

It is true that NSU could use updates to the student union. Also, the Engineering Department is overdue for a new building. Both are opportunities to heighten the visual appeal of our campus while also serving practical needs, and the faculty in the Engineering Department have been patient for several years while working in dated offices and classrooms. Still, the library must take priority in our current financial dilemma. Improving the looks of our student union and updating one of the academic buildings is highly unlikely to have much impact on enrollment or to make a difference in attracting stronger out-of-state students. Further, talented faculty are unlikely to seek out NSU because of either of the proposed improvements. Gaining R1 status, though, would give NSU a huge bump in recruiting both students and faculty. The payoff in those areas could mean more funding for various construction projects down the road. Patience will pay off in this regard.

**Commented [GK1]:** Felix begins the paragraph by acknowledging opposing viewpoints.

**Commented [GK2]:** Here, he further builds common ground by accommodating opposing viewpoints and using a respectful tone.

**Commented [GK3]:** He moves into rebuttal/refutation.

**Commented [GK4]:** Note that Felix includes a qualifying term to avoid being trapped by absolute language.

**Commented [GK5]:** Finally, Felix spends the rest of the paragraph with rebuttal/refutation and offers a suggestion that his claim makes more sense for the school in the long term.

As covered extensively in the *NSU Today*, the library did recently receive a \$200,000 donation to be used as the directors saw fit; however, that amount is nowhere near the \$2.3 million estimate to bring the library up to date with materials needed to match other Research 1 universities. Further, reports that the library mismanaged the donation are inaccurate. A review of the library budget shows clearly that the donation was used to fund a contingency account that will be implemented in years when state and federal funding do not match anticipated budget expenditures. Additionally, the current budget features a clause noting that the contingency account will be dissolved and the funds allocated for necessary projects in ten years should they be unused during that period.

**Commented [GK6]:** Janae acknowledges up front in this paragraph that the part about the donation is accurate. She is setting up rebuttal/refutation here but she wants to at least establish common ground and acknowledge that the different sides agree on this much.

**Commented [GK7]:** Janae uses rebuttal/refutation to show how some holding the opposing viewpoint may not even realize how little the \$200,000 donation is compared to the overall needs for the library.

**Commented [GK8]:** Here she uses strong, absolute language, but she keeps her tone respectful. Notice how the word “inaccurate” is much softer than calling some people liars. There is no need for Janae to qualify in this spot because she is about to present facts to counter what some people who oppose her claim have said.

**Commented [GK9]:** Janae continues her rebuttal/refutation with facts from her research.

**Commented [GK10]:** She ends the paragraph with more rebuttal/refutation that shows how the directors are not trying to hide any money but rather protect the library for the near future.