Whose Terms?

Teaching review · 26 October 2026

Instructor guide

Evidence and revision

All 20 required scenes, the original writing minima, evidence selections and optional comparison remain. First-response snapshots are kept before advancing or showing modeled responses. Earlier saves retain progress; older mutable records cannot be certified retrospectively as pre-outcome predictions. Use the original and current explanations, attached sources and revision notes to assess how reasoning changed. Completion checks entries; evaluate the argument separately.

The grant graphic follows your consultation choices: a selected actor is a planned consultation; the next file distinguishes recorded, missing and conditional commitments. Compare these with each route’s requirements. At reflection pauses, your retained opening response stays beside your current assessment so you can test what the new evidence changes.

If a browser save cannot be opened, download its recovery copy before explicitly replacing it. A fresh start or restore replaces the browser copy only after you choose to proceed.

Quick start for the current game

Your role. You play a fictional independent civic-support adviser. You help people navigate institutions and analyze how rules shape rights, resources, and authority. Cards distinguish invented teaching cases and model outcomes from documented events. Later Jalud/OCHA material reports real events; do not treat every case or claimant as fictional.

Choose an opening mode

Just for learning retains all cases, evidence, choices, and feedback. Writing and name are optional; no submission is required. Choose For class for assigned work, enter your name, and follow the assigned route and settings. Switching modes preserves writing and reopens missing class work.

For class retains all 20 scenes, the required name, displayed writing minima, specified evidence selections, substantive questions, reflection work, and closing account. Some scenes require writing without a recommendation choice. The optional Khalidi comparison remains optional; its displayed minimum applies if included for class.

Use the game in this order

The task overview shows choice and card counts before you open details.

• Read the case and its question. Follow the people, legal status, and institution in this file.

• Read the case materials. Press Use this card to attach evidence to this answer. Reading a card or opening source details alone does not select it; Selected for this answer confirms attachment.

• Choose a recommendation where one is offered and explain your reasoning. For a scene with writing only, answer its prompt without looking for a policy choice.

• Record the choice to see the response, then record the scene and continue. Review the outcome and revise if useful. How this is assessed gives the student criteria; the instructor guide remains separate.

Explain and test the argument

Evidence is material used to support or test a claim; your answer record contains your own choices and writing. Saving does not submit work.

Reconstruct Shafir and Peled's account accurately. Connect a named rule, actor, or resource to a consequence. Use the evidence the prompt specifies and explain its relevance, limits, or a serious alternative. Supported disagreement is allowed. Keep historical records, scholarly interpretation, fictional perspectives, and model outcomes distinct. Word counts check length, not argument quality. Completion confirms required entries, not a grade or certification of learning.

Save and hand in work

Use Save & export. Browser saves stay with this browser and address. Keep a JSON file to resume on another device or between online and downloaded copies. PDF, HTML, and TXT are readable records; submit the format your course requests separately to Canvas or your course system. Nothing is sent automatically. Just for learning records are personal; no submission is required.

Using the detailed guide

Detailed guidance follows. Older Explore, Exploration, and Practice labels mean Just for learning. Names are optional for learning and required for class. All assigned academic tasks and minima remain; this quick start adds none.

Use the backstory as part of the investigation

Origins and recurring perspectives help students explain why a choice matters. At a decision, ask whose circumstances make the account persuasive, which factual claim can be tested, and who bears the consequences. Then examine the relevant source and its limits. Do not treat all accounts as equally accurate or mark disagreements about values as factual errors.

Use the existing writing and debrief tasks; this update adds no separate assignment. Look for a fair account of another person’s reasoning, a specific evidence-based correction or qualification, and a traceable connection between a rule and a human consequence. Distinguish documented history, scholarly interpretation, fictional composite perspectives, and designed model outcomes. The added practical context can extend beyond the assigned author without being attributed to that author.

Purpose

A Right on Paper is a self-contained case game for introductory students, based on Gershon Shafir and Yoav Peled’s Being Israeli: The Dynamics of Multiple Citizenship (2002). Students act as a policy desk. They learn through choices, evidence, and explanations. No prior reading is required. Reconstruct the authors accurately before evaluating their claims.

Learning goals

- Explain how liberal, republican, and ethno-national claims combine through institutions.
- Distinguish a formal right from usable access, resources, and decision authority.
- Trace how coalitions, organizational resources, and vetoes produce institutional change.
- Apply democratic multiculturalism: cultural authority, material provision, and individual protections.
- Use evidence to qualify an explanation while preserving differences in legal status.

Suggested segmentation

Plan about 90–120 minutes for the full class activity, solo or in pairs. This is a planning estimate; writing and discussion affect the pace. The 20 scenes form eight chapters. Keep their order so earlier decisions carry forward. Split across two class meetings if useful; chapter 4 offers a convenient break.

Chapter	Scenes	Focus
Start with a case	1–3	Make an initial prediction, help Samira reach work, and learn the three citizenship claims.
Resources and organized claims	4–6	Choose consultations, negotiate a grant route, and distinguish employment data from political influence.
Contribution and national standing	7–8	Compare service-based eligibility, historical recognition, and collective-national standing.
An institution changes	9–10	Trace health-insurance reform and compare explanations of religious authority.
Boundaries and political authorship	11–13	Distinguish legal statuses, analyze an exception, and reconstruct democratic multiculturalism.
An order and its enforcement	14–16	Predict implementation, inspect a documented return attempt, and compare unequal legal positions.
Scope, rivals, and later evidence	17–18	Evaluate institutional pressure and distinguish a mechanism from its historical prediction.
Apply and explain the authors	19–20	Apply the authors to a new school case and write an evidence-based account.

Running the activity

Students choose For class, enter a name, read the short case, select a route where offered, and explain their reasoning. Required word counts and evidence selections are shown beside each task. “Use this card” selects evidence; opening source details does not. Let students write individually before comparing accounts at reflection pauses. Ask them to identify a rule, an actor, and a consequence rather than repeat theory labels.

Assessment

Use this proposed rubric across the fieldbook. Give each criterion 0–3: 3 = clear and supported; 2 = partly developed; 1 = labels or assertions; 0 = missing. Total: 12.

Criterion	Strong work
Author understanding	Accurately reconstructs interacting citizenship claims and the authors' institutional argument.
Institutional reasoning	Connects a rule, actor, resource, coalition, or veto to a bounded outcome.
Evidence and scope	Uses relevant evidence, preserves dates and populations, and separates historical findings from invented model outcomes.
Application and judgment	Applies the ideas to a new case and identifies a serious alternative or a finding that could weaken the account.

Grade reasoning, not political agreement. Students may defend a bounded reform or challenge the authors. The game's completion check verifies required entries; it does not establish learning or assess argument quality.

Saving and submission

For class requires a name, writing, decisions, and selected evidence where indicated. Just for learning uses the same full cases, evidence, and feedback with optional writing, an optional name, and no submission. Work saves locally in the current browser. Students should download a JSON backup before changing devices or file locations. PDF and semantic HTML provide submission records; full HTML/TXT preserve context. Desk notes are excluded by default unless the student chooses to include them. Nothing automatically submits to Canvas: students download their record and upload it through your course assignment.

Debrief

- Which intervention achieved a real improvement, and who authorized it?
- When did an opportunity require another resource or institution to become usable?
- How did health reform change both entitlement and organizational power?
- What did the school case reveal about authority without resources?
- Which evidence could strengthen or weaken your preferred explanation?

Keep documentary events separate from modeled consequences. Students analyze institutions rather than impersonate communities or disclose personal histories.