

3-2022

## Archives to Go: Creating a Virtual Primary Source Instruction Packet

Leigh Rupinski  
*Grand Valley State University*, [rupinski@gvsu.edu](mailto:rupinski@gvsu.edu)

Meghan Martinez  
*Grand Valley State University*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/library\\_sp](https://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/library_sp)



Part of the [Library and Information Science Commons](#)

---

### ScholarWorks Citation

Rupinski, Leigh and Martinez, Meghan, "Archives to Go: Creating a Virtual Primary Source Instruction Packet" (2022). *Scholarly Papers and Articles*. 71.  
[https://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/library\\_sp/71](https://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/library_sp/71)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the University Libraries at ScholarWorks@GVSU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Scholarly Papers and Articles by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@GVSU. For more information, please contact [scholarworks@gvsu.edu](mailto:scholarworks@gvsu.edu).

CASE #22

# Archives to Go: Creating a Virtual Primary Source Instruction Packet

AUTHORS

**Leigh Rupinski**

Archivist for Public Services and  
Community Engagement  
Grand Valley State University  
[rupinski@gvsu.edu](mailto:rupinski@gvsu.edu)

**Meghan Martinez**

Special Collections Research Assistant  
Grand Valley State University  
[Meghan.Marie.Martinez@gmail.com](mailto:Meghan.Marie.Martinez@gmail.com)

LEARNING OBJECTIVES ENGAGED FROM [GUIDELINES FOR PRIMARY SOURCE LITERACY](#) BY THIS CASE STUDY

- 3.B. Identify and communication information found in primary sources, including summarizing the content of the source and identifying and reporting key components such as how it was created, by whom, when, and what it is.
- 4.B. Critically evaluate the perspective of the creator(s) of a primary source, including tone, subjectivity, and biases, and consider how these relate to the original purpose(s) and audience(s) of the source.
- 4.C. Situate a primary source in context by applying knowledge about the time and culture in which it was created; the author or creator; its format, genre, or publication history; or related materials in a collection.
- 4.D. As part of the analysis of available resources, identify, interrogate, and consider the reasons for silences, gaps, contradictions, or evidence of power relationships in the documentary record and how they impact the research process.
- 4.F. Demonstrate historical empathy, curiosity about the past, and appreciation for historical sources and historical actors.

CASE STUDY LOCATION

Grand Valley State University Libraries  
Special Collections & University Archives  
1 Campus Drive, Allendale, MI 49401  
[www.gvsu.edu/library/specialcollections/](http://www.gvsu.edu/library/specialcollections/)

PUBLICATION DATE

March 2022

## Introduction and Institutional Context

Grand Valley State University (GVSU) is a public liberal arts institution founded in 1960, with an enrollment of approximately 25,000 students. Special Collections and University Archives (hereafter Special Collections) is a part of University Libraries. Special Collections is located in its own dedicated building on the university's main campus in Allendale, Michigan. In 2018, the department increased its staffing levels to 3 tenure-track faculty librarian/archivists and 1 full-time professional support staff member. The department's mission is to collect, preserve, and share rare and distinguished book collections and historical records, photographs, media, and artwork to support excellent teaching, high-impact student learning, and active scholarship. Collecting strengths are primarily in local and regional history, art, and literature as well as the history of books and printing and veterans' history.

In 2020, the COVID-19 pandemic forced Special Collections to alter how instruction was delivered. Instruction levels predictably dipped as instructors changed direction and made cuts to their curriculum. Some instructors who had scheduled in-person classes simply could not pivot to virtual sessions because the materials they would have used were not digitized. Occasionally, Archivist for Public Services and Community Engagement Leigh Rupinski would trek to campus to show materials with a document camera, but the experience was not as comprehensive. She had to rely on a show-and-tell method that did not allow students the same ability to analyze and reflect as in in-person sessions. As campus returned to in-person instruction, Rupinski thought about the parallels between class needs and reference requests. Instead of framing classroom needs as full digital collections—with all the accompanying workload of metadata and preservation—she considered scanning collection material for short-term need, as is done with reference work that is often digitized to an easily accessible and “good enough” standard. With that in mind, in fall 2021 Rupinski enlisted Special Collections Research Assistant Meghan Martinez, a current student in education, to help envision what creating a virtual instruction packet might look like.

This case study examines the process of creating a virtual primary source instruction packet using the Young Lords in Lincoln Park collection. This collection, donated by Young Lords Organization founder José “Cha-Cha” Jiménez, tells the story of how the Young Lords were founded and their civil rights activism, as well as their engagement with other civil rights groups in the 1960s. Typically, classes use these primary source materials in Special Collections' classroom space. Rupinski and Martinez hoped to create a packet of scanned primary source materials from the collection that could be taken and used by any faculty instructor, at GVSU or beyond, without additional facilitation by an archivist. The packet would complement instruction and enrich students' experiences when archival visits were not possible for any variety of reasons, including a pandemic, scheduling difficulties, remote learning, or distance.

Using the [Guidelines for Primary Source Literacy](#), Rupinski and Martinez identified the following learning objectives to guide the lesson plan:

- 3.B. Identify and communicate information found in primary sources, including summarizing the content of the source and identifying and reporting key components such as how it was created, by whom, when, and what it is.

- 4.B. Critically evaluate the perspective of the creator(s) of a primary source, including tone, subjectivity, and biases, and consider how these relate to the original purpose(s) and audience(s) of the source.
- 4.C. Situate a primary source in context by applying knowledge about the time and culture in which it was created; the author or creator; its format, genre, publication history; or related materials in a collection.
- 4.D. As part of the analysis of available resources, identify, interrogate, and consider the reasons for silences, gaps, contradictions, or evidence of power relationships in the documentary record and how they impact the research process.
- 4.F. Demonstrate historical empathy, curiosity about the past, and appreciation for historical sources and historical actors.

These objectives mapped well from the in-person class sessions where Rupinski had successfully engaged students with the Young Lords collection: 3.B., 4.B., and 4.C. focus on essential skills Rupinski and Martinez wanted students to build by working with primary sources, whereas 4.D. and 4.F. asked students to dive deeper into the resources by making connections to their personal and/or research experiences.

## Narrative

In initial searching, curricular primary source packets did not seem to be widely available. Larger institutions like the Library of Congress<sup>1</sup> and sites such as the Digital Public Library of America<sup>2</sup> offer primary source teaching sets; but there are few, if any, available at smaller institutions. While the Library of Congress sets offered good examples for format, they were often larger and more complex than necessary for the one-shot instruction sessions typically requested at GVSU. Rupinski and Martinez envisioned creating a similar type of resource set and lesson plan, but on a smaller scale.

Prior to selecting a collection in which to test the idea, Rupinski and Martinez considered a number of factors. They agreed that the best materials would be from a collection frequently pulled for classroom usage; even better if it could be adapted for a wide variety of classes. The Young Lords in Lincoln Park collection was well-suited as a pilot project because it had previously been used in classes such as Historical Research Methods, Writing History: Youth Activism in the Civil Rights Movement seminar, Introduction to American Civilizations survey course, and more. Its popularity in the classroom also speaks to the timeliness of the content, with many instructors looking for ways to engage students with diverse perspectives, including minority rights activism. Additionally, the collection largely dates from the 1960s–1970s, so many of the documents are fairly modern and translate well to scanning. The majority of documents are not fragile and the collection is composed of printed documents, newspapers, and photographs, all of which are familiar formats to students. There is also a digitized component of oral histories that could be used to supplement the instruction material if desired. Finally, Martinez’s Puerto Rican heritage created a strong interest in the collection and useful content expertise.

---

<sup>1</sup> "Classroom Materials at the Library of Congress." *Library of Congress*, [www.loc.gov/classroom-materials/](http://www.loc.gov/classroom-materials/).

<sup>2</sup> "Primary Source Sets." *Digital Public Library of America*, <https://dp.la/primary-source-sets>.

Once they had decided on a collection, Martinez outlined components of a lesson plan based on her education experience and the sample primary source sets found in preliminary research. These elements included the expected lesson time, learning objectives, requisite student knowledge, assessment, and discussion questions. Martinez and Rupinski started by working with the *Guidelines for Primary Source Literacy* to determine appropriate learning objectives for the materials. The objectives chosen were drawn from in-person sessions conducted with the materials previously. Originally, they considered including 4.E. as well for analyzing the relationship between physical versus digital copies, but ultimately decided it was not core to the goals of the project.

In a typical class session, most of the lesson would revolve around hands-on time with the documents, with students filling out a worksheet for comprehension and to prompt discussion. Rupinski wanted to keep a similar concept in the virtual format, while whittling down the number of available documents. While in person, students could theoretically examine a whole box of documents and choose what interests them, Rupinski and Martinez feared overloading and frustrating students who were working virtually. Therefore, they decided to keep the number of documents to a minimum while still creating a robust experience.

Martinez reviewed all of the materials in the collection. This was feasible because of the long timeframe on the pilot project—the majority of a semester’s part-time work for Martinez—and the size of the collection (approximately 5.5 linear feet). She made recommendations to Rupinski about the materials to include in the instruction packet. It was important to select only documents that required little additional contextual knowledge as well as documents that worked together thematically. They also considered how adaptable the materials were. Would working with just a portion of the materials still tell a compelling story? To make working with the materials easier, they culled the list of possible documents to fit several key thematic areas: Platforms, Government, Imagery, Media, and Challenges/Backlash.

Each section contains no more than six documents related to the theme, with most having only five. The number of documents mimics the in-person arrangement of table groups, which usually seat 4 to 5 students. Rupinski and Martinez envisioned virtual “tables” where a section could be shared with the same number of students, or one document from each section could be mixed among them. Documents in the Platforms category relate to the mission statements of the Young Lords Organization, Black Panthers, and American Indian Movement. The Government section includes FBI and government surveillance documents, as well as documents related to Fred Hampton’s assassination. Imagery includes Young Lords’ buttons, posters, and newspaper photographs of their activism. In the Media section, Rupinski and Martinez included newspaper articles related to the Young Lords’ operations, while Challenges/Backlash tells the opposing side of the story.

To supplement the chosen material, Martinez used the collection materials to write brief contextual paragraphs about the creation of the Young Lords Organization and its New York chapter, the Young Lords Party, a brief history of the Young Lords, and what the Puerto Rican independence and self-determination movement is. This material was intended to assist instructors who might not have as much subject expertise on the Young Lords or Puerto Rican history. Martinez also listed notable figures in the movement and connected themes that students might come across while working with the documents.

While Rupinski and Martinez wanted to provide flexibility for the professor to build assessment in as they preferred, they also created an Objective Mastery Framework. The framework includes the Guidelines for Primary Source Literacy objectives and how to assess whether or not the objective is being met, divided into “Emerging” and “Accomplished” sections. For example, for objective 4.B. students in the emerging category are unable to critically evaluate the creator’s perspective and may be unable to make connections about subjectivity or bias. In the accomplished category, students are able to include those kinds of connections and can consider how the creator’s tone or bias relates to the document’s purpose and/or audience for the source.

Using the Library of Congress and DPLA as guides, Martinez and Rupinski wrote specific discussion questions for each thematic area. The Platforms section includes questions such as “Compare and contrast the aims of different parties.” The Imagery section asks questions like “What catches your eye?” to introduce students to visual literacy; and then builds off that question to ask students to apply what they notice to the intent of the document and how people of the time period might have interpreted it. Each section’s discussion questions also map which *Guidelines’* objectives should be met through the students’ analyses.

The final component of the instruction packet is a worksheet for primary source analysis. Based on the template used with in-person classes, the worksheet provides a sample set of analysis questions for professors who might not be as familiar with working with primary sources. The worksheet is divided into three sections:

1. “Meet the Record,” which encourages students to think about material culture and the visual characteristics of the document;
2. “Initial Questions” are the who, when, why of the content; and
3. “Analysis,” which asks students to dive deeper into the content and make connections to previous knowledge.

Once the lesson plan was created and the documents chosen, Martinez digitized all the necessary materials to add to the packet. This proved to be the most complicated portion, as some of the chosen documents were too large to be used effectively. For example, the FBI’s documents are extensive and critical in understanding the government’s response to the Young Lords activism, but at 38 pages, it was unlikely students would have the time to examine them fully. Rupinski and Martinez decided to pre-select only the most relevant and easy-to-understand pages from the document rather than provide the full source, as they might in a regular class session.

Once the entire packet was assembled, there was some debate around where the final product should be located. Rupinski rejected the idea of incorporating the material into a LibGuide, largely because of the rigid formatting. On the other hand, the material was not suited to add directly to Special Collections’ Digital Collections website because it was not a full digital collection, with accompanying metadata, and the section formatting did not match up with the way the Digital Collections’ site functions. Ultimately, Rupinski uploaded the lesson plan and primary source set to the Special Collections’ webpage, where it can be easily accessed and downloaded.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> “Primary Source Sets”, *GVSU Special Collections and University Archives*, <https://www.gvsu.edu/library/specialcollections/instruction-47.htm>.

## Results

At this time, the authors have not attempted an assessment of the effectiveness of the packet. They created this particular packet from a popular, heavily-used collection in hopes that it would be marketable and broadly useful for a wide-range of classes at the institution and beyond. Initially, the project was undertaken as an experiment, with Rupinski and Martinez designing as they went along. Consequently, marketing was held off until the packet was completed and accessible. Rupinski is currently marketing the packet to GVSU faculty members who have used the materials in class sessions previously. She also shared the resource with liaison librarians at the university to increase awareness, and to hopefully make connections for future recommendations. Much of this outreach has simply been by word of mouth, although in the future, a more formalized approach could be utilized. For example, new virtual instruction packets could be highlighted in the beginning of the semester emails often sent to faculty by liaison librarians. Rupinski has also shared the resource on Special Collections' social media, and solicited feedback there. She is tracking general analytics for the instruction webpage where the packet is hosted as well. The authors anticipate that it might take several semesters for efficacy to be truly measurable. Ideally, Rupinski and Martinez are hoping to receive qualitative feedback from instructors using the packet in online or hybrid class sessions.

Regardless, they hope that simply by creating the packet they have made the Young Lords collection more accessible to potential researchers without needing to wait for a full-scale digitization project.

## Lessons Learned

Overall, creating the virtual primary source instruction packet was a fun and useful experiment. Taking the time to create the packet allowed for Martinez to get to know the collection intimately, in a way she would not have otherwise. The experience, while time-consuming in this iteration, could likely be streamlined in the future now that a model has been put in place. For example, the same components will be replicated within every packet, although the specific objectives and questions will likely change.

By completing the packet, Rupinski and Martinez also were able to identify a small checklist to aid in material selection, including if material from the collection has already been digitized, its fragility, its usage in the physical classroom, and how much additional context would be needed to work with the materials. However, it is still unlikely that a packet could be put together at "point of need" due to the planning-intensive nature of the project. If materials were already digitized, the packet might be able to be created much more quickly. Keeping the idea of virtual instruction in mind may help prioritize collections for future digitization projects. Both Rupinski and Martinez are interested in creating more instructional packets from other collections in future.

Specific lessons learned included:

1. Using a collection popular in the physical classroom space made it easier to identify themes and common discussion points. Some material already existed to inform analysis questions. By starting with a collection used in classes already, the authors were able to easily rework some components from presentations and pre-existing worksheets to fit the condensed material for the instruction packet.

2. Make use of student employee or volunteer labor. Martinez, a student employee, had more time to prioritize reviewing the collection. Leveraging her time and expertise helped keep the project on track. Martinez presented her top picks and rationale for which documents to include in the packet, then reviewed those choices with Rupinski before any were finalized.
3. Beginning with the *Guidelines for Primary Source Literacy* and keeping the learning objectives as the focus helped cull unnecessary materials that were interesting, but did not fit the instruction goals as easily.
4. Similarly, setting a limit on the number of documents from the start helped keep the packet size itself more manageable, both for uploading to the website and for student usage. It also provided Martinez with a goalpost of how much to look for as she assessed documents for inclusion.
5. It took some trial-and-error to determine the best way to upload the instruction packet to the Special Collections and University Archives' website. It would have been beneficial to think more about the location and "look" of the end product from the beginning.
6. Although ultimately the packet was placed on the website for ease of downloading, the platform does impact the ability to efficiently track its usage. The authors are constrained by the website restrictions for document size, as well as university protocol for the website design and system constraints for analytics. Other platforms may offer more flexibility for design and ease for assessment.
7. Martinez ended up needing to rescan a number of documents as PDFs instead of JPGs to create a cohesive packet. Initially, scans were made as JPGs by default, but once Martinez began thinking about how the final product would look, it became obvious that the PDF format would associate multi-page documents much more clearly. This, in turn, would make it easier for instructors and students to understand the connections between documents. Checking that scan settings and formats aligned at the beginning would have saved an extra step at the end of the process.

In future iterations, it might be useful to have faculty members request specific collections or talk with instructors to get a sense of their needs to inform material selection. While Rupinski and Martinez chose the Young Lords collection based on usage criteria, intentional collaboration with an instructor from the get-go would be beneficial to ensuring future usage and provide a clear pathway to assessment.



## Appendix 1: Civil Rights Era Community Activism: Case Study with the YLO Lesson Plan

### Introduction

This lesson will be done in an individual or group format, with students evaluating selected primary and secondary sources. They will use these sources to make connections between their prior knowledge about the civil rights movements of the 1960's-1970's, the Young Lords Organization (YLO), and the Rainbow Coalition. Students will explore and analyze artifacts from the GVSU Young Lords in Lincoln Park collection with a focus on: Civil rights organizations' platform statements, FBI and government surveillance documents, ads and imagery of the YLO, media response to the YLO and Young Lords Party (YLP) of New York, and challenges faced by members of these movements. Students will also explore the archival process by examining these primary and secondary source materials, analyzing each for: context, perspective, biases, subjectivity, and tone.

**Time:** 60–90 Minutes

### Objectives

#### *Lesson:*

- Students will display understanding and analyze (compare and contrast) the goals of the YLO, the Black Panthers, and other activist groups from the 1960's-1970's.
- Students will identify, analyze, and discuss the challenges these groups faced and their impact.
- Students will identify themes and make connections between historical activist groups and ongoing struggles in the present.

#### *Archival:*

- PSL 3. Read, Understand, and Summarize
  - B. Identify and communicate information found in primary sources, including summarizing the content of the source and identifying and reporting key components such as how it was created, by whom, when, and what it is.
- PSL 4. Interpret, Analyze, and Evaluate
  - B. Critically evaluate the perspective of the creator(s) of a primary source, including tone, subjectivity, and biases, and consider how these relate to the original purpose(s) and audience(s) of the source.
  - C. Situate a primary source in context by applying knowledge about the time and culture in which it was created; the author or creator; its format, genre, publication history; or related materials in a collection.
  - D. As part of the analysis of available resources, identify, interrogate, and consider the reasons for silences, gaps, contradictions, or evidence of power relationships in the documentary record and how they impact the research process.
  - F. Demonstrate historical empathy, curiosity about the past, and appreciation for historical sources and historical actors.

## Requisite Knowledge for Students

### *Creation of the YLO and YLP:*

The history of the Young Lords Organization starts in the tense and socially charged 1960's. Jacqueline Lazú, of DePaul University, worked closely with José "Cha Cha" Jiménez, previous chairman of the Chicago YLO to record a comprehensive history of the YLO and YLP. In her 2013 paper "The Chicago Young Lords: (Re)constructing Knowledge and Revolution" she wrote:

"The Young Lords and Young Lordettes began as a street gang, or crew as they were referred to at the time, led by a young Orlando Dávila in Chicago's Lincoln Park neighborhood in the 1960s. . . . The neighborhoods saw constant influxes of new immigrant groups and various stages of white flight in and out of the city. In fact, it was protection, not political activism that led the original agenda of the Young Lords. Informal groups of friends bonded, most often along class and/or ethnic lines for safety in the streets. By 1969 the Young Lords shifted toward an activist agenda and became the Young Lords Organization that eventually spread to other cities including the well-known New York chapter... In May 1970, the New York chapter of the YLO split from the Chicago YLO and became the Young Lords Party (YLP)."

### *History of the YLP:*

While working under the YLO umbrella the YLP proved it was more than capable of continuing the vision of the YLO. Darrel Enck-Wanzer wrote about the history and platform of the YLP in New York in his article "Crafting the People's Revolution in El Barrio: The Young Lords' People's Church" (for the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign, *Radicals in Black & Brown*, 2008):

"One of the first points of this expansion revolved around the issue of health and, among other problems, lead poisoning in particular was reaching near epidemic proportions in New York City at that time. Reporting in the *Village Voice* in late-1969, Jack Newfield wrote: "Medical authorities estimate there are 30,000 undiagnosed cases of lead poisoning each year in the city. The victims are usually children between the ages of one and three, who eat flaking or peeling paint from tenement walls." In response to this health disaster and the city's inability (or unwillingness) to address it, the Young Lords struck a deal with the Health Department to administer detection tests for lead poisoning."

The lead testing initiative was not the only action the YLP took in New York. In the last days of 1969 and the first week of 1970 the YLP took over the First Spanish Methodist Church in East Harlem for 11 days. According to Enck-Wanzer (2008):

"the People's Church' was home to all of the programs (child care, free breakfasts, liberation school, tuberculosis and lead poisoning testing, etc.) the Young Lords sought to implement. Furthermore, the church became a political and social refuge for the people of El Barrio, and the residence of some 300 people. They hosted a children's theatrical event (which was basically a play about 'the People's Church'), numerous speeches, poetry readings (including the first reading of Pedro Pietri's famous poem, *Puerto Rican Obituary*), musical events, and more. At 6:30 in the morning on January 7, 1970, one hundred five

Young Lords and supporters submitted to arrest, bringing a peaceful end to the church offensive.”

Before the 1970 break between the two organizations the YLP were able to accomplish door to door tuberculosis (TB) testing, the East Harlem garbage offensive, and the opening of a branch in the Bronx. After the split from the YLO they were able to open offices across New York, Puerto Rico, and New Jersey, liberate a TB testing x-ray truck, occupy the Lincoln Hospital for 12 hours, join the 1970 People’s Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia, and send members to represent the YLP internationally.

*Puerto Rican Independence and Self- determination Movement:*

The Puerto Rican independence movement is made up of Boricuas (Puerto Rican term for people from Puerto Rico) and Nuyoricans (Puerto Rican term for Puerto Ricans on the mainland). The movement works towards Puerto Rican independence from the United States and Nuyoricans rights within the mainland U.S. The movement has been active since 1493, fighting for independence from Spain till 1898 and the United States today. In 1917 President Woodrow Wilson signed the Jones Shafroth act, granting U.S citizenship to the peoples of Puerto Rico; but the Jones Shafroth act came with negative consequences for the island including a lack of representation in the U.S. Legislative branch, and predatory taxation on imports. According to Jacqueline Lazú (2013) the push for independence that inspired the YLO was the Vietnam War:

“ . . . between 1964 and 1973, the United States sent over 48,000 Puerto Rican soldiers to fight the war in Vietnam (Black: 2012: ii). Many Puerto Ricans enlisted voluntarily, but many others were drafted, subject to conscription as citizens of the United States. The obligation of Puerto Rican youth to fight in Vietnam cast light on the glaring contradictions of the United States’ relationship with its island territory. Beyond the social and political implications of the war, there was an even heavier burden for those who fought it, and were forced to confront the conflicting loyalties felt by the disparity between their nation and their state.”

The Puerto Rican independence movement was a central part of the YLO platform and could be seen in their acts (both on the island and the mainland U.S.) and their imagery “Tengo Puerto Rico en Mi Corazón”.

*Notable Members:*

- Orlando Dávila: Founder of the Young Lords gang in Chicago.
- Juan González: Co-founder of and Minister of Education for the YLP, and journalist.
- Pablo Yoruba Guzmán: Co-founder for the YLP and leader in the New York and Philadelphia chapters.
- José “Cha Cha” Jiménez: A founder and chairman of the Chicago YLO.
- Omar Lopez: Minister of Information for the YLO, moved to Chicago from Mexico with his family when he was 13.
- Felipe Luciano: Co-found of the YLP.
- Iris Morales: Leader of the YLO and co-founder of the Women’s Caucus.

- Angela Navedo: An Italian-American leader of both the YLO and the Young Lordetts. Wife of Pancho Lind, a member of the YLO murdered by members of a youth white gang in the early 1960s.
- Juan “Fi” Ortiz: Co-founder of the YLP.
- David Pérez: Co-founder of the YLP.

*Connections:*

- The creation of the Rainbow Coalition.
- Neighborhood gentrification.
- Police and government abuse.

**Assessments**

This lesson will be assessed informally via observation and discussion, and formally through the Critical Examination of Archival Documents worksheet found at the bottom of this document. The professor will look for the student’s ability to display understanding and analyze the goals, platforms, challenges, themes, and connections to the YLO, the Black Panthers, and other activist groups from the 1960s–1970s for the lesson objectives; and the student's ability to: read, understand, summarize, interpret, analyze, and evaluate archival artifacts for the archival objectives. The framework below can be used to determine a student's level of mastery in each objective.

## Objective Mastery Framework

Objective	Emerging	Accomplished
<p>PSL 3. B.</p> <p>Read, Understand, and Summarize</p> <p>Identify and communicate information found in primary sources.</p>	<p>Students are able to summarize most of the information in a specific document, but misses some of the information, or does not give specifics on key components such as how it was created, by whom, when, and what it is.</p>	<p>Students are able to summarize the information in a specific document, including specifics on key components such as how it was created, by whom, when, and what it is. Students also should address missing information and why it may be missing.</p>
<p>PSL 4. B.</p> <p>Interpret, Analyze, and Evaluate</p> <p>Critically evaluate the perspective of the creator(s) of a primary source.</p>	<p>Students are unable to critically evaluate the perspective of the creator(s) of a primary source. They may leave out connections to: tone, subjectivity, and biases. They may also not make connection to how these relate to the original purpose(s) and audience(s) of the source.</p>	<p>Students are able to critically evaluate the perspective of the creator(s) of a primary source. They will include connections to tone, subjectivity, and biases, and consider how these relate to the original purpose(s) and audience(s) of the source.</p>
<p>PSL 4. C.</p> <p>Interpret, Analyze, and Evaluate</p> <p>Situate a primary source in context by applying knowledge about the time and culture in which it was created.</p>	<p>Students are able to make some basic connections to the primary source contexts; while acknowledging some of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge about the time and culture in which the artifact was created</li> <li>• The author or creator of the artifact</li> <li>• The artifact’s format, genre, and publication history</li> </ul>	<p>Students are able to make strong and more nuanced connections to the primary source contexts; while acknowledging some of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge about the time and culture in which the artifact was created</li> <li>• People who are similar to the author or creator of the artifact</li> <li>• The artifact’s format, genre, and publication history</li> </ul>

<b>Objective</b>	<b>Emerging</b>	<b>Accomplished</b>
<p>PSL 4. D.</p> <p>Interpret, Analyze, and Evaluate</p> <p>Analyze resources by considering silences, gaps, contradictions, and evidence of power relationships.</p>	<p>Students are able to analyze artifacts for some of these aspects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Silences</li> <li>• Gaps</li> <li>• Contradictions</li> <li>• Evidence of power relationships</li> </ul> <p>Students may or may not make basic connections to how these aspects impact the research process.</p>	<p>Students are able to analyze artifacts for some of these aspects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Silences</li> <li>• Gaps</li> <li>• Contradictions</li> <li>• Evidence of power relationships</li> </ul> <p>Students make connections, on a nuanced level, to how these aspects impact the research process</p>
<p>PSL 4. F.</p> <p>Interpret, Analyze, and Evaluate</p> <p>Demonstrate historical empathy</p>	<p>Students are able to demonstrate limited historical empathy by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Showing curiosity about the past</li> <li>• Demonstrating appreciation for historical sources and actors</li> <li>• Making a personal connection to the artifact</li> </ul> <p>Students may not be able to fully make connections between historical artifacts and their own experiences. They may also demonstrate limited curiosity about the past.</p>	<p>Students are able to demonstrate thoughtful historical empathy by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Showing curiosity about the past</li> <li>• Demonstrating appreciation for historical sources and actors</li> <li>• Making a personal connection to the artifact</li> </ul>

## Discussion Questions

Section	Documents	Questions	Objectives
Platform Statements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Revolutionary Timeline</li> <li>• Young Lords Party 13 Point Program and Platform</li> <li>• What We Want to Believe</li> <li>• Young Lords, Organization and the State of America Today</li> <li>• Background of the American Indian Movement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Compare and contrast the different party aims.</li> <li>• Can you identify any common themes or outliers?</li> <li>• Did they list them and/or draw conclusions or interpretation?</li> </ul>	<p>PSL 3. Read, Understand, and Summarize</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• B</li> </ul> <p>PSL 4. Interpret, Analyze, and Evaluate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• B</li> <li>• C</li> <li>• F</li> </ul>
FBI and Government Surveillance Documents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FBI Investigated</li> <li>• Jiménez CPD Subversive Personal Files (Pages: 1–3)</li> <li>• COINTELPRO (Pages: 8–11, 24, 26–27 &amp; 31)</li> <li>• The Puerto Rican Revolutionary Workers Organization: A Staff Study (Pages: 11 &amp; 16–17)</li> <li>• Police Misconduct and Civil Rights – The Assassination of Fred Hampton (Pages: 1 &amp; 3)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why was the government concerned about the YLO?</li> <li>• How did the government’s actions impact the YLO?</li> </ul>	<p>PSL 3. Read, Understand, and Summarize</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• B</li> </ul> <p>PSL 4. Interpret, Analyze, and Evaluate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• B</li> <li>• C</li> <li>• D</li> <li>• F</li> </ul>

<p>Imagery</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● YLO El Pueblo en Mi Corazón poster</li> <li>● Power to the People/ Viva el Pueblo poster</li> <li>● Tengo Puerto Rico en Mi Corazón button</li> <li>● Free Cha-Cha buttons</li> <li>● YLO Newspaper Vol. 1 No.1 page 3</li> <li>● YLO Newspaper Vol. 1 No.2 page 1</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● What catches your eye?</li> <li>● What do those characteristics tell you about the document?</li> <li>● How would you interpret these images, how do you think people at the time responded to these images?</li> </ul>	<p>PSL 3. Read, Understand, and Summarize</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● B</li> </ul> <p>PSL 4. Interpret, Analyze, and Evaluate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● B</li> <li>● C</li> <li>● F</li> </ul>
<p>Media Response</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● “City Street Corner Becomes Open-air Drug Market” article</li> <li>● “Garelik Says Terrorists are Growing Peril Here” article</li> <li>● Hospitals V. the People!</li> <li>● 2 Supporters View Urban Renewal in Lincoln Park</li> <li>● Young Lord Terror in Lincoln Park Told</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● What are the common themes of anti-YLO groups used in their critique of the YLO?</li> <li>● What agendas or bias were these critiques connected to?</li> </ul>	<p>PSL 3. Read, Understand, and Summarize</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● B</li> </ul> <p>PSL 4. Interpret, Analyze, and Evaluate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● B</li> <li>● C</li> <li>● D</li> <li>● F</li> </ul>
<p>Challenges and Backlash</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Young Lords Back Again – Say Police Harassing LV Lady</li> <li>● <i>Revolucion!!</i></li> <li>● Memorial Marches and Rites to Honor Slain Minister, and Wife</li> <li>● Theft’s Harsh Sentence</li> <li>● Manuel Ramos Murdered May 4, 1969, and “Pancho” Murdered April 11, 1971</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● How are the YLO portrayed in these documents?</li> <li>● What are the effects of the actions taken against the YLO?</li> <li>● What are the effects of how these actions were portrayed?</li> </ul>	<p>PSL 3. Read, Understand, and Summarize</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● B</li> </ul> <p>PSL 4. Interpret, Analyze, and Evaluate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● B</li> <li>● C</li> <li>● F</li> </ul>



## **CRITICAL EXAMINATION OF ARCHIVAL DOCUMENTS**

### **Meet the Record: Without Reading, examine your document.**

1. What catches your eye? Are there any unique physical characteristics (handwritten, letterhead, notations, colors, logo, size, etc.)? What do those characteristics tell you about the document?

### **Initial Questions: Answer while reading your document.**

2. Who wrote this document?
3. When was it written?
4. Who is the intended audience?
5. Describe the document's contents. What is the purpose of the document? What evidence supports your conclusion?

### **Analysis: Read, Consider, and Discuss your item before answering.**

6. What intrigued or challenged you most in this document?
7. Link the resource to other sources or what you've already learned about a topic. What does this source add to your understanding of this time?
8. Why is this source significant? What does it tell us about this time period/perspective/topic?