



Mind Merit is a critical-thinking game that teaches students to judge whether an argument actually holds up — the skill AI can't hand them. It maps to one continuous thread of the Common Core: **Reading: Informational Text, Standard 8**, which runs from grade 3 through grade 12. **Every student plays both tracks from day one**, and difficulty adapts to the individual, not the grade — so a 4th grader and an 11th grader who both struggle to spot a conclusion each get the right level of the same task. Mind Merit is a targeted supplement, not a full ELA curriculum.

● Argument Sorter

Students sort an argument's sentences into **premise** and **conclusion**.

● Flaw Hunter

Students identify the **logical fallacy** in an argument's reasoning.

The table below shows how **Standard 8 itself escalates by grade** — and which track's skill meets each level. It's a map of the standard, not a limit on what any student plays.

GRADE	STANDARD & WHAT IT ASKS	HOW MIND MERIT ADDRESSES IT
3 FOUNDATION	RI.3.8 Describe the logical connection between particular sentences and paragraphs in a text (e.g., comparison, cause/effect, first/second/third in a sequence).	Argument Sorter At these grades, Standard 8 is about argument structure — telling the evidence from the point it supports. That's Argument Sorter's core task. Difficulty adapts per student, so the same task fits a 3rd grader or a struggling older reader.
4 FOUNDATION	RI.4.8 Explain how an author uses reasons and evidence to support particular points in a text.	
5 FOUNDATION	RI.5.8 Explain how an author uses reasons and evidence to support particular points in a text, identifying which reasons and evidence support which point(s).	
6 BRIDGE	RI.6.8 Trace and evaluate the argument and specific claims in a text, distinguishing claims that are supported by reasons and evidence from claims that are not.	Both tracks The bridge grade, where the standard's two verbs split across the tracks: Argument Sorter traces the structure, and Flaw Hunter begins the evaluation — judging whether the reasoning actually supports the claim.
7 DIRECT MATCH	RI.7.8 Trace and evaluate the argument and specific claims in a text, assessing whether the reasoning is sound and the evidence is relevant and sufficient to support the claims.	Flaw Hunter From grade 7 up, Standard 8 turns to evaluating reasoning and naming fallacies — Flaw Hunter's core task, across 24 types. Grades 7–10 are direct matches: "sound reasoning," "irrelevant evidence," and "fallacious reasoning" are what Flaw Hunter does, almost verbatim. The hardest levels provide real-world examples for students to evaluate (RI.11–12.8).
8 DIRECT MATCH	RI.8.8 Delineate and evaluate the argument and specific claims in a text, assessing whether the reasoning is sound and the evidence is relevant and sufficient; recognize when irrelevant evidence is introduced .	
9–10 DIRECT MATCH	RI.9–10.8 Delineate and evaluate the argument and specific claims in a text, assessing whether the reasoning is valid and the evidence is relevant and sufficient; identify false statements and fallacious reasoning .	
11–12 APPLIED	RI.11–12.8 Delineate and evaluate the reasoning in seminal U.S. texts, including the application of constitutional principles and use of legal reasoning, and the premises, purposes, and arguments in works of public advocacy.	

An honest note on grades 11–12. Standard 8 narrows here to seminal U.S. legal and political texts. Mind Merit builds the reasoning skill those texts demand but doesn't supply the documents — pair it with primary sources. It also reinforces **Speaking & Listening Standard 3** (evaluating a speaker's reasoning and evidence).