to the student’s ideas is capably maintained. | **8** |
| **Satisfactory** | Support is general, adequate, and appropriately chosen to reinforce the student’s ideas in an acceptable way but occasionally may lack persuasiveness.  A reasonable connection to the student’s ideas is suitably maintained. | **6** |
| **Limited** | Support is inadequate, inaccurate, largely a restatement of what was read, and/or inappropriately chosen to reinforce the student’s ideas and thus lacks  persuasiveness. A weak connection to the student’s ideas is maintained. | **4** |
| **Poor** | Support is irrelevant, overgeneralized, lacks validity, and/or is absent. Little or no connection to the student’s ideas is evident. | **2** |
| Form and Structure | | |
| **Excellent** | A judicious arrangement of ideas and details contributes to a fluent discussion that is developed skillfully. The unifying effect or controlling idea is effectively sustained and integrated. | **5** |
| **Proficient** | A purposeful arrangement of ideas and details contributes to a controlled discussion that is developed capably. The unifying effect or controlling idea is coherently sustained and presented. | **4** |
| **Satisfactory** | A straightforward arrangement of ideas and details provides direction for the discussion that is developed appropriately. The unifying effect or controlling idea is presented and maintained generally; however, coherence may falter. | **3** |
| **Limited** | A discernible but ineffectual arrangement of ideas and details provides some direction for the discussion that is underdeveloped. A unifying effect or controlling idea is inconsistently maintained. | **2** |
| **Poor** | A haphazard arrangement of ideas and details provides little or no direction for the discussion, and development is lacking or obscure. A unifying effect or controlling idea is absent. | **1** |
| Matters of Choice | | |
| **Excellent** | Diction is precise. Syntactic structures are effective and sometimes polished. Stylistic choices contribute to the creation of a skillful composition with a convincing voice. | **5** |
| **Proficient** | Diction is specific. Syntactic structures are generally effective. Stylistic choices contribute to the creation of a considered composition with a capable voice. | **4** |
| **Satisfactory** | Diction is adequate. Syntactic structures are straightforward, but attempts at complex structures may be awkward. Stylistic choices contribute to the creation of a conventional composition with an appropriate voice. | **3** |
| **Limited** | Diction is imprecise and/or inappropriate. Syntactic structures are frequently awkward and/or ambiguous. Inadequate language choices contribute to the  creation of a vague composition with an undiscerning voice. | **2** |
| **Poor** | Diction is overgeneralized and/or inaccurate. Syntactic structures are uncontrolled and/or unintelligible. A lack of language choices contributes to the creation of a confused composition with an ineffective voice. | **1** |
| Matters of Correctness | | |
| **Excellent** | This writing demonstrates confidence in control of correct sentence construction, usage, grammar, and mechanics. The relative absence of error is impressive considering the complexity of the response and the circumstances. | **5** |
| **Proficient** | This writing demonstrates competence in control of correct sentence construction, usage, grammar, and mechanics. Minor errors in complex language structures are understandable considering the circumstances. | **4** |
| **Satisfactory** | This writing demonstrates control of the basics of correct sentence construction, usage, grammar, and mechanics. There may be occasional lapses in control and minor errors; however, the communication remains clear. | **3** |
| **Limited** | This writing demonstrates faltering control of correct sentence construction, usage, grammar, and mechanics. The range of errors blurs the clarity of communication. | **2** |
| **Poor** | This writing demonstrates lack of control of correct sentence construction, usage, grammar, and mechanics. Jarring errors impair communication. | **1** |