

From Standards to Success: USHC 2 Lesson Design Exemplar

Designing Coherent, Evidence-Centered Instruction

Tra'Neisha LaRoche
Social Studies Subject Matter Expert

Use this planning portfolio to design a coherent, standards-aligned U.S. History lesson. As you complete each planning component, you'll build a classroom-ready learning experience that intentionally aligns historical thinking, instructional anchors, assessment, and differentiation.

1. Indicator & Instructional Anchor

Indicator Code: USHC.2.CE

Chosen Instructional Anchor: Missouri Compromise (1820)

Why It Works:

The Missouri Compromise was the first national legislative effort to resolve slavery's westward expansion. It directly links geography, politics, and sectional balance, illustrating how cause-and-effect shaped national conflict and eventual reunion.

2. Historical Thinking Skill

HTS Code: CE (Causation)

DOK Level: 2–3

Skill Focus:

Students will analyze both immediate and long-term causes and effects of the Compromise, distinguishing causal relationships from mere coincidence.

3. Content Mapping

Identify relevant historical developments that support the indicator and instructional anchor. Organize the content to show meaningful relationships among the anchor, related developments, and targeted historical thinking.

Role	Aligned Content
Causes	• Louisiana Purchase (1803) raised questions about slavery expansion • Accelerating westward migration increased pressure for new state lines
Instructional Anchor	• Missouri Compromise (1820): Congress admitted Missouri as a slave state, Maine as free, and drew a 36°30' line for future slavery decisions
Short-Term Effects	• Maintained Senate balance (11 free / 11 slave)
Long-Term Consequences	• Temporarily eased sectional tensions • Set precedent for political compromises (Compromise of 1850) • Contributed to later debates over slavery's expansion, including the Kansas-Nebraska Act and escalating sectional conflict.
Connection to Historical Thinking	• HTS: Causation (CE) • DOK 2–3 potential (identify cause → analyze effects) • Increasingly sophisticated causal reasoning connects multiple events and trends.
Suggested Sources	• Excerpt from the Compromise legislation (primary) • Modern map of Free/Slave States in 1820 (secondary) • Editorial from 1821 newspaper on compromise significance

4. Source Selection

1. **Missouri Compromise Text (primary law excerpt)**
 - Students reference specific clauses to identify legislative intent and short-term effect.
2. **Modern Map of Free and Slave States in 1820 (secondary)**
 - Students analyze geographic data to support claims about long-term sectional divisions.

5. Evidence-Centered Task & PLD-Informed Supports

Prompt (same for all students):

Use the Missouri Compromise legislation and map of free and slave states to explain how westward expansion contributed to the Missouri Compromise and evaluate one consequence for sectional conflict. Support your explanation with evidence from both sources.

PLD Level	What the Student Produces	Instructional Supports
Minimally Meets	Describes one cause or one effect with basic explanation (e.g., “It kept balance”)	Cause-effect graphic organizer, sentence frames, highlighted source excerpts
Meets	Explains one cause and one effect, connects each to evidence (e.g., clause number; map region)	Two-column cause/effect organizer or evidence checklist as needed
Exceeds	Analyzes how the identified cause led to the Compromise and how the effect influenced later events (e.g., Kansas-Nebraska Act)	Extension prompt inviting connections to longer-term consequences; additional sources for corroboration as appropriate

6. Lesson Alignment Reflection

The Missouri Compromise provides an instructional anchor for developing the causal reasoning required by USHC.2.CE. Students examine how westward expansion contributed to conflict over slavery and use the Compromise legislation and map of free and slave states to connect causes with immediate and longer-term consequences. The common evidence-centered task requires students to apply the same causal reasoning developed through the lesson while using evidence from both sources.

PLD-informed supports vary the amount of structure, prompting, and independence without changing the historical thinking goal. Together, the instructional anchor, aligned content, sources, task, and supports provide students with opportunities to develop and demonstrate standards-aligned causal reasoning.