INSTRUCTOR GUIDE

Who Can Change Who Counts?

Week 2 / U.S. Constitution / 45–50 minutes

Assign the simulation

Share the For Class link in Canvas. Assign the four responses and exported PDF. The class activity supplies all required evidence. The families and voting scenario are fictional. The executive order, court rulings and constitutional provisions are real.

Learning objectives

Students trace what an executive order directs, what a temporary injunction changes, what a court decides about the Constitution, and what evidence an agency needs. They then apply the difference between constitutional permission and implementation to a new voting case.

The four checkpoints

1. Executive order (7 min, 35 words). Predict whom the directive would affect if enforceable and isolate the one differing fact.
2. Court orders (10 min, 60 words). Replay two scopes of protection and correct a misleading headline using the two decisions.
3. Passport evidence (10 min, 55 words). Compare the two follow-up choices and explain why the qualifying document matters.
4. Article V transfer (15 min, 100 words). Trace the effect of the 38th ratification and a later state law on a 19-year-old. Allow the remaining minutes for setup and export.

Bridge from week one

Ask students to compare a survey response about who counts as American with a legal claim about citizenship. What would count as evidence for each claim? The optional Sides and Jardina cards are available for this connection.

INSTRUCTOR GUIDE

Who Can Change Who Counts?

Debrief and assessment / Edition 2

What to listen for

1. In the original files, Sol is the only child the order would target. June's father is a lawful permanent resident. In the temporary-order replay, the facts change so the directive would target both.
2. A named-plaintiff order protects Sol's family in the model. The defined-class order reaches June's family too. CASA concerns the reach of relief. Barbara decides the constitutional citizenship question.
3. Both children are citizens in the scenario. Sol's file still needs qualifying proof. Obtaining the certified record within the pickup window can clear the modeled evidence checkpoint.
4. At 37 approvals the existing voting-age protection governs. At 38 the hypothetical amendment permits state action. The portal notice alone leaves the 19-year-old eligible. A valid state age-21 law changes the result.

Suggested rubric · 8 points

Award 0–2 per checkpoint. Give 2 for a correct conclusion tied to the specific record and the institution or mechanism that produces the result. Give 1 for a mostly accurate answer with missing evidence or a missing step. Give 0 for an absent answer or a central error. Use first predictions to discuss revision.

Debrief prompts

If both children are citizens, why might one family still leave an appointment without a passport? When did a court ruling change which rule could be enforced? At what point in the voting case did the 19-year-old actually lose eligibility, and who made that change?

Primary records

Executive Order 14160 · Trump v. CASA · Trump v. Barbara · Article V · Amendments 14 and 26