

Day 1: Tinker v. Des Moines Independent Community School District

Begin lesson

Card 1 of 16

<p data-bbox="331 781 628 842">Begin lesson</p>	<p data-bbox="865 627 959 659">Notes</p>
---	---

Before the Lesson

Card 2 of 16

<p data-bbox="240 1404 787 1465">Before the Lesson</p>	<p data-bbox="865 1255 959 1287">Notes</p>
---	---


Anchor Text

Card 3 of 16

<p style="text-align: center;">United States Supreme Court 393 U.S. 503 TINKER v. DES MOINES INDEPENDENT COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT Argued: Nov. 12, 1968. --- Decided: Feb 24, 1969</p> <p>MR. JUSTICE FORTAS delivered the opinion of the Court.</p> <p>Petitioner John F. Tinker, 15 years old, and petitioner Christopher Eckhardt, 16 years old, attended high schools in Des Moines, Iowa. Petitioner Mary Beth Tinker, John's sister, was a 13-year-old student in junior high school.</p> <p>In December 1965, a group of adults and students in Des Moines held a meeting at the Eckhardt home. The group determined to publicize their objections to the hostilities in Vietnam and their support for a truce by wearing black armbands during the holiday season and by fasting on December 16 and New Year's Eve. Petitioners and their parents had previously engaged in similar activities, and they decided to participate in the program.</p> <p>The principals of the Des Moines schools became aware of the plan to wear armbands. On December 14, 1965, they met and adopted a policy that any student wearing an armband to school would be asked to remove it, and if he refused he would be suspended until he returned without the armband. Petitioners were aware of the regulation that the school authorities adopted.</p> <p>On December 16, Mary Beth and Christopher wore black armbands to their schools. John Tinker wore his armband the next day. They were all sent home and suspended from school until they would come back without their armbands. They did not return to school until after the planned period for wearing armbands had expired—that is, until after New Year's Day.</p> <p>This complaint was filed in the United States District Court by petitioners, through their fathers, under § 1983 of Title 42 of the United States Code. It prayed for an injunction</p>	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Notes</h2>
--	--

Student Notes Sheet

Card 4 of 16

<p style="text-align: center;"> LearnZillion</p> <p>Name: _____ Date: _____</p> <p>Student notes for: Tinker v. Des Moines Independent Community School District</p> <p>Day: 1</p> <p>1. Identify the petitioners. What were the petitioners' objections and how did they choose to publicize their opinions? Cite strong and thorough textual evidence to support analysis of what the text states.</p> <p>2. How did the school authorities respond to the student protest? Cite strong and thorough textual evidence to support analysis of what the text states.</p> <p>3. How did the conflict between several students and school authorities move from the local level to the Supreme Court? Analyze the sequence of events and explain how the events developed over the text.</p>	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Notes</h2>
---	--

Getting Started

Card 5 of 16

<h2>Getting Started</h2>	<h3>Notes</h3>
--------------------------	----------------

Introduction 1 of 2

Card 6 of 16

<div data-bbox="292 1045 527 1323" style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> <p style="text-align: center; font-size: small;">United States Supreme Court 578 U.S. 511 TINKER v. DES MOINES INDEPENDENT COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT Argued Nov. 12, 2006 — Decided Feb. 22, 2007</p> <p style="font-size: x-small;">MR. JUSTICE FORTAS delivered the opinion of the Court.</p> <p style="font-size: x-small;">Petitioner John T. Tinker, 15 years old, and petitioner Christopher Eckhardt, 14 years old, attended high schools in Des Moines, Iowa. Petitioner Mary Beth Tinker, John's sister, was a 13-year-old student in junior high school.</p> <p style="font-size: x-small;">In December 1965, a group of adults and students in Des Moines held a meeting at the public library. The group discussed the possibility that students wearing armbands in schools and their support for a strike to wearing black armbands during the holiday season and by fasting on December 14 and New Year's Day. Petitioner's and their parents had previously engaged in similar activities, and they decided to participate in the program.</p> <p style="font-size: x-small;">The principals of the Des Moines schools became aware of the plan to wear armbands on December 14, 1965. They sent an advisory circular that evening warning an armband to be worn would be cause for suspension. It said if the student's refusal to comply with the school would be cause for suspension. It said if the student's refusal to comply with the school would be cause for suspension. It said if the student's refusal to comply with the school would be cause for suspension. It said if the student's refusal to comply with the school would be cause for suspension.</p> <p style="font-size: x-small;">On December 16, Mary Beth and Christopher wore black armbands to their schools. John Tinker wore his armband the next day. They were all sent home and suspended from school until they would come back without their armbands. They did not return to school until after the planned period for wearing armbands had expired—that is, until after New Year's Day.</p> <p style="font-size: x-small;">This complaint was filed in the United States District Court by petitioners, through their fathers, under § 1983 of Title 42 of the United States Code. It sought first an injunction restraining the respondent school officials and the respondent members of the board of directors of the school district from disciplining the petitioners, and it sought monetary damages. After an involuntary hearing the District Court dismissed the complaint. It upheld [SCE] the constitutionality of the school authorities' action on the ground that it was reasonable in order to prevent disturbance of school discipline. 222 F.Supp. 971 (1964). The court referred to but expressly declined to follow the Fifth Circuit's holding in a similar case that the wearing of armbands like the armbands caused no prohibited action.</p> </div> <div data-bbox="592 1134 722 1207" style="color: green; text-align: center;"> <p>Written by Supreme Court Justice Fortas</p> </div>	<h3>Notes</h3>
---	----------------

Introduction 2 of 2

Card 7 of 16

<p>Step 1</p> <p>1. Identify the questions. "What were the petitioners' objectives and how did they choose to publicize their opinions?" Circle strong and thorough textual evidence to support analysis of what the text says.</p> <p>2. How did the school activities reported in the earlier pages? Circle strong and thorough textual evidence to support analysis of what the text says.</p> <p>3. How did the specific harms, harms, modern and school activities come into the legal mind in the Supreme Court? Analyze the responses of the text and explain how the text developed and the text.</p>	<p>we will be asking and answering questions.</p> <p>We will find and keep track of evidence from the text to support our ideas about each question.</p> <h2>Notes</h2>
---	---

Exploring the Text

Card 8 of 16

<h1>Exploring the Text</h1>	<h2>Notes</h2>
-----------------------------	----------------

Supporting Question 1

Card 9 of 16

<p>Identify the petitioners. What were the petitioners' objections and how did they chose to publicize their opinions? Cite strong and thorough textual evidence to support analysis of what the text states.</p>	<p>Notes</p>
---	---------------------

Supporting Question 2

Card 10 of 16

<p>How did the school authorities respond to the student protest? Cite strong and thorough textual evidence to support analysis of what the text states.</p>	<p>Notes</p>
--	---------------------

Supporting Question 3

Card 11 of 16

<p>How did the conflict between several students and school authorities move from the local level to the Supreme Court? Analyze the sequence of events and explain how the events developed over the text.</p>	<p>Notes</p>
--	---------------------

Supporting Question 4

Card 12 of 16

<p>How does Justice Fortas organize the opinion? Analyze and evaluate the structure of the ruling.</p>	<p>Notes</p>
--	---------------------

Focus Question

Card 13 of 16

<h1>Focus Question</h1>	Notes

Focus Question

Card 14 of 16

<p>In the conflict between Tinker and the Des Moines Independent Community School District, who did the United States Supreme Court rule in favor of? Analyze the sequence of events and how the interaction of specific individuals, ideas, and events led to the final ruling.</p>	Notes


After the Lesson

Card 15 of 16

<h1>After the Lesson</h1>	Notes

Comprehension Skill Video

Card 16 of 16

<div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; padding: 10px;"><p>Core Lesson Ask, "How do the sequence of events unfold?"</p><div style="display: flex; align-items: center;"><div style="background-color: #e91e63; color: white; padding: 5px; margin-right: 10px;">Sequence of Events</div><div style="background-color: #f5f5f5; padding: 5px; font-size: 0.8em;"><p>1. Petitioners were suspended by the principals for their protest.</p><p>This complaint was filed in the United States District Court by petitioners, through their fathers, under § 1983 of Title 42 of the United States Code. It prayed for an injunction restraining the respondent school and the respondent members of the board of the school district from disciplining the and it sought nominal damages. After an hearing the District Court dismissed the [505] the constitutionality of the [505] action on the ground that it was order to prevent disturbance of school</p></div></div><p style="text-align: right; font-size: 0.7em;">Page 2</p><p style="text-align: center; font-size: 0.8em;"> LearnZillion</p><p style="text-align: center;">Visit https://haywood.lzill.co/r/48459</p></div>	Notes