



We the People

THE CITIZEN AND THE CONSTITUTION

Directed by the Center for Civic Education and funded by the U.S. Department of Education under the Education for Democracy Act approved by the United States Congress.

SCORING GUIDE – WE THE PEOPLE SIMULATED CONGRESSIONAL HEARING

<p>1. UNDERSTANDING To what extent did participants demonstrate a clear understanding of the basic issues addressed by the questions?</p>	<p>9-10 in-depth understanding: key concepts/themes/issues/relationships identified, fully defined and extensively described (e.g., origin, development, people, significance, impact); acknowledgment of opposing viewpoints (if any)</p> <p>7-8 good understanding: key concepts, etc., identified, defined, and fully described, including significance</p> <p>5-6 average understanding: key concepts, etc., identified, partially defined, and described</p> <p>3-4 fair understanding: some concepts, etc., identified, inadequately defined, and described</p> <p>1-2 little understanding: few concepts, etc., identified, inadequately defined, or described</p>
<p>2. CONSTITUTIONAL APPLICATION To what extent did participants appropriately apply knowledge of constitutional history and principles?</p>	<p>9-10 full, accurate, and appropriate application of knowledge (e.g., historical and current application, examples, effects, results, problems, issues, future issues)</p> <p>7-8 accurate and appropriate with partial application</p> <p>5-6 mostly accurate and appropriate with minor errors and inappropriate application</p> <p>3-4 some accurate and appropriate with significant inappropriate application</p> <p>1-2 mostly inaccurate and inappropriate with little or no application</p>
<p>3. REASONING To what extent did participants support their positions with sound reasoning?</p>	<p>9-10 strong support of positions with sound reasoning: conclusions reached with consideration of opposing viewpoints, opinions with reasons, noting relationships, grasping principles, logical inferences</p> <p>7-8 support with sound reasoning for most positions</p> <p>5-6 support with sound reasoning for some positions</p> <p>3-4 support with opinions, beliefs, guesses</p> <p>1-2 no support</p>
<p>4. SUPPORTING EVIDENCE To what extent did participants support their positions with historical or contemporary evidence, examples, and/or illustrations?</p>	<p>9-10 accurate support of positions with extensive historical or contemporary evidence, examples, illustrations</p> <p>7-8 accurate, good, but partial support of positions</p> <p>5-6 accurate support of some positions: inaccurate support of others</p> <p>3-4 mostly inaccurate support of positions</p> <p>1-2 little/no support of positions</p>
<p>5. RESPONSIVENESS To what extent did participants' answers address the questions asked?</p>	<p>9-10 accurate and full response to all questions: main and subquestions, follow-up questions</p> <p>7-8 accurate and full response to main and subquestions; partial response to follow-up questions</p> <p>5-6 partial response to main and subquestions; partial response to follow-up questions</p> <p>3-4 partial response to main and subquestions; little or no response to follow-up questions</p> <p>1-2 partial response to main question only; little or no response to follow-up questions</p>
<p>6. PARTICIPATION To what extent did <u>most</u> group members contribute to the group's presentation?</p>	<p>9-10 participation by all/most on an equal basis</p> <p>7-8 participation by $\frac{3}{4}$ of group</p> <p>5-6 participation by $\frac{1}{2}$ of group</p> <p>3-4 participation by $\frac{1}{4}$ of group</p> <p>1-2 no participation</p>

Adapted from a scoring guide developed by the Hawaii **We the People** program