

## Unit 3

# Model Organizer and Scoring Guide

## Teacher Resource

### Resource Overview

This document is designed to help teachers support and assess students as they complete the unit's deconstructed DBQ organizer. It breaks down each section of the organizer and provides model responses and examples to guide instruction. Pair this resource with the Teacher Resource document for additional background on each primary source in the DBQ set. For guidance on teaching the necessary skills, refer to the mini-lesson slide deck.

**Question:** What were the principles of the new Constitution and how did they shape the debate between the Federalists and Anti-Federalists during the ratification debate?

**Thesis:** Answers will vary.

### Examples

1. The new Constitution was based on principles like federalism, checks and balances, and the separation of powers, which created a strong national government. Federalists supported these ideas, believing they would create stability, while Anti-Federalists feared the government would become too powerful and threaten individual rights, leading to a heated debate over ratification.
2. The Constitution introduced important principles such as a strong central government, separation of powers, and a system of checks and balances. While Federalists supported these ideas to create a stronger national government that could better protect rights, Anti-Federalists worried they would limit individual freedoms. This led to a major debate over whether the new government would protect or threaten people's rights.

**“VIEW”ing the Documents:** Answers will vary.

### Examples

#### Document A: Brutus I (1787)

- **Voice:** Brutus (likely Robert Yates), an Anti-Federalist who feared a strong central government.
- **Intent:** To warn against ratifying the Constitution by arguing that a large republic would lead to corruption, loss of public control, and abuse of power.

- **Environment:** The ratification debates of 1787–1788, where Anti-Federalists feared that the proposed Constitution would give too much power to the federal government at the expense of the states and individuals.
- **Who:** Written for state delegates and the general public, urging them to reject the Constitution in favor of a government that better protects individual liberties.

#### Document B: Thomas Jefferson to James Madison (1787)

- **Voice:** Thomas Jefferson, a strong advocate for individual rights and limited government, writing from France.
- **Intent:** To persuade Madison that the Constitution needed a bill of rights to explicitly protect freedoms such as freedom of religion, freedom of the press, and the right to a fair trial.
- **Environment:** Jefferson was concerned the new U.S. government might not sufficiently protect individual liberties without explicit guarantees.
- **Who:** Written privately to James Madison, a key figure in drafting and defending the Constitution, to influence him to push for a bill of rights.

#### Document C: Preamble to the U.S. Constitution (1787)

- **Voice:** The collective authors of the Constitution, primarily James Madison and other Federalists at the Constitutional Convention.
- **Intent:** To establish the foundational ideas of the new government—unity, justice, peace, defense, welfare, and liberty—framing the Constitution as a contract between the people and their government.
- **Environment:** The Constitutional Convention had just produced the final draft of the Constitution. Federalists were promoting a strong but balanced government in response to the weaknesses of the Articles of Confederation.
- **Who:** Addressed to the American people to justify and explain the purpose of the new Constitution.

#### Document D: James Madison to Thomas Jefferson (1788)

- **Voice:** James Madison, a Federalist who had initially argued against a bill of rights but was beginning to recognize its political and philosophical value.
- **Intent:** To explain why a bill of rights, while not strictly necessary for a government based on popular sovereignty, could still serve as a safeguard against potential abuses of power.
- **Environment:** The U.S. Constitution had been ratified by enough states to take effect, but Anti-Federalists were still demanding amendments to protect individual rights. Madison was navigating this debate while preparing to serve in the new government.

- **Who:** A private letter to Jefferson, addressing his concerns and laying the groundwork for Madison’s eventual support of the Bill of Rights.

**Document E: Federalist No. 51 (1788)**

- **Voice:** James Madison, writing as Publius, a Federalist defending the Constitution.
- **Intent:** To argue the Constitution’s system of separation of powers and checks and balances would prevent any one branch from becoming too powerful, protecting individual freedoms through structure rather than explicit rights.
- **Environment:** The Federalist Papers were written to persuade New York and other key states to ratify the Constitution. Anti-Federalists were deeply concerned about potential government overreach.
- **Who:** Addressed to the general public, particularly undecided state delegates and voters who were still debating whether to support the Constitution.

**VIEW Sentences: Answers will vary.**

Example: James Madison wrote Federalist #51 in 1788 to persuade Americans that a strong central government would protect liberty. This was written during the ratification debates as states decided whether to adopt the Constitution, and it was intended for American citizens and legislators.

## Scoring Guides

### 1-point Rubric

Evidence of Proficiency		Suggestions for Improvement
	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Claim</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Clearly and directly answers the prompt with a strong, defensible claim.</p>	
	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Line of Reasoning</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Provides a clear, logical structure that outlines key points.</p>	

	<p><b>Document Analysis</b> Clearly identifies the author, purpose, historical context, and/or audience for at least three documents. Provides insightful analysis of the document's significance.</p>	
	<p><b>VIEW Sentences</b> VIEW sentences are accurate, well-written, and concise. They effectively explain the document's significance with strong historical reasoning.</p>	
	<p><b>Use of Evidence</b> Effectively integrates relevant evidence from documents to support the claim.</p>	
	<p><b>Clarity &amp; Organization</b> Thesis is clearly written, well-organized, and easy to understand.</p>	
	<p><b>Mechanics &amp; Grammar</b> Free of errors in grammar, spelling, and punctuation.</p>	

## Scoring Matrix

Criteria	4 - Advanced	3 - Proficient	2 - Developing	1 - Beginning
<b>Claim</b>	Clearly and directly answers the question with a strong, defensible claim.	Answers the question with a defensible claim.	Partially addresses the question with a weak or unclear claim.	Does not address the question or lacks a claim.

<b>Line of Reasoning</b>	Provides a clear, logical structure that outlines key points.	Establishes a reasonable line of reasoning with some organization.	Attempts a line of reasoning but lacks clarity or coherence.	Does not establish a logical line of reasoning.
<b>Document Analysis</b>	Clearly identifies the author, purpose, historical context, and/or audience for at least three documents. Provides insightful analysis of the document's significance.	Identifies the author, purpose, context, and/or audience for at least three documents, but some explanations may lack depth.	Attempts to analyze three documents but misses key aspects of VIEW (e.g., unclear context or purpose).	Provides minimal or incorrect analysis of the documents. Missing multiple components of VIEW.
<b>VIEW Sentences</b>	VIEW sentences are accurate, well-written, and concise. They effectively explain the document's significance with strong historical reasoning.	VIEW sentences are mostly clear and accurate but may lack depth or connection to the thesis.	VIEW sentences attempt to summarize the documents but are unclear, too general, or contain inaccuracies.	VIEW sentences are confusing, missing, or incorrect, showing little understanding of the documents.
<b>Use of Evidence</b>	Effectively integrates relevant evidence from documents to support the claim.	Uses relevant evidence to support the claim.	Uses limited or somewhat relevant evidence.	Does not use evidence or evidence is unrelated.
<b>Mechanics &amp; Grammar</b>	Free of errors in grammar, spelling, and punctuation.	Minor errors that do not interfere with the meaning.	Noticeable errors that may distract from the meaning.	Frequent errors that make the thesis difficult to understand.

Total Score: \_\_\_\_\_ / 24

Comments: