

The casebook teacher edition

Plans, examples and feedback for teaching civic reasoning through stories.



Casebook 1

Before you run with it

Four stories about what we believe, what we share and who gets heard.

Grades 6-12. Eight workshops. Use the support that fits your class.

How the story becomes a workshop

Mateo and Gia met in Children, Youth, and Digital Culture at a college in New York. Their conversations became media nights at a neighborhood bookshop in Fort Greene. Younger neighbors join them to question posts, rules and decisions. The companions spark inquiry. The people and the learner do the reasoning.

Case	The problem	Finished work
1 Before you repost	What can a screenshot actually prove?	A correction with the original context and an arrival plan.
2 Same test. More questions	Does this task show what someone knows?	A support request that preserves the learning goal without making a diagnosis.
3 The apology is not the repair	What makes a correction more useful than "sorry"?	A correction, a repair commitment and a way to check understanding.
4 Whose room is it, anyway?	Who gets a say when a shared space changes?	A board comment with a checked budget and a fair alternative.

A manageable first run

Choose one case. Plan two 45-minute workshops. Read its source packet, use the matching teaching deck and collect a first draft and revision. Optional film and feed links extend the conversation after the core task.

English language arts and writing are the primary curricular fit. Civics, social studies, journalism, communication and sociology classes can add their disciplinary sources. The circuit case separates science understanding from the literacy demands of its written task.



Participation and assessment

Preview the evidence and optional media. Use the original fictional packet when a platform is blocked or a film is unsuitable. The Hunger Games excerpt includes danger and coercion involving young people. No social account, public post, political declaration or personal disclosure is required.

Access keeps the goal intact

Offer read-aloud text, clear copies, bilingual planning, oral rehearsal and diagrams. Use existing support plans and school procedures. When the assessed goal is writing, keep an appropriate written product. When the goal is understanding a concept, avoid grading the unrelated difficulty of a response format.

What to assess	Starting point	Ready to explain
Evidence	Repeats the claim or names a source without a specific detail.	Selects a relevant detail and explains what it supports.
Reasoning	Assumes the evidence settles more than it does.	Connects evidence to the claim and names a limit or fair alternative.
People and authority	Leaves out the affected person or the person who can decide.	Explains an effect and directs a feasible request to the right role.
Communication	The audience cannot tell what changed or what to do.	Accurate, readable message with a useful next step.
Revision	Makes a surface edit without a reason.	Explains how evidence or feedback changed the reasoning or wording.

Use a local 0-3 scale for each dimension: 0 absent, 1 attempted with material gaps, 2 accurate and supported, 3 precise with a meaningful qualification or revision. This is a classroom rubric, not an AP score or IB achievement level.

The case and the method



Use the original source to separate a claim from a supported fact, then write an update that helps people act.

Source verification + claim, evidence, reasoning

Claim: Write exactly what the post asks people to believe.

Evidence: Find the words about the side-door reader. Compare them with the booking email.

Reasoning: Explain why an entrance change does not establish an event cancellation.

Limit: What do we still need to check about the temporary entrance?

Watch for this misunderstanding

Calling the clip fake skips the actual problem. The clip is real in the story; its missing context changes its meaning.

Source links: [Digital Inquiry Group](#) and [Toulmin argument, Purdue OWL](#). These are adapted classroom methods. Ethics, policy, design judgments and legal rules have different authority.

The two workshop plan

Workshop 1 The screenshot problem

5 min Read the post. Show only evidence A. Individually write what happened and what you are assuming. Do not vote on whether the poster is a good person.

8 min Build the question. Compare one observation with one interpretation. Lupa asks: Where is the original? Pairs draft a question that could change their view.

12 min Open the receipts. Read B and C. Highlight the words that narrow "access." Put each document beside the claim it supports.

12 min Check beyond the post. Model lateral reading with a teacher-selected source: leave the page, investigate who is behind it, then return. For paper-only groups, compare source descriptions and dates.

8 min Revise the take. Students write a provisional update and name one remaining access question. Exit: Which exact detail changed your interpretation?

Check for understanding: A student identifies the broken side-door reader, keeps the screening separate from the entrance change, and names an unresolved access need.

Workshop 2 The update people need

5 min Recall the evidence. Pairs reconstruct the story without reopening the screenshot. Compare against the full update.

10 min Try two choices. Use both decisions in the case. Ask what each message could make a reader do before leaving home.

15 min Draft and test. Write a 50-80 word update. Another pair plays a visitor: Where do I go? When? What if I need support?

10 min Revise with a reason. Add a source and replace any claim about the poster's motive. Students mark one edit and explain it.

5 min Close the loop. Choose a private action: save the original, ask the coordinator or share the corrected draft with a teacher.

Check for understanding: The final update includes a confirmed event, entrance change, supporting source, useful next step and no invented motive.



Possible responses and useful feedback

One response that holds up

Model after students have a first attempt

Tonight's screening is still on, 6-9 p.m. The clip was about the broken side-door reader. Use the staffed, step-free front entrance. The booking email and full update confirm this. Need help arriving? Contact the coordinator before you travel.



Why the response works

Choice 1B names uncertainty while checking. Choice 2A corrects the claim and preserves the entrance change. Other choices overstate, erase context or invent intent.

A first draft with a problem

"The event is fine. The person who posted that was lying."

The event and entrance claims need separate treatment. Evidence does not establish the poster's motive. Ask: which words from the original would help a visitor get to the right door?

The revision to look for

The final update includes a confirmed event, entrance change, supporting source, useful next step and no invented motive.

More than one defensible answer

A different recommendation can earn full credit when the source use, reasoning, limits and audience fit hold up. Ask the learner to explain a revision, not to copy the model.

Support and course depth

Grades 6-8

Give students the three documents on separate pages. Read the transcript aloud. Use "The post claims __. The original says __. We still need __."

Grade 6: support one claim with a precise detail. Grade 7: use several details and acknowledge an opposing claim. Grade 8: select the strongest evidence and distinguish a factual disagreement from a difference in interpretation.

Grades 9-12

Compare how two different captions frame the same clip. Explain why a correction should reach the original audience. Add a source-authority check.

Grades 9-10: develop a fair counterclaim and explain the source's limits. Grades 11-12: synthesize records, identify unresolved uncertainty and state what evidence could change the recommendation.

Pre-AP: Annotate a pivotal detail before a paragraph in English 1. In English 2, sustain the analysis across sources and explain the revision.

AP English Language: Use audience, rhetorical choices, a defensible thesis and evidence-to-claim commentary. Address a fair counterargument.

IB: MYP: compare texts, organize evidence, produce a purposeful text and reflect on language. DP: analyze how authorial choices shape a substantive nonliterary text.

Honors: Test a serious rival explanation, independently corroborate a claim and specify a condition that would change the conclusion.

Use the separate crosswalk for exact grade codes and case-specific route tasks. These are selected skill practices, not official assessments or full-course certification.



The case and the method



Compare observations with a learning goal and ask for support without diagnosing a classmate.

Issue, rule, application, conclusion

Issue: Are we checking circuit understanding, reading speed, or both?

Rule: Separate the task goal from IDEA rules for a formal evaluation.

Application: Compare Dec's spoken explanation with his written attempt. Name what the mismatch leaves unresolved.

Conclusion: Propose a demonstration of the same goal and one question to ask next.

Watch for this misunderstanding

A failed quiz does not prove a disability, guarantee an IEP or establish a legal violation. Friends can support a request without diagnosing anyone.

Source links: [IRAC](#), [American Bar Association](#) and [IDEA evaluation rules](#). These are adapted classroom methods. Ethics, policy, design judgments and legal rules have different authority.

The two workshop plan

Workshop 3 The score and the story

5 min Meet the task. Read Dec's situation. Students name what the circuit activity is supposed to show. No one shares their own grades or support plans.

10 min Compare observations. Read A and B. Sort "observed," "possible explanation" and "not established."

10 min Ask Dec first. Pairs write one respectful question about the task. A student can respond in writing instead of role-play.

15 min Change one feature. Sketch a clearer practice sheet: larger diagram, numbered instructions or oral explanation. Explain how the goal stays the same. No live electrical work is needed.

5 min Exit with a limit. Complete: "This suggests __. It does not prove __."

Check for understanding: The learner connects a possible layout barrier to an observation without assigning Dec a disability or deciding eligibility.

Workshop 4 A request that helps

5 min Revisit the goal. Compare two proposed practice changes and ask whether each still shows circuit reasoning.

12 min Read the legal scope. Read evidence C and the federal source excerpt summary. Explain that IDEA's varied-measures rule governs its evaluation process, not every classroom quiz.

8 min Try the choices. Discuss the teacher messages. Pauta asks which claims are supported and which require another process.

15 min Prepare the request. Draft a 60-100 word message in Dec's voice with his permission. Include two observations, a question and no private records.

5 min Check the next step. Name an appropriate school contact and a question to ask. Use a fictional school if preferred.

Check for understanding: The response describes observations, requests a conversation and accurately limits the federal rule to IDEA evaluations.



Possible responses and useful feedback

One response that holds up

Model after students have a first attempt

We were practicing how circuits work. I could trace the route aloud, but lost my place in the written layout. Could we discuss how the task measures that goal and what support options are available? I can bring both examples.



Why the response works

Choice 1B gathers another observation while preserving the goal. Choice 2C makes a specific, permission-based request. A support conversation does not decide legal eligibility.

A first draft with a problem

"Dec failed because he has a disability, so every test has to be oral."

One performance does not establish a diagnosis or eligibility. Ask: what is the learning goal, what is the observed mismatch and what further information would help?

The revision to look for

The response describes observations, requests a conversation and accurately limits the federal rule to IDEA evaluations.

More than one defensible answer

A different recommendation can earn full credit when the source use, reasoning, limits and audience fit hold up. Ask the learner to explain a revision, not to copy the model.

Support and course depth

Grades 6-8

Provide "I noticed __" and "Could we talk about __?" stems. Read legal vocabulary aloud. Use a large circuit diagram or a paper sketch rather than timed reading.

Grade 6: support one claim with a precise detail. Grade 7: use several details and acknowledge an opposing claim. Grade 8: select the strongest evidence and distinguish a factual disagreement from a difference in interpretation.

Grades 9-12

Distinguish classroom practice, IDEA evaluation, eligibility and an IEP. Explain why one observation may justify a question but does not settle any of those steps.

Grades 9-10: develop a fair counterclaim and explain the source's limits. Grades 11-12: synthesize records, identify unresolved uncertainty and state what evidence could change the recommendation.

Pre-AP: Annotate a pivotal detail before a paragraph in English 1. In English 2, sustain the analysis across sources and explain the revision.

AP English Language: Use audience, rhetorical choices, a defensible thesis and evidence-to-claim commentary. Address a fair counterargument.

IB: MYP: compare texts, organize evidence, produce a purposeful text and reflect on language. DP: analyze how authorial choices shape a substantive nonliterary text.

Honors: Test a serious rival explanation, independently corroborate a claim and specify a condition that would change the conclusion.

Use the separate crosswalk for exact grade codes and case-specific route tasks. These are selected skill practices, not official assessments or full-course certification.



The case and the method



Correct an unsupported public claim and propose a repair with a named owner.

Research, planning, implementation, evaluation

Research: Put the recap beside the event log. Ask Anika what the group label changes for her.

Planning: Name who needs the correction and what they should understand afterward.

Implementation: Replace the inaccurate claim. State the repair and who will carry it out.

Evaluation: Ask readers what they now believe caused the delay. Views alone do not show understanding.

Watch for this misunderstanding

Feeling sorry can be sincere and still leave the record wrong. The person blamed does not owe public reassurance to the person who wrote the claim.

Source links: [RPIE](#), [Universal Accreditation Board](#) and [Sociological perspective](#), [OpenStax](#). These are adapted classroom methods. Ethics, policy, design judgments and legal rules have different authority.

The two workshop plan

Workshop 5 Who got blamed?

5 min Read the caption. Students silently note the claim and the group it blames. Keep the discussion about the fictional event.

10 min Compare the record. Read the setup log. Build a timeline. Which evidence challenges the caption? What does the log leave out?

10 min Hear the response. Read Anika's message. Explain how public blame can affect participation without asking anyone to represent a whole group.

15 min Examine the draft. Mark what Gia's draft says about intent and what it fails to correct. Try a factual opening sentence.

5 min Exit. Name one fact to correct and one person whose perspective is still missing.

Check for understanding: The student identifies the projector delay and explains why a general statement of good intent fails to correct the cause.

Workshop 6 The correction and the follow-through

5 min Recall the timeline. Ask what the log proves and what it cannot prove about every attendee's experience.

10 min Consider the choices. Compare deletion, a correction and asking Anika for reassurance. Discuss who does the work in each response.

15 min Write the repair. Draft a 70-100 word correction. Add one action, its owner and when the crew will check whether it happened.

10 min Peer editorial desk. Partners check factual accuracy, reach and responsibility using the workbook. Revision is part of the assessment.

5 min Exit. Complete: "Our next recap will change because ___."

Check for understanding: The correction owns the inaccurate claim, supplies a supported account and proposes a check the crew can actually perform.



Possible responses and useful feedback

One response that holds up

Model after students have a first attempt

Our recap wrongly blamed younger attendees for the late start. The event log shows a projector failure delayed the screening. We have corrected the original caption and contacted the people it blamed. Gia and Jordy will check factual claims against the event record before the next recap.



Why the response works

Choice 1B corrects the record. Choice 2C combines correction, outreach and a repeatable check. A different repair may work if it addresses the harm and is feasible.

A first draft with a problem

"Sorry you were offended. We did not mean anything by it."

The response puts responsibility on the reader and leaves the false claim intact. Ask: what actually caused the delay, what will you correct and how will you reach the affected people?

The revision to look for

The correction owns the inaccurate claim, supplies a supported account and proposes a check the crew can actually perform.

More than one defensible answer

A different recommendation can earn full credit when the source use, reasoning, limits and audience fit hold up. Ask the learner to explain a revision, not to copy the model.

Support and course depth

Grades 6-8

Use a four-line template: "We said __. The record shows __. We changed __. Next time __ will __." Let students annotate a provided draft.

Grade 6: support one claim with a precise detail. Grade 7: use several details and acknowledge an opposing claim. Grade 8: select the strongest evidence and distinguish a factual disagreement from a difference in interpretation.

Grades 9-12

Analyze how the correction reaches people who saw the original. Separate a factual correction from an apology and a repair. Identify a measurable follow-up.

Grades 9-10: develop a fair counterclaim and explain the source's limits. Grades 11-12: synthesize records, identify unresolved uncertainty and state what evidence could change the recommendation.

Pre-AP: Annotate a pivotal detail before a paragraph in English 1. In English 2, sustain the analysis across sources and explain the revision.

AP English Language: Use audience, rhetorical choices, a defensible thesis and evidence-to-claim commentary. Address a fair counterargument.

IB: MYP: compare texts, organize evidence, produce a purposeful text and reflect on language. DP: analyze how authorial choices shape a substantive nonliterary text.

Honors: Test a serious rival explanation, independently corroborate a claim and specify a condition that would change the conclusion.

Use the separate crosswalk for exact grade codes and case-specific route tasks. These are selected skill practices, not official assessments or full-course certification.



The case and the method



Compare a proposal's budget and access effects, then recommend a next step to the actual decision-maker.

Options and criteria + stakeholder inquiry

Problem: The weekly cost is \$600. Confirmed support is \$400. Who can decide how to cover the gap?

Options: Compare no rentals, one rental and two rentals using the same weekly figures.

People: Who loses an evening? Ask whose work, access or travel schedule the proposal misses.

Recommendation: Defend an option, name its cost and say what new evidence could change your mind.

Watch for this misunderstanding

An agenda is not a final vote. A revenue estimate is not guaranteed income. The nonprofit board in the story is not a government community board.

Source links: [Policy analysis](#), [CDC](#) and [Stakeholder inquiry](#), [EPA](#). These are adapted classroom methods. Ethics, policy, design judgments and legal rules have different authority.

The two workshop plan

Workshop 7 The room and the rules

5 min Name the decision. Read the board agenda. Ask whether it is a final decision and who can vote on this proposal.

10 min Hear the room. Make a people map from the listening notes. Add missing voices as questions, not invented testimony.

15 min Work the figures. Calculate the \$200 gap. Model no rental, one rental and two rentals. Underline that demand is uncertain.

10 min Ask better questions. Draft one budget question and one access question for the nonprofit board. Distinguish this board from a public city community board.

5 min Exit. Name a person affected who may miss the meeting and an alternate way they could contribute.

Check for understanding: The student calculates \$200 and \$80 correctly, describes projections conditionally and names the nonprofit board as the story's decision-maker.

Workshop 8 A recommendation with receipts

5 min Review the options. Restate all three options fairly. Students may support any option if they address evidence and constraints.

10 min Try the decisions. Consider the branch feedback. Ask what changes if a rental goes unbooked or an access need emerges.

15 min Prepare a comment. Write a 90-second comment or a 120-160 word letter. Include a supported fact, affected perspective, request and follow-up.

10 min Test and revise. A partner plays a board member and asks one good-faith question. Revise a claim or acknowledge a limit.

5 min Exit. Choose a private next step: find a meeting agenda, ask a school representative or discuss the proposal with a trusted adult.

Check for understanding: The recommendation addresses both budget and access, names an assumption and requests something within the board's authority.



Possible responses and useful feedback

One response that holds up

Model after students have a first attempt

I use the room after work. Removing both free evenings would leave me with fewer accessible meeting options. A one-night pilot would still leave a projected \$80 weekly gap, so I'm asking for a funding plan, input from evening users and a review after six weeks before a longer-term change.



Why the response works

Choice 1B gathers decision-relevant information. Choice 2C offers a conditional pilot, but other recommendations can earn full credit when they address the gap, access and uncertainty.

A first draft with a problem

"Two rentals solve everything because they make more money."

The figures support a possible \$40 weekly surplus if both bookings occur. They do not settle access. Ask: whose evening use changes and what happens if a rental does not book?

The revision to look for

The recommendation addresses both budget and access, names an assumption and requests something within the board's authority.

More than one defensible answer

A different recommendation can earn full credit when the source use, reasoning, limits and audience fit hold up. Ask the learner to explain a revision, not to copy the model.

Support and course depth

Grades 6-8

Use a calculator, a completed \$600 minus \$400 example and a people-map organizer. Read one option at a time. Offer a written comment rather than public speaking.

Grade 6: support one claim with a precise detail. Grade 7: use several details and acknowledge an opposing claim. Grade 8: select the strongest evidence and distinguish a factual disagreement from a difference in interpretation.

Grades 9-12

Test a zero-booking scenario and explain what the pilot would measure. Compare who attends with who is affected. Suggest an accessible feedback route.

Grades 9-10: develop a fair counterclaim and explain the source's limits. Grades 11-12: synthesize records, identify unresolved uncertainty and state what evidence could change the recommendation.

Pre-AP: Annotate a pivotal detail before a paragraph in English 1. In English 2, sustain the analysis across sources and explain the revision.

AP English Language: Use audience, rhetorical choices, a defensible thesis and evidence-to-claim commentary. Address a fair counterargument.

IB: MYP: compare texts, organize evidence, produce a purposeful text and reflect on language. DP: analyze how authorial choices shape a substantive nonliterary text.

Honors: Test a serious rival explanation, independently corroborate a claim and specify a condition that would change the conclusion.

Use the separate crosswalk for exact grade codes and case-specific route tasks. These are selected skill practices, not official assessments or full-course certification.



Feedback that gives a next move

Ask about the work

"Which source detail supports that sentence?"

"Where did the argument move from evidence to a guess?"

"What would a person affected by this need to know?"

"What is the strongest version of the other option?"

Keep the discussion observable

Give everyone silent thinking time. In pairs, one learner explains a source-based claim and the other asks a question. The first learner paraphrases the challenge and either revises or gives an evidence-based reason to keep the claim. Collect the before/after line and a short discussion note. A solo recording is presentation evidence, not collaborative discussion.

Calibrate sample work

Use one anonymized or invented response. Score each dimension separately, then compare the evidence for the score. Do not raise a reasoning score because a video looks polished or lower it because the student uses an accent, assistive technology or a private format.

A common ending

"My first take was __. Record __ changed or confirmed it because __.
One thing I still need to know is __." En español: "Al principio pensaba __. La fuente __ cambió o confirmó mi idea porque __."



Tools that follow the learning task

Task	Input	Work and export
Evidence memo	Case brief DOCX	Upload to Pages for iCloud, draft with source IDs, use comments, keep a separate revision log, download Word or PDF.
Civic briefing	Three-slide PPTX	Upload to Keynote, show decision/evidence/action, include the tradeoff, download PowerPoint or PDF.
Correction card	Editable correction PDF	Import to approved Adobe Express, replace prompts with checked copy, add source and text equivalent, export PDF or PNG.

All assessed thinking can happen on paper or in the site's local response workbench. Students download before opening an external editor. There is no automatic import, synchronization or school-account provisioning.

Check access before assigning an app

Use school-approved accounts or a teacher demonstration. Apple web editing is documented for supported Mac/Windows browsers; Android sharing can be view-only. Pages web cannot edit tracked changes. Adobe school licensing and access for children differ from personal accounts. Never send private student records to an optional tool.

[Pages import guide](#) [Keynote guide](#) [Adobe student access](#)

Sources and the scope of this casebook

Common Core ELA Literacy

Selected grade-specific reading, writing and discussion targets. The crosswalk names the work needed to assess them.

<https://www.thecorestandards.org/ELA-Literacy/>

College Board AP and Pre-AP

Selected course-skill extensions. Not official tasks, score predictions or authorized-course claims.

<https://apcentral.collegeboard.org/courses/ap-english-language-and-composition>

IB Language and Literature

MYP and DP use different descriptors. DP extension is textual-analysis practice, not an assessed IO or Paper 2.

<https://ibo.org/programmes/middle-years-programme/curriculum/language-and-literature/>

CAST UDL

Goal-aligned access and expression. Individual support requirements still apply.

<https://udlguidelines.cast.org/>

PRSA ethics

Professional ethics, distinct from legal requirements.

<https://www.prsa.org/professional-development/prsa-resources/ethics>

IDEA evaluation

Varied measures in formal disability/educational-needs evaluations. Not a universal classroom quiz rule.

<https://sites.ed.gov/idea/regs/b/d/300.304>

