

NAME _____

TASK: Choose a current topic that is under debate regarding issues of federalism in the United States. The topic should have a “grey area” between state and federal powers or local and state powers.

Examples:

- | | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| -Gun Control | -Legalization of Marijuana |
| -Marriage Rights | -Death Penalty -Mandatory Vaccination |
| -Immigration /Sanctuary Cities | -Voting Process/Rights -LGTBQ issues |
| -Police reform | |

Keeping in mind the United States Constitution and ideas of federalism discussed in class, you will research the histories and current debates over the issue you have chosen, explain possible debates to the argument and address concessions, and justify whether or not the federal government or state government has authority to uphold any law in existence or currently in legislation. Your essay may contain moral issues, must contain anecdotes, data, and facts, **but must discuss the topic in the scope of interpretations of the Constitution** through case law, Amendments, state laws, federal laws, and the ways lawmakers have approached the concept.

1-Do not use first or second person perspective

2-Build depth when citing a study. Your job is to provide the numbers and data from the research your citing. **BAD** Example: “A study in 2006 showed Americans were mostly for gay marriage”

GOOD Example: “A study from Gallup, America’s largest polling agency, conducted a study in 2006 that showed 74% of Americans were in support of gay marriage, an increased of 20% since 1996. Results from all quarters of the country showed an increase in support showing it is not just an isolated trend.”

3-It helps to review SCOTUS cases. , **Cornell Law, Oyez, and Justia** are great places to find *excerpts* from the Justice’s written arguments and opinions that explain their decisions further. Copy/paste to build depth when you can and this is an easy time to do it!

OUTLINE: Example is found on ilovesocialstudies.com

CHECK IN DATE 1:

FINAL SUBMISSION DUE:

CATEGORY	Available Points	Below Standard -70%	Approaching Standard 70%	At Standard 85%	Above Standard 90% +
Composition, Conventions & Citations	10	<p>MLA, APA, or Chicago Style is not present. In-text citations are absent. Works cited page does not exist or is only a compilation of links</p> <p>Paper has many errors in grammar and composition (perspective/rhetorical questions)</p>	<p>MLA, APA, Chicago Style is used. Several missed in-text citations in required spaces. Formatting has significant errors in citation</p> <p>Some errors in compositions such as first person perspective and/or rhetorical questions</p>	<p>MLA, APA, Chicago Style is used. Minimal (1-3) missed in-text citations. Minimal errors in the works cited page. Proper format throughout submission</p> <p>No first person perspective (unless part of a quote)</p> <p>Minimal errors in grammar</p>	<p>MLA, APA, Chicago Style is used. No significant missed in-text citations. No significant errors in the works cited page. Proper format throughout submission</p> <p>No first person perspective (unless part of a quote)</p> <p>Minimal errors in grammar</p> <p>No rhetorical questions</p>
Anecdotal Evidence (ethos/pathos)	10	No anecdote is included or it may just be a story from a presented court case	The anecdote is about the topic but is presented without creating interest, bias, or reflecting the issue	Anecdote is presented, reflects a position, represents the topic, and is authentic beyond a presented court case	Anecdote uses vivid language, creates interest, reflects a position, represents the topic, and is authentic beyond a court case
Constitutional Foundations of Federalism	10	Foundations are not presented, contain significant inaccurate information, is unclear, and vague	Foundations of government and the principles of federalism's roots are presented but unclear, with errors, or vague	Foundations of government and the principles of federalism's roots are presented through Constitutional references	Foundations of government and the principles of federalism's roots are thoroughly and clearly presented through Constitutional references and/or subsequent Amendments
Topical History	20	History on the topic is vague, underdeveloped and does not relate to the topic of federalism.	Relevant topical history included movements, legislation, key groups, people, and debate are inaccurate and/or unsupported. At times this information may be vague or have missing key elements.	Relevant topical history included movements, legislation, key groups, people, and debate are presented accurately with examples, and direct evidence from credible sources and authoritative figures. At times this information may be undeveloped or have missing key elements.	Relevant topical history includes direct evidence from movements, legislation, key groups, people, and past debates are presented accurately with detail, statistics and examples from credible sources and authoritative figures. The history is thorough with no significant gaps.
Case Law and Related Constitutional Principles (logos)	40	<p>Landmark cases are missed. Analysis from the court opinions are absent.</p> <p>Connections from mentioned cases/Constitution are not related..</p>	<p>Landmark cases are missed. Analysis from the court opinions are vague. Direct evidence is underutilized in the argument regarding federalism in regards to the topic.</p> <p>Relative constitutional elements such as clauses and Amendments are absent or vague.</p>	Landmark case law from the Supreme Court is included. It is properly analyzed with relevant Constitutional elements (such as Amendments and specific clauses) and relationships also presented. Evidence is not direct, minimal, or is not thoroughly developed.	Landmark case law from lower and/or Supreme Court are included with abundant pieces of direct evidence from the justices opinions. It is properly analyzed in depth with relevant Constitutional elements (such as Amendments and specific clauses) and relationships to the topic of federalism.
Conclusion	10	No outlook on the issue is addressed.	Outlook on issue is presented - no current debate is presented. Evidence is not presented and/or unsupported. May be hypothetical.	Outlook on issue is presented - little if any debate is characterized. Evidence is vague and/or unsupported.	Outlook on the issue and continued debate is presented with direct evidence from studies, polls, politicians, and/or experts in the field - may be related to upcoming elections