INSTRUCTOR GUIDE

Who Paid for This Race?

U.S. Government · 45–55 minutes

Students use real filings, ads, polls and certified returns to trace campaign money and decide what to publish. A second primary tests what they can infer about its effect.

Assign in Canvas

Share the For Class launch on Under These Rules. Students select **Start Class investigation** and enter their name and course or section. The evidence and definitions are built in. Set Canvas to accept one PDF and use the 20-point rubric on page 4.

After the second race, students choose a headline and preview it alongside their first judgment and recorded verdict. They select **Finalize Class report for Canvas**, then **Print or save as PDF**. Students check their name, all four answers and final page and confirm submission in Canvas.

Work saves locally when browser storage is available. **Download progress backup** creates a JSON to restore on another device. If another tab changes the saved work during a restore, the activity shows the new destination and asks for confirmation again. Back up unsaved work before refreshing or closing the tab.

The activity page includes a student manual, editable Canvas instructions, a sample report and a downloadable offline copy.

What to assess

1. Identify who supplied, received and controlled money in the filing.
2. Count reported transactions once and compare fundraising using the same period and denominator.
3. Make a defensible claim from the record, weigh a rival explanation and state what additional evidence would help.

Plan for 45-55 minutes

Stage	Time	Work students do
The lead	4-5 min	Pick a first record and predict who received the money.
The audit	11-13 min	Match IDs, check the total, trace the gift and test a claim about control.
The ad desk	7-8 min	Compare the organization’s stated purpose with the ad’s argument.
The verdict	13-16 min	Open a follow-up record, cite the first request and design a comparison.
A second race	8-9 min	Test the New York reasoning with different returns.
PDF and Canvas	3 min	Save, check and submit.

Four responses total at least 240 words (50, 55, 75 and 60). Class uses direct entry by default. **Writing input options** enables paste or drop with instructor approval under the same report requirements. For Fun, learners choose a final claim and study design. Writing and headlines are optional.

The audit and fundraising

Two reports, two transactions

UDP reported media placements and listed Targeted Platform Media LLC as the payee. The **public distribution date** is May 28, 2024. The field for the date of disbursement or obligation is blank. The 48-hour notice was filed May 30. The monthly report, filed June 20, covers May 1 through 31. Students can view the original entries and transcriptions in N1 and N2.

Reported position	Transaction ID	Amount
Oppose Jamaal Bowman	E8E2E3F4EAC3448F1980	$837,065
Support George Latimer	EB3639FE90312412F859	$837,065

Each ID appears twice. Counting all rows gives $3,348,260. Counting each ID once gives **$1,674,130**. A full-race total requires a defined window and rules for notices, periodic reports, amendments and refunds. Identifying a specific ad would require an order, invoice or comparable record.

Editor's check. UDP's filer certified independence [N1]. Latimer's campaign controlled the contribution after receipt [C1]. An optional replay tests how a change in who chooses an ad's audience can change its legal classification [R3].

Follow a gift through a conduit

Latimer's April report lists one **$2,700** gift and an AIPAC PAC memo. ID 10976857 records the donor-to-conduit date of March 25. ID 10976857E records the conduit-to-campaign date of March 27. The donor chose Latimer. C1 shows the original fields.

AIPAC PAC and United Democracy Project have separate FEC registrations. In a second example, Peter Berger gave **$100,000 to UDP** on May 21. The receipt identifies which committee got the money. It leaves open whether this specific gift financed a particular ad or race.

Match the reporting period and the denominator

Selected Form 3 receipt line	Bowman	Latimer
Itemized individual contribution dollars	$1,136,957.16	$1,934,060.59
Unitemized individual contribution dollars	$434,286.39	$143,428.34
All individual contribution dollars	$1,571,243.55	$2,077,488.93
Other political committee contributions	$31,951.55	$17,625.00
Total receipts	$1,603,635.10	$2,095,113.93
Unitemized share of individual dollars	**27.64%**	**6.90%**

Both originals were filed June 13 for April 1 through June 5. The audit checks **all individual dollars** as the denominator separately from identifying the larger share. Dividing by all receipts would also rank Bowman first. These are dollar shares. His amended unitemized line was $433,356.89 on the same individual total.

The ad, the polls and the verdict

Separate sponsor purpose from ad content

United Democracy Project says it seeks to elect candidates who support the U.S.-Israel relationship. The Bowman ad argues he resists working with President Biden. The House Clerk records Bowman's votes against the infrastructure and debt-limit bills [R14, R15]. A policy priority may guide which candidate a group backs, while anticipated voter concerns may guide its public argument. Credit other explanations when students distinguish the evidence from their inference.

The three evidence requests

Request	What the record measures	What would strengthen the comparison
Early support	A March 26-30 Mellman poll of 400 likely primary voters put Latimer ahead 52% to 35%. DMFI PAC sponsored it and backed Latimer.	Compare viability before UDP engaged in similar races it backed or considered but passed over.
Exposure	The notice gives spending and purpose. The ad shows a message. AdImpact [A7] counts repeatable TV airings across a media market.	Candidate preference over time among comparable voters with different measured or assigned exposure.
Participation	UDP's monthly report lists $3,480 for phone banking opposing Bowman, with May 13 as the public distribution date.	Validated participation records and a credible comparison across people with different outreach exposure.

UDP ran digital issue ads targeting Bowman in November 2023 [A5]. AIPAC PAC endorsed Latimer separately in January [A6]. March is a benchmark before the May push and after both events. The June 6-8 Emerson poll had 425 likely voters, 48% Latimer, 31% Bowman and 21% undecided. March included Farber, at 0% rounded. The polls used different samples and methods.

Read the returns

Latimer won 45,909 to 32,440, a margin of **13,469**. If students calculate shares for just those two names, the denominator is 78,349. The Bronx counts are 1,355 Latimer and 6,839 Bowman. Subtracting them from the district totals yields 44,554 Latimer and 25,601 Bowman in the Westchester portion. These are counts of votes for candidates. The records give no measure of who saw an ad or who changed their vote.

A supportable verdict. The March lead [P1] preceded the May push and followed earlier issue ads. Random assignment to an ad or neutral video makes groups comparable on average. A larger gain in support after the ad supports persuasion in the study. A claim about who won requires evidence about reach and votes. For mobilization, use validated turnout and assign contact attempts.

Optional rule replay

A fictional hybrid PAC's $50,000 public ad expressly backs a House candidate. The payer, content and price stay fixed. Private, material campaign involvement in choosing the audience meets the conduct test. With no prior gift for the election, this in-kind contribution would exceed the $5,000 limit by $45,000. The PAC can use its independent account for the independent branch.

Transfer, rubric and debrief

In the five-candidate Pennsylvania District 12 Democratic primary on May 17, 2022, UDP reported media placements opposing Summer Lee and supporting Steve Irwin. Lee won **48,002 to 47,014**, a margin of **988**. The example rules out a guarantee of victory and leaves any effect on votes open. The full Democratic contest counted 115,063 votes, including 483 scattered write-ins.

Analytic rubric · 20 points

Task	Points	Evidence to credit
Audit and funding route	7	**2** match both IDs and name the spender and payee using records. **1** state the scoped total. **1** trace the single gift, memo and campaign control. **1** distinguish UDP's own spending and its signed declaration from a finding of compliance. **2** compare both unitemized shares and explain the denominator.
Sponsor and message	3	**1** document UDP's stated aim. **1** identify a documented appeal. **1** connect them in an explanation that distinguishes the sources from an inference about strategy.
Verdict and comparison	6	**2** defend or revise the first judgment using two records, one from the chosen path. **1** match a mechanism to an outcome. **1** explain what the rival predicts. **1** describe a credible comparison, threat and safeguard. **1** identify a result favoring one explanation and explain what it would substantiate.
Second race	4	**1** match the spending direction and winner. **1** give the correct margin. **1** revisit the New York claim and explain how spending could help Irwin despite his loss. **1** identify what makes the races differ and the evidence needed to address it.

Grade the student's evidence and inferences. Eight checks indicate completion. A student may defend the initial judgment and earn full credit. Grade earlier editions against the prompts on their reports.

Debrief in 10 minutes

1. Put the $2,700 contribution beside one $837,065 outside expenditure. Ask who decided how each amount could be used.
2. Compare two student verdicts. Ask what observation would favor a persuasion account, a turnout account or an account centered on the choice to enter a winnable race.
3. Use the Pennsylvania result to ask what would make a student revise their generalization one more time.

What the Class report preserves

The report preserves the first judgment, chosen records, editor's checks, and original and revised responses. Edition 1.4 records the follow-up title and source labels. Grade the evidence cited in the student's prose. The sample uses fictional student work.

Source ledger

The newsroom, sequence of evidence requests and optional ad decision are teaching devices. The cases use excerpts from public records. Attribution of a position in a filing records what the committee reported. The decision replay models statutory limits under stated facts.

Code	Record	Locator
N1	UDP 48-hour notice	May 30, 2024. Schedule E, pp. 1 and 3. Signed independence certification.
N2, N3	UDP June monthly report	June 20. Schedule A p. 6. Schedule E pp. 35 and 51-52.
C1	Latimer April quarterly and FEC date guidance	Schedule A, pp. 9-10, IDs 10976857 / 10976857E.
B1, L1, B2	Bowman original, Latimer original, Bowman amendment	Form 3, p. 3, column A, lines 11 and 16.
A1, A2, A3	UDP mission, UDP ad page, Reuters on the May ad push	Sponsor’s account, actual message and publication context.
A5, A6	Jewish Insider on UDP’s November ads and AIPAC PAC’s January endorsement	Two earlier events that qualify the March benchmark.
A7	AdImpact’s June 24 NY-16 report	Political broadcast airings in the New York City television market.
R14, R15	House Clerk roll call 369 and roll call 243	Infrastructure and debt-limit votes.
P1, P2	Mellman memo for DMFI PAC, Emerson release	March and June likely-voter samples.
V1, V2	NY-16 election return, Certified Bronx return	June 25 Democratic primary.
T1, T2	UDP’s PA-12 spending, FEC’s official results compilation	May 10, 2022 rows. Printed pp. 110-111, PDF pp. 116-117.

Federal rules by source

The FEC explains 2024 limits, PAC types, independent expenditure data, notices and periodic disclosure [R16], coordination and itemization. For 2010, see Citizens United and SpeechNow.

The IRS distinguishes Section 527 political organizations from 501(c)(4) social welfare organizations. For a real disclosure extension, One Nation’s 2024 Form 990, Schedule C, Part I-C, line 5, reports $58.4 million paid to Senate Leadership Fund. The annual return gives the recipient of those funds and leaves upstream donor identities open.

Research behind the interpretation

- **Donor motives.** Barber uses a donor survey and contribution patterns to examine access and ideological motivation. Fouirnaies and Hall use close-election comparisons to estimate how winning office affects later contributions. Barber, 2016 · Fouirnaies and Hall, 2014
- **Access and nominations.** Kalla and Broockman's randomized experiment measures access to congressional officials. Manento's study uses open-seat House primaries to examine when outside groups can challenge broader party coalitions. Kalla and Broockman, 2016 · Manento, 2021
- **Persuasion.** Coppock, Hill and Vavreck find small average effects in randomized 2016 presidential ad tests. Sides, Vavreck and Warshaw estimate effects of TV advertising in general elections using changes over time and media-market comparisons. Hewitt and colleagues study how campaigns test messages before buying distribution. The case keeps specific NY-16 effects open. Coppock, Hill and Vavreck, 2020 · Sides, Vavreck and Warshaw, 2022 · Hewitt et al., 2024

Source and scope notes

Ask which outcome each study measures before bringing it into the verdict. Experimental persuasion differences concern candidate preferences. Validated voter files measure participation. Donor access, committee choice of a race and winning that race are separate outcomes. Multiple explanations can fit the same result.

The catalog cover and start-screen illustration are AI-generated newsroom artwork. Seven embedded excerpts come from original FEC filings and have text equivalents. External links are optional during the activity.

Blind review and revisions

Four independent AI reviews covered seven perspectives. Reviewers first received the same student materials without the developer's notes or earlier ratings. Each scored only their assigned dimension. The two faculty perspectives alone scored academic rigor. A follow-up applied the same 0-4 scales to the revised materials. Scores reflect desk judgment and do not measure student performance.

Perspective	Dimension	1.0 → 1.1
Faculty, U.S. institutions	Academic rigor	3 → 4
Faculty, political methodology	Academic rigor	3 → 4
Novice college student	Clarity / engagement	3 → 3 / 3 → 4
Running Start multilingual student	Clarity / engagement	2 → 3 / 3 → 4
UX and accessibility	Usability	2.5 → 3.25
Gen X civic explainer	Engagement	3 → 3.5
Gen X digital newsroom editor	Engagement	2.75 → 3.5

What changed in response

- **Faculty.** Students can read original filing fields and check both votes named in the ad. The verdict and rubric now require a comparison with a defined population, measure, source of variation, grounds for comparability and predicted finding. Transfer requires explaining how a case difference matters.
- **Students and UX.** Short instructions sequence decisions. Ledger feedback leads back to the affected fields. New evidence and filing instructions receive focus. The verdict prompt is divided into three tasks. Glossary and source links are available at each step.
- **Gen X creators.** The first record choice uses neutral descriptions. The student's initial judgment, first request and written verdict come together in the preview. The chosen headline stays visible at submission. For Fun supports an optional headline.

Verification

Primary-source checks reconciled the fundraising filings and amendment, six exhibit excerpts, both House votes and the Pennsylvania contest denominator. The standalone bundle passed six data checks, model checks and simulated event flows. Twenty generated views were checked for labels and structure, and both instructor PDFs were inspected.

The reviews used AI personas. The event flows used simulated browser APIs. Browser and device behavior, classroom timing, screen-reader output and student outcomes remain unverified.

Second blind review

A fresh set of AI reviewers read Edition 1.1 without access to earlier ratings. The same reviewers assessed the revised edition on a 0-4 scale. Only the faculty reviewers rated rigor. This table compares each reviewer's own two ratings.

Perspective	Dimension	1.1 → 1.2
Faculty, institutions and finance	Academic rigor	3 → 4
Faculty, political methodology	Academic rigor	3 → 4
First-generation college student	Clarity / engagement	3 → 4 / 3 → 3
Multilingual dual-enrollment student	Clarity / engagement	2 → 3 / 3 → 3
UX and accessibility	Usability	2 → 3
Gen X civic explainer	Engagement	3 → 4
Gen X newsroom creator	Engagement	2 → 3

What shaped the revision

- **Faculty.** Students decide what the signed filing licenses an editor to claim. Their verdict must use one record from the first evidence they requested. A proposed comparison needs a credible safeguard and an explicit limit. Pennsylvania tests how spending could help a candidate who still loses.
- **Students and UX.** Audit formulas sit beside the questions. Erroneous or missing choices get focus guidance. Whole-dollar entry accepts common grouping formats. Approved alternate text entry and same-page resumption address Class access and saving failures.
- **Gen X creators.** The preview places the student's headline above the record their audience will see. Each evidence choice supplies a different finding and limitation. Learner lenses still identified sustained writing in the middle as an engagement cost.

Verification of Edition 1.2

Primary-source inspection verified the signed notice and clarified the March poll's answer choices and Reuters' description of the ad release. Generated views and simulated event flows covered both modes, the delayed returns, Class finalization and re-locking after edits, earlier backups and the new input and recovery paths. The report and guide PDFs were rendered and inspected.

Reviewers used AI roles. No classroom trial, screen-reader test or native browser printing was completed. Allow approximately 45-55 minutes for Class.

Third blind review

Four independent AI testers received Edition 1.2 without earlier ratings. They ran Class and Fun paths through the bundled code with simulated browser events, then assessed Edition 1.3 on the same 0-4 scales. The faculty reviewer alone rated rigor. These ratings describe the tested materials and scenarios.

Reviewer and measure	For Class 1.2 → 1.3	For Fun 1.2 → 1.3
Faculty, institutions and finance	4 → 4	3 → 4
Faculty, political methodology	3 → 4	2 → 4
Learner clarity	3 → 4	3 → 4
Learner engagement	3 → 3	3 → 4
Learner doability	3 → 4	4 → 4
Usability and accessibility	3 → 4	3 → 4
Gen X civic explainer, engagement		3 → 4

Ranked fixes

1. **Prevent lost work.** Both modes refresh a restore preview if another tab changes its destination. The newer save stays available for download. Temporary restore offers a clear choice before replacing a paused investigation.
2. **Correct the timeline.** The March poll follows UDP’s November issue ads and the separate AIPAC PAC endorsement in January. It precedes the May push. The selection question asks for observations from before the group’s earlier involvement.
3. **Give Fun a meaningful finish.** Learners choose a supportable verdict and a study design. The recap shows their first and final claims. Headline evidence follows the chosen headline, and learners can remove a kept note.
4. **Check the denominator and clarify Class.** The audit checks the denominator and larger share separately. Class shows the required length range up front and groups the existing verdict prompt into a checklist. Engagement stayed at 3/4 for the Class tester.

What was verified

All three evidence paths reached their intended ending in each mode. Class recorded all four responses and invoked the print handler. Fun completed with zero written notes. Simulated tests covered wrong answers, restores, note removal, and the report gate. The instructor PDFs were rendered and inspected. Live student use, device timing, native browser printing, screen readers and Canvas submission remain unverified.

Edition 1.4 enhancements

The third blind review found that Class engagement held at 3/4. An earlier Fun reviewer also found that the exposure path repeated records readers had already seen. The revised Class route gives students one consequential choice after the returns and before the long written verdict. All four responses and the 20-point rubric still apply.

Which record to open after the returns

First request	Class follow-up options	What students can investigate
Early support	Broadcast count or local vote counts	Ask whether later message distribution or variation between local areas would help test what the polls suggest.
Exposure	Earlier timeline or phone-bank filing	Check for prior intervention or consider turnout as a rival to persuasion.
Turnout	Earlier timeline or local vote counts	Consider earlier activity or ask what districtwide returns conceal about local differences.

The student opens one follow-up. Its evidence and limits appear next to the verdict, and the choice supplies a question on the Pennsylvania page. Students still cite at least two records, including one from the first request. The follow-up can supply another source. Grade reasoning by the same rubric regardless of which follow-up the student chose.

Read the broadcast denominator

AdImpact’s June 24 snapshot reported that UDP accounted for 52% of political broadcast ad airings in the New York City television market since May 16 [A7]. The denominator is broadcasts in the market. A single person could encounter several airings, and people outside NY-16 could see them. Compare that measure with the FEC filing’s reported dollars [N1] and the sponsor’s example message [A2]. A viewer count or an effect on preference would need different evidence.

Verification

Simulated playthroughs reached the intended endings for all six Class follow-ups and all three Fun paths. They covered premature advance, missing and invalid selections, report and print-call states, and backup safeguards. The new edition accepts earlier saved runs. Instructor PDFs were rendered and inspected. A further live engagement rating, browser printing, screen-reader use and Canvas submission remain unverified.