Who Will Fight to Keep It?

Class report · Edition 5.1

Instructor verification

Name	Sample Student
Course or section	Comparative Politics · Classroom sample
Assignment	riverford-policy-feedback
Run	R-mwh2io00-zcfx170yuv
Completion	Class Full · Complete
Words in the report	420 of 230 minimum across four checkpoints
First-choice practice	2 of 2 correct. Payment data correct · Millhaven outreach correct. Use the rubric for the written reasoning grade.
Hearing forecast	4 expected · 4 under the first signing rule.
Prior Fun exposure	No earlier Fun reveal found in this browser
Research note	Comparative politics · Hacker (1998)
Hearing-rule practice	Require both neighborhoods → Count five from anywhere

Current assessment entries

Checkpoint	Words	Minimum	Revisions
Plan forecast	48	20	0
Vote and evidence	93	50	0
Hearing and replay	118	80	0
New town and research	161	80	0

Plan forecast

1. How would your plan help the four households that are short on rent? What do you give up by choosing this plan?
2. How many more yes votes do you need?

Your choice. Targeted relief · 4 households would receive 6 credits each.

Current response

I would propose Targeted relief. It gives six credits to each of the four households behind on rent, enough to close those gaps. The other eight households receive nothing, although they also lost income. Two council members already support the plan, so it needs one more yes vote.

Reasoning questions unopened.

Vote and evidence

1. Use the payment data. How many Alder and Juniper households would get help under Targeted relief?
2. For Targeted relief, compare the votes with and without the flyer. Whose vote changes? Does the plan pass?
3. How might the flyer change that member's mind while the plan stays the same?

Your choice. Payment data selected. Vote with the flyer: 2 yes, 3 no. Zero households were paid in this vote. The hearing case assumes Targeted passed without the flyer.

Payment data if each plan passes

Plan	Alder	Juniper	Total
Targeted relief	2 of 6	2 of 6	4 of 12
Broad relief	6 of 6	6 of 6	12 of 12

Vote count · three yes votes needed

Plan	Without flyer (what if?)	With flyer
Targeted relief	3 yes · passes	2 yes · fails
Broad relief	3 yes · passes	3 yes · passes

Current response

The payment data shows that two of six Alder households and two of six Juniper households qualify for Targeted relief. The flyer claims that only Juniper households qualify. Without the flyer, the undecided member votes yes and the bill gets three yes votes. With it, the member votes no and the bill falls to two. The claim could make the bill look like favoritism even though the rule still uses the rent gap. The comparison changes the entire flyer, so I cannot tell whether the ancestry label or the false claim mattered more.

Reasoning questions unopened.

Hearing and replay

1. Use the same contact list for both plans. Under the first signing rule, how many people sign for each plan? What explains the counts?
2. Keep the contact list. For both plans, what happens to the counts if households short on rent sign only when their payment covers the whole gap? Explain.
3. What evidence could you use to test one of the game's assumptions in a real town?

Your choice. Ask the neighborhood help centers. Forecast 4. First rule: Eastbank 2, Westbank 2, 4 total. Signing replay: 4 signatures.

Signatures if each plan had passed

Plan	First signing rule	Full rent gap rule
Targeted relief	4 total · 2 Eastbank, 2 Westbank · Hearing	4 total · 2 Eastbank, 2 Westbank · Hearing
Broad relief	4 total · 2 Eastbank, 2 Westbank · Hearing	0 total · 0 Eastbank, 0 Westbank · No hearing

Current response

Targeted lost the vote with the flyer. This comparison assumes it passed. With the help centers list, both plans first get four signatures, two from each neighborhood, so both qualify for a hearing. In the replay, Targeted stays at four because it covered the six credits each of those households needed. Broad drops to zero because it paid those same households only two credits each. The address check asks a different question. It shows how four households can sign while the clerk counts only three. In a real town I would compare data on payments, contacts and signatures to see whether people reached by the same centers were more likely to sign when their rent gap was covered.

Reasoning questions unopened.

New town and research

1. Both lists get five signatures. Using Millhaven's starting rule, explain why only one gets a hearing.
2. Now imagine only the four households that need help most get paid. How many signatures does each list get from Harbor and Bluff? Does either get a hearing under the starting rule?
3. What did your chosen study look at? Name one real piece of evidence you would use to test the idea. Explain what it could show.

Your choice. Work with the community groups. Millhaven choice: Harbor 3, Bluff 2, 5 signatures. Hearing. Source selected: Hacker (1998).

All eight households got a payment

Contact list	Signatures and result
Mail	5 total · 5 Harbor, 0 Bluff · No hearing
Community groups	5 total · 3 Harbor, 2 Bluff · Hearing

Current response

When all eight households got paid, mail collected five signatures from Harbor and none from Bluff. It met the total but missed the neighborhood requirement. The community groups collected three from Harbor and two from Bluff, so they got a hearing. When only four urgent households got paid, mail could get two signatures, both from Harbor. The groups could get four, two from each neighborhood. Both miss the five-signature minimum. Counting five from anywhere changes only the first mail result. Hacker compares the development of health coverage in Britain, Canada and the United States. He argues that earlier choices shaped who had a stake when reforms came up. I would compare data on who had coverage in Britain and the United States at the start of the postwar reform debates. I would then use legislative testimony to check which proposals medical associations and unions supported. Together, these sources could show whether groups with a stake in existing coverage took different positions.

Reasoning questions unopened.

Research note used

Hacker (1998). How early choices shaped health coverage. Jacob S. Hacker. Studies in American Political Development 12(1), 57–130.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0898588X98001308

Riverford and Millhaven data is fictional. Assess the reasoning and evidence through the instructor's rubric.