

What does the learner take away?

Nine fresh AI perspectives, concrete revisions and an observed-classroom pilot plan.

Instructional judgment: the activity is strongest at teaching a bounded research move: identify how an action, rule or resource affects a political opportunity; distinguish the record from an inferred effect; test a competing account and a comparison. The evidence is less suited to settling the total cause of national election outcomes. The revised instructions make that scope explicit.

The strongest recurring problem was placement, rather than lack of information. Essential actor relationships were easy to miss in disclosures; source cautions were easier to repeat than apply; and two source-answer/decision cycles made a long hearing page. The new structure brings the key context forward and separates each cycle without removing the second question or any source.

ID	Fresh perspective	Actual scope
T1	Low-preparation first-year	Browser through evidence selection, then a clearly labelled cold read of remaining screens.
T2	High-school student, age 16	All six stages; 72-word main and 39-word comparison drafts; two source decisions; no final filing.
T3	Advanced undergraduate	Cold read and a substantive sample account, rival and comparison.
T4	Curious nonstudent adult	All stages inspected; 72-word draft and one challenge/decision; no completed comparison or filing.
T5	Educational Instagram creator lens	Student-text and entry-image review; proposed an accurate short demonstration.
T6	Average working first-year	Cold comprehension review: Serbia and Malawi comparison.
T7	Instructional designer	Cold review of goals, scaffolding, transfer and feasibility.
T8	Political-science faculty	Cold review of institutional context, evidence and comparison.
T9	Game designer / UX / art direction	Cold content and entry-image review of agency, structure and cognitive burden.

All are fresh independent AI simulations, without previous feedback or code. Three used the interface to varying extents; six were content-only. No one in this round verified a newly filed complete record. These are not real students, faculty, creators or a completion-rate study.

More context where it matters.

The change is to guidance and structure, with the complete analytical work retained.

Finding	Revision implemented
The basic political relationships became clear only after extra reading.	A visible three-part power map identifies office/holder, challengers/checks and opportunity at stake. Full background, names, dates and added sequence help remain available.
The target could drift from an opportunity to the overall winner.	A required short research-target label names one event or opportunity, actor and period. It carries into drafting, comparison and the readable report, outside the paragraph word count.
A directly documented step could make the rival task feel artificial.	Keep the recorded fact. Name the unresolved motivation, implementation or broader-effect link that both accounts address. An alternative is a hypothesis to test, not evidence of equal plausibility.
Correct practice recognition could leave the original overclaim untouched.	Each existing decision reason points to a phrase or link in the learner response and a case ID. A connection inspector stays available while drafting. A person still judges the warrant.
Source limits could sound as if nothing can be concluded.	Each card pairs a recorded, source-supported point with where the claim stops. Full source text, provenance and limitations remain. Detailed MEC numerical audit is layered under an explicit notice.
The hearing was a long page with two answer/decision cycles.	A hearing agenda shows one question at a time or both, with separate attempt and decision status. Both questions remain required and every attempt, source and decision remains available.
An unfamiliar second case could become another summary assignment.	The named target and current connection travel into comparison. A topic index helps locate relevant evidence; all six cards remain accessible and a failed analogy is legitimate.
Casual visitors felt obliged to complete a class assignment.	They can save an explicitly labelled readable draft at any point. A complete hearing still meets the same source, challenge, writing and comparison requirements as class mode.

Entry now names the transferable skill and gives case-specific research hooks. The optional closing reflection asks for a supported statement, a further inference and a reusable check. The teacher guide adds a practical observation sheet rather than treating a correct multiple-choice response as independent transfer.

Keep the intellectual demand.

The program checks a record structure. The teacher or reader checks its meaning.

Retained or strengthened	Verification / boundary
Historical evidence	All 24 historical card bodies and all 12 active/12 legacy practice answer keys are preserved. Offices, dates, denominators, original links and unresolved source discrepancies remain.
Analytical work	Two distinct supports, a separate complication, actor/action/option connection, two practice attempts and reasoned decisions, a rival and discriminating evidence, and a second case remain.
Authored writing	Main explanation remains 60-85 words; comparison remains 30-45. The new target is a short label. No historical paragraph is written or repaired by the app.
Current and earlier work	Target/view/reflection data persist and import. Old completion timestamps remain as history if current requirements are missing. Changing a view or optional reflection does not undo valid completion.
No substitute score	No score for a political conclusion, speed, caution words or changing views. A complete record can still contain poor reasoning. No semantic auto-grading or learning-gain claim.
Engineering checks	594 assertions pass: 268 new and 326 prior. Prior complete fixtures include the new target; every earlier analytical gate is retained. These are event/state and HTML-output tests, not browser or learning evidence.

A reporting inconsistency found and corrected

Independent engineering review found old comparison-purpose labels still in the export, even though the screen used neutral labels. That could revive a false outcome contrast. The report now matches the interface; new consistency regressions pass.

Informed learner retest

Verified visible power map, required target, target carried into comparison, current-connection inspection, Question 2 and Show both navigation, separate attempt/decision status, and both decisions still required. Source-supported points and card limits were visible. Audit expansion readback, report preview and casual draft delivery were interrupted or outside that sampled retest; they are not claimed as browser-verified.

The first two browser attempts reached a different prototype because of preview routing. They were excluded entirely. Correct title and country choices were verified before accepted observations. Those setup/protocol errors are not evidence of product confusion.

How to test the teaching claim.

All nine full reports and the detailed response register are included in the kit.

Perspective	What changed / what remains to test
T1 low-preparation learner	Earlier neutral example and plainer terminology; positive source points, short target and layered audit. Full independent completion remains untested in that profile.
T2 high-school learner	Essential power context is visible, the task names all required work, and the hearing separates answer/check/decision. The later informed retest confirms the core interaction changes.
T3 advanced learner	Unresolved-link rival framing and persistent target support a higher analytical ceiling. The app cannot decide whether an account is well warranted.
T4 nonstudent	Voluntary readable drafts and mode-appropriate sharing language; complete analysis retains all class requirements. No shorter route is represented as a complete hearing.
T5 creator	Concrete entry action, dated case context and supplied-claim labels. The proposed short clip remains one move within the longer activity; no posting or engagement forecast.
T6 average reader	Office relationships, simpler source/rival language, an invented denominator example and topic-based comparison browsing.
T7 instructional design	Own-writing decision prompts, documented-fact versus uncertain-link guidance, optional reflection and a human-pilot sheet. Automatic relaxation of word limits was not adopted.
T8 political science	Explicit institutional target, viable hypothesis-limit guidance and the Malawi threshold qualification in the opening. No common regime classification is imposed.
T9 game/UX	Focused agenda, visible connection and selected evidence relevance. New timers, political scores, simulated electoral effects and another required essay were not added.

Is it doable in one class?

The reconciled 55-minute timetable remains a planning estimate. The high-school simulation produced substantive drafts and two decisions, but browser operation is not student time. Reading confidence, discussion and revising a novel comparison may require more time. The guide provides a carryover point and a two-session option that preserve all reasoning.

Collect evidence of understanding

Use the new guide sheet: phase times and help needed; distinct observations; an actor-to-option warrant; a claim-relevant limit; rival accounts of a common uncertain link; differing expected patterns; and a valid comparison. Ask the learner to explain one reusable research move without supplied options. Use unfamiliar later material to probe retention. A causal learning claim needs an appropriate comparison design.

Physical-phone use, a full screen-reader audit, cloud-browser download completion, durable transfer and actual human learning gains remain unverified. The review supports a stronger design and a concrete pilot, not a claim of measured educational effectiveness.