

# Constitutional Issues

Citizens in a democracy have the right and responsibility to make informed decisions. You will make an informed decision about a public issue after researching and discussing different perspectives on this issue.

## Your Task

In a cohesive paper or presentation, you will:

- Present an argument that:
  - Includes a precise, knowledgeable claim that states a position.
  - Provides reasoning supported by relevant and credible evidence.
  - Includes a call to action
- Consider the interaction between individual rights and the common good, including:
  - An analysis of how the Constitution promotes one specific ideal or principle that is logically connected to your position on the issue.
  - An evaluation of how well the Constitution was upheld by a court case OR a government policy related to your position on the issue.
  - A fair interpretation of a position on the issue that contrasts with your own.
- Cite textual evidence that logically supports your claim:
  - Cite your sources when you draw information from them: for instance, when you summarize, paraphrase, or quote, and when you refer to facts, figures, and ideas.
  - Provide complete publication information for each source in your bibliography or list of works cited.

## Constitutional Issues Rubric

Score	4	3	2	1
Claim	I stated a claim regarding the issue; my claim is clear, specific, and arguable.	I stated a claim regarding the issue; my claim is clear and arguable, but not specific.	I stated a claim regarding the issue; my claim is clear and arguable, but too general/vague.	I stated a claim regarding the issue; my claim is confusing, vague, and/or not arguable.
Civics Concepts	I included an analysis that advocates for balancing individual rights and the common good. I provided a thorough evaluation of how well a court case <i>or</i> a governmental policy upholds a constitutional principle related to the issue. I provided a fair/balanced interpretation and refutation of a counterclaim regarding the issue that contrasts with my own.	I included an analysis that considers the interaction between individual rights and the common good. I provided an evaluation of how well a court case <i>or</i> a governmental policy upholds a constitutional principle related to the issue. I provided an interpretation and refutation of a counterclaim regarding the issue that contrasts with my own.	I addressed individual rights <i>or</i> the common good. I provided a description of a court case <i>or</i> a governmental policy, but I didn't evaluate how it upholds a constitutional principle related to the issue. I mentioned a counterclaim regarding the issue that contrasts with my own.	I didn't address individual rights <i>or</i> the common good. I provided a description of a court case <i>or</i> a governmental policy, but it was partial or unclear. I didn't mention a counterclaim regarding the issue that contrasts with my own.
Reasoning	I provided coherent reasoning that connects the evidence to the claim; <i>and</i> I included a thorough and convincing analysis of how the Constitution promotes specific ideals or principles.	I provided coherent reasoning that connects the evidence to the claim; <i>and</i> I included an adequate analysis of how the Constitution promotes specific ideals or principles.	I provided reasoning for the claim, including how the Constitution promotes specific ideals or principles; <i>but</i> I did not connect the evidence to the claim.	I provided reasoning for the claim, but I didn't explain how the Constitution promotes specific ideals or principles; <i>and</i> I did not connect the evidence to the claim.
Evidence	I provided thorough and convincing evidence for the claim. I provided clear, coherent reasoning that connects the evidence to the claim. I made explicit connections between corroborating evidence.	I provided adequate evidence for the claim. I provided mostly clear and coherent reasoning that connects the evidence to the claim. I presented corroborating evidence, but without making explicit connections.	I provided uneven, cursory evidence for the claim. Some of the reasoning that connects the evidence to the claim has flaws in logic. I presented no corroborating evidence.	I provided minimal and/or irrelevant evidence for the claim, including few or no use of facts and details from sources. Most of the reasoning that connects the evidence to the claim has flaws in logic. I presented no corroborating evidence.
Advocacy	I included a call to action* that explains the need for change <i>and</i> a specific implementation strategy.	I included either a call to action* that explains the need for change, <i>or</i> a specific implementation strategy.	I included a call to action,* but without specifics.	I did not include a call to action.

Score	4	3	2	1
Citations	I referred explicitly in the paper or presentation to the Constitution and three or more credible sources that provide relevant information.	I referred explicitly in the paper or presentation to the Constitution and two credible sources that provide relevant information.	I referred explicitly in the paper or presentation to the Constitution and one credible source that provides relevant information.	I referred explicitly in the paper or presentation either to the Constitution, or to one credible source that provides relevant information.
Sources	My sources are varied (primary and secondary), represent more than one point of view, and provide in-depth and reliable information.	My sources are varied (primary and secondary) and represent more than one point of view.	My sources are not varied, and they represent one point of view far more than another.	My sources are not varied, and I rely too much on one source for my evidence.

**No Score (NS)** is given if the work is unintelligible, in a language other than English, off topic, off purpose, or copied.

\*A “call to action” could include what would have happened in the past, or, if the topic is a current issue, what should be done.