

Northwest History Consortium

Indian Removal Act

Tim Livingston
8th Grade

National Standard

Era 4: Expansion and Reform (1801-1861) / Standard 1

Standard 1: United States territorial expansion between 1801 and 1861, and how it affected relations with external powers and Native Americans.

BACKGROUND

America has had conflicts with Native Americans since the first English Colonists landed at Jamestown. Many of the conflicts arose from white settlers taking native land. The United States government allowed this to happen and even passed laws to make it easier for white settlers to claim native land. Eventually, Native Americans were forced to live on small reservations that were many thousands of miles from their original settlements. This has caused many wounds between the Native Americans and the United States government. If one compares the Israeli/ Palestinian conflict they will see many similarities between these two conflicts.

SCENARIO

President Barak Obama has made Middle East peace a priority of his administration. One area that he sees of great concern is the conflict between the Palestinians and Israelis. As America has had a similar conflict in its history in dealing with Native Americans, President Obama feels that America can offer advice that may help solve this conflict. He has formed a committee that will report back to him on lessons learned from the Indian Removal Act.

TASK

You and your fellow committee members are to research the following resource documents and create a list of “lessons learned.” President Obama will use this list to help him when he meets at Camp David with the leaders of both sides. Each committee must give documented support for each of the lessons learned.

When each committee has finished their reports on the lessons learned, we will have a debriefing session to come up with a whole class list of all lessons learned.

Northwest History Consortium

Indian Removal Act

RESOURCES

Internet

“In a Nutshell: Israeli Palestinian Conflict.” MidEastWeb.org. ©2002 – 2010 MidEastWeb for Coexistence and Ami Isseroff.. [location unknown]. 23 July 2010 <<http://www.mideastweb.org/nutshell.htm>>.

“Indian Removal Act [primary document]” from the *U.S. Congressional Documents and Debates, 1774 – 1875*, 21st Congress, 1st session. 5 May 1830. Library of Congress. 2010. Washington, DC. 23 July 2010 <<http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/ampage>>.

“Indian Removal Act 1814 – 1858.” Public Broadcasting Service Organization (WGBH). ©1995 – 2010. Boston, MA. 23 July 2010 <<http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/aia/part4/4p2959.html>>.

“Zionism and Manifest Destiny Redux” 13 July 2006 from *God Given Right: Palestine and Native America* by Bob Robideau, 1 Feb. 2006. Colorado American Indian Movement. ©2004 – 2010. Denver/Boulder, CO. 23 July 2010 <<http://www.coloradoaim.org/blog/2006/07/zionism-and-manifest-destiny-redux.html>>.

ASSESSMENT

- 1) Students will complete a BKWHL as a pre-assessment activity.
- 2) Each student will write a three paragraph summary on each of the readings.
- 3) Students will complete a group list of up to 10 lessons learned with supporting documentation.
- 4) Students will complete a group presentation to the class and complete their rubric.

Northwest History Consortium

Indian Removal Act

Group Project Grading Rubric

Name: _____

Date of Evaluation: _____

Part I: Evaluate the group as a unit with this section of the evaluation tool. Write the score in the score box.

Category	Beginning 1	Developing 2	Accomplished 3	Exemplary 4	Score
Group Cooperation	We did most of the work by ourselves; we talked a little among our group members.	We worked together most of the time, sharing information regularly.	We worked together so that everyone contributed to the final project.	Everyone worked together using his or her abilities and knowledge to make the project come together.	
Distribution of Group Tasks	Some group members did not complete any of the work.	Everyone had a job to do, but some jobs were incomplete.	We divided up and completed the work equally.	Work was shared fairly according to the abilities and interests of the members.	
Group Leadership	We had no leader, so we just did our own thing.	No one person was a leader, so we usually helped each other get the job done.	One or more persons took a leadership role and gave good directions that kept us going	We had a leader who helped us organize and stay on task until the job was complete.	
Communication Among Group Members	We only talked when we thought we needed to, but received little feedback.	We talked about what we were doing.	We usually asked each other for help and showed our work to each other.	We talked all the time and shared our work for group feedback.	
Individual Participation	A few people tried very hard, but most didn't do much.	Each person did some work and tried to do a fair share.	We all seemed to find our place and do what was needed.	Everyone did a great job; I would work with these people again.	
Listening to Other Points of View	We usually listened to what others were saying, but some either did not share ideas or argued.	We usually listened to each other and tried to use what they said in the project.	We listened while others talked; we learned about different viewpoints, and we used some of that information in the project.	Everyone listened to each other a lot, and we used what we heard to improve our work and the whole project.	
Showing Respect	No one was courteous, and opinions were not valued	Some were courteous, and some opinions were valued.	Most were courteous, and most opinions were valued.	All were courteous and valued each other's opinions.	
Group Total Score					

Rate your experience of this group project.	I would rather work alone.	I learned that group work can sometimes be helpful.	I liked learning this way and would probably try it again.	It was a valuable and realistic way to learn. My group was great.	
----------------------------------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------	--

Northwest History Consortium

Indian Removal Act

Part II. Use the following section to evaluate each member of your group. Your evaluation should be honest.

Group Member Name: _____

Category	Beginning 1	Developing 2	Accomplished 3	Exemplary 4	Score
Source of Conflict	Participated in regular conflict that interfered with group progress. The conflict was discussed outside of the group.	Was the source of conflict within the group. The group sought assistance in resolution from the instructor.	Was minimally involved in either starting or solving conflicts.	Worked to minimize conflict and was effective at solving personal issues within the group.	
Assistance	Contributions were insignificant or nonexistent.	Contributed some toward the project.	Contributed significantly, but other members clearly contributed more.	Completed an equal share of work and strived to maintain equity throughout the project.	
Effectiveness	Work performed was ineffective and mostly useless toward the final project.	Work performed was incomplete, and contributions were less than expected.	Work performed was useful and contributed to the final project.	Work performed was very useful and contributed significantly to the final project.	
Attitude	Rarely had a positive attitude toward the group and project.	Usually had a positive attitude toward the group and project.	Often had a positive attitude toward the group and the project.	Always had a positive attitude toward the group and the project.	
Attendance & Readiness	Rarely attended group meetings, rarely brought needed materials, and was rarely ready to work.	Sometimes attended group meetings, sometimes brought needed materials, and was sometimes ready to work.	Almost always attended group meetings, almost always brought needed materials, and was almost always ready to work.	Always attended group meetings, always brought needed materials, and was always ready to work.	
Focus on the Task	Rarely focused on the task and what needed to be done. Let others do the work.	Focused on the task and what needed to be done some of the time. Other group members sometimes had to nag, prod, and remind to keep this member on task.	Focused on the task and what needed to be done most of the time. Other group members could count on this person most of the time.	Consistently stayed focused on the task and what needed to be done. Other group members could count on this person all of the time.	
Group Member Total Score					

Brown, Denise, PhD. "Group Project Scoring Rubric, Part I and II." [University of Southern Mississippi \(Quality Improvement Program\)](http://www.usm.edu/qep/docs/NFS_Group_Project_Rubric.htm). ©1995 - 2010. Hattiesburg, MS. 27 July 2010 <http://www.usm.edu/qep/docs/NFS_Group_Project_Rubric.htm>. Reprinted with the permission.

Northwest History Consortium

Indian Removal Act

REFERENCES/CITATIONS

Brown, Denise, PhD. "Group Project Scoring Rubric, Part I and II." University of Southern Mississippi (Quality Improvement Program). ©1995 - 2010. Hattiesburg, MS. 27 July 2010 <http://www.usm.edu/qep/docs/NFS_Group_Project_Rubric.htm>.

"History Standards for Grades 5-12 United States." UCLA National Center for History in the Schools. 2005. Los Angeles, CA. 27 July 2010 <<http://nchs.ucla.edu/standards/us-standards5-12.html>>.

Livingston, Tim. "Indian Removal Act." NWESD Organization. 2008. Anacortes, WA. 27 July 2010 <http://www.nwesdorg/1510101216191755740/lib/1510101216191755740/4.1_IndianRemovalAct.Livingston.8.pdf>.