

# Case 17: How should the crew give out ten free seats?

## Overview

Students read a short story in which the crew has ten free workshop seats and thirty people who want one. They compare three options, first come, a lottery and a needs-based rubric, and apply two ethical lenses from the Markkula Center framework. They then write a note that explains one method to the people affected, names its strongest objection and revises it.

## Before this case

Students should already be able to:

- write a memo with a recommendation and reasons
- apply an ethical principle to a practical choice
- write a short public announcement

## Objectives

Students will be able to:

- recommend a method for sharing ten seats and compare all three options with the sign-up evidence
- publish the method and criteria before sign-ups open
- protect any personal information a needs-based step would collect
- explain how people who do not get a seat are told and treated

## Materials

- This chapter, one copy per participant
- Evidence A, B and C, and the Belmont and ASPA rows on the idea page
- An options matrix, a model criteria statement and a privacy checklist

## The task in this edition

**Task:** Write a memo to a student government committee recommending how to give out ten free workshop seats among thirty applicants. Then draft the announcement that publishes the method before sign-ups open.

**Students make:** Memo, 350—450 words, plus an announcement of 80—120 words

## Pacing

**Opener (page 338):** 4 min. Short on time: 3 min. Read What happened aloud and go straight to the key terms.

**Key terms (pages 339 and 340):** 4 min. Short on time: 2 min. Read the key terms aloud. Skip Who is involved.

**Look at the evidence (page 344):** 8 min. Short on time: 7 min. Participants fill in only the What it leaves out boxes.

**Look at the evidence (page 345):** 6 min. Short on time: 5 min. Read Evidence C aloud. Participants fill in only its What it shows box.

**Key idea (pages 346 and 347):** 12 min. Short on time: 10 min. Skip the In the news section.

## Pacing, continued

**Sort the evidence (page 348):** 8 min. Short on time: skip.

**Practice (page 349):** 5 min. Short on time: skip.

**Your task (pages 350 and 351):** 12 min. Short on time: 12 min.

**Your draft (page 352):** 30 min. Short on time: 28 min. Participants draft the recommendation in the session and finish the memo afterward.

**Check your work (pages 353 and 354):** 8 min. Short on time: 4 min. Participants answer the Check your work questions only.

**Questions to discuss (pages 355 and 356):** 10 min. Short on time: 4 min. Use question 4 as a closing question.

**Talk about this case at home (page 357):** at home.

**Periods:** full chapter 107 minutes; one period 75 minutes.

## Standards

**Ethical Reasoning VALUE Rubric** AAC&U’s rubric for recognizing ethical issues and applying and weighing different ethical perspectives. In this case: Students apply two ethical lenses to the options and evaluate the strongest objection to their choice (Evaluation of Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts).

# Case 17 plan, continued

## Standards, continued

**Civic Engagement VALUE Rubric** AAC&U’s rubric for taking part in community life, including civic communication and working within community structures toward a civic aim. In this case: Students design a process that people who do not get a seat can still accept (Civic Contexts/Structures).

**Written Communication VALUE Rubric** AAC&U’s rubric for writing that fits its context and purpose, develops its content and uses sources and evidence. In this case: Students write a memo for a committee and an announcement for applicants (Context of and Purpose for Writing; Genre and Disciplinary Conventions).

**Information Has Value** Information has value, including as a means to influence people, so credit, access and privacy matter. In this case: Students decide what personal information a needs-based method would collect and how to protect it.

## Codes of ethics

- **The Belmont Report:** B. Basic Ethical Principles: 3. Justice
- **The Belmont Report:** C. Applications: 1. Informed Consent
- **ASPA Code of Ethics:** 4. Strengthen social equity.

## Heat map

- **Opener (page 338):** Low
- **Key terms (pages 339 and 340):** Low
- **Look at the evidence (page 344):** Low
- **Look at the evidence (page 345):** Low
- **Key idea (pages 346 and 347):** Low
- **Sort the evidence (page 348):** Medium
- **Practice (page 349):** Low
- **Your task (pages 350 and 351):** Medium
- **Your draft (page 352):** Low
- **Check your work (pages 353 and 354):** Low

## Try it at your school

**Ask how your school decides who gets limited spots.**

- Pick one limited resource at school: a class, a trip, a club seat
- Find out the selection method and whether it’s published
- Ask who the method helps and who it might leave out
- Suggest publishing criteria in advance if they aren’t

**Who to ask:** Club advisor, activities director, school counselor, student council

## Try it at your school, continued

**Safety:** Never ask classmates to share financial or personal information for a needs-based process. Adults should handle that privately.

## Sources

- Ticketmaster, “The Eras Tour onsale explained,” November 19, 2022
- Markkula Center for Applied Ethics, Santa Clara University, “A Framework for Ethical Decision Making,” No date listed

# Case 17: How should the crew give out ten free seats?

Thirty people want ten free workshop seats, and the crew must choose a fair way to decide who gets them.

**On your own** Read What happened and underline the sentence that tells how many people want a seat. About 4 minutes.



Duda holds up a phone and points at a blank card on a bulletin board.

**Your role:** You're the one who writes down the rule before the crew picks the ten names. **New skill:** Set fair criteria before choosing.

## What happened

The crew has ten free seats for a workshop, and thirty people want one. The crew opened a sign-up sheet on Monday at 9 a.m. Twenty-two names were on it before 10 a.m. By Wednesday, the sheet has thirty names.

The sheet says only "How seats will be chosen: to be announced." The crew has argued about the rule since dinner on Sunday. Gia is running the sign-up. She wants to give the seats to the first ten names, because that is simple and fast. Mateo suggests a lottery instead.

**Your question:** How should the crew choose who gets the ten seats, and how should they explain the choice to all thirty people?

Anika, 16, is at rehearsal most days, and she checks her phone after rehearsal ends. Under first-come, she would see the message after the seats were gone. A third option on the crew's whiteboard would give seats to people who cannot afford the paid version of the workshop. That option would ask people for personal information.

Every method seats exactly ten people. The crew has to decide which ten, and then explain the rule to all thirty.

## ⌚ Pacing

Full chapter: 4 min.

✂ Short on time: 3 min. Read What happened aloud and go straight to the key terms.

## 💬 Say this

"Ten seats, thirty names. Before we read on, how would you pick?" — Collect three quick answers. Do not judge any of them yet.

## 👁 Watch for

**Misconception:** Students assume one method can be fair to everyone. **Listen for:** "A lottery is fair, so nobody loses." **Then:** Ask how many people still get no seat. Every method leaves out twenty.

## 📖 Support

- Read What happened aloud. Draw 30 dots on the board and circle 10.

## 🔥 Heat check

■□□ Low.

## Key terms

**On your own** Read each key term and its example, then write your first guess in the box. About 4 minutes.

**Criteria** Criteria are the standards or reasons a group uses to make a decision.

En español: criterios

**In this case:** The sheet says “How seats will be chosen: to be announced.” Twenty-two names arrived before 10 a.m. Monday, before the crew stated any criteria.

**Trade-off** A trade-off is a choice where getting one benefit means accepting a cost or giving something up.

En español: compensación entre opciones

**In this case:** First-come is fast for Gia to run but favors whoever sees the message first. A lottery gives everyone the same chance but needs a sign-up window and a drawing.

**Equity** Equity is a way of sharing that adjusts for different needs so everyone gets a fair chance.

En español: equidad

**In this case:** Option C would give seats to people who cannot afford the paid version of the workshop. It would also ask applicants for personal information.

## Who is involved



**Gia**  
Running the sign-up

“First ten to reply get a seat. It’s simple, I can post it tonight, and I have a shift at seven.”



**Anika**  
Checks her phone  
after rehearsal

“By the time I see the message, ten people will have answered. I don’t even need a seat. I just want to know how you’re picking.”

## ⌚ Pacing

Full chapter: 4 min.

✂ Short on time: 2 min. Read the key terms aloud. Skip Who is involved.

## 💬 Say this

“Criteria are stated before anyone decides. Why does the timing matter?” — Point to “to be announced” on the sign-up sheet.

## 👁 Watch for

**Misconception:** Students treat equity and equality as the same word. **Listen for:** “Equity means everyone gets the same.” **Then:** Contrast option B, the same chance for all, with option C, which adjusts for need.

## 📖 Support

- Pair students who share a language to explain each term with an example from the case.
- **Cognates:** criteria (criterios), equity (equidad), option (opción), method (método), decision (decisión), consequence (consecuencia), information (información), justice (justicia).

## 🔥 Heat check

■□□ Low.

## 🔑 Answer key

Any first guess is fine. Students return to it on the My take page.

Before you look at the evidence, how do you think the crew should choose who gets the ten seats?

➤ My first guess is a lottery with published criteria, because the sign-up opened with no rule at all.

## This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal blue ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There is no handwriting or other markings on the paper.

This page continues page 339. The notes for both pages are on the sheet for page 339.

## Reading passage

### Allocating scarce goods fairly

**On your own** Read the passage. At each Stop and think box, pause and answer the question in your head or with a partner. About 5 minutes.

#### Words to know

- **Criteria:** Criteria are the standards or reasons a group uses to make a decision.
- **Trade-off:** A trade-off is a choice where getting one benefit means accepting a cost or giving something up.
- **Equity:** Equity is a way of sharing that adjusts for different needs so everyone gets a fair chance.
- **Consent:** Consent is permission a person gives for something specific, such as sharing a record with a named person.

#### The story: Thirty applicants, ten places

The crew has ten free seats in a workshop and thirty people who want them. A sign-up sheet opened Monday at 9 a.m. with no stated selection method. Twenty-two names arrived within the first hour, and the list reached thirty by Wednesday. The crew's whiteboard lists three methods, each with its benefit and cost. First come, first served is fast but favors whoever sees it first. A lottery after a three-day window gives equal chances but requires a window and a drawing. A needs-based rubric prioritizes those who cannot afford the paid version but requires personal information and a judge.

The crew members' positions are candid. Gia, who runs the sign-up and has a shift at seven, prefers first-come because it is simple. She later admits she mostly wanted the task off her list. Mateo proposes a lottery. Anika, 16, who checks her phone only after rehearsal, would be excluded by first-come. She explicitly declines to make the decision about herself. She does not need a seat. She wants a stated method and an honest account of who loses.

The case asks students to treat a small allocation as a serious ethical problem, because the same structure governs school admissions, housing lotteries and medical triage.

Your role is to write down the rule before the crew picks the ten names.

**Stop and think.** Why might a procedurally fair rule be accepted even by people it excludes?

## ⌚ Pacing

Reading: about 5 min (726 words). Short on time: read it aloud together, pausing at each Stop and think.

## ❓ Stop and think

1. **After “The story: Thirty applicants, ten places”:** Why might a procedurally fair rule be accepted even by people it excludes?
2. **After “Procedure, criteria and consent”:** How should the crew weigh equity against the privacy cost of a needs-based rubric?
3. **After “Frameworks and real-world allocation”:** Emanuel and colleagues reject first-come in medicine. Does their reasoning apply to the crew's workshop? Why or why not?

**Procedure, criteria and consent**

**Criteria** are the standards or reasons a group uses to make a decision. The new skill is setting fair criteria before choosing and disclosing who each rule disadvantages. Case 4's **trade-off**, a choice where getting one benefit means accepting a cost or giving something up, is unavoidable here. Every method seats ten and excludes twenty. Choosing among them means choosing which cost to accept and defend.

Each method encodes a principle. First-come rewards speed and availability, which correlate with flexible schedules rather than need or merit. A lottery embodies equal chance and treats applicants as interchangeable. A needs-based rubric pursues **equity**, a way of sharing that adjusts for different needs so everyone gets a fair chance. It also shifts costs onto applicants, who must disclose personal information. Case 6's **consent**, permission a person gives for something specific, frames that cost. Any data collection should be minimal, voluntary and limited to people who need to see it.

Procedure carries independent moral weight. The sheet shows that most names arrived before any rule was posted, so a rule adopted now will be applied to a known list. That invites the suspicion that it was chosen to produce a result. Announcing criteria before selection is a form of procedural fairness that can secure acceptance from those who lose. A decision note should therefore state the method and the reason for it, name the strongest objection and offer one mitigation for those who miss out.

Anika's proposed framing, comparing which option helps the most people and whether the method is fair to everyone, separates outcome-based and fairness-based reasoning. Holding both keeps the crew from mistaking an efficient rule for a just one.

 **Stop and think.** How should the crew weigh equity against the privacy cost of a needs-based rubric?

**Frameworks and real-world allocation**

The Markkula Center's framework examines decisions through lenses of consequences, rights, fairness, the common good, character and care. It explains that ethics and law are different questions (Markkula Center for Applied Ethics, revised November 5, 2021). The Belmont Report treats justice as fairness in distribution and names five accepted bases: equal share, need, effort, societal contribution and merit. It also holds that "respect for persons requires that subjects, to the degree that they are capable, be given the opportunity to choose what shall or shall not happen to them" (Belmont Report, April 18, 1979). That principle bears directly on a rubric that asks for personal information.

High-stakes allocation debates mirror the crew's options. Emanuel and colleagues argued that first-come, first-served is a poor way to allocate scarce medical resources (New England Journal of Medicine, May 21, 2020). Commentators laid out competing vaccine criteria such as risk, fairness and benefit (Scientific American, September 3, 2020).

This page continues page 341. The notes for both pages are on the sheet for page 341.

**Frameworks and real-world allocation, continued**

New York City uses random lottery numbers for some school admissions (Chalkbeat New York, October 1, 2024). Consumer markets make similar choices. For the Eras Tour presale, more than 3.5 million people registered, about 1.5 million received codes and 2 million were waitlisted (Ticketmaster, November 19, 2022).

For public servants, ASPA asks members to “treat all persons with fairness, justice, and equality and respect individual differences, rights, and freedoms” (ASPA Code of Ethics, 2013).

**? Stop and think.** Emanuel and colleagues reject first-come in medicine. Does their reasoning apply to the crew’s workshop? Why or why not?

**Sources**

**Real source** | Markkula Center for Applied Ethics, Santa Clara University | November 5, 2021

**A Framework for Ethical Decision Making**

**Real source**

| National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research; published by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare  
| 1979

**The Belmont Report**

**Real source** | New England Journal of Medicine (Emanuel et al.) | May 21, 2020

**Fair Allocation of Scarce Medical Resources in the Time of Covid-19**

**Real source** | Scientific American | September 3, 2020

**How to Decide Who Should Get a COVID-19 Vaccine First**

**Real source** | Chalkbeat New York | October 1, 2024

**What your ‘lottery’ number for middle and high school applications means**

**Real source** | Ticketmaster | November 19, 2022

**The Eras Tour onsale explained**

**Real source** | American Society for Public Administration (ASPA) | 2013

**ASPA Code of Ethics**

This page continues page 341. The notes for both pages are on the sheet for page 341.

## Look at the evidence

**On your own** Read each document and write what it shows and what it leaves out. About 8 minutes.

### Evidence A | Sign-up sheet

#### The workshop sign-up sheet

“Free workshop: 10 seats. Add your name to show interest. How seats will be chosen: to be announced.” The sheet opened Monday at 9 a.m. By Wednesday it had thirty names. The first 22 names were added before 10 a.m. on Monday.

**Look closely:** When did most names arrive, and what rule was posted then?

#### What it shows

➤ Thirty names for ten seats, 22 of them in the first hour, before any rule.

#### What it leaves out

➤ Who signed up late and why, and whether early sign-up says anything about need.

### Evidence B | Group-chat thread

#### The crew’s thread, Sunday at 8:30 p.m.

Gia: first come is easiest to run, we just take the top ten.

Anika: I’m at rehearsal most days, I’d see it after it’s full.

Mateo: lottery?

Gia: then we need a sign-up window and someone to run the drawing.

**Look closely:** Which cost does each person name? Which cost does nobody name?

#### What it shows

➤ The crew weighs the work each method needs, and Anika raises timing.

#### What it leaves out

➤ Anyone arguing for need, and any voice from the thirty applicants.

## ⌚ Pacing

Full chapter: 8 min.

✂ Short on time: 7 min. Participants fill in only the What it leaves out boxes.

## 💬 Say this

“Look at the times on the sign-up sheet. Who was likely to see it in the first hour?” — Wait for someone to connect the times to Anika at rehearsal.

## 👁 Watch for

**Misconception:** Students read an early sign-up as proof of stronger interest. **Listen for:** “The first ten wanted it more.” **Then:** Ask what else could explain an early name. The sheet shows timing, not need.

## 📄 Support

- Give each document on its own half-page.
- Read the crew’s thread aloud with three voices.
- **Cognates:** criteria (criterios), equity (equidad), option (opción), method (método), decision (decisión), consequence (consecuencia), information (información), justice (justicia).

## 🔗 Stretch

- Ask which document would let the crew count need, and why none of the three can.

## 🔥 Heat check

■□□ Low.

## Look at the evidence, continued

### Evidence C | Whiteboard

#### Three options on the whiteboard

A. First come, first served: fast to run; favors whoever sees it first. B. Lottery after a three-day sign-up: equal chance for everyone; needs a sign-up window and a drawing. C. Needs-based rubric: prioritizes people who can't afford the paid version; needs personal information and someone to judge it.

**Look closely:** Underline the cost the crew wrote for each option.

#### What it shows

Each method comes with a named benefit and a named cost.

#### What it leaves out

Who would judge need under C, what data it collects and where that data goes.

#### What is still missing from the evidence?

How many applicants have the greatest need, and whether a second session is possible. Who would see personal information under option C, and how the twenty without seats want to be told.

#### Notes

### ⌚ Pacing

Full chapter: 6 min.

✂ Short on time: 5 min. Read Evidence C aloud. Participants fill in only its What it shows box.

### 💬 Say this

“Look at the times on the sign-up sheet. Who was likely to see it in the first hour?” — Wait for someone to connect the times to Anika at rehearsal.

### 👁 Watch for

**Misconception:** Students read an early sign-up as proof of stronger interest. **Listen for:** “The first ten wanted it more.” **Then:** Ask what else could explain an early name. The sheet shows timing, not need.

### 📄 Support

- Give each document on its own half-page.
- Read the crew's thread aloud with three voices.
- **Cognates:** criteria (criterios), equity (equidad), option (opción), method (método), decision (decisión), consequence (consecuencia), information (información), justice (justicia).

### 🔗 Stretch

- Ask which document would let the crew count need, and why none of the three can.

### 🔥 Heat check

■□□ Low.

## Key idea: fair criteria

**On your own** Read the key idea and the code of ethics, then answer the question in the box. About 12 minutes.

Any way of giving out ten seats to thirty people leaves twenty people without one. A **trade-off** is a choice where getting one benefit means accepting a cost or giving something up. First-come is fast, but it favors people who see the message first. A lottery gives everyone the same chance, but it does not consider need. A needs-based rubric aims at equity by helping people who cannot afford the paid version, but applicants must share personal information. Each option has a cost, so the crew has to choose which cost to accept.

**Criteria** are the standards or reasons a group uses to make a decision. When the crew states its criteria early, everyone knows the rule before anyone is chosen. Even people who do not get a seat may accept the result if the rule was clear in advance. If the crew picks a rule after seeing the names, people may wonder whether it was chosen to favor someone.

The Markkula Center for Applied Ethics at Santa Clara University suggests looking at a decision through several ethical lenses. They include consequences, rights, fairness, the common good, character and care. The lenses can point toward different options, and they do not add up to one automatic score. A strong decision explains which concern matters most in this case, who carries the cost and what could reduce it.

### Professional standards

#### Adapted from a real source

| National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research; published by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

#### The Belmont Report: B. Basic Ethical Principles: 3. Justice

**Summary:** Summary, not a quotation: the report treats justice as fairness in distribution and lists five widely accepted ways to share benefits and burdens: an equal share, individual need, individual effort, societal contribution and merit.

**In plain words:** The Belmont Report, written for research with people, lists several fair ways to share limited benefits, such as equal shares or need.

**Question:** Which whiteboard option comes closest to “an equal share,” and which comes closest to “individual need”?

### Pacing

Full chapter: 12 min.

✂ Short on time: 10 min. Skip the In the news section.

### Say this

“The Belmont Report lists fair ways to share benefits, such as an equal share or need. Which option matches each?”  
— Point out that it was written for research with people.

### Watch for

**Misconception:** Students treat the Belmont Report as a law the crew must follow. **Listen for:** “They have to follow the Belmont rules.” **Then:** Say: “It was written for research with people. The crew can use it as a way to think.”

### Support

- Read the code summary aloud. Point out the label: it is a summary, not a quotation.

### Stretch

- Use the Informed Consent row: what should option C applicants be told before they share personal information?

### Heat check

■□□ Low.

**Professional standards, continued****Your answer**

Option \_\_\_ matches an equal share and option \_\_\_ matches individual need. The limit is \_\_\_.

➤ **B matches an equal share of chances, not of seats. C matches individual need. The limit is that C requires personal information and a judge.**

**In the news**

**Real source** | NPR | December 20, 2020

**The Ethics Of Who Gets The COVID-19 Vaccine And When**

A bioethicist explains how leaders chose who went first when there wasn't enough for everyone.



**Real source** | Scientific American | September 3, 2020

**How to Decide Who Should Get a COVID-19 Vaccine First**

Lays out competing criteria such as risk, fairness and benefit, the same lenses the crew uses.

**Notes**

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

This page continues page 346. The notes for both pages are on the sheet for page 346.

## Sort the evidence

**On your own** Follow each option to its effects and write who carries the cost in each box. About 8 minutes.

Follow each method to its consequences. Who carries the cost under each one, and what makes the chosen process legitimate to the twenty who lose?

### First come, first served

The ten fastest responders get seats; people at rehearsal or work see the sign-up late

**Who is affected**

➤ Anika and  
others who check  
messages late

### Lottery after a three-day sign-up

Each of the thirty has the same chance, and need is not considered

**Who is affected**

### Needs-based rubric

Those with the greatest need are prioritized; applicants must share personal information

**Who is affected**

➤ Applicants asked to  
disclose their finances

## Whose perspective is missing?

Whose view is missing from these documents? What would you ask them?

The view that is missing is \_\_\_\_\_. I would ask \_\_\_\_\_.

➤ Applicants with the greatest need are missing. I would ask what information they would share, with whom, and what would help them trust the process.

## ⌚ Pacing

Full chapter: 8 min.

✂ Short on time: skip this page.

## 💬 Say this

“Follow each option to its effect. Who carries the cost?” —  
Model the first-come row together.

## 👁 Watch for

**Misconception:** Students list costs only for the options they dislike. **Listen for:** “The lottery has no downside.” **Then:** Ask what a lottery does for someone with the greatest need. Write that cost in the box.

## 📋 Support

- Let students write names or simple icons in the boxes before writing sentences.

## 🔥 Heat check

■ ■ □ **Medium.** The missing-perspective question can lead students to talk about money at home.

**Cool-down:** Keep it about the applicants in the case. Nobody shares their own finances. Return to the whiteboard wording.

## Practice: choose a response

**On your own** Choose the note you would send, explain why and fix the two marked phrases. About 5 minutes.

Gia is drafting a note to the thirty people on the sign-up sheet. Which sentence could the crew defend?

- ☐ A “We picked the fairest method, so nobody loses out.”
- ☒ B “We’re holding a lottery so everyone has the same chance. A lottery doesn’t favor people with the most need, so we’re looking into a second session.”
- ☐ C “Seats go to the first ten names on the sheet, because those people wanted it most.”

Why I chose it

➤ B. It is the only note that admits a real cost and names a remedy. A denies the cost, and C treats seeing the sheet first as wanting a seat most.

## Improve a draft

### A student’s first draft

We should do first come first served because ① it’s the most fair. Everyone has the same chance to sign up and if you really want it you’ll sign up fast. It’s simple and ② nobody can complain because they had the same opportunity as everyone else. Also it’s way less work for us than reading thirty applications or doing some random drawing. The people who don’t get in can just come to the next workshop whenever we have one. This is obviously the best way.

Rewrite each marked phrase so it says only what the evidence supports.

Rewrite phrase 1

➤ First-come is the fastest option to run, which matters to a busy crew.

Rewrite phrase 2

➤ People who check messages late, like Anika, would carry the cost.

## ⌚ Pacing

Full chapter: 5 min.

✂ Short on time: skip this page.

## 💬 Say this

“Gia has to post tonight. Which note could the crew defend to all thirty people?” — Hold a quick vote before any discussion.

## 👁 Watch for

**Misconception:** Students pick the note that sounds kindest. **Listen for:** “A is nicest, nobody gets upset.” **Then:** Ask whether A is accurate. Twenty people will not get a seat.

## 📖 Support

- Read the three notes aloud before students choose.

## 🌡 Heat check

■□□ Low.

## ➤ Answer key

**A revised version:** We recommend a lottery after a three-day sign-up period. A lottery gives each of the thirty people an equal chance, while first-come, first-served favors whoever sees the message first, which leaves out people like Anika who check their phones after rehearsal. The cost is that a lottery doesn’t prioritize people with the greatest need. To reduce that, we’ll announce the sign-up in the group chat, at the bookshop counter and on paper, and we’ll run a second session for the twenty people who don’t get seats. We’d reconsider if the second session can’t happen.

## College

## Your task

**On your own** Read the steps and fill in the planner boxes before you start your draft. About 12 minutes.

Write a memo to a student government committee recommending how to give out ten free workshop seats among thirty applicants. Then draft the announcement that publishes the method before sign-ups open.

**Use:** Case documents: the sign-up sheet, the crew's debate thread, the three options on the whiteboard and Anika's statement. Real sources: the Markkula Center framework, the Belmont Report's principles of justice and informed consent and ASPA's principle on social equity.

**You'll make:** Memo, 350—450 words, plus an announcement of 80—120 words

**Time:** 75 minutes

- 1 Fill in the options matrix: who gains, who carries the cost and what information each option needs.
- 2 Apply two ethical lenses, including one that challenges your choice.
- 3 Draft the memo's recommendation section on the Your draft page.
- 4 Finish the memo, 350 to 450 words, on lined paper or in the online workspace.
- 5 Write an announcement of 80 to 120 words that publishes the method.
- 6 Add how people who do not get a seat will be told.



Prefer typing? Scan to open the online workspace.

## Options matrix

👉 A: fast, favors early viewers, needs no data. B: equal chance, ignores need, needs a window and a drawing. C: targets need, needs personal data and a judge.

## Case 17 | Your task | College educator edition

## ⌚ Pacing

Full chapter: 12 min.

✂ Short on time: 12 min.

## 💬 Say this

"The sign-up sheet opened Monday with no rule. What would you post today to fix that?" — Point to "to be announced" in Evidence A.

## 👁 Watch for

**Misconception:** Participants recommend a hybrid method without saying who judges need. **Listen for:** "We'll just add a need category." **Then:** Ask who reads the information, and what applicants are told first.

## 📄 Support

- Options matrix: who gains, who carries the cost and what information each option needs
- Model criteria statement
- Privacy checklist for any needs-based step: what is collected, who sees it, when it is deleted
- Privacy checklist: what is collected, who sees it, when it is deleted.

## 🔗 Stretch

- If you choose a needs-based or hybrid method, explain how applicants give informed consent to share personal information and who will see it.

## 🔥 Heat check

■ ■ □ **Medium.** Participants may share their own money situations when they discuss need.

**Cool-down:** Keep examples to the applicants in the case. Return to the privacy checklist.

## Two lenses, one that challenges my choice

## Notes

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal blue ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There is a vertical margin line on the left side, creating a narrow left margin. The paper appears to be from a notebook or a standard ruled document.

## Standards

## ACRL Framework: Information Has Value.

## Answer key

- Compares all three options using the sign-up evidence: 22 of the 30 names came in before 10 a.m. on Monday
- Publishes the method and criteria before sign-ups open
- Protects any personal information a needs-based step would collect
- Explains how people who do not get a seat are told and treated
- Applies at least two ethical lenses, including one that challenges the choice

## Your draft

**On your own** Write your draft in the boxes, using your planner from the page before. About 30 minutes.

### Memo: recommendation section

🔗 We recommend a lottery after a three-day sign-up, with the method and criteria published before sign-ups open. The sign-up evidence shows why. Twenty-two of the thirty names came in before 10 a.m. on Monday, while the sheet still said “to be announced.” First-come would reward that hour, not need or interest. A needs-based rubric would reach people who cannot afford the paid version, but it would collect personal information and require someone to judge it. The lottery gives every applicant the same chance and collects nothing private. Its cost is that it gives no extra weight to need.

### Announcement, 80 to 120 words

🔗 Free workshop: 10 seats. How seats will be chosen: a lottery. Sign up any time in the next three days. Everyone on the list has the same chance, whenever they signed up. We ask for no personal information. We will draw ten names in public on the fourth day and tell all thirty people the result the same day. If you do not get a seat, you will hear first about any second session we can hold. Questions? Ask Gia.

## Case 17 | Your draft | College educator edition

### 🕒 Pacing

Full chapter: 30 min.

✂ Short on time: 28 min. Participants draft the recommendation in the session and finish the memo afterward.

### 💬 Say this

“Read your announcement as one of the twenty who will not get a seat. Is anything missing?” — Partners check for the method, the date and what happens next.

### 👁 Watch for

**Misconception:** The announcement explains the method but not what happens to people left out. **Listen for:** “Winners will be notified.” **Then:** Ask how everyone else hears the result, and when.

### 🔗 Heat check

■□□ Low.

### 🔗 Answer key

#### What to notice in the sample:

1. Publishes the criteria in advance.
2. Compares the options with the sign-up evidence.
3. Names the cost of the recommended method.
4. Protects applicants' privacy in the public announcement.
5. Says how people who do not get a seat are treated.

## Check your work

**On your own** Answer the Check your work questions, mark your level in each rubric row and write one change you made. About 8 minutes.

|                                                                      |                                                                     |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Does your memo compare all three options using the sign-up evidence? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Does the announcement publish the method before sign-ups open?       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Is any personal information protected?                               | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Does it say how people who do not get a seat are told?               | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |

### How your work is scored

Mark one box in each row.

| Skill                         | Beginning                                                    | Developing                                        | Proficient                                                                | Advanced                                                                                |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Evidence</b>               | <input type="checkbox"/> No reference to who is affected.    | <input type="checkbox"/> Mentions people vaguely. | <input type="checkbox"/> Names specific people and effects from the case. | <input type="checkbox"/> Uses case facts to show who gains and who pays.                |
| <b>Reasoning</b>              | <input type="checkbox"/> Claims an option is obviously best. | <input type="checkbox"/> Gives one reason only.   | <input type="checkbox"/> Uses a lens and names the strongest objection.   | <input type="checkbox"/> Uses two lenses and proposes a revision tied to the objection. |
| <b>Audience &amp; purpose</b> | <input type="checkbox"/> Ignores the twenty who miss out.    | <input type="checkbox"/> Mentions them briefly.   | <input type="checkbox"/> Explains the process to all applicants.          | <input type="checkbox"/> Builds legitimacy by publishing criteria and a remedy.         |
| <b>Revision</b>               | <input type="checkbox"/> No change.                          | <input type="checkbox"/> Wording only.            | <input type="checkbox"/> Adds a named cost and revision.                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Explains how the revision addresses the objection.             |

### Pacing

Full chapter: 8 min.

 Short on time: 4 min. Participants answer the Check your work questions only.

### Say this

“Find the sentence that names who carries the cost. If you cannot find it, add one.” — Circulate and ask for one named cost or one fix.

### Watch for

**Misconception:** Students revise wording only. **Listen for:** “I fixed my spelling.” **Then:** Point to the Revision row. Ask for an added cost or a change tied to the objection.

### Heat check

 Low.

### Answer key

**How to assess:** Score with the case rubric. Add checks that the criteria are published before sign-ups open and that the privacy plan is specific.

#### Proficient looks like:

- **Evidence:** Names specific people and effects from the case.
- **Reasoning:** Uses a lens and names the strongest objection.
- **Audience & purpose:** Explains the process to all applicants.
- **Revision:** Adds a named cost and revision.

## This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal blue ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There is a vertical margin line on the left side, creating a narrow left margin. The paper appears to be from a notebook or a standard ruled sheet of paper.

## Questions to discuss

**On your own** Write a short answer to each question, then complete the sentence frames. About 10 minutes.

**1** Whose view would most challenge the option you prefer?

➤ If I back a lottery, applicants with the greatest need would challenge it most. Equal chance ignores unequal starting points.

**2** Anika says she does not need a seat. What is she asking the crew for?

➤ She wants a clear rule and an honest count of who loses. Her request is about how the crew picks, and it holds even without a seat.

**3** Option C would help people who cannot afford the paid workshop. What would applicants give up to be chosen that way?

➤ They give up privacy and control over their information. They also accept that someone else judges their need.

**4** What would make the twenty people without seats accept the result as fair?

➤ Criteria published before anyone is chosen, one rule for everyone and a real remedy, such as a second session if one is possible.

## My take

My claim: \_\_\_\_.

➤ The crew should publish its criteria, then hold a lottery and plan for the twenty left out.

## ⌚ Pacing

Full chapter: 10 min.

✂ Short on time: 4 min. Use question 4 as a closing question.

## 💬 Say this

“Answer with a detail from the evidence, such as a time on the sheet or a line on the whiteboard.” — Ask for one answer per question.

## 🔗 Stretch

- Find out how your school fills one limited spot, such as a trip or a club seat, and whether the rule is published first.
- Going further: Each method treats a different problem as the main one. For each of the three options, write the problem it tries to solve and one problem it leaves unsolved.
- Going further: Write down the option you picked first. Then find one person in the case that option treats unfairly. Decide whether you would change your criteria or explain them more carefully.
- Going further: Write two short sign-up announcements, each using a different method. Ask a friend to read both. Check whether they can tell who each plan leaves out and how to ask a question about it.
- Going further: Pick one limited spot at school, such as a class, a trip or a club seat. Find out how people are chosen and whether the rule is published. Ask who the rule helps and who it might leave out. Never ask classmates to share financial or personal information.
- Research how a real program uses a lottery and what critics say

## My take, continued

The best evidence is \_\_\_\_, because \_\_\_\_.

🔗 The sign-up times, because 22 names arrived before any rule existed.

Someone who disagrees might say \_\_\_\_.

🔗 A needs-based rule is fairer when some applicants cannot afford the paid version.

The limit of the evidence is \_\_\_\_.

🔗 The evidence does not show how many applicants have the greatest need.

I would change my mind if \_\_\_\_.

🔗 Most of the thirty could not afford the paid version of the workshop.

### Notes

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

This page continues page 355.

### Heat check

■ ■ □ **Question 3: Medium.** Students may bring up money at home or guess which classmates need help.

**Cool-down:** Say: “Answer about the applicants in the case, not anyone you know.” Return to the whiteboard wording for option C.

## Talk about this case at home

### Case 17: How should the crew give out ten free seats?

In this case, a group of friends has ten free workshop seats and thirty people who want one. Your student compared three ways to choose and wrote a note that explains the choice and who carries its cost.

#### Questions to talk about

- 1 When something is limited, like tickets or seats, what makes a way of choosing feel fair?
- 2 Why might it help to announce a rule before anyone signs up?
- 3 What is one kind way to tell people they were not picked?

Nobody needs to share personal stories or private information to talk about this case.



See the case online.

## Case 17 | Talk about this case at home | College educator edition

### 🕒 Pacing

At home: this page takes no class time.

### 💬 Say this

“Read this page at home with someone you trust.” —  
Nobody needs to share personal or money information to complete it.