

California's ELA/ELD Framework
EIGHTH GRADE

ELA/Literacy and ELD in Action in Grade Eight

Both the CA CCSS for ELA/Literacy and the CA ELD Standards acknowledge the importance of reading complex texts closely and thoughtfully to derive meaning. In addition, reading texts multiple times can reveal layered meanings that may not present themselves during a single reading. In order to support their students to comprehend specific complex texts, as well as to support their abilities to read closely in general, teachers should prepare lessons carefully and purposefully before teaching. Teachers should select challenging and interesting texts that are worth spending the time on reading and rereading. Teachers should read the texts ahead of time in order to determine why they might be challenging for all students and for particular students (including EIs and students with disabilities) and plan a sequence of lessons that build students' abilities to read the text with increasing understanding and independence. This requires teachers to analyze the cognitive and linguistic demands of the texts, including the sophistication of the ideas or content of the text, students' prior knowledge of the content, and the complexity of the vocabulary, sentences, and organization of the text, as well as the purpose for reading particular texts.

During instruction, teachers should model how to read texts closely by thinking aloud, highlighting the comprehension questions they ask themselves as they read, the language, and the ideas that catch their attention. Teachers should provide concrete methods for students to read analytically and guide them to read complex texts frequently while providing with appropriate levels of scaffolding. Eighth graders need many opportunities to read a wide variety of complex texts and to discuss the texts they read.

Importantly, for EL students, teachers should explicitly draw attention to text structure and organization and to particular elements of language (e.g., complex sentences, vocabulary) that serve as resources that help the author convey particular meanings. Examples of language resources are text connectives, which create cohesion (e.g., *for example, suddenly, in the end*); long noun phrases, which expand and enrich the meaning of sentences (e.g., “the whole strange-familial world, glistening white” [NGA/CCSSO 2010a: Appendix B, 80]); and complex sentences, which combine ideas and create relationships between them (e.g., “Now that we no longer belonged to

California’s ELA/ELD Framework
EIGHTH GRADE

the Company, we somehow had to acquire a thousand dollars worth of property, a faraway figure when you can only save nickels and dimes.” [NGA/CCSSO 2010a: Appendix B, 80]). Providing English learners with opportunities to discuss the language of the complex texts they are reading enhances their comprehension of the texts while also developing their awareness of how language is used to make meaning.

Lesson planning should look forward to unit and year-end goals and incorporate the framing questions in Figure 6.30.

Figure 6.30. Framing Questions for Lesson Planning

Framing Questions for Lesson Planning	
Framing Questions for All Students	Add for English Learners
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the big ideas and culminating performance tasks of the larger unit of study, and how does this lesson build toward them? • What are the learning targets for this lesson, and what should students be able to do at the end of the lesson? • Which clusters of CA CCSS for ELA/Literacy does this lesson address? • What background knowledge, skills, and experiences do my students have related to this lesson? • How complex are the texts and tasks that I will use? • How will students make meaning, express themselves effectively, develop language, and learn content? How will they apply or learn foundational skills? • What types of scaffolding, accommodations, or modifications will individual students need to effectively engage in the lesson tasks? • How will my students and I monitor learning during and after the lesson, and how will that inform instruction? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the English language proficiency levels of my students? • Which CA ELD Standards amplify the CA CCSS for ELA/Literacy at students’ English language proficiency levels? • What language might be new for students and/or present challenges? • How will students interact in meaningful ways and learn about how English works in collaborative, interpretive, and/or productive modes?

ELA/Literacy and ELD Vignettes

The ELA/literacy and ELD vignettes that follow are intended to provide concrete illustrations of how to implement the CA CCSS for ELA/Literacy and the CA ELD Standards in tandem. The vignettes are useful resources for teachers to discuss and

California's ELA/ELD Framework
EIGHTH GRADE

use as they collaboratively plan lessons, extend their learning, and refine their practice. The examples in the vignettes are not intended to be prescriptive, nor are the instructional approaches limited to the content areas identified. Rather, they are provided here as tangible ideas that can be used and adapted as needed in flexible ways in a variety of instructional contexts.

ELA/Literacy Vignette

Vignette 6.5 illustrates how a teacher might implement the CA CCSS for ELA/Literacy and the CA ELD Standards during ELA instruction where close reading is the focus of instruction. The designated ELD vignette that follows provides an example of how can build from and into the types of lessons outlined in the ELA vignette.

**Vignette 6.5 Integrated ELA and Social Studies Grade Eight
Freedom of Speech: Analyzing Complex Texts Collaboratively**

Background:

Mr. Franklin, an eighth grade English teacher, Ms. Austin, his social studies colleague, and Mrs. García, the school's English language development specialist, frequently collaborate on interdisciplinary projects. Mrs. García frequently plans with the teachers and co-teaches some lessons in order to support the students who are ELs, most of whom are at the Bridging level of English language proficiency (ELP), as well as students who are newly reclassified as English Proficient (RFEP). Recently, the teachers decided to work together to address an issue that came up in their classes. The school's principal had asked a student to change her T-shirt because, according to the principal, it displayed an inflammatory message. Some students were upset by the principal's decision and felt that their right to freedom of speech had been violated, citing the U.S. Constitution. Their position was that the T-shirt was an expression of their youth culture and that they had a right to display it.

Eager to use this *teachable moment* to promote critical thinking, content understandings, and disciplinary literacy, the teachers worked collaboratively to create a series of lessons on the First Amendment so that their students would be better equipped to first determine whether or not their First Amendment rights had been violated and, if so, engage in civil discourse in order to, possibly, persuade the principal to reconsider his decisions. While the teachers plan to discuss how the First Amendment establishes five key freedoms of expression for Americans—freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of press, freedom to assemble peacefully, and freedom to petition the government—they will delve most deeply into that which seems to be most relevant to the students at the moment: freedom of speech.

Lesson Context:

The two-week long unit the teachers designed includes reading and discussing primary and secondary sources, viewing media, writing short texts, and engaging in a debate. The culminating writing task is a jointly constructed letter to the principal advocating for particular decisions and actions around student free speech, an idea that the teachers and principal generated as a purposeful application of student learning. Mr. Franklin and Ms. Austin have selected three documents for close reading and analysis.

They agree that in her social studies class, Ms. Austin will review the events leading up to the writing of the Constitution and facilitate students' reading of the First Amendment of the Bill of Rights. She'll also engage them in learning about the role of the Supreme Court pertaining to cases related to the

California's ELA/ELD Framework EIGHTH GRADE

First Amendment. In English class, Mr. Franklin will facilitate students' reading and discussion of four Supreme Court decisions: *Tinker v. Des Moines Independent Community School District*, *Bethel School Dist. No. 403 v. Fraser*, *Morse v. Frederick*, and *Hazelwood School District v. Kuhlmeier*. Each text is about one page long and is at a text complexity level suitable for students at this grade level. Mr. Franklin will guide students in a highly structured reading of *Tinker v. Des Moines* and then facilitate an expert group jigsaw for reading the three other cases. The close reading tasks, as well as additional research they will conduct, will prepare the students to engage in a classroom debate about the topic.

The teachers' goal is to support their students to begin to formulate a position about the rights and restrictions of free speech in public schools and convey this position through spoken and written language, using evidence to support their ideas. In preparation for the lessons, they themselves analyze the texts in order to clarify their understandings. Mrs. García helps them to identify language and concepts that may be particularly challenging for some of their EL students, as well as other culturally and linguistically diverse students. She also has an opportunity to learn more about the content the teachers are teaching so that she can help her students make connections to it during designated ELD. Excerpts from the four texts the teachers examine are provided below:

- **First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution of the United States (1791) states:**

“Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.”

- **Tinker v. Des Moines (1969)**

Court Ruling: Student expression may not be suppressed unless it substantially disrupts the learning environment.

In December 1965, John and Mary Beth Tinker of Des Moines, Iowa, wore black armbands to their public school as a symbol of protest against American involvement in the Vietnam War. When school authorities asked the students to remove their armbands, they refused and were subsequently suspended. The Supreme Court decided that the Tinkers had the right to wear the armbands, with Justice Abe Fortas stating that students do not “shed their constitutional rights to freedom of speech or expression at the schoolhouse gate.”

- **Bethel School Dist. No. 403 v. Fraser (1987):**

Court Ruling: Schools may sanction students for using indecent speech in educational settings.

A student who gave a sexually suggestive speech at a high school assembly was suspended. The Supreme Court ruled that offensively vulgar, lewd, and indecent speech is not protected by the First Amendment and that school officials could sanction students for this type of speech since they need to have the authority to determine appropriate speech for educational environments, stating that the “constitutional rights of students in public school are not automatically coextensive with the rights of adults in other settings.”

- **Hazelwood v. Kuhlmeier (1988):**

Court Ruling: Administrators may edit the content of school newspapers.

In May 1983, Hazelwood East High School Principal Robert Reynolds removed pages from the school newspaper because of the sensitive content in two of the articles. The articles covered teenage pregnancy at the school and the effects of divorce on students. The Supreme Court decided that Principal Reynolds had the right to such editorial decisions, as he had “legitimate pedagogical concerns.”

- **Morse v. Frederick (2007)**

Court Ruling: School officials can prohibit students from displaying messages or engaging in symbolic speech that promotes illegal drug use.

At a school-supervised event, student Joseph Frederick displayed a banner that read “Bong Hits 4 Jesus,” a slang reference to smoking marijuana. Deborah Morse, the school's principal,

California's ELA/ELD Framework EIGHTH GRADE

confiscated Frederick's banner and suspended him from school for ten days, citing a school policy that bans the display of material advocating illegal drug use. Frederick sued, and the Supreme Court ruled that school officials can prohibit students from displaying messages that promote illegal drug use.

The learning target for the first few days of lessons and the focal standards addressed in them are provided below:

Learning Target: Students will analyze four landmark court cases about students' First Amendment rights to free speech to determine to what extent these rights are protected.

CA CCSS for ELA/Literacy: *RI.8.1 – Cite the textual evidence that most strongly supports an analysis of what the text says explicitly as well as inferences drawn from the text; RI.8.2 – Determine a central idea of a text and analyze its development over the course of the text, including its relationship to supporting ideas; provide an objective summary of the text; SL.8.1c – Come to discussions prepared, having read or researched material under study; explicitly draw on that preparation by referring to evidence on the topic, text, or issue to probe and reflect on ideas under discussion; L.8.4c – Consult general and specialized reference materials (e.g., dictionaries, glossaries, thesauruses), both print and digital, to find the pronunciation of a word or determine or clarify its precise meaning or its part of speech.*

CA ELD Standards (Bridging): *ELD.PI.1 – Come to discussions prepared, having read or researched material under study; explicitly draw on that preparation by referring to evidence on the topic, text, or issue to probe and reflect on ideas under discussion; ELD.PI.2 – Adjust language choices according to task (e.g., facilitating a science experiment, providing peer feedback on a writing assignment), purpose, and audience; ELD.PI.6a – Explain ideas, phenomena, processes, and text relationships (e.g., compare/contrast, cause/effect, problem/solution) based on close reading of a variety of grade-level texts and viewing of multimedia with light support.*

Related CA History-Social Science Standards:

8.2 - Students analyze the political principles underlying the U.S. Constitution and compare the enumerated and implied powers of the federal government.

Lesson Excerpts:

Mr. Franklin provides an overview of the unit, telling them that, over the next two weeks, they'll engage in a variety of reading, writing, discussion, and viewing tasks in order to learn more about their freedom of speech rights so that they can articulate a civil response to the principal's decision. He explains that, today, they will begin reading about one of several court cases that will provide them with information about freedom of expression in public schools. The *big question* they will be learning to address is the following:

Should students be allowed to express any message or point of view while they are at school?

He posts this big question on the wall, in a section that he has prepared for posting terms and photographs related to the unit, as well as current news articles related to free speech. He previews several terms (such as *symbolic act, prohibit, majority opinion, minority opinion, exercise rights, in favor of*) from the texts, which he suspects will be challenging or new for them, and he also highlights some words for which they may know other meanings than those that are in the text (such as *exercise*). He provides the students with a First Amendment Cases terms sheet, which contains the words, as well as their explanations and an example of the terms in use.

Mr. Franklin briefly previews the content of the short *Tinker v. Des Moines* text, and he provides a quick overview of the historical context for the case (the Vietnam War, the 1960's). He shows the students photographs of anti-war protests in the U.S. and a short video (<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SqQvygBVSxA>) about the case made by a high school student. He

California's ELA/ELD Framework EIGHTH GRADE

asks the students to discuss their initial impressions about the case so far in their table groups.

He then asks the students to follow along as he reads the *Tinker v. Des Moines* text aloud, referring to their terms sheet if needed. Before reading, he asks them to just try to get the big ideas in the text and not to worry too much about the details, and he lets them know that they'll be reading the text two more times. As he reads, he stops at strategic points in the text to explain terms and model good reading behaviors, such as thinking aloud to summarize what he's read or to figure out challenging words. After he reads, he asks students to turn to a partner and briefly discuss what they think the text is about. He acknowledges that the text is challenging, both in terms of the content and the language used.

Mr. Franklin: This is a pretty complex text, and you might not know every single word or understand everything perfectly the first time you listen to or read this. With texts like this one, you need—I even need—to read it several times because there are lots of layers in it. That's the kind of reading we're going to be doing: layered reading. I like to call it that because each time you go back to the text and read it again, you peel away the different layers of meaning, just like you can pull away the layers of this artichoke.

As he explains, he pulls out a real artichoke. He tells them that in order to get to the heart of the artichoke, he has to work at it and peel away first the outer layers and then the inner layers, and then finally, when he gets to the center, he has to do some additional peeling away in order to get to the heart. He shows them a photo of a peeled artichoke with all of the leaves piled high on a plate.

Mr. Franklin: What's interesting to me is that once I've peeled away the layers, there's more on my plate than when I started peeling. That's how it is when you read a text very closely, in a layered way: you end up understanding more about the text each time you read it, with more on you plate than when you started.

He provides his students with a handout of *focus questions*, and he discusses the questions with them to make sure they understand what to look for. The focus questions for the *Tinker v. Des Moines* text are provided below:

Tinker v. Des Moines Focus Questions

1. What was the case about?
2. How did the three students involved in this case participate in expressing "symbolic speech?"
3. How did the school try to justify *prohibiting* the students' rights to free speech?
4. Why did the Supreme Court rule in favor of the students and say that the school did **not** have just cause (fair reasons) for banning the armbands?

He asks the students to read the short text independently and to write their comments in the margins of the text and to take notes on the focus questions handout. Each student has a dictionary to look up unfamiliar words as they are reading independently, including bilingual dictionaries for students who choose to use them. (Earlier that morning during designated ELD, Mrs. García previewed the text and the focus questions for the EL students at the late Emerging and early Expanding levels of ELP.)

Next, Mr. Franklin asks them to read the text again with a partner, taking turns to read chunks of the text and adding notes to their focus questions handout. Mr. Franklin then asks the partners to join one or two other sets of partners to discuss their notes. As they engage in their discussions, he listens in to determine how they are interpreting the information. Julissa, Caitlin, Sirtaj, and Liam are discussing the text at their table.

Julissa: Caitlin and me said that the Supreme Court ruled for the students because they were quiet and not making any problems when they were wearing the armbands. They weren't – what did it say (looking at her notes) – they weren't disrupting the school activities.

Caitlin: Yeah, can I add something? There's something here about that, about them not

California’s ELA/ELD Framework
EIGHTH GRADE

disrupting what was happening in school. The judges said, “There is no indication that the work of the schools or any class was disrupted ... there were no threats or acts of violence on school premises.” So, the Supreme Court ruled in their favor because they weren’t really interfering with the other students’ rights.

Sirtaj: I think that’s why the school was wrong. The Supreme Court said that they had to protect the free speech at school, for the students’ free speech. Here it says, “... students are entitled to freedom of expression of their views...” and here, it says that what the school did “is not constitutionally permissible.”

Caitlin: What does that mean? *Constitutionally permissible?*

Julissa: It sounds like permission. Like they don’t have permission to do that.

Caitlin: So, they don’t have the permission to do that in the constitution?

Liam: Yeah, I think that’s what that means. So schools can’t tell students they can’t wear something unless they have evidence that it’s disrupting what’s happening in the school or that it’s interfering with the rights of other students. If they don’t have evidence, then it’s not permitted in the constitution.

Mr. Franklin: Can you say a bit more about why the Supreme Court ruled in favor of the students?

Julissa: The judges said that the students weren’t hurting anyone at the school when they were wearing the armbands. They were just expressing their beliefs about the Vietnam War in a peaceful way. They weren’t saying it, but they were showing it in a (looking at her notes), in a *symbolic way*.

Mr. Franklin: And what was guiding the Supreme Court’s decision?

Julissa: It just wasn’t fair. It wasn’t ... it wasn’t fair in the First Amendment, and the judges had to look at the First Amendment when they decided if it was fair.

The groups continue to discuss the focus questions, going back into the text to find evidence and clarify their thinking. To wrap up the day’s lesson, Mr. Franklin asks his students to discuss the following question at their table groups for a few minutes and to then spend a couple of minutes responding to the following question:

How might a school justify *protecting* its students’ rights to free speech?

The next day, now that Mr. Franklin’s students have had an opportunity to use the *layered reading* process on one text, he has them follow the same process for reading three other texts. This time, however, he will split the class into three groups. Each group will read only one of three cases (Bethel School Dist. No. 403 v. Fraser, Morse v. Frederick, or Hazelwood School District v. Kuhlmeier). They will have an opportunity to discuss the focus questions and the text with an *expert partner*, or another who read the same text, and then a second time with an *expert group* comprised of four to six students who read the same text. The following day, they will meet in *jigsaw groups* comprised of six students—with two students who read each text—so that each set of partners can share what they learned from their text and learn about the other two texts, which they didn’t read.

Once the students have had a chance to delve deeply into the four texts by reading them closely and discussing them in depth, they’ll apply this knowledge in a variety of ways in collaboration with others: conducting additional research on the case that interests them the most, writing a script for and recording a newscast on the case, engaging in a debate about the big question, writing a letter to the principal and discussing it with him. The outline for the two-week mini-unit is provided below:

Freedom of Speech Mini-Unit		
Day 1	Day 2	Day 3
<i>Whole group and small group reading: Tinker vs. Des Moines</i>	<i>Expert group jigsaw: The three other court cases</i>	<i>Expert Group Jigsaw (continued)</i>

California's ELA/ELD Framework
EIGHTH GRADE

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preview the two-week unit, discuss new terms • Read aloud • Students read independently and take notes on focus questions handout • Students read the text a second time with a partner • Students discuss notes in their table groups • Facilitate whole group discussion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students read one text independently with handout of focus questions • Students read the text a second time with an expert group partner • Students meet in expert groups (four to six students) to discuss the text • Students re-read the text a third time for homework, highlighting any ideas or phrases that are still confusing • Students do quick-write summarizing the text • Teach vocabulary in depth: <i>justify, prohibit, protection</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students meet in their expert groups and agree on specific information that they will all share in their jigsaw groups • Students meet in jigsaw groups (6 students) to discuss three texts • Students go back to expert groups to compare their jigsaw group notes • Debrief with whole group to clarify understandings • Students do quick-write summarizing the three texts
<p style="text-align: center;">Day 4</p> <p><i>Research</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students choose one court case they're most interested in researching further and gather in groups. • Students conduct internet research to gather additional information about the case (teacher has bookmarked sites as a start) • Students take notes using note-taking handout 	<p style="text-align: center;">Days 5-6</p> <p><i>Newscasts</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Show a model newscast about a court case • Facilitate a discussion about the structure of a newscast and what type of language is used • Students meet in their interest groups and write a short newscast of the court case with required elements • Check in with groups to review the newscast • Students practice their scripts and record their newscasts 	<p style="text-align: center;">Day 7</p> <p><i>Newscasts (continued)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students watch all the newscasts and take notes using handout on the content and language used • Facilitate discussion about how well the issues were addressed and how persuasive the language was in the newscasts

California's ELA/ELD Framework
EIGHTH GRADE

Day 8	Day 9	Day 10
<p><i>Debate</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students work in small teams (3 for and 3 against the position in each team), and use the texts and their notes to support their position on: "Should students be allowed to express any message or point of view while at school?" Whole group debate 	<p><i>Write Letter Collaboratively</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students discuss and chart words and phrases important to include in a letter Facilitate a whole class, jointly constructed letter to the principal Students rehearse in small groups discussion of letter, going back to evidence gathered. Students write first draft of their own letters to the editor about free speech Debrief with whole group 	<p><i>Present Letter and Write Independently</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students invite principal in to discuss the letter and engage in dialogue. Students finish their individual letters in peer editing groups (letters will be posted, and students can choose to send in a copy to the local newspaper)

When the students engage in the newscast script-writing, Mr. Franklin provides the guidelines that each script must meet. Each script must

- Include a brief overview of the freedoms established by the First Amendment
- Provide a summary of the case
- Explain the main points made in the Court's majority opinion
- Explain the main points made in the Court's dissenting opinion
- Include interviews with key people involved in the case (such as the students involved, parents, school staff, attorneys, but not the Supreme Court justices since they have little or no direct contact with the press)

At the end of the two-week unit, Mr. Franklin facilitates a whole group, jointly constructed text: a letter to the principal persuading him to *refine* his approach to limiting students' First Amendment free speech rights. The excerpt below includes evidence from an article the students found during their internet search:

We learned that, according to legal scholar Nathan M. Roberts, "administrators when confronted with a student speech issue should now categorize the speech into one of the following four categories: (1) constitutes a substantial disruption; (2) is offensive; (3) is school sponsored or carries the imprimatur of the school; or (4) could be reasonably interpreted as advocating for illegal drug use. Once the speech is categorized, administrators must analyze it under the appropriate standard to determine if it is permissible student expression." We agree with this suggestion, and we invite you to include it in our school's policy.

After the students jointly construct the letter to the principal, Mr. Franklin asks them to write their own letter to either the school or city newspaper. He shows them two recent examples of letters to the editor, written by teenagers, in the local newspaper, and he briefly discusses with the students what the purpose of the letters are, how many words the letters have, and the tone of the letters. He encourages them to use these letters as a model for their own. The students will have an opportunity to edit their letters with peers, and Mr. Franklin offers to provide further editing support, if they choose to submit the letters to a newspaper.

Next Steps:

Mr. Franklin, Ms. Austin, and Mrs. García meet to reflect on the unit and to review the individual letters students wrote. They look for patterns in understandings and misunderstandings so that they can clarify in the appropriate classes. For example, Mr. Franklin will address misunderstandings having to do

California's ELA/ELD Framework EIGHTH GRADE

with the readings on the court cases, and Ms. Austin will clarify understandings about the First Amendment and the role of the Supreme Court. Mrs. García works with both teachers to address literacy challenges the students exhibit in their letters (e.g., cohesion, sentence structure, vocabulary), and she will also continue to address argument writing with a focus on language during designated ELD.

The teachers have noticed that their students have started noticing many current events related to free speech. For example, one student brought in a newspaper article about a person who was a legal resident in the U.S. had been deported to their home country because they spoke to the press. The students ask to delve more deeply into the topic, and the teachers decide to extend the unit for another week. After surveying the classes, the teachers develop guidelines for a multimedia project (using Prezi or iMovie, for example) that students will develop in collaborative groups in order to demonstrate their understandings from the unit and to connect them with current events and their own experiences.

Sources:

National Constitution Center. n.d. "Free to Be You." <http://constitutioncenter.org/learn/educational-resources/lesson-plans/free-to-be-you>

Roberts, J.D., Ph.D., Nathan M. 2008. "Bong Hits 4 Jesus': Have Students' First Amendment Rights to Free Speech Been Changed after *Morse v. Frederick*?" *Journal of Educational Controversy* 3 (1). <http://www.wce.wvu.edu/Resources/CEP/eJournal/v003n001/a014.shtml>

Hirvela, Alan. 2013. "Preparing English Language Learners for Argumentative Writing." In Luciana C de Oliveira and Tony Silva (Eds.) *L2 Writing in Secondary Classrooms*. Routledge: New York.

Resources

Lesson plans and units for engaging students in debatable issues, along with videos of the lessons in action, can be found at the [Word Generation](#) Web site. Primary and secondary source documents and other teaching materials can be found at the following:

- National Constitution Center (<http://constitutioncenter.org/learn/educational-resources>)
- Landmark Cases of the U.S. Supreme Court (<http://www.streetlaw.org/en/landmark/home>)
- American Bar Association Division for Public Education (http://www.americanbar.org/groups/public_education.html)
- Constitutional Rights Foundation (<http://www.crf-usa.org/>)
- Center for Civic Education (<http://www.civiced.org/>)
- First Amendment Freedom Forum (<http://www.freedomforum.org/templates/document.asp?documentID=4494+>)
- Student Press Law Center (<http://www.splc.org/knowyourrights/legalresearch.asp?id=4>)
- Legal Information Institute, Cornell University Law School (<http://www.law.cornell.edu/supremecourt/text/484/260>)
- FindLaw for Legal Professionals (<http://caselaw.lp.findlaw.com/scripts/getcase.pl?court=US&navby=case&vol=393&invol=503>)