

Transforming Civics for High-Need Students

Diana Owen

Professor

Director, Civic Education Research Lab

Georgetown University

owend@georgetown.edu

[Civic Education Research Lab \(georgetown.edu\)](http://georgetown.edu/civiced)

Donna P. Phillips

Vice President & Chief Program Officer

Center for Civic Education

phillips@civiced.org

Alissa Irion-Groth

Director of National and International Programs

Center for Civic Education

irion@civiced.org

Introduction

The disparities in civic education between high-need middle and high school students and their more advantaged counterparts have widened during the COVID-19 pandemic (Kuhfeld, et al, 2020). High-need students have fewer school-based opportunities to gain civic knowledge, skills, dispositions, and social and emotional learning (SEL) competencies that would prepare them to engage successfully in political life. The James Madison Legacy Project Expansion (JMLPE) is an innovative educator professional development program and curriculum intervention aimed at mitigating these educational disparities. The core goals of the JMLPE are to impart civic knowledge, skills, dispositions, and SEL competencies to English Language Learners (ELLs), students with disabilities, and students of color. The Center for Civic Education (Center) implements the JMLP and the Civic Education Research Lab (CERL) of Georgetown University is the project evaluator.

The goal of this study is to offer a blueprint for the development, implementation, and assessment of a civic education program through a cooperative, iterative process. It explores the evolution of the JMLPE during its formative stages. The Center was responsible for the implementation aspects of the JMLPE which involved updating and adapting the *We the People: The Citizen and the Constitution* (WTP) curriculum for the three student populations while designing and providing teacher professional development (PD). CERL simultaneously conducted research on the JMLPE that informed the implementation process. During the first phase of the project, the Center and CERL consulted with teacher-experts to identify priorities, educational objectives, pressing needs, best instructional practices, and barriers to curriculum implementation, including pandemic-related obstacles. The Center worked with teachers and educational consultants to develop lesson plans and instructional strategies for using WTP with the target student populations. A pilot study was fielded by CERL in fall 2022 where teachers instructing high concentrations of the target population students implemented the adapted WTP materials in their classrooms. Data were collected using a quasi-experimental, pretest-posttest design that addressed the how was the WTP curriculum was adapted to meet students' needs and assess how well the intervention improved students' civic knowledge, skills, dispositions, and SEL outcomes. The Center used the evidence from the pilot study to update and revise the curricular materials and design a teacher professional development (PD) program that was launched in the summer of 2023.

The Need for Civics for All

For decades, seminal reports have signaled alarms that the United States is failing to adequately prepare young people for authentic, informed, and engaged citizenship (Carnegie Corporation of New York and CIRCLE, 2003; Gould, et al., 2011; Vinnakota, 2019; Hamilton, Kaufman, and Hu, 2020; EAD, 2021). Concerns that Americans understand little about constitutional provisions and principles, do not know much about government institutions and how they function, and are mystified by voting and other political processes have increased as the civic challenges facing the country have intensified. Support for civic education is pervasive, as 85% of Americans believe that it is important for students to learn how the U.S. system of government works and that history classes should cover the country's best achievements and worst mistakes (PPRI, 2021; Saavedra, 2021). Civic education requirements have proliferated, and most students receive some form of civics instruction (Shapiro and Brown, 2018). At the

same time, threats to civic learning have multiplied in the current hyper-partisan environment. Politicians have stoked controversy over classroom civics preparation, prompting legislative initiatives to censor content and limit discussions of current events. School board meetings have devolved into polarized disputes and angry protests over wide-ranging policies, including the teaching of America’s racial history (Sawchuk, 2021). K-12 teachers, principals, and education policymakers have become wary of engaging with civic and political content that could be perceived as controversial (Kahne, Rogers, and Kwako, 2021). Fears of unemployment, physical harm, and even death threats against educators have become more common (Borner, Ax, and Tanfani, 2022).

The civic mission of schools—providing students with “the skills, knowledge, and attitudes that will prepare them to be competent and responsible citizens through their lives” (Carnegie Corporation of New York and CIRCLE, 2003: 4)—has become even more challenging for high-need students in this fraught environment. High-need students are those at risk of educational failure, are underserved, and in need of special assistance and support. These students often receive substandard civic education or are denied opportunities for civic learning entirely. As the K-12 student population has become increasingly diverse, disparities in civic education have persisted, even grown. Studies consistently find that White students whose parents are of higher socio-economic status are the recipients of more and higher quality civic education (Kahne and Middaugh, 2008; Kiesa, et al., 2022). White, wealthy students are four to six times as likely as Black or Latine students from low-income households to exceed the “proficient” level on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) civics instrument (Commission on Youth Voting and Civic Knowledge, 2013). NAEP scores for ELLs and students with disabilities are significantly lower than those of middle- and upper-income White students. While NAEP eighth-grade civics scores for Latine students, students with disabilities, and ELLs were slightly higher in 2022 than in 1998, they have not improved much in two decades (U.S. Department of Education, 2023).

The civic education experience for students with disabilities has been given less attention than that of other high-need student populations even in studies that seek to be inclusive of diverse populations (Levinson, 2012). These students are not only marginalized in schools, they also are sidelined in civic education research. The dominant theoretical models of civic education do not readily accommodate students with disabilities. They assume a restrictive notion of citizenship based on conformity to limited conceptions of intellectual ability, communicative competence, social independence, and behavior (Agran and Hughes, 2013; Taylor, 2020). When they are not entirely excluded, students with disabilities are relegated to lower-level civic learning opportunities which have deleterious consequences for their civic capacity. They are less likely to have the chance to participate in class discussions of issues where they can gain skills in deliberation. They develop fewer self-advocacy skills and are less inclined to make decisions for themselves. They are left out of the planning process for community engagement projects and are given perfunctory tasks when they volunteer. As a result, students with disabilities are less likely to follow local and national politics or to participate in the full range of citizen actions (Bueso, 2022). They have lower voter registration and voter turnout rates than their non-disabled peers (National Center for Learning Disabilities, 2019; Schur and Kruse, 2020).

This disparity in civic learning has been referred to as an “achievement gap” in academic performance (Hansen, et al., 2020). However, the conditions that underpin the low NAEP scores and persistent indicators of civic underperformance have been mostly overlooked. Civic education varies greatly in quantity and quality across—and within—schools and the breach is widening (Kaufman and Diliberti, 2023). A civic learning opportunity gap has been identified for lower-SES, non-White students (Kahne and Middaugh, 2008; Levine, 2009; Levinson, 2010) and students with disabilities (Bueso, 2022). The civics instruction and curricular materials that students of color, ELLs, and students with disabilities receive omit content that is most germane to them. Civics classes do not encourage high-need students to develop reasoning skills or dispositions for engagement. They fail to generate enthusiasm for the subject that they will carry forward as participatory citizens. As a result, subordinated groups are unable to build civic capacity. They are marginalized in the political process and ultimately deprived of the power to influence decisions that affect them. Alternatively, privileged citizens who benefit inordinately from high-quality civic learning opportunities, are encouraged to engage in politics and aspire to leadership positions in government. They are in a favorable position to advocate effectively for policies that are favorable to their interests (Bartels, 2016).

Teachers are crucial to ensuring that providing quality civics for all students is more than an aspirational slogan. Many civics and social studies teachers, however, do not feel adequately prepared for the task at hand. A 2020 RAND study found that half of elementary school teachers and between thirty and forty percent of secondary school teachers have received no training in civic education. Teachers indicated that top-level, generic PD programs focusing on classroom management and SEL were prevalent, but opportunities tailored to their specific teaching contexts and student populations were lacking. They expressed a need for targeted PD focused on specific civic outcomes that imparted strategies for managing discussions of current events and difficult topics and supported simulations of democratic processes. Teachers also lamented the lack of readily accessible curricula, lesson plans, and instructional materials that were engaging and culturally relevant, especially for instructing students of color and ELLs (Hamilton, Kaufman, and Hu, 2020). The JMLPE addresses these concerns.

Cornerstones of Civic Learning

It is within this contested environment that educators seek to convey the cornerstones of civic education—knowledge, dispositions, and skills. The WTP curriculum provides students with foundational knowledge about the U.S. constitution, government institutions, and political processes. JMLPE teachers are provided with the pedagogical tools that facilitate students' active learning of these constructs, especially through the WTP simulated congressional hearings. The updated curriculum and materials are designed to make civics content relevant for students of color, ELLs, and students with disabilities by intentionally making connections to their lives.

At its core, JMLPE is centered on providing essential civic content knowledge to teachers and students. Civic knowledge encompasses a vast amount of information pertinent to the foundations and institutions of government, political processes, public policies, and laws. Knowledgeable citizens understand their role in a democratic polity, know their rights and responsibilities in society, and are aware of America's place in the world (Branson and Quigley, 1998; Van Camp and Baugh, 2016). The argument that knowledge forms the foundation for

citizens' engagement in political life has been used to justify its prominence in civics instruction. The consistent finding of a correlation between political knowledge and engagement suggests that knowledge is a building block, if not a necessary precondition, for action (DelliCarpini and Keeter, 1996; Niemi and Junn, 1998; Neimi, 2001; Galston, 2004; Milner, 2010; Campbell, 2006; Kleinberg and Lau, 2019). People possessing greater civic knowledge tend to be supportive of democratic values, such as liberty, equality, and political tolerance, and are more politically efficacious. They have the confidence and ability to stake a position in the marketplace of political ideas as well as to actively engage in governmental and civic affairs (Finkel and Ernst, 2005; Galston, 2004; Brody, 1994; Youniss, 2011).

Civics instruction in middle and high school can impart lasting democratic proclivities and prime citizenship orientations that develop over a lifetime (Pasek et al., 2008, Kahne and Spote, 2008). These civic orientations are more difficult to convey to students than content knowledge. Civic dispositions are traits, attitudes, and ingrained “habits of the heart” that are consistent with the common good and are central to the functioning of a healthy democracy (Tocqueville, 1838; Crittenden and Levine, 2018). Quality civic education contributes to students' acquisition of the capacities that support democratic citizenship by providing young people with deep educational experiences that enable them to understand their rights and responsibilities and develop skills necessary to engage effectively in political and civic life (Branson, 1998; Branson and Quigley, 1998).

Civic skills are people's abilities to engage in democratic processes as informed, active, and responsible citizens (Campaign for the Civic Mission of Schools, 2011). They are skills related to organization, communication, and collective decision-making (Torney-Purta and Amadeo, 2017). Intellectual civic skills involve critical thinking, such as the capacity to describe, explain, and analyze issues, express opinions, and consider opposing viewpoints respectively. They encompass 21st century media skills, including the ability to distinguish fact from falsehood. Participatory civic skills are central to the capacity for collective action. They encompass skills in coalition-building, communication, and participation in a wide range of activities, such as voting and electoral engagement, participating in public meetings, and protesting (Brennan and Railey, 2017).

Educating the whole person for democracy goes beyond their acquisition of civic knowledge, skills, and dispositions. Social-emotional learning (SEL) is “the process through which all young people and adults acquire and apply the knowledge, skills, and attitudes to develop healthy identities, manage emotions, and achieve personal and collective goals, feel and show empathy for others, establish and maintain positive relationships, and make responsible and caring decisions” (CASEL, 2020). Essential SEL competencies dovetail civic skills, especially those that require communication, collaboration, and critical thinking, and are integral to the JMLPE. The five core SEL competencies identified by CASEL—self-awareness, self-management, responsible decision-making, social awareness, and relationship skills—can be applied to the civics context.

James Madison Legacy Project Expansion

The James Madison Legacy Project (JMLP), the precursor to the JMLPE, was a nationwide initiative of the Center that expanded the availability and effectiveness of civics instruction in elementary and secondary schools by providing PD to teachers of high-need students so that they could implement the *We the People: The Citizen and the Constitution* (WTP) curriculum in their classrooms. The JMLP was instituted from 2015 through 2020 and was funded by a Supporting Effective Educator Development (SEED) grant from the U.S. Department of Education (ED). The program provided PD to over 2,200 teachers in 48 states and the District of Columbia who taught the WTP curriculum to 258,000 students. The JMLP successfully increased the number of highly effective teachers who taught the WTP curriculum, many of whom continue to use the curriculum. The PD program substantially improved teachers' content knowledge and pedagogy skills, which in turn significantly enhanced students' achievement in attaining state standards in civics and government.

Research conducted by CERL over the first three years of the program found that elementary, middle, and high school students gained greater civic knowledge after taking a WTP class than control group students who took a standard civics, social studies, or American government class. The WTP students were more disposed to keep informed and follow government and politics in the media than those in the control condition. Over 70% of students in the JMLP program indicated that they had become more attentive to government affairs and felt more prepared to take part in their community after their WTP class. More than 90% of students believed that it is a citizen's duty to vote in elections following the program (Owen, Hartzell, and Sanchez, 2020).

The JMLP targeted high-need students broadly defined by ED as students at risk of educational failure or in need of special assistance and support, including students who are living in poverty, attend high-minority schools, are far below grade level, are homeless, are in foster care, are incarcerated, have disabilities, or are ELLs. The CERL study found that the achievement of students in the JMLP was not uniform across high-need categories. The improvements in learning for students of color, students with disabilities, and ELLs, while statistically significant, were not as robust as for some other high-need students. Students of color are defined as students who identify as Black or African American, Latine, Chicanx, Asian, South Asian, Pacific Islander (AAPI), Middle Eastern, Native American, and multiracial (Institute of Education Sciences, 2023). ELLs are students whose native language is something other than English or who lack proficiency in English and are eligible to participate in language assistance programs (U.S. Department of Education, 2016). They are a diverse group of students who have different language abilities and backgrounds. Among their ranks are refugees, migrants, students with interrupted education, internationally adopted students, and unaccompanied minors (Colorin Colorado, 2019). Students with disabilities, as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, are students with "a disability that adversely affects academic performance and are in need of special education and related services" (IDEA, 2018). Students with disabilities have unique learning needs and require specially designed instruction. The range of disabilities that can affect students' learning ability includes intellectual disabilities, speech or language impairment, hearing impairment, visual impairment, serious emotional

disturbance, traumatic brain injury, orthopedic impairments, autism spectrum disorder, and developmental delay.

The James Madison Legacy Project Expansion (JMLPE) is a multi-year project that aims to empower, engage, and expand the civic and SEL competencies of students of color, students with disabilities, and ELLs. It is funded through an Education Innovation and Research grant from the U.S. Department of Education. From 2022 to 2026, the Center for Civic Education and its partners are innovating and disseminating teacher PD and instructional resources in the WTP curricular program to address the needs of these student populations. The Center is working with experienced classroom teachers and expert consultants to develop new lesson plans for teachers that accompany existing lessons in the WTP curriculum. The lesson plans aim to make civic learning accessible for all students. They incorporate various levels of scaffolding, optional adaptation suggestions, and supporting materials for teachers to engage learners of various abilities and backgrounds through multiple modalities. The lesson plans include full primary and secondary sources, student-facing materials for activities, and graphic organizers. The iterative development process incorporates regular feedback from participants and data from CERL's research studies.

While being developed, evaluated, and improved upon, the new resources are cornerstones in the JMLPE teacher PD that prepares middle and high school teachers with content knowledge and pedagogies to effectively engage all learners in the WTP curriculum. The PD is being implemented in seven states in the 2023-2024 academic year and will expand to a total twelve states in the following academic year. The project will provide fifty-two hours of PD to 400 teachers and reach more than 28,000 students in schools with high concentrations of high-need students.

We the People Curriculum Intervention

The JMLPE adapts the *We the People: The Citizen and the Constitution* curriculum for ELLs, students with disabilities, and students of color. The WTP program was developed in 1987 and adopted as the principal education program of the U.S. Constitution by the Commission on the Bicentennial of the U.S. Constitution chaired by Chief U.S. Supreme Court Justice Warren E. Burger. Congress authorized WTP through ED from 1993 until 2011 under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Over 30 million students and 75,000 educators have participated in WTP (<https://civiced.org/pdfs/WethePeopleOverview.pdf>).

The WTP classroom curriculum provides upper elementary, middle, and high school students with instruction on the history and principles of U.S. constitutional democracy. The program is grounded in the foundations and institutions of American government and is distinctive for its emphasis on Constitutional principles, the Bill of Rights, and Supreme Court cases, and their relevance to current issues and debates. The curriculum consists of six units:

- Unit 1: What Are the Philosophical and Historical Foundations of the American Political System?
- Unit 2: How Did the Framers Create the Constitution?

- Unit 3: How Has the Constitution Been Changed to Further the Ideals Contained in the Declaration of Independence?
- Unit 4: How Have the Values and Principles Embodied in the Constitution Shaped American Institutions and Practices?
- Unit 5: What Rights Does the Bill of Rights Protect?
- Unit 6: What Challenges Might Face American Constitutional Democracy in the Twenty-first Century?

Students take part in a range of learning activities, such as primary document analysis, group projects, debates, democratic simulations, and student speeches. The culminating experience is a series of simulated congressional hearings where student teams testify before a panel of judges who are typically community leaders, government officials, including members of Congress and their staffs, academics, lawyers, judges, and distinguished civic educators. Students research and prepare sets of questions that allow them to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of constitutional principles. They take and defend their positions on historical and contemporary issues. The simulated congressional hearings can be implemented in the classroom in a non-competitive environment. WTP middle and high school classes also can participate in district and statewide competitions based on the congressional hearings. States send middle school representatives to the National Invitational and high school students to the National Finals in Washington, D.C., held each spring.

Teacher-Expert Study

The first phase of the JMLPE research was a teacher-expert study conducted in the spring of 2022. CERL collected data from 33 educators from fourteen states who had experience designing civics curricula and instructing students of color, ELLs, and students with disabilities. The participants were middle and high school educators who had taught history and/or civics for an average of sixteen years. All of them had experience teaching the WTP curriculum and most had taken part in the Center’s PD programs. Teachers responded to an online survey, the results of which informed the first phase of the adaptation of the WTP lesson plans and curricular materials at the JMLPE Curriculum Workshop that took place in June of 2022 (Owen, 2022).

Teacher-experts were asked to share their knowledge by responding to the following open-ended questions:

- What are the most pressing professional development needs for teachers instructing *We the People*?
- What instructional strategies for adapting and successfully instructing the *We the People* curriculum should be covered in the JMLPE professional development program?
- What barriers to the implementation of the *We the People* curriculum with the target student populations do you feel teachers will likely encounter?
- What SEL competencies should be emphasized in the WTP curriculum intervention with this student population?

A central objective of the JMLPE is to provide teachers with specialized strategies and instructional materials for the target student populations. The teacher-experts identified major

challenges for teachers and areas where PD would be most beneficial. Providing content knowledge to teachers so that WTP can be accessible to students who have limited prior awareness of the U.S. Constitution, American government, and history was a top priority. Teachers should make the curriculum accessible and relevant by connecting students' experiences and cultural background to the content and showing the relationship to their daily lives. Teacher-experts noted the challenge of adopting teaching practices and protocols for student-centered, active learning. Classroom implementation of WTP should be consistent with Universal Design for Learning (UDL) and scaffolded for ELLs and students with disabilities. Students should be taught the skills required by WTP, including elements of public speaking and collaboration with other students as they research and write their responses to the unit questions and prepare their testimony for the simulated congressional hearings (Owen and Phillips, 2023).

The teacher-experts emphasized the particular importance of imparting SEL competencies to students of color, ELLs, and students with disabilities. When working in an inclusive classroom, social awareness and relationship skills are key to the success of most activities. Students from diverse backgrounds should be made aware of different worldviews as well as their own biases and perspectives when examining controversial issues to create a more comfortable environment. They should develop respect for diverse cultures and outlooks, including the understanding that opinions can differ and that all people should be treated respectfully. Students in the target populations are likely to encounter micro and macro aggressions, discriminatory words, and actions that can be unintentional or overt attacks (Miller and Miskimon, 2021). The respondents suggested that teachers use affirming strategies consistent with SEL approaches that foster inclusion and support. Civil discourse—teaching students how to act and react when they disagree with others—should be a top priority. Teachers should work on developing students' ability to base their viewpoints on reason and factual evidence, rather than making emotional arguments. Students should understand how to engage in respectful communication and disagreement. Instructional techniques should emphasize multiple perspective-taking, active and empathetic listening, respectful dialogue, and tolerance of diverse groups and ideas (Owen and Phillips, 2023).

JMLPE Lesson Development: Phase I

Informed by the teacher-expert study, Center staff with expertise in curriculum development worked closely with the teacher-experts on an initial draft of the JMLPE lesson plans. Working with experts in the fields of SEL, UDL, culturally responsive pedagogy, and ELL instructional best practices, Center staff narrowed down the approach to the curricular adaptations and fortifications that would encompass the JMLPE lessons and resources. The fifty lessons developed included an inquiry approach with UDL structures, ELL adaptations, integrated SEL pedagogies, as well as objectives which called for content, language, and cultural alignment.

Inquiry

The overall curricular approach to the JMLPE lessons is through inquiry. Inquiry-based learning is a “student-centered teaching method that encourages students to ask questions and investigate real-world problems” (Scholl, 2023). The text-based nature of the WTP program

makes the use of inquiry an important equity strategy so that students have a chance to experience more agency, voice, and choice in their learning of American constitutional history. Through inquiry, students can explore more primary and secondary sources beyond the text and bring their own perspectives, as well as learn about and value others' perspectives. Asking and answering questions generated by themselves, their class, and their peers gives students a chance to enter into the curriculum more fully and experience more cultural relevance. The JMLPE lesson format thus aligned with best practices in the field including the College, Career, and Civic Life (C3) Framework, *The Roadmap to Educating for American Democracy*, and the BSCS 5E Instructional Model (Bybee, et al., 2006).

From these inquiry instructional approaches, the JMLPE lesson template capitalized on the use of compelling questions, and the *Engage, Explore, Explain, Elaborate, Evaluate* format through which UDL, ELL, and SEL supports and adaptations were structured. (See Appendix A for a completed lesson in the template.) All such adaptations, strategies, and options were written in line with the lesson directions so teachers could anticipate options and opportunities to adapt their lessons for their unique students' needs (Owen and Phillips, 2023).

Social-Emotional Learning

Unique to the Center's approach to SEL was the intentional integration of the competencies into the pedagogical strategies in the lesson. Rather than only a stand-alone focus on a related competency, the competencies were integrated into the lesson design and reinforced in-line with the lesson plan steps. In this way, it draws teachers' attention to the SEL implications of their teaching and of the pedagogical decisions and opportunities they have in their instructional decisions. For example, if social awareness is a prioritized SEL competency for the lesson, it is first noted in the overview in context of the whole lesson's objective. Then throughout the lesson the opportunities to develop and reinforce this competency are noted in-line with the teacher directions. The SEL notations exemplify this approach:

- **SEL Focus:** Students will develop their **responsible decision-making** by analyzing situations and consequences as it relates to the Supreme Court decision-making process and the ramifications of those decisions.
- **Integrated SEL Notations**
 - Students practice **social awareness** and developing empathy for others by considering different perspectives about the idea of school appropriate dress codes (in-line with the teacher directions for the SCOTUS decision analysis activity).
 - Students practice **self-management** and **responsible decision-making** by working with their peers to make decisions about *US vs. Lopez* (in-line with the teacher directions to explore the case outcomes and implications).

Universal Design for Learning

The structure of the lesson template additionally allows UDL suggestions and options throughout the lesson. Thus, in addition to SEL alignment, UDL adaptations and ELL strategies and suggestions are also in-line with the teacher directions for each phase of the inquiry. Teachers can likewise make planning and implementation decisions in time for each step of the lesson. There are varying degrees of specificity of the suggestions. For example, some are more general:

- **UDL:** Invite students to respond verbally or in writing (in-line with teacher direction for students to respond to a prompt)

Others are more specific:

- **UDL:** For the discussion, the teacher may call on individual students, have students move to different sides of the room and then call on students, or use technology like a Jamboard to have students place their name on a sticky note on a slide of the prompt.

This approach to supporting students with disabilities allows teachers to make instructional decisions best for their student(s) and gives specific resources and cues on how to do so. There were additional options in the form of varying levels of scaffolding of different resources such as texts and graphic organizers. A UDL or ELL in-line notation might say for teachers to choose from different formats of the same resource depending on their student need, or to use an optional multilingual vocabulary as needed.

Lesson Delivery

Anchored in the approaches previously described, the 28 teacher-experts developed over 50 lessons aligned to either Level 2 or Level 3 of the WTP text or supporting the simulated congressional hearing preparation process. Teachers were given a high level of autonomy to choose the content from within the WTP program and were tasked with developing the entire lesson in the inquiry template and creating all student-facing materials such as text analysis documents, graphic organizers, rubrics, formative assessments, and multiple versions or adapted visions of certain texts and worksheets. Because of the high level of autonomy given, the lessons varied across a spectrum with some closely aligning to a WTP lesson with supporting materials for use in conjunction with the text, and others aligning topically to the WTP content but with added primary sources and additional activities to augment and expand on the text content and strategies.

JMLPE Student Pilot Study

CERL conducted a pilot study to assess the effectiveness of the adapted WTP curriculum and associated pedagogic practices in promoting students' acquisition of civic content knowledge, civic dispositions, and SEL competencies. The pilot study employed a quasi-experimental pretest/posttest design. It was conducted in classes of a select group of teachers with expertise in instructing the WTP curriculum with at least one of the three target student populations. The study was fielded during the fall and early spring of academic year 2022-23. Teachers administered an online pretest survey prior to their students receiving the WTP intervention and gave the posttest at the conclusion of the class. The results of the pilot study informed subsequent phases of the implementation of the JMLPE.

Twenty-four of the 30 teachers recruited for the study completed the research requirements. The attrition rate—teachers who administered the pretest but not the posttest—was highest for teachers of ELLs (23%), followed by those instructing students of color (14%). Only one teacher of students with disabilities left the study. Teachers were from schools in Arizona, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Jersey, Virginia, and the District of Columbia. The vast majority of teachers held Master's degrees (20), three had

Bachelor's degrees, and one had a doctorate. They had been teaching civics for an average of 16 years, with a range of one to 26 years. Eleven teachers instructed at the middle school level and 13 taught high school. Twenty-one participants taught average size classes ranging from 16 to 32 students, and four teachers instructed small classes of 15 or fewer students. 48% of participants taught in Title I schools which received financial assistance from the government because they had high percentages of students from low-income families. Eighteen educators taught high concentrations (30% or more) students of color, 13 taught ELLs, and 9 taught students with disabilities. It was possible for a teacher to instruct students in more than one of the target populations.

A total of 1,119 students took the pretest. 773 students completed the pretest and posttest, and constitute the sample employed in this research. The sample consisted of 48% female, 48% male, and 4% non-binary students. The racial composition of the sample was 20% Black/African American, 30% White/Caucasian, 31% Latine, 7% Asian American or Pacific Islander (AAPI), and 11% Mixed-Race. Students were aged 12 (6%), 13 (32%), 14 (19%), 15 (11%), 16 (16%), and 17/18 (16%). 41% of students were in middle school (6th-8th grades) and 59% were in high school (9th-12th grades). Almost all students (90%) in the study had taken a prior class in social studies, civics, or American history.

The pilot study assessed the change in students' pretest and posttest scores on outcome measures of civic knowledge, dispositions, and skills, as well as SEL competencies. Independent variables for the target student populations, WTP instructional level, use of simulated congressional hearings, and Title I school status were used in the analysis. Dichotomous indicators of classes comprised of 30% or more students of color, ELLs, or students with disabilities were constructed. These categories were not mutually exclusive, especially for classes with both high percentages of students of color and ELLs. Teachers could choose to instruct using the Level 2 (middle school) or Level 3 (high school) WTP curriculum. Level 2 was used most often with both middle school (83%) and high school (78%) students in the study. Level 3 was taught to 17% of middle school and 22% of high school students. WTP level was coded 1 for Level 2 and 2 for Level 3. A variable indicated whether the culminating simulated congressional hearing was held in the students' class (coded 1) or not (coded 0). A dichotomous variable measured whether a student attended a Title I school which served high percentages of children from low-income families and received financial assistance from the federal government (U.S. Department of Education, 2018).

Difference of means tests were performed to examine the overall change in pretest/posttest scores for each of the outcome measures. These tests also were calculated for the outcomes by each of the three target student populations. Hedge's g was used to ascertain the effect size of the pretest/posttest mean difference. OLS regression analyses were performed to determine the effects of the independent measures on posttest outcomes. The models incorporated the pretest scores on the outcomes as a covariate. Models with a posttest score as the dependent variable and the pretest score as a covariate are preferred for conducting analyses of pre-post design data as they eliminate systematic bias and reduce error variance when the usual assumptions underpinning OLS regression are maintained (Cornell Statistical Consulting Unity, 2020). Independent variables were entered in blocks to assess the relative contribution of each variable category based on the R^2 value. The three indicators of the target student

populations formed a block. The block of WTP-specific indicators were curriculum level and use of simulated hearings. Title I school was entered as a separate block.

Civic Knowledge

In the present study, knowledge was based on student's responses to 24 items related to the U.S. Constitution, founding principles, American governmental institutions, and political processes. The topics represent standard content covered in civics, social studies, and American history classes. The questions were not overly aligned with the WTP curriculum and were comprised of standard items used in testing in these subject areas that have known reliability and validity, including questions from the NAEP civics assessment (Institute of Education Sciences, 2022b). The questions were developed after consulting prior research, civics inventories, civics tests, and state civic education rubrics. One point was assigned to each correct answer and zero points were awarded for an incorrect answer. Additive indexes were constructed that ranged from zero to 24. The index reliabilities were good; Cronbach's α was .861 for the pretest and .834 for the posttest.

The pilot study reconfirmed the consistent finding that the WTP curriculum intervention is successful in conveying civic knowledge to high-need students (Owen, 2015; Owen and Riddle, 2017; Owen, 2018; Owen, Hartzell, and Sanchez, 2020; Owen and Irion Groth, 2020). Students made large, statistically significant gains in civic content knowledge after taking the adapted WTP class. (See Table 1.) All students in the study gained an average of six points from pretest (\bar{x} =9.71) to posttest (\bar{x} =14.12). The effect size based on Hedge's g (.92) is large. Overall, students had a 45% increase in knowledge after their WTP class. Knowledge gains for students in classes with high percentages of students in all three of the target student populations were large and statistically significant at $p \leq .01$. The average pretest/posttest increase in knowledge was five points for students of color (pretest \bar{x} =9.42; posttest \bar{x} =14.46), indicating a 54% gain. ELLs began with an average score on the pretest (\bar{x} =8.41) that was a full point lower than for students of color. They gained five and a half points on average on the posttest (\bar{x} =13.89), representing a 65% increase in knowledge. The growth in mean knowledge scores was greatest for students with disabilities, improving 5.81 points from \bar{x} =8.38 on the pretest to \bar{x} =14.19 on the posttest, or a 69% increase.

[Table 1 about here]

An OLS regression analysis predicts students' scores on the knowledge posttest holding the effects of their pretest scores constant. (See Table 2.) As expected, the standardized regression coefficient for pretest knowledge is large (β =.604) and statistically significant, accounting for 32% of the variation in posttest knowledge. The block corresponding to the target student populations explained 4% of the variance in the dependent variable. The strength and direction of the relationship to civic knowledge was similar for students of color and students with disabilities. The coefficients for students of color (β =.094) and students with disabilities (β =.090) were positive. The coefficient for ELLs (β =-.107) was negative. All of the coefficients were statistically significant. This finding reflected the lower posttest knowledge scores for ELLs (\bar{x} =13.89) compared to students of color (\bar{x} =14.46) and students with disabilities (\bar{x} =14.19). The WTP-related variables explained 3% of the variance in posttest civic

knowledge. Students who were taught the WTP Level 3 curriculum scored significantly higher on civic knowledge than those whose teachers used the Level 2 materials ($\beta=.136$). Students whose classes held simulated congressional hearings gained significantly more knowledge than those who did not have this experience ($\beta=.090$). Finally, the posttest knowledge scores of students in Title I schools were significantly greater than those of students in non-Title I schools ($\beta=.156$). Title I school status explained 1% of the variation in knowledge scores.

[Table 2 about here]

In addition to the content knowledge items, students were asked whether they understood more about American government and historical events that shaped the United States because they took the WTP class. The vast majority (90%) agreed with these statements. 49% of students strongly agreed that they understood more about American government and 46% strongly agreed that they understood more about historical events. Students reported having a greater understanding of government and history than of other races and cultures after their WTP class. 69% of students agreed that they understood more about other races and cultures, with 28% strongly agreeing. One third of the students (31%) disagreed. There were no meaningful differences based on whether a student was in a class with a high concentration of students of color, ELLs, or students with disabilities.

Civic Dispositions

The pilot study analyzed the extent to which civic dispositions were conveyed to students through WTP. A civic disposition index was created from five items to which students responded that they agree, neither agree nor disagree, or disagree: 1) I understand important political issues facing the country, 2) I feel prepared participate in my community, 3) I have a say about what government does, 4) I follow government and politics in the media almost every day, and 5) I plan on voting in elections when I am eligible. The additive indexes ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 11 (strongly agree). The index reliabilities were adequate (Cronbach's α pretest=.656; posttest=.678). In addition, students' interest in and attention to government, politics, and community affairs were measured. Two items were combined to form an index: 1) How interested are you in American government and politics? and 2) How much attention do you pay to issues that are affecting your community? The additive pretest/posttest indexes were scored 1 (not very interested/attentive) to 5 (very interested/attentive). The index reliabilities were adequate with a pretest Cronbach's α of .632 and a posttest value of .640.

Students exhibited a modest increase in their mean score on the civic dispositions index from pretest ($\bar{x}=7.02$) to posttest ($\bar{x}=7.26$). The pretest/posttest difference of .24 was statistically significant at $p \leq .01$. The effect size was small (Hedge's $g=.11$). The only statistically significant pretest/posttest mean difference among the target populations was for students of color, which was small (.20). The findings for ELLs and students with disabilities were negligible. (See Table 3.)

[Table 3 about here]

The OLS regression analysis showed that students' pretest score on civic dispositions (beta=.429) was the strongest predictor of post-WTP orientations. (See Table 4.) The relationship was statistically significant and explained 20% of the variation in the posttest outcome. The target student population block explained 2% of the variance in posttest dispositions. The relationship for students of color (beta=.115) was positive and statistically significant. In comparison, the coefficient for ELLs (-.156) was negative and significant while there was no relationship for students with disabilities. This reflects the differences in the posttest mean scores across groups, with students of color having the highest score (\bar{x} =7.32), followed by students with disabilities (\bar{x} =7.15), and ELLs (\bar{x} =6.88). The WTP-related variables explained 2% of the variance in posttest civic dispositions. The coefficient for students whose classes held simulated congressional hearings (beta=.144) was positive and statistically significant. The WTP level of instruction had a weak, nonsignificant relationship to dispositions. Title I school status had no effect.

[Table 4 about here]

Students' interest in and attention to government, politics, and community affairs increased modestly after the WTP curriculum intervention. (See Table 5.) Overall, students' mean scores increased by .13 on the interest and attention index, a small but statistically significant difference. The pretest/posttest mean difference scores of students of color (.19) and ELLs (.20) were small and statistically significant. There was no significant change in pretest/posttest scores for students with disabilities.

[Table 5 about here]

Pretest interest and attention was the strongest predictor of the posttest outcome in the OLS regression model. The variable block for target student population explained 2% of the variance in the model. The only statistically significant relationship was for ELLs, where the beta coefficient (.206) indicated a moderate gain in interest/attention. None of the other variables in the analysis was significant. (See Table 6.)

[Table 6 about here]

Social-Emotional Learning

A core objective of the JMLPE is to foster students' acquisition of SEL competencies related to the civics curriculum. SEL competencies can be developed using the WTP curriculum through class discussion, collaboration, and hands-on activities that emphasize responsible decision-making. The simulated congressional hearings provide opportunities for students to work as a unit to address questions through evidence-based collaboration, to consider different perspectives, and to express their ideas and viewpoints in a civil environment.

The SEL measures employed in this study were derived from prior assessments using the CASEL framework and have known reliability and validity (see Denham, 2016; Taylor, et al., 2018). Relationships skills in two domains relevant to the JMLPE—communication and collaboration—were examined. Communication skills were measured by three items: 1) I am

comfortable speaking in front of a group, 2) I enjoy sharing my views with others, and 3) I put a lot of effort into getting involved in class discussions. The three items were combined to form an additive communication skills index that ranged from 1 (never) to 7 (always). The reliability (Cronbach's α) of the index was good with a pretest value of .703 and a posttest value of .705. Collaboration was measured by two items: 1) I like to work with other students on projects and 2) I enjoy collaborating to achieve a common goal. An additive index measuring collaboration skills was created that ranged from 1 (never) to 5 (always). The collaboration skills index had a good pretest reliability (Cronbach's α) of .724 and posttest reliability of .772. Social-awareness was measured by three items: 1) I care about other people's points of view, 2) When others disagree with me, I respect their views, and 3) It's important to arrive at an agreement or consensus when working with others. An additive index of social-awareness was constructed that ranged from 1 (never) to 7 (always). The reliability of the social-awareness index was adequate (Cronbach's α pretest=.609 and posttest=.619).

Pilot study students achieved small, statistically significant improvements in their average communication skills scores after their WTP class. (See Table 7.) For all students, scores on the communication index increased by .22 from pretest (4.07) to posttest (4.30). The effect size (Hedge's g =.14) was small. There was a small, statistically significant rise in communication skills for students of color (.21). However, there was no change in communication skills for ELLs or students with disabilities. The OLS regression analysis found no statistically significant relationships for any of the independent variables other than the pretest control.

[Table 7 about here]

The difference of means tests uncovered no statistically significant differences in students' collaboration skills based on target population. However, the OLS regression analysis revealed that the collaboration skills of students who were taught the Level 3 WTP curriculum (beta=.159) and whose classes held simulated congressional hearings (beta=.094) improved significantly after their JMLPE class. The pretest variable had the highest association with posttest collaboration skills. None of the other independent variables was related to the outcome measure. (See Table 8.)

[Table 8 about here]

A small, positive, statistically significant difference (.12) in pretest (5.62)/posttest (5.74) mean scores was found for social-awareness for the entire pilot student sample. There were no differences based on target population. The control for pretest self-awareness was the strongest predictor in the model. However, it explained 15% of the variance, which is the lowest for any of the controls in the regression analyses. Students who participated in simulated congressional hearings in their classes developed greater self-awareness (beta=.133). Holding hearings was the only statistically significant indicator other than pretest self-awareness. (See Table 9.)

[Table 9 about here]

Recommendations from the Pilot Study

The pilot study teachers were given the considerable task of implementing an adapted WTP curriculum with new lesson plans and materials. Although they all had prior experience teaching the WTP curriculum, they did not attend a PD program to facilitate implementation of the adapted curriculum. Assuring that the new lesson successfully conveyed content knowledge was of paramount importance. The pilot study indicated that the WTP curriculum intervention achieved this objective. The large knowledge increases were especially evident for students of color and students with disabilities. The gains were somewhat less pronounced for ELLs, suggesting the need to further develop the curriculum to meet their needs, including translated materials. The intentional integration of SEL competencies into the WTP curriculum is an innovation of the JMLPE. The pilot study revealed a need to strongly emphasize SEL competencies and related pedagogies in the lesson plans and PD program. The PD program should provide teachers of the three target student populations with proven practices and concrete examples of how SEL competencies can be prioritized in their classrooms and effectively incorporated into the adapted lessons. The SEL items used in the pilot study were derived from prior research using the CASEL framework and needed to be refined to be more relevant to the target student populations. Finally, one-third of students reported that they did not learn about other races and cultures in their WTP class. This finding pointed to a need to integrate more civics content that is historically and culturally relevant to students in the target populations into the curriculum, lesson plans, and pedagogy.

JMLPE Lesson Development: Phase II

In March 2023, the Center team and CERL held an annual workshop in Chattanooga Tennessee, attended by site coordinators for seven sites and three to four mentor teachers for each site. In addition to sharing the overall research goals, theory of action, and outcomes of the pilot study from implementation of the JMLPE lessons, the overarching goal of the workshop was to deepen knowledge and practical application of SEL, UDL, ELL strategies, and culturally relevant teaching strategies in civic education and We the People.

The workshop consisted of a series of immersive experiences in the inquiry lesson plan model, debriefing, and discussion, then site planning time to contextualize and adapt for the specific teachers they would see in the summer. Three of the original JMLPE pilot lessons were edited and improved from pilot and observational data. These three lessons were used as a basis for the modeling and immersive experiences. For example, the workshop began by going deep into the inquiry approach, how inquiry serves the ends of equity, and its importance in civic education. Mentors and coordinators explored where SEL and ELL strategies and culturally relevant pedagogical connections live within the inquiry-based lesson templates. Site coordinators and mentors continued to give feedback which was eventually used to strengthen the remaining lessons that were edited and improved in time for the summer institutes.

The decision to workshop the three lessons and to continue taking in feedback from the mentor teachers underscores the iterative process that is a cornerstone of this research project. In working to serve the needs of students and teachers all over the country, there is no single approach that will work for everyone. Using the feedback from valued mentor teachers and state

partners, the Center team improved the lessons in the following ways to make them as accessible, adaptable, and relevant to the teachers from all over the country.

Strengthening Social-Emotional Learning

The pilot study revealed that teachers did not always know how they were reinforcing SEL competencies within their teaching. Furthermore, they may have used some of their own descriptions to explain SEL competencies that differed from the terms CASEL used. Throughout the lessons revised for use in year two, the in-line SEL notations were expanded to speak even more specifically to the instructional move and the SEL impact such as in the example below:

SEL: By working in groups, (to prepare for the simulated hearings) students will set collective goals, manage emotions, and use planning and organizational skills. Additionally, they must demonstrate **relationship skills** by communicating effectively, by resolving conflicts constructively, and by seeking or offering help when needed.

Adding English Language Learning Supports

The pilot study as well as anecdotal and survey feedback showed an overwhelmingly positive reaction to vocabulary and translation supports. Since teachers had high autonomy in creating the original lesson, it was not required to include the exact same type of student resources or scaffolds in each lesson. As a result, some lessons had multilingual vocabulary organizers, others had translated documents in Spanish, and still others had more generic but adaptable graphic organizers. Due to this feedback, most of the revised lessons contain the multilingual vocabulary organizer (see Appendix B) as well as Spanish-translated student documents. Although not all ELL students speak Spanish, a large proportion do. Creating these further ELL resources gives teachers even more of a running start to their planning.

Prioritizing Culturally Relevant Pedagogies

The nature of the research project calls for resources and strategies to be developed around the existing WTP program, which is anchored by the text. As such, most of the JMLPE lessons focused on the pedagogical approaches and strategies to support the three different subgroups of students. Noting that bringing diverse sources and voices is a teacher pedagogical decision, the JMLPE lessons were not positioned to supply alternate documents beyond what was already in the text and program. In reviewing the feedback that only one third of students noted they learned about other races and cultures, the adjustment to the lessons included more cuing for culturally relevant connections for teachers to make. Indeed, this was fortified in a few key areas. The Engage lesson segment was tailored to allow students to bring their lived experiences around a concept or issue to the conversation. Throughout their learning, teachers are prompted, within the lesson, to relate the content back to the students' experiences, further reinforcing cultural relevance. The Evaluate segment includes opportunities for students to incorporate their new learning with their own experiences as well, as is shown in the example below taken from the lesson on congressional power:

- **ENGAGE:** Initiate a discussion for the following question: At what age should kids be allowed to create their own social media accounts? Why? Before talking about regulations, have students generate opinions and evidence on potential benefits and costs of youth social media use. The teacher should consider charting their answers on a timeline for a visual showcase of their answers.
- **EVALUATE:** Should Congress regulate social media for teens? As the assessment for this lesson, ask students to present their policy proposal to the class for comments and questions.

Additionally, a new section was added to the overall lesson format to highlight other culturally relevant strategies for teachers to use specific to the lesson topic such as the one below from the lesson “Which branch has the most power?”

CULTURAL RELEVANCE/TEACHER BACKGROUND: Students may have differing levels and types of experiences with the three different branches of government. Make culturally relevant connections to your students by activating students’ prior knowledge by asking them about their experiences with government and how they think it works. Make learning contextual by using examples that are relevant to students’ lives. For example, you could use examples of how the government has impacted their community or family. Encourage students to leverage their cultural capital by incorporating their cultural backgrounds into the lesson. For example, you could ask students to research how their culture has influenced government systems in other parts of the world. In addition to the scenarios provided, pull power scenarios from your local context that may be of interest to your students, so they make greater connections to the powers of the branches. Be ready to field questions and have conversations about the different branches and students who may have negative and positive experiences and/or beliefs about them.

In the annual workshop, the Center team emphasized the importance for JMLPE mentors to work deeply with their teachers on what culturally relevant strategies will be most impactful for their unique populations of students and ways they can bring in more diverse voices and vie

Teacher Professional Development

Mentors incorporated the revised JMLPE lesson plans and core instructional approaches in PD for teachers new to WTP beginning in the summer of 2023. Summer institutes in Arizona, Colorado, Kentucky, Maryland, Tennessee, Virginia and West Virginia in June–July 2023, provided thirty-six hours of PD to 116 teachers. A total of twenty-six mentor teachers led the PD in the WTP curricular program. The mentors organized unique agendas that aligned with JMLPE PD parameters for delivery of content and pedagogical strategies while customized to the institute locations, state curricular standards, and experiences of the participating teachers.

The JMLPE PD model, like the model employed in the original JMLP, addresses the need to build teachers’ content knowledge and pedagogical skills in order to effectively increase high-need students’ civic knowledge, skills, and dispositions. During the intensive four- to five-day summer institutes, teachers engaged in twelve hours of content presentations and

discussions, eight hours of pedagogical activities and discussions, eight hours of research and preparation to participate in a simulated congressional hearing on the Constitution, four hours of engagement with online instructional and professional development resources, and four hours presenting in a simulated hearing and evaluating their experience. Institute organizers took advantage of their locations by including field-based experiences in civics and history, meetings with government leaders, and local guest speakers, such as university professors researching focal areas of constitutional content.

The pedagogical segments responded to project priorities as well as needs identified through CERL's research. They included an emphasis in fostering SEL competencies and other strategies targeting JMLPE student populations, such as inquiry-based learning, language learner support, and culturally responsive pedagogy. Mentors used the JMLPE lesson plans to engage teachers in activities that utilize the target instructional practices. Teachers debriefed the activities by reflecting on what they learned as participants and on how the activities might be implemented with their students. (See Figure 1.)

Figure 1
Example of Teacher Reflection

Teacher comments on a school lunch menu decision-making simulation included:

- *That was productive chaos.*
- *The activity will get students to the conclusion of compromise.*
- *We get riled up about broccoli and then tie it back to arguments that happened in the past.*
- *I would give students cards of the food images.*

Teachers also examined the lesson plans and the adaptations embedded for different learners. "These lessons must be written by teachers! They are teacher-friendly," said a middle school teacher upon examining a JMLPE lesson for the first time. The participants commented on how the lessons might be improved. This included recommendations to add to the materials to enhance teacher knowledge and use in classroom instruction. For example, to accompany a handout that challenges students to interpret laws that may violate the establishment and free exercise clauses of the U.S. Constitution (Appendix C), teachers requested a resource key that provides information on how courts actually decided the selected court cases.

Mentors introduced teachers to an online professional learning community that they will use to participate in ongoing professional learning during the academic year with the other teachers at their PD site. Throughout the ensuing academic year, mentors will engage teachers in an additional sixteen hours of online PD that includes content and pedagogy demonstrations and discussions. As teachers implement WTP, they will have the opportunity to share their experiences, challenges, and strategies with each other through the PD sessions and online community. The mentors will support the learning community and provide additional resources and instructional ideas, guided by needs identified by the teachers and the iterative evaluation process.

Conclusion

The JMLPE has entered the next phase when teachers receiving the JMLPE PD will implement the WTP curriculum intervention in their classes. The first program cohort in academic year 2023-24 will serve students of color and students with disabilities and their teachers. Evaluation data collected during the first cohort will inform additional adaptations to the curricular resources and PD. The second cohort will take place during the 2024-25 academic year and will focus on teachers instructing classes with high concentrations of students of color and ELLs. The iterative research and development process will continue to identify teacher and student needs so that culturally enhanced curricular resources and teacher PD are responsive to classroom realities and designed to increase the civics and SEL competencies of the target student populations.

REFERENCES

- Agran, Martin, and Carolyn Hughes. 2013. "You Can't Vote—You're Mentally Incompetent": Denying Democracy to People With Severe Disabilities," *Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities*, vol. 38, no. 1: 58–62. <https://doi.org/10.2511/027494813807047006>
- Bartels, Larry. 2016. *Unequal Democracy: The Political Economy of the New Gilded Age*. 2nd ed. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Booth, Ruby Belle. 2023. "Youth Are Interested in Political Action, but Lack Support and Opportunities," CIRCLE, January 30. [Youth Are Interested in Political Action, but Lack Support and Opportunities | CIRCLE \(tufts.edu\)](#)
- Borter, Garbiella, Joseph Ax, and Joseph Tanfani. 2022. "School Boards Get Death Threats Amid Rage over Race, Gender, Mask Policies," Reuters, February 5. [School boards get death threats over race, gender, mask policies \(reuters.com\)](#)
- Branson, Margaret Stimmann. 1998. *The Role of Civic Education: An Education Policy Task Force Position Paper With Policy Recommendations*. Research Report. Calabasas, CA: Center for Civic Education. <http://www.civiced.org/promote-rationale/position-paper-with-policy-recommendations>
- Branson, Margaret Stimmann, and Charles N. Quigley. 1998. "The Role of Civic Education." Washington, D.C.: The Communitarian Network. http://www.gwu.edu/~ccps/pop_civ.html
- Brennan, Jan, and Hunter Railey. 2017. "The Civics Education Initiative 2015-17," *Education Trends*. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States. [The-Civics-Education-Initiative-2015-2017.pdf \(ecs.org\)](#)
- Brody, Richard. 1994. "Secondary Education and Political Attitudes: Examining the Effects on Political Tolerance of the We the People . . . Curriculum," Calabasas, CA: Center for Civic Education.
- Bueso, Leah. 2022. "Civic Equity for Students With Disabilities," *Teachers College Record*, vol. 124, no. 1: 62-86. [Civic Equity for Students With Disabilities \(sagepub.com\)](#)
- Bybee, Roger W., Joseph A. Taylor, April Gardner, Pamela Van Scotter, Janet Carlson Powell, Anne Westbrook, and Nancy Landes. 2006. *The BSCS 5E Instructional Model: Origins and Effectiveness*. Colorado Springs, CO: BSCS. https://bscs.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/bscs_5e_full_report-1.pdf
- Campaign for the Civic Mission of Schools. 2011. *Guardian of Democracy: The Civic Mission of Schools*. Research Report. Philadelphia, PA: Leonore Annenberg Institute for Civics at the Annenberg Public Policy Center, University of Pennsylvania.
- Campbell, David E. 2006. *Why We Vote: How Schools and Communities Shape Our Civic Life*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Carnegie Corporation of New York and CIRCLE. 2003. *The Civic Mission of Schools*. Research Report. New York: Carnegie Corporation. [CIRCLE Draft_1.14.03.qxd \(carnegie.org\)](#)

CASEL. 2020. “What Is the CASEL Framework?” Chicago, IL: Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning. [What Is the CASEL Framework? - CASEL](#)

CIRCLE. 2023. “State-by-State Youth Voter Turnout Data and the Impact of Election Laws in 2022,” Tufts University, April 6. [State-by-State Youth Voter Turnout Data and the Impact of Election Laws in 2022 | CIRCLE \(tufts.edu\)](#)

Colorin Colorado! 2023. “ELL Basics.” [English Language Learners \(ELL\) Basics | Colorín Colorado \(colorincolorado.org\)](#)

Commission on Youth Voting and Civic Knowledge. 2013. *All Together Now: Collaboration and Innovation for Youth Engagement: The Report of the Commission on Youth Voting and Civic Knowledge*. Research Report. Medford, MA: Center for Information & Research on Civic Learning and Engagement. [www.civicyouth.org/about-circle/commission-on-youth-voting-civic-knowledge/](#)

Conrad, Jenni, Jane C. Lo, and Zahid Kisa. 2022. “Civic Mandates for the ‘Majority’: The Perception of Whiteness and Open Classroom Climate in Predicting Youth Civic Engagement,” *The Journal of Social Studies Research*, vol. 46, no. 1: 7-17. [Civic mandates for the ‘majority’: The perception of whiteness and open classroom climate in predicting youth civic engagement - ScienceDirect](#)

Cornell Statistical Consulting Unit. 2020. “Data Analysis of Pre-Post Study Designs,” Statnews #79, Cornell University, October. [Data Analysis of Pre-Post Study Designs \(cornell.edu\)](#)

Delli Carpini, Michael X., and Scott Keeter. 1996. *What People Know About Politics and Why It Matters*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Denham, Suzanne. 2016. “Tools to Assess Social and Emotional Learning in Schools,” *Edutopia*, June 17. [Tools to Assess Social and Emotional Learning in Schools | Edutopia](#)

Educating for American Democracy (EAD). 2021. *Educating for American Democracy: Excellence in History and Civics for All Learners*. Research Report. iCivics, March 2. [www.educatingforamericandemocracy.org](#)

Finkel, Stephen E., and Howard R. Ernst. 2005. “Civic Education in Post-Apartheid South Africa: Alternative Paths to the Development of Political Knowledge and Democratic Values,” *Political Psychology*, vol 26: 333-364.

Gallo, Maria, and Diana Owen. 2021. “Closing the Civic Empowerment Gap: Professional Development for Teachers of High-Need Students,” *The Journal of the Middle States Council for the Social Studies*, no. 3: 17-23.

Galston, William. 2004. "Political Knowledge, Political Engagement, and Civic Education," *Annual Review of Political Science*, vol. 4: 217-234.

Gould, Jonathan, Kathleen Hall Jamieson, Peter Levine, Ted McConnell, and David B. Smith, eds. 2011. *Guardian of Democracy: The Civic Mission of Schools*. Research Report. Philadelphia: Leonore Annenberg Institute for Civics of the Annenberg Public Policy Center at the University of Pennsylvania. [ccny_grantee_2011_guardian.pdf \(carnegie.org\)](#)

Hamilton, Laura S., Julia H. Kaufman, and Lynn Hu. 2020. *Preparing Children and Youth for Civic Life in the Era of Truth Decay*. Research Report. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation. [RAND RRA112-6.pdf](#)

Hansen, Michael, Elizabeth Mann Levesque, Jon Valant, and Diana Quintero. 2018. *The 2018 Brown Center Report on American Education: How Well Are American Students Learning?* Research Report. Washington, D.C.: Brookings. [2018-Brown-Center-Report-on-American-Education_FINAL1.pdf \(brookings.edu\)](#)

Herczog, Michelle M. 2012. "It's Up to Us: Bridging the Civic Opportunity Gap," *Leadership*, vol. 14, no. 1: 20-22, 24, 26. [Flash \(ed.gov\)](#)

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). 2018. "Section 300.8 Child with a Disability." [Sec. 300.8 Child with a disability - Individuals with Disabilities Education Act](#)

Institute for Education Science (IES). 2023. "Racial/Ethnic Enrollment in Public Schools." Research Report. U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. [COE - Racial/Ethnic Enrollment in Public Schools \(ed.gov\)](#)

Kahne, Joseph, and Ellen Middaugh. 2008. "Democracy for Some: The Civic Opportunity Gap in High School," Circle Working Paper 59, February. Washington, D.C.: Center for Information & Research on Civic Learning & Engagement. [democracy_some_circle.pdf](#)

Kahne, Joseph, John S. Rogers, and Alexander Kwako. 2021. "Do Politics in Our Democracy Prevent Schooling for Our Democracy? Civic Education in Highly Partisan Times," *Democracy and Education*, vol. 29, no.2, art. 3: 1-18.

Kahne, Joseph E., and Susan E. Sporte. 2008. "Developing Citizens: The Impact of Civic Learning Opportunities on Students' Commitment to Civic Participation," *American Educational Research Journal*, 45 (3): 738-766.

Kaufman, Julia H., and Melissa Kay Diliberti. 2023. "Social Studies Achievement Has Plummeted Nationally. Four Reasons This Trend Will Not Be Reversed Without Systemic Action," *The RAND Blog*, May 22. [Social Studies Achievement Has Plummeted Nationally. Four Reasons This Trend Will Not Be Reversed Without Systemic Action | RAND](#)

Kiesa, Abby, Ruby Belle Booth, Noorya Hayt, Kei Kawashima-Ginsberg, and Alberto Medina. 2022. *CIRCLE Growing Voters: Building Institutions and Community Ecosystems for Equitable*

Election Participation. Research Report. Medford, MA: Center for Information & Research on Civic Learning & Engagement. [circle_growing_voters.pdf \(tufts.edu\)](#)

Kleinberg, Mona S., and Richard R. Lau. 2019. "The Importance of Political Knowledge for Effective Citizenship: Differences Between the Broadcast and Internet Generations," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, vol. 83, no. 2: 338-362.

Kuhfeld, Megan, Jim Soland, Beth Tarasawa, Angela Johnson, Erik Ruzek, and Karyn Lewis. 2020. "How Is COVID-19 Affecting Student Learning?" *Brookings*, December 3. [How is COVID-19 affecting student learning? | Brookings](#)

Levine, Peter. 2009. "The Civic Opportunity Gap," *Educational Leadership*, vol. 66, no. 8: 20-25.

Levinson, Meira. 2010. "The Civic Empowerment Gap: Defining the Problem and Locating Solutions." In *Handbook of Research on Civic Engagement*, eds. Lonnie Sherrod, Judith Torney-Purta, and Constance A. Flanagan. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons: 331-361.

Levinson, Meira. 2012. "Diversity and Civic Education." In *Making Civics Count: Citizenship Education for a New Generation*, eds. David E. Campbell, Meira Levinson, and Frederick M. Hess. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press: 89-114.

Milner, Henry. 2010. *The Internet Generation*. Lebanon, NH: Tufts University Press.

National Center for Learning Disabilities. 2019. "Getting Serious About the Civic Learning Gap," December 6. Washington, D.C. [Getting Serious About the Civic Learning Gap - NCLD](#)

Niemi, Richard G., and Jane Junn. 1998. *Civic Education: What Makes Students Learn*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Owen, Diana, Kathryn Hartzell, and Chelsea Sanchez. 2020. *The James Madison Legacy Project: Evaluation Report*. Washington, D.C.: CERL Georgetown University. <https://cerl.georgetown.edu/james-madison-legacy-project-evaluation-report/>

Owen, Diana. 2022. *Teacher Expert Report: James Madison Legacy Project Expansion*. Research Report. June. Washington, D.C.: Civic Education Research Lab, Georgetown University.

Owen, Diana, and Alissa Irion-Groth. 2022. "Teaching Civic Engagement Through Immersive Experience: Students' Acquisition of Civic Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions," Paper prepared for presentation at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association Theme Panel on Educating Young Citizens for Engaged Citizenship, Montreal, Canada, September 16, 2022.

Owen, Diana, and Alissa Irion-Groth. 2020. “Civic Education for Youth Empowerment: The Impact of We the People and Project Citizen,” *Journal of Higher Education Theory and Practice*, vol. 24: no. 4.

Owen, Diana, and Donna P. Phillips. 2023. “Toward an Accessible Civics Curriculum: Adapting *We the People* for High-Need Students,” Paper prepared for Presentation at the American Political Science Association Teaching and Learning Conference on the panel on Inclusive Curriculum and Institutional Change, February 11, 2023, Baltimore, MD. DOI: [10.33774/apsa-2023-gqdb0](https://doi.org/10.33774/apsa-2023-gqdb0)

Owen, Diana, and M. Bradlee Sutherland. 2023. *James Madison Legacy Project Expansion: Pilot Study*. Research Report. Washington, D.C.: Civic Education Research Lab, Georgetown University. DOI: [10.13140/RG.2.2.31955.14882](https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.31955.14882)

Pasek, Josh, Lauren Feldman, Daniel Romer, and Kathleen Hall Jamieson. 2008. “Schools as Incubators of Democratic Participation: Building Long-Term Political Efficacy with Civic Education.” *Applied Developmental Science*, 12 (1): 26–37.

PPRI. 2021. “Competing Visions of America: An Evolving Identity or a Culture Under Attack?” November. <https://www.ppri.org/research/competing-visions-of-america-an-evolving-identity-or-a-culture-under-attack/>

Saavedra, Anna. 2021. “While Politicians Fight Over Civic Education, Most Parents and Adults Agree on the Subject,” June, 18. Los Angeles, CA: USC Dornsife, Center for Economic and Social Research. [While Politicians Fight Over Civic Education, Most Parents and Adults Agree on the Subject – USC Schaeffer](#)

Sawchuk, Stephen. 2021. “Why School Boards Are Now Hot Spots for Nasty Politics,” *EducationWeek*, July 29. [Why School Boards Are Now Hot Spots for Nasty Politics \(edweek.org\)](https://www.edweek.org/why-school-boards-are-now-hot-spots-for-nasty-politics)

Scholl, Andrew. 2023. “What is Inquiry-Based Learning? Types, Benefits, Examples,” SplashLearn, January 3. (splashlearn.com)

Schur, Lisa, and Douglas Kruse. 2020. “Fact Sheet: Disability and Voter Turnout in the 2020 Election.” New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers. [Fact Sheet on Disability and Voter Turnout in 2020 \(eac.gov\)](https://www.eac.gov/fact-sheet-on-disability-and-voter-turnout-in-2020)

Shapiro, Sarah, and Catherine Brown. 2018. *The State of Civics Education*. Research Report. Washington, D.C.: Center for American Progress. [020618_CivicsEducation-UPDATED.pdf \(americanprogress.org\)](https://www.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/020618-CivicsEducation-UPDATED.pdf)

Taylor, Ashley. 2020. “The Metaphor of Civic Threat: Intellectual Disability and Education for Citizenship,” *Critical Readings in Interdisciplinary Disability Studies*, ed. Linda Ware. New York: Springer: 53.67.

Taylor, Jeremy, Katie Buckley, Laura S. Hamilton, Brian M. Stecher, Lindsay Read, and Jonathan Schweig. 2018. *Choosing and Using SEL Competency Assessments: What Schools and Districts Need to Know*. Research Report. Assessment Work Group, Rand Corporation. [practitioner-guidance.pdf \(casel.org\)](#)

Tocqueville, Alexis de. 2002. *Democracy in America*. Paperback Edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Torney-Purta, Judith, and Jo-Ann Amadeo. 2017. “Civic and Political Knowledge and Skills.” In *The Sage Encyclopedia of Political Behavior*, Fathali M. Moghaddam, ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications: 87-90. [Civic and Political Knowledge and Skills \(civxnow.org\)](#)

U.S. Census Bureau. 2023. *Volunteering and Civic Life in America*. Research Report. Washington, D.C.: Americorps. [Volunteering in America: New U.S. Census Bureau, AmeriCorps Research](#)

U.S. Department of Education. 2016. Our Nation’s English Learners: What Are Their Characteristics. Washington, D.C. [Our Nation's English Learners \(ed.gov\)](#)

[U.S. Department of Education. 2023. NAEP Report Card: Civics. Washington, D.C.: Institute for Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress \(NAEP\), 2022 Civics Assessment. NAEP Civics: Civics Highlights 2022 \(nationsreportcard.gov\)](#)

[Vinnakota, Raj. 2019. From Civic Education to a Civic Learning Ecosystem: A Landscape Analysis and Case for Collaboration. Research Report. Red & Blue Works, November. From Civic Education to a Civic Learning Ecosystem - Institute for Citizens & Scholars \(citizensandscholars.org\)](#)

Youniss, James. 2011. “Civic Education: What Schools Can Do to Encourage Civic Identity and Action.” *Applied Developmental Science*, vol.15, no 2: 98-103.

Table 1
Civic Knowledge by Target Student Population
Pre/Post Difference of Means

| | All Students | Students of Color | ELL Students | Students with Disabilities |
|--|---------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Pretest \bar{x} | 9.71 | 9.42 | 8.41 | 8.38 |
| Posttest \bar{x} | 14.12 | 14.46 | 13.89 | 14.19 |
| Pretest SD | 5.44 | 5.27 | 5.37 | 5.42 |
| Posttest SD | 5.94 | 4.24 | 5.02 | 5.04 |
| \bar{x} Difference | 5.94 | 5.02 | 5.48 | 5.81 |
| Significance | .00 | .00 | .00 | .00 |
| Hedge's g | .92 | 1.04 | 1.01 | 1.05 |
| % Increase | 45% | 54% | 65% | 69% |
| n | 733 | 413 | 258 | 196 |

Table 2
OLS Regression Analysis
Civic Knowledge

| | beta | R ² for Block |
|----------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|
| Pretest Knowledge | .604 ^a | .319 ^a |
| Students of Color | .094 ^a | .036 ^a |
| ELLs | -.107 ^b | |
| Students with Disabilities | .090 ^b | |
| WTP Level | .136 ^a | .026 ^a |
| Hearings | .090 ^a | |
| Title I School | .156 ^a | .013 ^a |
| n=773 | | Model R ² =.394 |

Table 3
Civic Dispositions by Target Student Population
Pre/Post Difference of Means

| | All Students | Students of Color | ELL Students | Students with Disabilities |
|--|---------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Pretest \bar{x} | 7.02 | 7.10 | 6.79 | 7.00 |
| Posttest \bar{x} | 7.26 | 7.32 | 6.88 | 7.15 |
| Pretest SD | 2.18 | 2.05 | 2.06 | 2.04 |
| Posttest SD | 2.17 | 2.09 | 2.16 | 2.09 |
| \bar{x} Difference | .24 | .20 | .08 | .15 |
| Significance | .00 | .03 | NS | NS |
| Hedge's g | .11 | .09 | .04 | .06 |
| n | 724 | 431 | 264 | 201 |

Table 4
OLS Regression Analysis
Civic Disposition Index

| | beta | R ² for Block |
|----------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|
| Pretest Dispositions | .429 ^a | .203 ^a |
| Students of Color | .115 ^a | .022 ^a |
| ELLs | -.156 ^b | |
| Students with Disabilities | .032 | |
| WTP Level | .061 | .016 ^a |
| Hearings | .144 ^a | |
| Title I School | .002 | .000 |
| n=773 | | Model R ² =.241 |

Table 5
Interest and Attention by Target Student Population
Pre/Post Difference of Means

| | All Students | Students of Color | ELLs | Students with Disabilities |
|----------------------|--------------|-------------------|------|----------------------------|
| Pretest \bar{x} | 3.05 | 3.00 | 3.18 | 3.11 |
| Posttest \bar{x} | 3.18 | 3.19 | 3.38 | 3.23 |
| Pretest SD | 1.08 | 1.03 | 1.06 | 1.11 |
| Posttest SD | 1.02 | .99 | .97 | .96 |
| \bar{x} Difference | .13 | .19 | .20 | .12 |
| Significance | .00 | .00 | .00 | .06 |
| Hedge's g | .11 | .18 | .18 | .11 |
| n | 761 | 467 | 295 | 229 |

Table 6
OLS Regression Analysis
Interest and Attention

| | beta | R ² for Block |
|----------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| Pretest Interest/Attention | .407 ^a | .188 ^a |
| Students of Color | .006 | .017 ^a |
| ELLs | .206 ^a | |
| Students with Disabilities | -.021 | |
| WTP Level | -.040 | .008 |
| Hearings | -.086 | |
| Title I School | -.048 | .001 |
| n=773 | | Model R ² =.214 |

Table 7
Communication Skills
Pre/Post Difference of Means

| | All Students | Students of Color | ELL Students | Students with Disabilities |
|--|---------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Pretest \bar{x} | 4.07 | 4.06 | 3.97 | 4.14 |
| Posttest \bar{x} | 4.30 | 4.27 | 4.06 | 4.2 |
| Pretest SD | 1.61 | 1.56 | 1.57 | 1.63 |
| Posttest SD | 1.66 | 1.64 | 1.62 | 1.65 |
| \bar{x} Difference | .22 | .21 | .08 | .06 |
| Significance | .00 | .00 | NS | NS |
| Hedge's g | .14 | .13 | .05 | .03 |
| n | 646 | 439 | 271 | 212 |

Table 8
OLS Regression Analysis
Collaboration Skills

| | beta | R ² for Block |
|------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| Pretest Collaboration Skills | .464 ^a | .230 ^a |
| Students of Color | -.040 | .002 |
| ELLs | -.036 | |
| Students with Disabilities | -.057 | |
| WTP Level | .159 ^a | .020 ^a |
| Hearings | .094 ^a | |
| Title I School | -.052 | .001 |
| n=773 | | Model R ² =.253 |

Table 9
OLS Regression Analysis
Self-Awareness

| | beta | R ² for Block |
|----------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| Pretest Self-Awareness | .343 ^a | .152 ^a |
| Students of Color | .023 | .002 |
| ELLs | -.059 | |
| Students with Disabilities | -.018 | |
| WTP Level | .045 | .019 ^a |
| Hearings | .133 ^a | |
| Title I School | -.023 | .000 |
| n=773 | | Model R ² =.170 |

APPENDIX A

What are Fair Procedures of Due Process?

| PART 1 | | | |
|--|------------------------|--|----------------------|
| LESSON OVERVIEW | | | |
| WTP LEVEL(S) | Level 2, Middle School | TIMEFRAME | 2 -45 MINUTE LESSONS |
| WE THE PEOPLE UNITS & LESSON CORRELATION | | HEARING PREPARATION ALIGNMENT | |
| Unit 5, Lesson 27: How Does the Constitution Protect the Right to Due Process of Law? | | Students will work cooperatively to investigate due process rights/procedures and, using the information they learned, make individual decisions about what rights they believe are most important. They will then defend and explain their opinion, a skill needed in the simulated hearing. Students will also gain content knowledge about how individual rights are included in the Constitution and Bill of Rights. | |
| PURPOSE OF LESSON | | | |
| All people have rights that are protected by the U.S. Constitution, which created a limited government. In particular, many of these rights ensure that people are treated fairly and equally when interacting with the government (such as the police). In this lesson, students will investigate the specific due process protections that are included in the Constitution and learn about Supreme Court cases involving those rights. Finally, they will choose and defend which of these rights they think is most important. | | | |
| OBJECTIVES | | | |
| <p>Content:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Students will investigate the due process rights that are found in the Constitution and explain/defend which right they believe is most important to U.S. citizens. <p>Language:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Students will use academic language and new vocabulary (due process) to explain why it is important that the Constitution protects a person’s right to be treated fairly and equally. ● Reading: Students will read summaries of Supreme Court cases involving due process rights ● Speaking/Writing: Students will create a final product explaining which due process right is most important | | | |

and will choose a format (written, oral or visual) to present their ideas.

- Listening: Students will work in groups to evaluate and discuss real-world scenarios.

Cultural:

- Students will examine the concept of Constitutionally protected “due process” rights, and learn why people have different ideas about what it means to ensure all persons are treated fairly when dealing with the government.

| MATERIALS/ TEXTS/ RESOURCES | VOCABULARY |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● John Jacob’s Bad Day Handout ● In re Gault Oyez ● Due Process Scenario Posters ● Due Process Scenarios Student Answer Sheet Handout (one per student) ● Rights of the Accused Handouts (class set) ● Enmund v. Florida Supreme Court Case Student Questions ● Enmund v. Florida Oyez ● Handout D10 (from Level 2 We the People Teacher text) ● Due Process Poster Template ● Due Process Final Assessment Grading Rubric ● Vocabulary Graphic Organizer | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● due process: A requirement, stated in the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments, that treatment by state and federal governments that involves life, liberty, or property of individuals be reasonable, fair, and follow known rules and procedures. ● Fifth Amendment: An amendment to the Constitution that states that no person will have their life, liberty, or property taken away by the federal government without due process of law. This amendment protects your right to be treated fairly by the federal government. ● procedure: The methods or steps taken to accomplish something. |

CULTURAL RELEVANCE/ TEACHER BACKGROUND

Culturally Responsive Teacher Tips for a Lesson on Due Process Protections in the Constitution:

- **Emphasize diverse perspectives:** Incorporate diverse examples and case studies that reflect the experiences and perspectives of individuals from various cultural backgrounds. This helps students see how due process protections impact different communities and promotes empathy and understanding.
- **Acknowledge historical context:** Discuss the historical context of due process protections and their evolution over time. Highlight landmark Supreme Court cases that have shaped the interpretation and application of these rights, taking care to address the impact on diverse communities.
- **Encourage critical thinking:** Prompt students to analyze and evaluate the impact of due process protections on marginalized communities, such as historically oppressed racial or ethnic groups. Encourage them to critically examine how these rights have been upheld or compromised in different cases.
- **Address current issues:** Discuss current events and contemporary cases that involve due process protections. Help students understand how these rights are relevant in today's society and how they can impact individuals from diverse backgrounds.
- **Provide opportunities for reflection:** Allow students to reflect on their own experiences or those of their

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>families or communities with due process protections. This can help them understand the relevance and impact of these rights in their lives.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Seek culturally diverse resources: Utilize resources, such as case studies, articles, and videos, that represent diverse cultural perspectives and experiences. This promotes inclusivity and helps students see the breadth of experiences related to due process protections. | |
| SEL FOCUS | |
| <p>Students will develop their social awareness by evaluating scenarios involving due process rights and discussing with their peers what it means to be treated “fairly” by the government.</p> | |
| ASSESSMENT | |
| <p>Students will choose a due process right that they feel is most important and they will create a “public service message” to raise awareness of that right. A variety of final product options (written, visual, with or without technology) can be offered to best meet the needs of students.</p> | |
| PART 2 | |
| LESSON PROCEDURE | |
| INQUIRY QUESTION(S) | |
| <p>Does our Constitution (and amendments) adequately protect the rights of the accused?</p> | |
| INQUIRY STEPS: TEACHER PROCEDURES, AND ANTICIPATED STUDENT OUTCOMES | DIFFERENTIATION |
| ENGAGE - <i>Capture students’ attention, activate prior knowledge and experiences</i> | SEL, UDL, ELL Supports |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ask students: “Can you think of a time when you (or a friend) were treated unfairly in school, perhaps during an interaction with a teacher or administrator?” Allow students time to discuss their experiences with a seat partner. 2. Solicit student responses. Students will often mention issues such as the dress code, gum chewing or cell phones. The teacher can list ideas on the board if desired. 3. Ask students: “How did you <u>know</u> you were being treated unfairly?” 4. Solicit student responses. Students will usually say that they were not treated the same as someone else. They were dress coded, but a friend wearing the same thing did not get in trouble. 5. Tell students: Now, let’s read about another student who feels he was not treated fairly. 6. Have students read the handout John Jacobs’ Bad Day. As they read, they | <p>UDL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Provide options for recruiting interest by optimizing relevance, value and authenticity <p>SEL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Discussing their own experiences with a seat partner builds self-awareness of their own actions |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>should list ways that John was not treated fairly on the back of the handout.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. After they finish, ask students to share some of their ideas. Responses will vary, but will include ideas such as John being told he could not appeal, he did not know the charges against him, his punishment was too harsh or he was not offered the help of a lawyer. 8. Ask students: Could events like this actually happen? 9. Explain that the case described on the handout did actually happen (with a few small changes). The actual case involved a boy named Gerald Gault and took place before cell phones existed. All other basic details about how he was treated are true. 10. Tell students that they will read more about this case and how the Constitution describes how the U.S. government should treat U.S. citizens fairly under the law. | <p>and how they relate to the school community.</p> <p>ELL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Students could work in pairs or groups when reading the handout. Students with language needs could be paired with students with stronger reading skills so they have assistance with understanding the text. |
| <p>EXPLORE -Guided/open Inquiry of sources to investigate the question(s)</p> | <p>SEL, UDL, ELL Supports</p> |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Define the term “due process”: The Constitutional protection against unfair treatment by the government. 2. Ask students for examples of how the government (including the police) must treat people fairly. Most students will usually know that the police must “read people their rights” when arrested. The teacher may list student ideas on the board. 3. Explain that the Constitution includes guarantees that people be treated fairly when dealing with the government. 4. Have students independently read Level 2, pages 222-227. 5. Ask students: Based on your reading, what parts of the Constitution mention “due process”? Students should respond with the 5th and 14th Amendments. 6. Ask students: In your reading, you learned the actual details of the case involving Gerald Gault. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What is your opinion in this case? ○ Should the court find in favor of Gerald or the state? 7. Solicit student responses. If desired, the teacher can share the decision of the Supreme Court using the In re Gault Decision handout/slide. 8. Explain to students that although the 5th and 14th Amendments include the general principle of due process, specific due process rights are incorporated in several other amendments. They will explore these rights today. <p>Carousel Activity</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 9. You will need the Due Process Scenarios Posters and Student Answer Sheet (enough for each student) and a class set of the Rights of the Accused handouts. 10. Hang the Due Process Scenarios Posters around the classroom and provide | <p>UDL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● If technology allows, scenarios could be read aloud and recorded then provided to students online or through a learning management system. <p>SEL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Students will develop their social awareness as they evaluate scenarios involving due process rights and discuss with their peers what it means to be treated “fairly” by the government. <p>ELL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Set up groups in advance to ensure that special needs and ELL students are |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>each student with a copy of the Student Answer Sheet and the Rights of the Accused handout.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 11. Assign students to groups using a Jigsaw model or other preferred method. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Students will rotate around the room in their groups, moving from poster to poster. ○ At each poster, they will work with the other students in their group to read and analyze the posted scenario. ○ For each scenario, they have to determine which amendment is being violated and how that right is being violated. ○ Allow students 2 to 3 minutes at each poster and continue rotations until students have visited all posters. ○ Alternatively, students could be seated in groups and the posters can be rotated through the groups. 12. After students have seen all scenarios, review the answers by calling on groups to share their responses. Ensure that students have correctly identified the due process rights that match each scenario. | <p>distributed in groups with other students who can provide language support.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Instruct one student in each group to read each scenario out loud to their group. ● Sentence starters provided for Student Answer Sheet <p>Extension: Students could use copies of the full Constitution/Bill of Rights instead of the shortened Rights of the Accused handout</p> |
| <p>EXPLAIN—Clarify understandings via varied means of class conversation & dialogue</p> | <p>SEL, UDL, ELL Supports</p> |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. One job of our government is to protect the health and safety (“general welfare”) of all persons, including those accused of a crime. 2. It might seem odd that the Constitution is “helping” people accused of crimes, but it is important that this happens. 3. Have students work in groups to discuss the following questions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Why is it important that due process rights be protected for <u>all</u> people? ● What might happen if rights are <u>not</u> applied equally to all people? ● What can a person do if they feel their due process rights have been violated? 4. Allow time for students to share their responses. | <p>UDL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Provide options for expression and communication by allowing students to discuss answers or post their answers on a jamboard or similar application <p>SEL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Students practice social awareness by listening to different perspectives about the application of due process rights <p>ELL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Consider placing students in mixed ability groups |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>ELABORATE -Apply new knowledge and skills and extend learning</p> | <p>SEL, UDL, ELL Supports</p> |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Students read an example of a court case that involves due process rights in a real-world situation. 2. Provide students with the handout for the Enmund v. Florida Supreme Court case. 3. Students can work individually or in groups to review the facts of the case and make their own decision: Was the defendant (Enmund) treated fairly? 4. Students can write their decisions and explanations or a class discussion can be held to share ideas. 5. The teacher can share the actual outcome using the Enmund v. Florida Decision Oyez Link. | <p>UDL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Provide options for engagement Engagement through community collaboration during court case activity <p>SEL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Holding a class discussion of the Supreme Court case helps build social awareness, as students share their own ideas but also hear perspectives that are different from their own. <p>ELL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Enmund v. Florida Case has chunked text, sentence starters and lined responses |
| <p>EVALUATE -Check for understanding and assess learning</p> | <p>SEL, UDL, ELL Supports</p> |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Have students complete Handout D10 (Level 2 Textbook, Lesson 27) listing where specific due process rights are found in the Constitution and Bill of Rights. 2. Ask students to reflect, write, then share their response to the inquiry question; Does the Constitution adequately protect the rights of the accused? <p><u>Extend</u>: Research a court case involving due process rights. Examples could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Miranda v. Arizona (and the implications of Vega v. Tekoh) ● Brown v. Board of Education ● Gideon v. Wainwright ● Loving v. Virginia ● Summaries of other cases may be found on the website www.landmarkcases.org. (This site includes leveled readings and links to primary sources). | <p>UDL:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Provide options for Expression & Communication - usage of multimedia to research different cases <p>SEL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Students practice self-awareness by reflecting on their understanding of due process protections |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>ELL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Consider allowing students to work in mixed ability groups to complete handout D10 |
|--|--|

PART 3

LESSON REFLECTION AND DATA-INFORMED ACTION

Considerations: *After you collect data on student learning at the end of the lesson, what considerations do you need to make to best meet the needs of students for subsequent lessons?*

- Groupings (i.e. Interests, Skills, and/or Language Strengths)
- Supports (i.e. Remediation and/or Enrichment)
- Instructional Priorities (i.e. Reteach, Review, or Extend)
- Curriculum and Assessment Needs (i.e. Supplemental resources, accommodations, etc.)


APPENDIX B



Center for
Civic Education

Lesson 1: What did the Founders think about Constitutional Government? - Vocabulary Graphic Organizer (ELL/MLL)

Header

| Vocabulary Word | Word in Home Language | Definition | Definition in Home Language or in my own words | Picture |
|-----------------|-----------------------|---|--|---|
| constitution | <u>constitución</u> | A plan of government that sets forth the structures and powers of government. | Un plan de gobierno que <u>establece las estructuras y los poderes del gobierno.</u> |  |
| Parliament | | | | |
| Representation | | | | |
| Congress | | | | |

Footer



Center for
Civic Education