Teach and respond to the civics inquiry

Teach the target and read the evidence

Assess four components separately: institution and recipient; requested or enacted action; document status; supporting detail and limit. A sound stance for or against the project is not the goal. Accept accurate paraphrases, spoken answers or labeled diagrams; note supports. Read a weak response for access or terminology before assuming the civic idea is missing.

Lesson 1

After the starting task, model Hypatia: the recipient is a senator, the action is keeping an existing permission, and the letter is a request. Ask students to point to the requested verb. In Graffort, underline the requested actions separately: executive permit revocation and legislative defeat. The letter to Gallinger requests action by more people than its addressee. Do not teach that a sender’s request proves officials had or exercised the requested power.

Lesson 2

Show the August bill heading and official December Act. Explain that proposal language anticipates enactment. Read section 2’s condition, then draw file maps → Interior Secretary approval → permanent construction may begin on the land. The arrows represent a stated legal sequence, not proof it happened. Use the independent Merced inquiry for students to apply the distinctions.

Starting task answers

- 1. Hypatia Women’s Club, signed by Edith Webster, to U.S. Senator Frank P. Flint; asks that permission to take water not be revoked. Require the request and addressee, not a guessed permit authority.
- 2. A request about an existing permit: “be not revoked”. It does not establish a new law, Flint’s response, implementation or the claimed adequacy of water. An accurate limit earns credit.

Record what the answer shows

For each component write clear, partial or not yet shown, with a short student detail. These are teaching notes, not a validated scale, grade-placement test or combined score. If an answer supplies the stance but not the requested action, ask a neutral clarification: What action does the document ask that person or body to take?

Guided practice answers

- 1. President and Interior Secretary: revoke the existing revocable permit. Senators and representatives, especially Public Lands Committees: defeat a confirming bill. Gallinger receives the letter, but the resolution names these additional actors.
- 2. The Graffort Club adopted its own resolution requesting actions. That is not Congress acting and does not establish permit revocation. The final resolution names the requested actions.
- 3. August first-page heading “A BILL”, introduction and printing; December official approved Act. The first-page image does not contain all proposed terms or establish what changed before enactment. Shared H.R.7207 identifies the legislative subject, not identical whole text.
- 4. Grantee files maps; Secretary of the Interior approves them; only then may permanent construction begin on that land. The law states a requirement, not the fact or date of compliance.
- 5. February 4, 1910 Graffort request; August 1913 proposed bill page; December 19, 1913 approved Act. Introduction Aug 1 and commitment/printing Aug 5 are both acceptable when identified. Chronology alone does not show cause.
- 6. Seek committee reports, hearing records, debate or correspondence showing lawmakers considered that club’s request and used it in deciding a condition. Merely finding similar concerns does not establish influence.
- 7. The letter establishes that the club asserted the water claim. Independent water studies, supply records or engineering evidence would help evaluate it. Do not require agreement with either side.

Misreadings to address while teaching

“Resolved” signals an adopted statement, but identify its adopter. “Be it enacted” appears in proposed legislation too. “Grant” in an Act establishes a legal action subject to its terms; it does not describe completed construction. “Only supply” in a petition is the writer’s claim.

Independent inquiry answers

- 1. Citizens of Merced and Stanislaus counties at Livingston, May 30, 1913. Calls on California’s senators and representatives in Congress and other members, urging support against passage of the Raker bill or similar diversion measures. Congress is the institution, not the county assembly.
- 2. Opposes diverting Tuolumne waters out of the San Joaquin Valley for other uses; favors federal aid for water conservation and floodwater storage for irrigation. Opposition to all reservoirs is inaccurate.
- 3. Assembly adoption and urging bill opposition are actions of the public group; the Act’s legal grant is the enacted government decision. Public adoption is not federal enactment.
- 4. The protest records opposition, not Congress’s rejection. The later Act grants rights but section 2 requires maps filed and approved before permanent construction begins on the land; compliance and building are not established here.
- 5. Example: At Livingston the assembly asked congressional members to oppose the Raker bill’s diversion. Its resolution urges action against passage. The December Act later granted San Francisco specified rights and required map approval before permanent construction. These documents alone do not show how the assembly influenced the law. Equivalent accurate explanations count.
- 6. Indigenous-authored accounts, other local residents, downstream users, engineering reports or implementation records can be justified depending on the question. The assembly’s reported 2,000 attendees are a selected meeting, not everyone affected. Do not manufacture a position for absent people.

Read support and omissions separately

If the student identifies Congress accurately but drops the requested action, use recipient-and-action practice. If the student maps the request correctly but calls the club resolution a law, use status practice. If both are sound but a cause or outcome is assumed, use an additional-record question. Recheck with a different source after teaching rather than marking the familiar practice as independent evidence.

Short check and focused next teaching

- Check 1. Officers of the San Francisco Fire Department Widows and Orphans and Mutual Aid Associations; to Senator Charles S. Thomas, U.S. Senate; ask favorable vote and support for the bill. Do not infer a firefighting argument solely from the organization’s name.
- Check 2. Corrected example: On November 24 the associations asked a senator to vote in favor of giving San Francisco water-use rights. Their petition did not itself grant rights. The requested favorable vote is the supporting detail.
- Check 3. Section 1 grants specified water-work rights of way and necessary reservoir/dam lands; section 2 requires filed maps and Interior Secretary approval before permanent construction on the land. Valid limits include actual construction, representativeness, petition influence or water predictions. A grant alone is incomplete when the task requests a condition too.

Choose a concrete next task

- Continue: if all four components are clear, use the Merced four-sentence explanation again with a different precise source detail, then the later check. Note its familiar-source status.
- Clarify: if recipient and requested actors are mixed up, give Next tasks page 1. Model one Graffort action, let the learner name the other, then recheck Massachusetts.
- Reteach: if a request or bill is treated as law, give Next tasks page 2 status task. Have the learner point to heading/date and restate the map condition. Recheck Massachusetts status and later Maine enactment.
- Extend: if the main distinctions are secure, give the additional-record question on Next tasks page 2. Require what the record would show, not just a generic call for more research.

Next task answers

Page 1: Gallinger receives; President/Interior Secretary are petitioned to revoke; senators/representatives are urged to defeat. The source establishes the club’s request, not official compliance. Page 2 status: August bill = proposal; December Act section 1 = approved grant; section 2 = map filing/Interior approval condition. Enacting wording alone is insufficient. Extension: two well-chosen records with the specific connection each would test; no invented existence, contents or causal conclusion.

Follow-up and later revisit answers

Massachusetts follow-up

- 1. Massachusetts State Federation of Women’s Clubs, November 25, 1913; petitions President and urges its senators to defeat authorizing bills unless the stated public-welfare necessity is established. Require the legislative action; accept a faithful shortened paraphrase.
- 2. It favors transportation and lodging for public enjoyment, so it does not oppose all such development. Adoption establishes the federation’s resolution and stated position; it does not establish presidential response, Senate defeat, a new law or all members’ separate views.
- 3. These selected documents neither show lawmakers used the federation’s request to write a condition nor represent all affected people. Useful causal evidence needs an explicit connection in committee/debate/correspondence; broader opinion needs additional voices and a defensible account of whose views are represented.

Maine later revisit

- 1. Augusta, Hallowell, & Gardner Central Labor Union; petitions U.S. Senate to grant the rights sought by San Francisco and embodied in the Raker bill. It endorses San Francisco’s petition to Congress.
- 2. It is the union’s public resolution requesting further Senate action. A statement that the House already passed the bill is not completed enactment; the official approved Act records a different legal status. Do not impose an exact date on the undated image.
- 3. The source establishes the union’s favorable claim/prediction about scenery. It does not establish actual environmental outcomes. Dated landscape records, construction records or environmental observations with known scope could help evaluate change.

Use the recheck to plan another step

If institution/action becomes clear but status is still mixed up, revisit the bill/Act headings and give Maine later. If only the limit is missing, ask which claim needs another record and why. If all components remain clear on the later source, continue to a locally selected civic case after checking its institutions, rights and complete task conditions; this collection alone does not show broad transfer.

What your notes can support

Record dates, exact tasks, prior exposure and support. The notes show responses to these sources under those conditions. They do not establish a general civics level or classroom effectiveness.

Fictional teaching response — sound for the named task

Named task: Short check, Check a request for a Senate vote, questions 1–3: identify the writers, recipient, request and institution; distinguish the petition from the Act; state a grant, a condition and a limit.

Fictional response — sound for the named task: “Officers of the San Francisco Fire Department Widows and Orphans and Mutual Aid Associations asked Senator Charles S. Thomas for a favorable Senate vote and support for the bill. Their November 24 petition requested action; it did not grant the water rights. The Act approved December 19 grants specified water-work rights of way and necessary reservoir or dam lands, with filed maps and Interior Secretary approval required before permanent construction on that land. It does not prove the works were built or that this petition caused the law.”

Visible evidence: Names the public writers and Senate recipient, identifies the requested action, distinguishes request from enacted grant, and includes a condition and valid evidential limits.

Not established: Does not establish compliance, construction, public consensus or petition influence. It is evidence about these supplied documents, not a general civics level.

Clarify: Ask the learner to point to the requested action in the petition and the map condition in Act section 2. Accept accurate paraphrases and record source-reading support.

Next teaching/evidence: Reserve the Massachusetts follow-up and its separate source selection for another occasion if unseen. Check the requested legislative action, the resolution’s public-group status and the limit on a causal claim. It supplies another source for the distinctions, without validated equivalence to the short check.

This response is invented for teacher interpretation. Accept defensible alternatives. Record access, prior exposure and the actual response; do not assign an ability label or claim mastery from this example.

Follow up check

Source cards for this stage only — Follow up check

Original Act source pages for sections 1–2 — Follow up check

Fictional teaching response — partially developed

Named task: Short check, Check a request for a Senate vote, questions 1–3: identify the writers, recipient, request and institution; distinguish the petition from the Act; state a grant, a condition and a limit.

Fictional response — partially developed: “The associations wrote to Senator Thomas in the Senate to ask him to support the bill. They did not give San Francisco the rights themselves. The December Act grants rights of way for water works.”

Visible evidence: Identifies the recipient and institution, describes the request, and separates it from the later legal grant.

Not established: Does not yet state the required pre-construction map approval or a limit on what these documents prove. The accurate grant alone leaves question 3 incomplete.

Clarify: Ask what must happen before permanent construction and which outcome the documents leave open. Let the learner locate section 2 before deciding that the distinction is missing.

Next teaching/evidence: Give Next tasks page 2 and its selected-response source cards. Read section 2 and model “required before construction” as a condition, not proof it happened. Have the learner label the bill, approved grant and condition, then state a specific unproved outcome. Use the original short-check question 3 as familiar practice. Reserve the Massachusetts follow-up and its sources until after teaching.

This response is invented for teacher interpretation. Accept defensible alternatives. Record access, prior exposure and the actual response; do not assign an ability label or claim mastery from this example.

Selected response

Source cards for this stage only — Selected response

Original Act source pages for sections 1–2 — Selected response

Reserve: Follow up check

Fictional teaching response — plausible error

Named task: Short check, Check a request for a Senate vote, questions 1–3: identify the writers, recipient, request and institution; distinguish the petition from the Act; state a grant, a condition and a limit.

Fictional response — plausible error: “The associations passed the water-rights law on November 24 by sending it to Senator Thomas. The December Act says the project was approved, so the reservoir must already have been built.”

Visible evidence: Recognizes a named public group, a senator and two documents with different dates; attempts to connect a legal document with an outcome.

Not established: Confuses a public petition with government enactment and legal permission with completed construction. The dates alone do not establish that the petition caused the Act.

Clarify: Ask who wrote each document, what action each records and where completed building is stated. Check the meaning of “petition” and “approved” without supplying an answer to a check the learner has not seen.

Next teaching/evidence: Use Next tasks page 2 with its selected-response sources. Model: “asks for a favorable vote” records a request; the official approved Act records a legal grant; section 2 states a condition before permanent construction. Ask the learner to classify all three and explain why “Be it enacted” in a proposed bill is insufficient. Revisit short-check questions 2–3 as familiar practice. Later use the reserved Massachusetts follow-up with its own sources; do not score agreement with the project.

This response is invented for teacher interpretation. Accept defensible alternatives. Record access, prior exposure and the actual response; do not assign an ability label or claim mastery from this example.

Selected response

Source cards for this stage only — Selected response

Original Act source pages for sections 1–2 — Selected response

Reserve: Follow up check