

BEHIND THE CASE

Educator edition

Case-specific teaching moves, explanation of the evidence, model responses, misconceptions, and feedback for all twenty cases.

20 cases / 5 units

[The Why Files](#) · [Case Notes](#) · [The Receipts](#) · [Save This](#) · [Make It](#) · [What Changed?](#) · [Behind the Case](#)

In this edition

Educator edition	1
Teaching with the evidence	3
01 The transcript says more than the GPA	4
02 What can a recommendation letter actually do?	6
03 “Test optional” does not mean the same thing everywhere	8
04 The aid offer is not the bill	10
05 My deposit is smaller than my hours times my rate	12
06 Can my manager schedule me for that?	14
07 What do I document before I report?	16
08 The internship says “for experience”	18
09 Debit, credit, and “buy now” are not the same thing	20
10 The subscription kept charging	22
11 The creator said “not sponsored”	24
12 The video is real. The voice is not.	26
13 Why did I get that ad?	28
14 Can the school stop the story?	30
15 Register, preregister, or wait?	32
16 City, state, federal, or school?	34
17 Can I see the record behind the decision?	36
18 A petition is not the decision	38
19 Turning 18 changes some things, not everything	40
20 Before you sign the lease	42

Teaching with the evidence

Use the student reader for the story, The Receipts for the complete documents, and Case Notes for the learner's reasoning. This edition supplies the explanation, model, and teaching moves particular to each case.

A 45-minute route: 5 minutes for the initial interpretation, 12 for the source set, 8 for the reasoning check, 15 for the response, and 5 for revision or exit. In 90 minutes, add a second source comparison, peer feedback, and an external or local extension.

Provide the same essential source information in readable text. Preteach the listed vocabulary using the actual records. Allow a spoken, typed, handwritten, or visual response when that format does not change the intended skill. Do not require learners to disclose private records or lived experiences.

Four things to look for

Score each area from 0 to 3. A score of 0 means missing or unsupported work; 1 means partial or imprecise; 2 means accurate with a gap; 3 means accurate, supported, and clear. Use the case-specific model as an example, not a required script.

Accuracy and scope

The response matches the records and marks what remains unknown.

Evidence

The learner connects a claim to an appropriate receipt and explains why that receipt helps.

Authority and next step

The response identifies the actor who can clarify or decide the question and suggests an action within that actor's role.

Communication and revision

The product fits its audience, is understandable in the chosen format, and revises an earlier interpretation with a reason.

01 The transcript says more than the GPA

UNIT 1 / EDUCATOR EDITION

Concept: transcripts and records

How the receipts work

Source A is closest to the student's recorded coursework. Source B explains conditions under which that record was produced, including weighting and course availability. Together they support a contextual reading. They do not establish an exact recalculated GPA, because the excerpt does not supply individual grades, credits or a full calculation rule.

Source C describes this fictional college's stated review approach. It supports discussing trends and opportunities, not assigning them admission points or promising how a reader will react. A counselor or registrar can clarify the school record; the college admissions office can clarify its own requirements. These are distinct questions for distinct offices.

Teaching moves

- Reveal only 3.42 first. Have students privately record one inference, then revise it after the course history and profile appear; assess the revision's evidence.
- Ask students to mark recorded facts, interpretations and missing information in different ways. Challenge invented reasons for the repeated course without inviting personal disclosures.
- Compare two fictional weighting rules with identical grades. Discuss why comparability matters without ranking students or soliciting real GPAs from the class.

Model response

The 3.42 GPA summarizes recorded performance but does not tell the full academic story. Source A also shows improving grades, advanced courses in the last two years and a repeated course. Source B says the school offers six AP courses, weights AP/Honors and does not report rank, so direct comparison with another school's GPA may be misleading. Source C considers academic context and provides no guaranteed cutoff. I would ask the counselor to confirm how the repeat and weighting appear, then use the college's current instructions. These receipts cannot predict admission or explain why the student repeated a course.

Check for understanding

Which conclusion is supported by A, B and C together?

- A. A 3.42 guarantees rejection because course history cannot affect review.
- B. The GPA needs academic context, and these documents do not predict admission.
- C. The upward trend cancels the repeated course and guarantees acceptance.

Answer: B. A records the trend, B supplies school context, and C rejects a guaranteed cutoff. None supplies an individual admission decision.

Vocabulary to prepare

Transcript: A school-issued record of courses, grades and related academic information.

Weighted GPA: A grade average calculated with additional weight for designated courses.

School profile: A document describing a school's curriculum, opportunities and reporting practices.

Transfer and feedback

How would your interpretation change if the same grades came from a school with a different course menu and weighting system?

If the learner gives an overbroad answer, ask which sentence in a receipt would establish it. If the learner reaches a supported answer by a different route, ask them to make the connection visible rather than copying the model.

02 What can a recommendation letter actually do?

UNIT 1 / EDUCATOR EDITION

Concept: recommendations and evidence

How the receipts work

A establishes the recommender's assignment. B suggests supporting categories but supplies no verified accomplishment or actual anecdote. Label classroom examples separately from outside responsibilities. These receipts cannot support inventing a project result or job history.

Source C establishes status and a recorded waiver choice, not the wording, strength or confidentiality terms of a letter. Those terms must be read in the actual application instructions. The teacher controls what they write; the admissions office or application support team can clarify submission problems. Neither role turns receipt into admission assurance.

Teaching moves

- Give pairs a packet containing only the receipt categories. Ask them to identify what information must be collected before sending it to a recommender.
- Practice replacing praise requests with evidence reminders. Accept a request about classroom growth without requiring students to disclose grades, family matters or difficult experiences.
- Use a mock portal status to distinguish requested, submitted and received. Do not ask students to choose a waiver in class or imply one guarantees admission.

Model response

Recommendation packet: Requirement: one teacher letter on classroom performance, contributions and context (A). Evidence sheet: coursework and project reminders observed by this teacher; job and responsibility details separately labeled student-provided (B). Request: Please describe contributions and growth you can support; I am not asking you to copy praise. Administrative fields: verified deadline, portal route and waiver instructions, still to be supplied. Status check: C says received, which does not reveal the contents. Next step: verify completion before the actual deadline and contact admissions about a missing item. Do not invent dates, project outcomes or job duties absent from B.

Check for understanding

Which addition best serves the purpose in Source A?

- A. A paragraph the teacher is instructed to copy without changes.
- B. A claim that an average grade should be removed from consideration.
- C. A specific classroom example, clearly marked as something the teacher observed.

Answer: C. Observed classroom evidence fits A's stated purpose. A copied endorsement substitutes the student's judgment, and neither the letter nor packet changes the transcript.

Vocabulary to prepare

Firsthand observation: Information someone can describe from directly seeing or participating in an event.

Context: Relevant circumstances that help a reader interpret an experience or record.

Submission status: A system's record of where an item stands in a submission process.

Transfer and feedback

How would a recommendation packet for a job supervisor differ from one prepared for a classroom teacher?

If the learner gives an overbroad answer, ask which sentence in a receipt would establish it. If the learner reaches a supported answer by a different route, ask them to make the connection visible rather than copying the model.

03 “Test optional” does not mean the same thing everywhere

UNIT 1 / EDUCATOR EDITION

Concept: admissions policy verification

How the receipts work

A answers whether College A considers an applicant's submitted scores. B separates admission from certain scholarships at College B. Their similar admission labels do not establish identical rules for every purpose. Neither receipt supplies test-free or test-required policies, so those labels from the opening scenario cannot be assigned to a named college here.

C supplies a submission sequence but leaves the applicable institution and exact deadline unspecified. A table should show that limit instead of inventing a date. The date checked records the student's research activity; it is different from the application deadline. Admissions and scholarship offices can clarify their respective rules and application cycles.

Teaching moves

- Build the comparison with separate admission and scholarship columns. Require unknown in any cell that the receipts cannot support instead of rewarding a fully filled table.
- Ask groups to locate every date and explain its function. Distinguish the research date, scholarship deadline and later score-verification step.
- Have a partner audit whether checklist C was wrongly assigned to both colleges. Students should identify the missing source ownership before recommending a process.

Model response

Practice sources checked: September 29, 2026.

Source Admission Other requirements Verify next
--- --- --- ---
A: College A Score consideration optional Scholarship rules unknown Current cycle and deadlines
B: College B Test optional Some merit awards require scores by Dec. 1 Which awards and cycle
C: unidentified checklist Not established Self-report by deadline; official scores after enrollment Institution and exact deadline

I would confirm the current rules with each admissions or scholarship office. This table does not predict whether submitting a score helps; C cannot yet be assigned to either college.

Check for understanding

What is the most defensible reading of College B's policy?

- A. Scores may be unnecessary for admission but required for certain scholarships.
- B. An optional admission policy cancels all score deadlines on other pages.
- C. The December 1 scholarship deadline establishes the admission deadline too.

Answer: A. B distinguishes two purposes. The scholarship exception does not establish the admission deadline or identify every scholarship that requires scores.

Vocabulary to prepare

Test optional: A policy allowing applicants to choose score consideration for a specified process.

Self-report: Enter information yourself instead of initially submitting the issuing organization's official record.

Application cycle: The particular admission period to which requirements and deadlines apply.

Transfer and feedback

Where else might an optional admission requirement become required for a separate benefit, placement process or program?

If the learner gives an overbroad answer, ask which sentence in a receipt would establish it. If the learner reaches a supported answer by a different route, ask them to make the connection visible rather than copying the model.

04 The aid offer is not the bill

UNIT 1 / EDUCATOR EDITION

Concept: financial aid and net price

How the receipts work

A classifies offered or eligible aid. B records charges and pending credits. Subtracting the grants once reconciles their figures: \$43,000 minus \$18,000 equals \$25,000. Deducting the same grants again would double-count them. A loan could change the account balance if accepted and credited, but would not convert that amount into gift aid.

C explains why work-study is not upfront cash. It establishes no job, wage rate or earnings date for this student. The receipts omit a complete attendance budget, renewal conditions and disbursement schedule, all relevant to planning payments.

Teaching moves

- Use three colors for grants, borrowing and earnings. Ask students to explain the categories before they calculate any total or compare offers.
- Have learners reconcile B's \$25,000 with the charge and grant lines. Watch for counting the grant twice or subtracting work-study as immediate credit.
- Use only the fictional figures. Accept a written, spoken or table response, and assess identified unknowns rather than a student's own ability to pay.

Model response

Gift aid: \$18,000 in grants (A). Borrowing: \$5,500 in loan eligibility, not another grant (A). Earnings opportunity: up to the stated \$2,500 work-study eligibility, requiring a job and paid work rather than upfront cash (A/C). B lists \$43,000 in billed charges and \$18,000 pending grants, leaving \$25,000 before loans or other payments. I cannot identify final posted credits, payment dates, job earnings or nonbilled costs from these receipts. I would ask financial aid about award conditions and student accounts about the payment timeline, then build a budget that separates borrowing from gift aid.

Check for understanding

Why does B show \$25,000 before loans and other payments?

- A. It subtracts grants, loans and future work-study wages from the charges.
- B. It subtracts the pending \$18,000 grants from \$43,000 in billed charges.
- C. It includes every possible expense and all money the student will earn.

Answer: B. The displayed calculation is \$43,000 minus \$18,000. B does not treat loan eligibility or future work-study earnings as already posted payments.

Vocabulary to prepare

Gift aid: Aid such as grants that is generally not borrowed, subject to its conditions.

Pending credit: An expected account credit that has not yet finished posting.

Work-study: Aid eligibility linked to earning wages through an eligible job.

Transfer and feedback

How would you compare two colleges if one offer highlights a large total that combines loans with grants?

If the learner gives an overbroad answer, ask which sentence in a receipt would establish it. If the learner reaches a supported answer by a different route, ask them to make the connection visible rather than copying the model.

05 My deposit is smaller than my hours times my rate

UNIT 2 / EDUCATOR EDITION

Concept: gross/net pay and deductions

How the receipts work

A and B agree about gross earnings, so the known issue is not a missing displayed hour. B explains the numerical gap between gross and net. It does not verify the underlying tax calculation or meal authorization. Arithmetic consistency and proper payment are related checks, but passing one does not automatically establish the other.

C supplies an internal contact and a particular correction process. Its five-business-day instruction cannot establish any statutory deadline or waive rights not discussed in the receipt. A useful payroll message identifies the pay period from the actual statement, names the disputed line and asks what documentation supports it instead of accusing an unnamed person.

Teaching moves

- Let students calculate gross and net separately. Ask where each number comes from before discussing whether a deduction is appropriate.
- Present two possible messages: a broad accusation and a request naming the \$12 line. Have students improve specificity without requiring a deferential tone.
- Underline the phrase timecard corrections in C. Ask whether the receipt supports extending that deadline to taxes, deductions or an external complaint.

Model response

My timecard shows 18 hours at \$16, which equals \$288 gross (A). The statement also shows \$288 gross, then \$34.21 taxes and a \$12 meal deduction, producing \$241.79 net (B). Payroll, could you explain what the meal deduction covers and the policy or authorization supporting it? I am attaching the timecard and pay statement. The arithmetic matches, but that alone does not confirm every deduction is appropriate. C directs questions to payroll and gives five business days for timecard corrections. I will ask promptly and save your response rather than assume that deadline governs every possible concern.

Check for understanding

What can the matching calculation establish?

- A. Every deduction is permitted because the net pay adds up.
- B. The timecard correction deadline governs all legal complaints.
- C. The displayed deductions explain the gross-to-net difference, but their basis still needs checking.

Answer: C. The figures reconcile. Neither arithmetic nor a payroll label establishes authorization, legal compliance or the correct deadline for an outside process.

Vocabulary to prepare

Gross pay: Earnings before the deductions shown on a pay statement.

Net pay: The amount remaining after the statement's deductions are applied.

Deduction: An amount subtracted from gross earnings for an identified purpose.

Transfer and feedback

If the gross line showed fewer hours than the timecard, how would your first payroll question change?

If the learner gives an overbroad answer, ask which sentence in a receipt would establish it. If the learner reaches a supported answer by a different route, ask them to make the connection visible rather than copying the model.

06 Can my manager schedule me for that?

UNIT 2 / EDUCATOR EDITION

Concept: youth employment rules and jurisdiction

How the receipts work

A supports a concrete comparison with C: 11:30 p.m. is later than the stated 9 p.m. availability. It does not establish an accepted scheduling agreement. B explains which missing details are legally relevant but gives no state's actual cutoff. An answer that supplies a universal nine-o'clock rule would invent a legal fact absent from the receipts.

The separately verified federal reference, DOL Fact Sheet 43, concerns nonagricultural work and distinguishes hours from hazardous occupations. It does not settle an unspecified state's rules or this employee's duties. The model response should preserve that scope and direct the local check to the state labor agency, while taking the availability issue to the manager.

Teaching moves

- Make separate columns for law, communicated availability and agreed schedule. Ask students which column each receipt can actually support.
- Before a local extension, provide the state and a nonhazardous job description. Have learners record the official source, age band and date checked.
- Evaluate a student's qualified answer as complete when key facts are missing. Do not reward invented certainty or direct students to test a potentially unsafe shift.

Model response

A schedules a sixteen-year-old until 11:30 p.m.; C records availability only until 9 p.m. on school nights. That is a scheduling mismatch, but the receipts do not prove a legal violation. DOL's nonagricultural guidance permits unlimited federal hours at sixteen and seventeen while restricting hazardous jobs; a stricter applicable state rule may still control. B makes age, school day, state and occupation relevant. I would identify the state and duties, check the official state labor page, and ask the manager to correct or explain the shift against my availability. These records do not show whether that availability was accepted.

Check for understanding

Which conclusion follows from A and C alone?

- A. The shift extends beyond the availability the student supplied.
- B. The shift violates every state's law for sixteen-year-olds.
- C. The manager accepted a binding agreement to end every shift at nine.

Answer: A. The two times can be compared directly. The receipts do not identify state law or show that the employer accepted an agreement.

Vocabulary to prepare

Jurisdiction: The place or authority whose rules apply to a particular question.

Availability: The times a worker has communicated they can work.

Hazardous occupation: Work classified under applicable rules as posing specified dangers to young workers.

Transfer and feedback

What new facts would you need before applying your answer to a fifteen-year-old doing a different job?

If the learner gives an overbroad answer, ask which sentence in a receipt would establish it. If the learner reaches a supported answer by a different route, ask them to make the connection visible rather than copying the model.

07 What do I document before I report?

UNIT 2 / EDUCATOR EDITION

Concept: harassment reporting pathways and documentation

How the receipts work

A is a record-building tool, not an investigation outcome. Its strongest entries separate observation, attributed information and inference. A description of someone's words may support a question about conduct; it does not automatically establish the person's motive. The supplied template contains no actual incident details, so a model must not invent them.

B establishes the fictional employer's internal channels and policy. C establishes that a report was received, with a date and case number. Neither confirms what an investigation found. If a concern requires outside guidance, the relevant law, jurisdiction and agency process must be checked separately rather than inferred from the company's policy wording.

Teaching moves

- Use only the fictional template. Do not ask students to disclose experiences, reenact unwanted comments or publicly identify a person who caused harm.
- Sort sample entries into observed, reported by someone else and inferred. Accept uncertainty instead of asking learners to make a record sound certain.
- Compare report received with report resolved. Have students draft a neutral follow-up using case 1842, and make clear that documentation is not a prerequisite for seeking help.

Model response

My incident file would have one row per event: date/time, location, observed words or actions, witnesses and saved-message ID, with unknown details marked unknown (A). I would label paraphrases and separate any interpretation from what I observed. B lists the manager, HR and hotline as internal routes; I would use a route suitable to the concern and ask about support and next steps. I would save C's September 21 confirmation under case 1842 and document any later safety or schedule changes for HR. Receipt does not establish an outcome, and B alone does not explain outside legal protections.

Check for understanding

What does the September 21 email establish?

- A. The employer determined the worker's account was correct.
- B. The report was received and assigned case number 1842.
- C. All internal and external reporting requirements have been completed.

Answer: B. C confirms receipt and a reference number. It supplies neither a finding nor the requirements of every possible reporting process.

Vocabulary to prepare

Incident record: A dated account of relevant events, sources and remaining uncertainties.

Inference: An interpretation drawn from evidence rather than a directly observed fact.

Retaliation: A harmful response to reporting or other protected activity, defined by the applicable policy or law.

Transfer and feedback

How would you document a concerning message when you know its content but cannot yet identify who sent it?

If the learner gives an overbroad answer, ask which sentence in a receipt would establish it. If the learner reaches a supported answer by a different route, ask them to make the connection visible rather than copying the model.

08 The internship says “for experience”

UNIT 2 / EDUCATOR EDITION

Concept: internships and worker classification intro

How the receipts work

A supplies business duties and hours, not a legal classification. B describes a college's credit-approval process, not approval of this particular placement. Credit may be relevant to educational integration, but the phrase college credit preferred does not resolve employee status. Treating it as a complete legal answer would ignore the distinction between the two documents.

C supplies the general federal framework for for-profit employers, independently checked against DOL Fact Sheet 71. Its application depends on the actual relationship, not a checklist score or one persuasive phrase. Ask whether training complements paid employees' work or displaces it, and who supervises learning. The receipts do not establish the employer category or all relevant facts.

Teaching moves

- Annotate A: facts supplied and questions raised. Do not replace missing information with automatic approval or automatic illegality.
- Assign employer and faculty-office roles to different pairs. Ask which questions each can answer and why employer assurances do not award college credit.
- Discuss access without requiring income disclosure: twenty-five unpaid hours can affect transportation, paid work and caregiving. Evaluate options rather than a willingness to sacrifice.

Model response

Before accepting, I would ask the employer who teaches and supervises the work, what feedback is scheduled, and whether inbox and client-report duties replace tasks otherwise handled by paid staff (A). I would ask the faculty office whether this placement qualifies for credit, what approval requires and whether credit adds costs (B). C's federal framework for for-profit employers considers the whole relationship; credit alone does not settle worker status. I would request a written learning plan and compensation explanation. The listing does not establish legality or enough training details, so I would seek qualified guidance if the answers remain unclear.

Check for understanding

What does optional college credit establish here?

- A. The placement automatically meets every legal requirement for unpaid work.
- B. The employer can award credit without the faculty process.
- C. A possible educational connection that requires approval and does not settle classification alone.

Answer: C. B requires approval of learning objectives and supervision. C describes a flexible framework rather than treating credit as a decisive single factor.

Vocabulary to prepare

Primary beneficiary: The party who benefits primarily from an internship relationship under the relevant framework.

Learning objective: A specific skill or understanding an educational experience is designed to develop.

Supervision: Guidance and oversight, including feedback, provided during the work or learning.

Transfer and feedback

What additional questions would matter if the same listing came from a nonprofit, school program or government agency?

If the learner gives an overbroad answer, ask which sentence in a receipt would establish it. If the learner reaches a supported answer by a different route, ask them to make the connection visible rather than copying the model.

09 Debit, credit, and “buy now” are not the same thing

UNIT 3 / EDUCATOR EDITION

Concept: consumer finance basics

How the receipts work

A identifies the account that funds debit spending. B identifies borrowing terms, but lacks the numbers required to compare interest and fees. C provides an installment sum and a route to additional conditions. Comparing only the prominently displayed payment would give C an artificial advantage while leaving the other products' terms unexamined.

The strongest comparison separates payment timing, available funds, interest or fees, and missed-payment consequences. Known details and unknown details belong in different cells. These receipts cannot identify a universally cheapest option, establish an approval decision or predict credit consequences. The bank, card issuer or installment provider's actual disclosures must supply the missing contract details.

Teaching moves

- Use a comparison grid allowing unknown. Assess identification of missing APR, fees and installment conditions rather than invented numbers.
- Ask learners to calculate four payments of \$37.50, then explain why that calculation alone does not establish the total price of the laptop in the hook.
- Use a fictional income calendar to examine payment timing. Discuss choices and terms without accessing students' real accounts.

Model response

Debit draws from the checking balance, with insufficient-funds handling and fees requiring an account-specific check (A). Credit creates repayment obligations described by APR, minimum payment, due date and late-fee terms, but B provides no values to calculate cost. C's four \$37.50 installments total \$150 for the displayed example; the missed-payment and collection link must be opened. I cannot rank these options from the first payment alone or assume the example is the laptop's full price. I would gather each provider's complete terms, map payment dates against available money and compare total obligations before selecting a method.

Check for understanding

Which comparison is supported by the receipts?

- A. C shows \$150 in scheduled installments, while other terms still need checking.
- B. C must cost less because its first payment is the smallest number shown.
- C. B is always cheaper because making the minimum payment clears the purchase.

Answer: A. Four times \$37.50 is \$150. The linked conditions and missing credit figures prevent a complete cost comparison or a universal recommendation.

Vocabulary to prepare

APR: Annual percentage rate, a measure used to express a borrowing rate over a year.

Installment: One payment in a series used to meet a larger payment obligation.

Overdraft: A situation where account payments exceed the available balance under account rules.

Transfer and feedback

How would your comparison change if the smallest installment came due before the student's next available funds?

If the learner gives an overbroad answer, ask which sentence in a receipt would establish it. If the learner reaches a supported answer by a different route, ask them to make the connection visible rather than copying the model.

10 The subscription kept charging

UNIT 3 / EDUCATOR EDITION

Concept: subscriptions, scams, consumer protection

How the receipts work

A establishes an introductory month followed by recurring monthly pricing. B verifies charge dates, not the amounts, the starting date of the promotion or any earlier cancellation attempt. A timeline can show what happened before what, while leaving those facts unresolved. It cannot establish a refund entitlement without the applicable terms and facts.

C is evidence of the July 4 cancellation and its stated effect. August 1 is the end of access, not a new renewal deadline stated in the receipt. Keep any proposed calendar reminder separate from an actual contractual deadline. A later charge would create a new comparison between the account history and the saved cancellation confirmation.

Teaching moves

- Ask students to correct the opening claim using A: this packet concerns a paid introductory month and monthly renewal, not a free annual trial.
- Place July 2, July 4 and August 1 on a timeline. Require separate labels for charge, cancellation and access end.
- Have learners build an evidence folder index rather than expose real subscriptions. Check that calendar reminders are labeled as personal actions, not invented provider deadlines.

Model response

Evidence file: save A's \$4.99 introductory-month and \$14.99 monthly-renewal terms; save B's May 2, June 2 and July 2 charges with actual amounts when available; save C's July 4 cancellation and August 1 access end. Calendar: mark those dates, note no further renewals after cancellation, and set a personal reminder to check the next statement. July 2 came before July 4, so its refund status is a separate unanswered question. I would ask billing support about that specific charge and the refund terms. Neither B nor C proves an earlier cancellation attempt or guarantees a refund.

Check for understanding

Which statement best matches the timeline?

- A. Access through August 1 proves the July 4 cancellation failed.
- B. The July 2 charge guarantees a refund because cancellation followed two days later.
- C. July 4 cancellation stops later renewals as stated, while the July 2 refund question remains separate.

Answer: C. C separates continued access from future renewal. It gives no refund determination for the charge that B records before cancellation.

Vocabulary to prepare

Introductory price: A starting price that changes after the stated introductory period.

Renewal: Continuation of a subscription into another billing period under its terms.

Cancellation confirmation: A provider's record stating that a cancellation was received or processed.

Transfer and feedback

What evidence would you compare if a new monthly charge appeared after the saved cancellation confirmation?

If the learner gives an overbroad answer, ask which sentence in a receipt would establish it. If the learner reaches a supported answer by a different route, ask them to make the connection visible rather than copying the model.

11 The creator said “not sponsored”

UNIT 3 / EDUCATOR EDITION

Concept: creator economy and disclosures

How the receipts work

Source A shows the audience-facing claim and the affiliate link together. Source B adds the missing mechanism: an 8% commission on completed tracked sales. These documents support a clear statement that purchases can benefit the creator. They do not establish earnings, sales volume, or whether every viewer saw the link.

Source C summarizes a disclosure principle about material connections. Use it to explain why the relationship belongs where viewers can understand it. This teaching summary does not establish that a regulator investigated this creator, that a particular punishment applies, or that one sentence covers every benefit in the scenario.

Teaching moves

- Before opening B, have pairs identify what viewers could infer from “not sponsored” in A. Compare those inferences with the dashboard.
- Read revised disclosures aloud as video openings. Can listeners explain the purchase relationship without opening another screen?
- Credit evidence-based disclosure and explicitly unverified travel details. Reject invented gift amounts or automatic enforcement verdicts.

Model response

Proposed opening: “I earn an 8% commission on completed purchases through my affiliate link.” I would place that explanation with the endorsement so viewers encounter it before following the link. Source A shows why “not sponsored” leaves the relationship unclear; Source B confirms the commission. Source C supports making material connections understandable, but does not decide an enforcement case. Before posting, I would ask the creator and affiliate-program contact to confirm the travel and product arrangements, then name any relevant benefits accurately. I would not claim a dollar value or call the recommendation dishonest without evidence.

Check for understanding

Which opening is best supported by the three receipts?

- A. “I earn an 8% commission on completed purchases through this link.”
- B. “I received \$500 in travel and gifts for this post.”
- C. “No one paid me cash, so there is no financial relationship.”

Answer: A. Source B establishes the 8% commission. No receipt gives a travel or gift value, and the absence of an upfront cash payment would not erase the documented commission.

Vocabulary to prepare

Affiliate commission: Payment tied to purchases attributed to a tracked referral link.

Material connection: A relationship that could affect an audience’s evaluation of an endorsement.

Disclosure: An explicit explanation of a relevant relationship or benefit.

Transfer and feedback

How would disclosure change for a free product without commission? What additional evidence would you need?

If the learner gives an overbroad answer, ask which sentence in a receipt would establish it. If the learner reaches a supported answer by a different route, ask them to make the connection visible rather than copying the model.

12 The video is real. The voice is not.

UNIT 3 / EDUCATOR EDITION

Concept: deepfakes and provenance

How the receipts work

Compare Source A and Source B at the message level: the visible event matches, while the audio and claimed announcement do not. This supports identifying an altered soundtrack. The receipts do not identify a software tool, the first uploader, or a motive, so none belongs in a factual correction.

Source C checks the separate policy claim. Its current notice conflicts with the repost, providing institutional corroboration alongside the original video. Absence from an archive alone would be a weaker basis for declaring that nothing was ever said. Here, the comparison with Source A gives the correction additional support.

Teaching moves

- Place A and B transcripts in parallel columns. Students mark changed claims without relying on hearing, lip-reading, or detection software.
- Separate “Was this event recorded?” from “Does this version preserve the message?” Require evidence for both answers.
- Review corrections for repeated false claims and unsupported accusations. Require clarity about the alteration and uncertainty about its author.

Model response

Verification chain: compare the repost (B) with the original recording (A), then check the current policy notice in the official archive (C). Correction: “The circulating clip uses footage from a real event, but its audio differs from the original. The policy announcement in the repost is not supported by that recording, and the current school notice says something different. Please use the original and official notice when checking the rule.” We do not know who altered the sound. I would ask the school office responsible for announcements to confirm the current notice and share this correction where the repost circulated.

Check for understanding

Which conclusion stays within the evidence?

- A. The school probably changed its policy between the original recording and the repost.
- B. The footage depicts the same event, but the repost changes its audio and message.
- C. The repost's uploader can be identified as the audio editor because they shared it.

Answer: B. A and B establish the audio mismatch, while C contradicts the repost's policy claim. The receipts neither establish a policy change between recordings nor identify who edited the audio.

Vocabulary to prepare

Provenance: The documented origin and history of media.

Corroboration: Support from another relevant source when checking a claim.

Synthetic audio: Sound generated or reconstructed by software rather than preserved from the original recording.

Transfer and feedback

Without A, what could C still establish, and which part of the correction would need qualifying?

If the learner gives an overbroad answer, ask which sentence in a receipt would establish it. If the learner reaches a supported answer by a different route, ask them to make the connection visible rather than copying the model.

13 Why did I get that ad?

UNIT 4 / EDUCATOR EDITION

Concept: targeted advertising and privacy

How the receipts work

Source B gives the clearest campaign-level evidence: its disclosed audience settings include ages, ZIP codes, and college-planning interest. Source A shows account categories, including college prep, but does not prove which category delivered this impression. The similarity between “college prep” and “college planning” is relevant, not proof of identical internal labels.

Source C documents behavior that might help explain the interest category. It cannot establish causation or an exact weight. None of A, B, or C demonstrates that the platform knows household income, that the ad offers a suitable loan, or that the two teens were treated differently for one identified reason.

Teaching moves

- Give students a map legend: documented, possible, unknown. Require a receipt-based explanation for every connection they draw.
- Review certainty words such as “because.” Preserve firm language for B’s documented settings; qualify proposed causal relationships.
- Use the fictional log for assessment. Personal account inspection, search history, and family financial disclosure are unnecessary.

Model response

My map begins with the campaign settings in B: age range 16-20, selected ZIP codes, and college-planning interest. A separately lists the account’s sneakers, college-prep, and local-events categories. C shows scholarship searches and college-tour viewing; I would connect those to the interest category with a dotted “possible relationship” line. I cannot identify the exact trigger or explain the other teen’s ad from these records. Next I would use the platform’s ad-information or privacy controls to inspect the explanation it provides. The advertiser can clarify its stated audience choices, while the platform controls the delivery system.

Check for understanding

Which statement does Source B establish most directly?

- A. The college-prep category proves exactly which signal delivered this ad.
- B. The activity log lists every factor used to select this ad.
- C. The campaign disclosed age, ZIP-code, and college-planning audience settings.

Answer: C. B directly discloses campaign settings. A and C show categories and activity, but neither reveals the exact delivery cause or every factor used.

Vocabulary to prepare

Targeting: Selecting the audience an advertiser wants to reach.

Inferred interest: A category estimated from signals rather than necessarily provided directly.

Causal claim: A statement that one factor produced an outcome.

Transfer and feedback

What evidence could distinguish one search triggering this ad from the advertiser selecting a broad audience?

If the learner gives an overbroad answer, ask which sentence in a receipt would establish it. If the learner reaches a supported answer by a different route, ask them to make the connection visible rather than copying the model.

14 Can the school stop the story?

UNIT 4 / EDUCATOR EDITION

Concept: student journalism and speech

How the receipts work

Source A establishes the subject and described contents of the draft, without private student records. Source B identifies a review process and the need to consult district policy and applicable law. B does not, by itself, prove that any proposed restriction is legally valid or that the adviser has unlimited power.

Source C warns that school sponsorship, jurisdiction, and other facts matter. It supports a contextual inquiry, not a universal outcome. A/B/C identify further questions: the publication's status, the precise concern, the full district policy, and current law in the relevant jurisdiction. The receipts do not resolve those missing details.

Teaching moves

- Sort claims into content facts, school policy, and legal questions. Identify which column each source can actually address.
- Rehearse an editor-adviser meeting. Each concern must identify a passage or missing fact, without inventing prohibitions.
- Assess useful next questions instead of a preferred legal verdict. Do not require disclosure of students' actual publication disputes.

Model response

Issue map: A describes reporting on inspection records with student quotes and no private student records. For the school-policy question, B requires adviser review and refers to district policy; I would ask the adviser to identify any specific disputed passage and the written basis for a change. For the constitutional question, C says publication context matters. For the state-law question, we still need the applicable jurisdiction and current authority. I cannot conclude from these excerpts that the school either may or may not stop the story. Next, the editors should gather the full policy and seek context-specific student-press guidance.

Check for understanding

What is the most defensible use of the publications policy?

- A. Treat its adviser-review clause as the final answer to the constitutional question.
- B. Use it to identify the review process while checking the applicable legal context.
- C. Use the absence of private records in A to skip every remaining policy question.

Answer: B. B describes a local review process and refers to applicable law. C makes context necessary; A's privacy detail alone cannot settle the remaining questions.

Vocabulary to prepare

Editorial authority: Responsibility or power to decide publication content.

Jurisdiction: The place or legal system relevant to a question.

School-sponsored publication: A publication connected to school support or oversight; exact status requires contextual facts.

Transfer and feedback

If the story appeared independently, which questions would change? Identify the publication-status facts you would verify.

If the learner gives an overbroad answer, ask which sentence in a receipt would establish it. If the learner reaches a supported answer by a different route, ask them to make the connection visible rather than copying the model.

15 Register, preregister, or wait?

UNIT 4 / EDUCATOR EDITION

Concept: voter registration and official sources

How the receipts work

Source A supports a state-specific lookup. Source B supplies an example of preregistration at ages 16–17, explicitly limited to the practice scenario. Source C turns that limited example into “everyone,” and also drops the difference between registration and preregistration. Those are the two errors a correction should address.

None of these receipts gives a current rule for a named reader’s jurisdiction. Do not add a deadline, identification requirement, or universal eligibility claim. The information card can be accurate by directing readers to their state’s official election information and labeling the sample rule as an example rather than instructions for every student.

Teaching moves

- Circle scope words: state, residents, eligible, everyone. Discuss which conditions the school post drops from the other receipts.
- Have partners check whether each card distinguishes preregistration from voting eligibility. Neutral language alone does not guarantee accuracy.
- Use fictional audience profiles. Grade source routing and scope, without asking students to disclose status or political beliefs.

Model response

Check your state before sharing a registration rule. Start with the state lookup described in [Vote.gov](#) (A), then read your jurisdiction’s official election page for current eligibility, registration or preregistration instructions, and deadlines. In our practice example, residents ages 16–17 may preregister, becoming active when eligible (B). That does not support the school post’s claim that everyone can register at 16 (C). This card cannot determine your eligibility because the receipts do not identify your jurisdiction or circumstances. If the official instructions are unclear, contact the listed election office. Save the official link and the date you checked it.

Check for understanding

Which correction preserves the useful message without extending the evidence?

- A. All students ages 16-17 should follow the sample state's preregistration instruction.
- B. Registration and preregistration can be used interchangeably if the reminder links to Vote.gov.
- C. Some jurisdictions offer preregistration; check your own current official election instructions.

Answer: C. A requires a state-specific lookup. B supplies one example, while C drops its limits. A link does not make registration and preregistration interchangeable.

Vocabulary to prepare

Preregistration: An advance registration process governed by particular jurisdiction rules.

Eligibility: Conditions required to participate in a specific process.

Official source: Information from the institution responsible for a rule or service.

Transfer and feedback

What should a reader moving between jurisdictions ask an official election office before following the card?

If the learner gives an overbroad answer, ask which sentence in a receipt would establish it. If the learner reaches a supported answer by a different route, ask them to make the connection visible rather than copying the model.

16 City, state, federal, or school?

UNIT 4 / EDUCATOR EDITION

Concept: levels of authority

How the receipts work

Source A identifies four decisions but supplies no actual notices, locations, or complete rules. Source B maps each decision to an institution or role. Because B describes “many” graduation rules and deadlines “subject to higher rules,” a diagram that treats each level as completely separate would misread the evidence.

Source C supplies a process principle: begin with the decision owner and use a higher-level appeal where the rule provides it. It does not promise an appeal for every issue or authorize bypassing the first contact. A/B/C support a qualified route, not a guarantee that a particular office must reverse a decision.

Teaching moves

- Match each scenario to an initial contact before revealing B. Discuss mismatches as problems of routing a question.
- Add “can explain” and “can decide” labels. Ask what evidence supports assigning both functions to one actor.
- Challenge automatic escalation to presidents or governors. Require a rule supporting each appeal arrow or mark the route unknown.

Model response

For the classroom deadline in A, my ladder starts with the teacher or school because B identifies that level as the starting owner, subject to higher rules. I would ask for the written deadline policy and the procedure for requesting a change. If that policy identifies a review contact, I would take the documented question there next, following C. The receipts do not name the course, explain why the deadline exists, or establish an appeal right. My first message would ask: “Which policy governs this deadline, and who can review a request under it?” I would save the response before escalating.

Check for understanding

Which ladder best follows Source C?

- A. Decision owner > written rule > any review route provided by that rule.
- B. School office > elected official, regardless of which institution controls the issue.
- C. Decision owner > next higher office, assuming every decision has an appeal.

Answer: A. C makes escalation conditional on the actual rule. B also shows that different decisions have different owners, so a universal chain would be misleading.

Vocabulary to prepare

Authority: Assigned power to make a particular decision.

Implementation: Putting an established rule or decision into practice.

Appeal: A request for review through a process provided by the relevant rules.

Transfer and feedback

If an office does not own the decision, what evidence-based referral should you request next?

If the learner gives an overbroad answer, ask which sentence in a receipt would establish it. If the learner reaches a supported answer by a different route, ask them to make the connection visible rather than copying the model.

17 Can I see the record behind the decision?

UNIT 5 / EDUCATOR EDITION

Concept: public records and meeting records

How the receipts work

Source A establishes the denial and its stated reason, not whether that reason was correctly applied. Source B identifies records that could connect criteria with the recorded decision. It proves neither unfair treatment nor a complete record of the review.

Source C names the clerk as the request route and limits the access claim by noting institutional and legal variation. A request can ask for available portions and an explanation of withheld material, but these receipts do not guarantee release, a response deadline, or a successful challenge. Any claimed exemption needs a relevant rule, not a guess.

Teaching moves

- Separate record requests from interpretations. A criterion score is identifiable; “Why do you dislike our club?” assumes motive.
- Simulate the clerk’s role. Return vague requests for clarification without inventing application numbers, dates, or institutional procedures.
- Describe potentially sensitive information conditionally. Require an applicable rule before naming an exemption, and never promise universal access.

Model response

Dear clerk: Under the procedure in C, I am requesting the criterion scores and committee-minute entry associated with the club funding denial described in A, including the motion and vote identified in B. Please let me know which application or meeting identifier you need to locate those records. If any portion is restricted, please explain the applicable basis and whether an accessible version or remaining portion can be provided. I am seeking how the stated documentation issue was recorded, not other students’ personal information. I understand this procedure does not guarantee complete access; my next step is to clarify the request with your office.

Check for understanding

What does the procedure in C establish?

- A. Identifying the requested record precisely guarantees that the clerk must release it.
- B. Specified records can be requested through the clerk, with access depending on applicable rules.
- C. The committee minutes necessarily include the full discussion behind every criterion score.

Answer: B. C provides a request route while noting access variation. Precision helps locate records but does not guarantee release, and minutes are not necessarily a complete transcript.

Vocabulary to prepare

Minutes: A meeting's institutional record, not necessarily a verbatim transcript.

Redaction: Masking particular information within a released document.

Records request: A request for identifiable records through the relevant access procedure.

Transfer and feedback

If the clerk provides minutes but no scores, what conclusion and focused follow-up would be justified?

If the learner gives an overbroad answer, ask which sentence in a receipt would establish it. If the learner reaches a supported answer by a different route, ask them to make the connection visible rather than copying the model.

18 A petition is not the decision

UNIT 5 / EDUCATOR EDITION

Concept: advocacy, petitions, public comment

How the receipts work

Source A establishes the size and purpose of the petition: 1,248 signatures for evening bus service. It does not show signature verification, projected ridership, or a formal decision. Source B explicitly says no vote at that meeting, so “petition approved” would misstate what the board was scheduled to do.

Source C documents the later approval of a six-month pilot after staff analysis. The chronology supports distinguishing public support, investigation, and authorization. It does not prove signatures alone caused the vote or establish permanent service. A strong plan uses C to update the status without reading unprovided operating details into the resolution.

Teaching moves

- Reveal A, B, then C. Save a one-sentence public update at every stage to show how the claim changes.
- Sort actions into support-building, analysis, decision, and implementation. Identify responsible actors and unresolved operating details.
- Challenge both “signatures automatically win” and “petitions do nothing.” Require evidence for the petition’s role without inventing board motives.

Model response

Decision-path plan: A records 1,248 signatures requesting evening buses. At B, the transit board is receiving the petition and requesting ridership/cost analysis; there is no vote, so our update should say “under review.” Students can ask staff what rider information would help that analysis. C then documents approval of a six-month pilot after the staff report. Our new update should say “pilot approved,” without promising permanent service. The board owns the decision; transit staff are the next contact for implementation questions. We still need the launch schedule and review process, so our next step is to request those details.

Check for understanding

Which headline matches the latest receipt?

- A. Transit board approves a six-month evening-bus pilot after staff analysis.
- B. Transit board makes evening bus service permanent after receiving 1,248 signatures.
- C. Transit board approves new service when it schedules receipt of the petition.

Answer: A. C establishes a six-month pilot. B's lack of a vote was a process stage, not a rejection, while A alone could not establish any service change.

Vocabulary to prepare

Petition: A request supported by signatures; its procedural effect depends on the system.

Resolution: A governing body's formal recorded decision.

Pilot: A limited trial before a longer-term decision.

Transfer and feedback

What evidence during the pilot could support a continuation request without treating anecdotes as overall ridership data?

If the learner gives an overbroad answer, ask which sentence in a receipt would establish it. If the learner reaches a supported answer by a different route, ask them to make the connection visible rather than copying the model.

19 Turning 18 changes some things, not everything

UNIT 5 / EDUCATOR EDITION

Concept: legal adulthood basics

How the receipts work

Source A provides an issue inventory rather than a complete statement of law. Source B describes a specific education-records transition and points to school procedures. Read it as the notice in this practice case; it does not resolve all exceptions, every access question, or all communications between school and family.

Source C establishes that the sample gym contract includes a 12-month term and cancellation conditions. It does not give the fee amount, notice period, or a jurisdiction's rules on enforceability. Combining A/B/C supports targeted questions and source routing, not a universal adulthood checklist with made-up legal deadlines.

Teaching moves

- Sort claims into established, needs another source, and depends on circumstances. Use fictional examples without requesting personal disclosures.
- Require a responsible source beside every adulthood-card question. Replace vague “do research” instructions with a useful destination.
- Treat the notice as practice evidence. Verify any added local legal instruction with its current responsible source.

Model response

Check before you assume: For each item in A, record the issue, your relevant jurisdiction, and the official source or qualified support that can explain it. For school records, ask the school's records office how the rights and access procedures described in B apply to your situation; do not assume every family-school connection changes the same way. Before signing the gym agreement in C, read the 12-month term and request the full cancellation conditions and costs. These receipts do not settle every legal requirement. My next step is to obtain the actual school procedure and complete contract before making either decision.

Check for understanding

What can you conclude from the gym contract example?

- A. The agreement cannot be ended before 12 months under any circumstances.
- B. The excerpt provides enough information to calculate the full membership cost.
- C. This example has a 12-month term and cancellation conditions that need to be read before signing.

Answer: C. C gives a term and notes cancellation conditions. It does not supply the conditions themselves or the fees, so neither an absolute cancellation limit nor total cost follows.

Vocabulary to prepare

Term: The stated period an agreement remains in effect.

Cancellation conditions: Specified steps or circumstances for ending an agreement.

Education-record rights: Rights concerning covered school records, interpreted under applicable rules and procedures.

Transfer and feedback

Choose an unexplained item from A. What exact question would you bring to its responsible source?

If the learner gives an overbroad answer, ask which sentence in a receipt would establish it. If the learner reaches a supported answer by a different route, ask them to make the connection visible rather than copying the model.

20 Before you sign the lease

UNIT 5 / EDUCATOR EDITION

Concept: contracts and leases intro

How the receipts work

Source A gives the rent, deposit, lease term, and separate utilities. It supports distinguishing recurring rent from a deposit, but not a complete budget or payment schedule. Source B supplies additional categories and an insurance requirement; the effect of its terms depends on the actual language and incorporation into the agreement.

Source C recommends preserving condition and transaction records. It is a documentation checklist, not a statement that any particular deduction or clause is lawful. None of A/B/C supplies jurisdiction-specific tenant law. An annotation should therefore separate stated obligations, missing details, and legal questions requiring an appropriate local source.

Teaching moves

- Annotate stated, missing, or verify locally. Separate listed amounts from utility estimates and claims about enforceability.
- Calculate only supported totals and label exclusions. Do not call rent plus deposit the complete move-in bill.
- Rehearse renter-manager questions. Mark gaps for written follow-up instead of inventing guest policies, fees, or deposit rules.

Model response

Annotations: A lists \$1,150 rent, a \$1,150 deposit, the August 1-July 31 term, and separate utilities. B needs reading alongside the lease; C prompts dated condition photos and saved records. My five questions are: Which utilities and other charges would I pay? When are rent, deposit, and other move-in payments due? What do the guest, pet, and subletting clauses allow? What notice and charges apply if I leave? What insurance and damage-documentation process are required? I would request written answers and the complete agreement from the property manager. The receipts do not establish local tenant rights; unresolved legal questions need a current local tenant resource.

Check for understanding

Which budget statement is supported by Source A?

- A. Rent and the listed deposit total \$2,300, with utilities and any other costs still unresolved.
- B. The full move-in bill is exactly \$2,300, including every fee and utility.
- C. The \$1,150 deposit automatically replaces the final month's rent.

Answer: A. A supports adding the two stated amounts but lists utilities separately and omits other cost details. It does not state that the deposit substitutes for rent or give a complete move-in bill.

Vocabulary to prepare

Addendum: Additional terms that may form part of an agreement.

Security deposit: Money listed separately from rent, governed by applicable terms and rules.

Move-in record: Documentation of condition and transactions when occupancy begins.

Transfer and feedback

If a verbal answer conflicts with the addendum, what should you request before signing?

If the learner gives an overbroad answer, ask which sentence in a receipt would establish it. If the learner reaches a supported answer by a different route, ask them to make the connection visible rather than copying the model.