

Learning Progression: Organizing Evidence

	1	2	3	4	5
	There is no deliberate order.	Order is attempted, but it's mechanical.	Evidence is ordered by a convenient, surface logic.	Evidence is deliberately sequenced for effect.	The sequence itself makes an argument.
Looks Like	Uses whatever evidence is on hand without asking whether it's accurate, relevant, or trustworthy.	Follows a rote structure – "first point, second point, third point" – without asking whether that sequence actually serves the argument.	Groups or sequences evidence by an easy organizing principle – strict chronology, or by source type – without asking if that's actually the best order for the reader or the argument.	Chooses an order based on what a reader needs first, which piece is strongest, and where the natural logical or emotional progression lies – the sequence has a reason behind it.	The order is doing rhetorical work – building tension, meeting likely objections exactly when they'd arise, escalating or resolving on purpose – and the writer can explain why this order beats the alternatives.
Sounds Like	"Um, lunch should be longer... oh yeah, and there's this survey... wait, I also remembered my friend said something... and there was that other stat too, I think?"	"Firstly, the survey. Secondly, the nutritionist quote. Thirdly, the other district's example. That's my three points."	"I'll just go in the order I found them – this article's from September, so first, then this one's October, so second, then November."	"I'll start with our own school's survey since everyone can relate to that, bring in the nutritionist next to back it up with expertise, and save the other district's example for last since it's the most concrete."	"I know people are going to say there's no room in the cafeteria for a longer lunch, so I'm bringing that up myself first – then walking through evidence that answers it, so by the time I get to my strongest point, the objection's already handled."