

Sustain the architecture and test its limits

Turn the book's accumulated methods into a manageable month, choose ledger domains intelligently and continue studying with an evidence standard. Build a maintenance plan that preserves honest records and responds to changing circumstances.

3 lessons · approximately 8 hours, plus multi-day practice

How to use this workbook

Read the assigned manuscript first. This workbook contains accompanying teaching and invented cases, not a revision of the source. Attempt exercises before consulting the rubrics and explanations. Written work is self-assessed or discussed with a tutor; no secure examination, academic credit or certificate is implied. Use a clearly labelled fictional case when live practice or personal disclosure would be unsuitable. Links use the course's intended publication address; for offline review, open the supplied source PDF at the full-book page numbers shown.

- Reconstruct the four-week challenge and adapt its implementation transparently.
- Choose a small, coherent set of ledger domains with observable criteria.
- Use the glossary without confusing philosophical concepts with numerical measures.
- Evaluate a further-reading claim and distinguish interpretation from verification.
- Defend a sustainable ninety-day continuation with explicit review and restart rules.

[Open the module and source reading links](#)

Lesson sequence

1. Build the month without overloading the day
2. Choose domains and interpret the ledger with judgment
3. Study further, verify claims and plan the next ninety days

Build the month without overloading the day

Allow approximately 150 minutes, plus any continuing activity.

Learning objectives

- Explain what each week adds and why the sequence matters.
- Distinguish administration time from the time required by the actual practices.
- Create a disruption rule that preserves evidence without demanding unsafe persistence.

Assigned source readings

[Afterword and Appendix A: the four-week challenge](#)

Full-book PDF pages 420–423. Section links open the chapter at the relevant page.

Develop the argument

Transfer responsibility from the book to a procedure

The afterword identifies a predictable gap between admiring a framework and continuing to use it. Its answer is procedural: keep the ledger active, review standards, respond to misses and build checkpoints into ordinary life. The important transfer is from a persuasive text to decisions the learner can inspect. A procedure earns its place by supporting useful work and truthful judgment. Merely repeating the author's vocabulary does not establish that a system is functioning.

Appendix A therefore assumes prior reading and a prepared notebook. It is an integration exercise rather than a shortcut around the chapters. Week one establishes nightly observation. Week two adds a morning sequence. Week three examines the working environment. Week four connects the routine to a value hierarchy and a longer review. This cumulative structure matters because introducing everything simultaneously would make it difficult to identify either the source of overload or the practice that helped. The course allows the sequence to take longer when necessary; record that adaptation rather than pretending the original timetable was followed.

Reconstruct the four weeks accurately

In the first week, choose three to five rows, define their criteria and use a seven-day grid. The appendix also offers six default rows; that is an alternative starting set, not a reason to ignore the instruction to keep the system small. The nightly review is brief, followed by a weekly examination of the weakest row and a practical adjustment. In week two, the source adds its Morning Tax: physical, psychological and moral actions, alongside a named hard thing. Choose safe, proportionate equivalents. A useful challenge can be an avoided clarification or a bounded practice session; physical strain is not required to demonstrate understanding.

Week three introduces a functional room or workspace reset and asks whether the environment supports the intended conduct. The source suggests private photographs, but a checklist or written sketch can serve the same learning purpose without images. Week four reviews the five most important values, links rows to those values and brings the routines together. Day thirty asks what changed, what remains performative, what should continue and what can stop being tracked. It ends with a dated ninety-day commitment. This is a review of implementation, not

proof that a month has transformed character.

Budget the whole activity and preserve uncertainty

The appendix describes a short daily administrative burden, but a full time budget must include the activities themselves. Three minutes of planning do not include the deep work being planned. List preparation, activity, recording and review separately. If the plan exceeds available time, reduce its scope before beginning. This avoids a common failure in which an apparently tiny system quietly adds hours of obligations. The source's central concern with coherence is better served by an honest budget than by an impressive list of incompatible practices.

The appendix recommends backfilling a missed entry from memory. The course adds an explicit evidence rule: label retrospective entries and uncertainty. Unknown data should remain unknown rather than become a convenient success or failure. During illness, emergency or another genuine disruption, the source protects a minimum version and a return to ordinary practice. Apply judgment to the minimum too. Recovery, care or seeking assistance may take precedence. Restart at a specified opportunity, review what failed and preserve the original record. A restart is useful information about the design; it is not permission to erase the interruption.

Original course example: a realistic month for a workshop tutor

Invented for this course.

A fictional tutor has forty minutes on three evenings each week and a short daily planning window. Their initial plan contains five new daily activities, including an hour of preparation.

1. Calculate the actual weekly time. Separate the review's few minutes from the preparation activity.
2. Choose three connected rows: prepare the next demonstration, check instructions for accuracy, and fulfil or renegotiate commitments.
3. Introduce the nightly record first, then a brief morning plan, then a workspace checklist. Keep preparation within the existing three sessions.
4. For a disrupted evening, record the interruption and arrange the next feasible preparation period. Do not mark an invented session as completed.
5. At the month-end review, examine whether learners could follow the demonstrations, not merely whether the tutor accumulated ticks.

The adapted sequence retains observation, deliberate action, order and review while fitting the available time. It does not establish a general causal claim about the method.

Practice and evidence

1. Reconstruct and schedule

Build a four-week plan that identifies the source sequence and your stated adaptations.

Deliverable: A weekly schedule plus a time budget separating administration and activity.

1. Name each week's addition.
2. Specify three feasible criteria and their purpose.
3. Include an ordinary-day and disrupted-day version.

Source fidelity · 4 points

Preserves the sequence and labels adaptations.

Complete budget · 3 points

Includes activity and review time.

Proportionate restart · 3 points

Specifies a feasible next opportunity and relevant limits.

2. Audit an interrupted record

Create a clearly fictional seven-day record with one missed observation and one disrupted opportunity.

Deliverable: A record and 300-word explanation of how uncertainty is handled.

1. Keep unknown, missed and not-applicable entries distinct.
2. Label any retrospective reconstruction.
3. Explain the next design change without rewriting earlier entries.

Integrity · 4 points

Does not convert uncertainty into invented observations.

Interpretation · 3 points

Distinguishes execution from missing data.

Revision · 3 points

Changes future practice for a stated reason.

Reflection

Which part of your plan would still serve its purpose during an ordinary difficult week, and which part exists mainly to make the plan look impressive?

Formative self-check

Choose an answer before looking at the answer key. These questions are open practice, not a secure assessment.

1. What does the first week primarily establish?

- A. Every practice in the book at full intensity.
- B. A nightly record and initial pattern review.

- C. A final judgment of the learner's character.
- D. A public accountability campaign.

2. A plan claims ten minutes a day but includes a forty-minute study session. What should change?

- A. Count only the tracking time.
- B. Ignore the study time because it is valuable.
- C. Budget the activity and administration separately.
- D. Remove all reviews permanently.

3. A learner cannot recall whether Tuesday's action happened. Which entry best preserves evidence?

- A. Completed, because the learner usually does it.
- B. Failed, because uncertainty always proves failure.
- C. Unknown, with a dated retrospective note if useful.
- D. Delete Tuesday.

Answer explanations

1. B — A nightly record and initial pattern review.

The first week establishes the ledger and review. Later weeks add the morning sequence, environment work and value alignment.

2. C — Budget the activity and administration separately.

A realistic plan counts all demands. Short administrative time does not make the underlying activity free.

3. C — Unknown, with a dated retrospective note if useful.

The course's evidence rule preserves uncertainty. Neither an invented success nor an invented failure is an observation.

Choose domains and interpret the ledger with judgment

Allow approximately 150 minutes, plus any continuing activity.

Learning objectives

- Select domains according to purpose rather than accumulate all available rows.
- Write criteria that distinguish opportunities, performance and context.
- Explain why phronesis, the mean and flourishing cannot be reduced to a tally.

Assigned source readings

Appendix B: twenty-two domains; Glossary of Key Terms

Full-book PDF pages 424–428. Section links open the chapter at the relevant page.

Develop the argument

A catalogue offers choices, not twenty-two obligations

Appendix B groups twenty-two possible domains into character, daily conduct, relationships, body and mind. Character includes honesty, courage, temperance, patience and humility. Daily conduct includes diligence, order, the hard thing, the Morning Tax, punctuality and single-tasking. Relationship rows address usefulness, promise-keeping, presence and generosity. The remaining groups include training, sleep, food, learning, financial discipline, creative output and silence. This variety is meant to help a learner choose standards that fit a real pattern of life. It is not a requirement to track everything at once.

The source recommends three to five rows initially and expansion only when the system is fast, stable and honest. Choose rows that represent a purpose and do not merely count the same action repeatedly. A preparation session might support diligence and useful teaching, but assigning two identical ticks does not provide two independent observations. Explain the distinct quality each row captures, or combine them. A small set can also omit an important responsibility, so test the selection against the person's actual obligations rather than assuming that simplicity alone guarantees completeness.

Operational clarity must leave room for circumstances

The appendix asks for criteria and allowances to be defined before the week. Promise-keeping, for example, includes fulfilment or renegotiation before the deadline; it is not satisfied by silently changing a promise after it has been missed. Presence concerns attention in a specific interaction, rather than a claim to be universally attentive. Humility concerns accuracy and correction, not self-abasement. These distinctions make the row useful because the observation can challenge an appealing self-description. Define what counts as an opportunity and what evidence supports the entry.

Several suggested rows concern health, spending or emotionally charged conduct. They remain examples from the book, not personal clinical or financial advice. This course can be completed through study, craft or a fictional case. Do not adopt restrictive food, sleep or exercise rules merely to satisfy a rubric. Likewise, the silence row must not become a prohibition on reporting danger, asking for help or raising a legitimate complaint. A criterion should serve an examined

purpose, respect duties and constraints, and be open to revision when it causes harm or measures the wrong thing.

Use the glossary as a connected conceptual map

The glossary defines the book's architecture as the relationship between habits, standards and actions. Anchors tie practices to dependable moments; an audit compares conduct with standards; drift is unexamined movement away from the intended pattern. The hard thing and Morning Tax are named methods within that architecture. A moving average shifts attention from one episode to a longer pattern. These concepts help interpret a record, but the record still depends on definitions, opportunities and data quality. A stable average of a poor measure is still a poor measure.

The philosophical terms add another level. Eudaimonia concerns a flourishing life, not a daily score. Phronesis names practical judgment; the mean concerns appropriate action rather than a mechanical midpoint. Kalon, thumos and the value hierarchy concern the quality, motivation and ordering of conduct as the book presents them. The ledger can support deliberation about these matters, but cannot settle them automatically. The source's terse nightly-review ideal should therefore be read alongside later, fuller review. Keep the observation concise while allowing the review to consider relevant context. Clear recording and thoughtful interpretation are complementary tasks, not competing loyalties.

Original course example: three rows that all count the same thing

Invented for this course.

A fictional learner tracks diligence, courage and learning by awarding a tick to each whenever they attend one study session. They report a perfect week but cannot explain the session's quality.

1. Identify the duplication: all three rows currently measure attendance.
2. Keep attendance as one process measure and define a separate learning output, such as a correct explanation with an unresolved question recorded.
3. Use courage only where a relevant opportunity exists, such as asking a necessary question despite discomfort. Do not manufacture confrontation to earn a mark.
4. Review whether the study supported the intended understanding and whether another duty was neglected.
5. If a row no longer adds useful information, retire or revise it prospectively and retain the earlier definition.

More ticks did not create more evidence. The improved system makes its limited claims clearer and returns interpretation to practical judgment.

Practice and evidence

1. Design a domain set

Choose three of the appendix's domains for a fictional learner with defined responsibilities.

Deliverable: Three criteria, an opportunity rule for each and a duplication check.

1. Describe the learner's purpose and constraints.
2. Define completion before the observation period.
3. Name one important consideration the chosen rows do not measure.

Fit · 4 points

Domains serve the stated purpose and responsibilities.

Observable criteria · 3 points

Entries can be supported by specific evidence.

Limits · 3 points

Identifies overlap and an omitted consideration.

2. Map concepts to a decision

Use six glossary terms to analyse a conflict between a planned work session and a newly urgent responsibility.

Deliverable: A 500-word decision analysis and a concept map in text.

1. Include phronesis, value hierarchy and ledger.
2. Explain how the record should represent the decision.
3. Distinguish a justified exception from a post-hoc excuse using available evidence.

Conceptual accuracy · 4 points

Uses terms in their source roles without equating them.

Reasoning · 4 points

Weighs the actual conflict and evidence.

Record integrity · 2 points

Preserves the decision and relevant uncertainty.

Reflection

What important quality would remain invisible even if every row in your current ledger were completed?

Formative self-check

Choose an answer before looking at the answer key. These questions are open practice, not a secure assessment.

1. What is the role of the twenty-two domains?

- A. A mandatory daily checklist.

- B. A catalogue for a small, purposeful selection.
- C. A validated scale of moral worth.
- D. A ranking of professions.

2. Three rows award the same tick for attending one session. What is the main concern?

- A. The notebook is too small.
- B. The same observation is being counted as several distinct kinds of evidence.
- C. Attendance never matters.
- D. All three rows must be retained forever.

3. Which best describes the relation between the ledger and practical judgment?

- A. The ledger eliminates the need for judgment.
- B. Judgment requires ignoring all records.
- C. The record informs judgment but cannot mechanically resolve every conflict.
- D. A high average proves flourishing.

Answer explanations

1. B — A catalogue for a small, purposeful selection.

The appendix recommends a limited selection. Listing domains does not validate a universal score or require every row.

2. B — The same observation is being counted as several distinct kinds of evidence.

Duplication can inflate apparent evidence. Retain distinct measures only when they answer distinct questions. One observation does not become three independent observations merely because it receives three labels.

3. C — The record informs judgment but cannot mechanically resolve every conflict.

The ledger supplies observations under chosen criteria. Interpreting purpose, context and competing duties still requires judgment.

Study further, verify claims and plan the next ninety days

Allow approximately 180 minutes, plus any continuing activity.

Learning objectives

- Explain the role assigned to each group in the further-reading list.
- Distinguish a literary illustration, philosophical argument and empirical claim.
- Design a continuation plan with review criteria and a fair test of the framework.

Assigned source readings

Further Reading / Recommended Works

Full-book PDF pages 452–455. Section links open the chapter at the relevant page.

Index, About the Author and Value Statement

Full-book PDF pages 456–462. Section links open the chapter at the relevant page.

Afterword: continuing the work

Full-book PDF pages 420–420. Section links open the chapter at the relevant page.

Develop the argument

Read the recommendations as an argued selection

The further-reading section treats study as material for practice rather than a display of membership or prestige. It places Aristotle alongside Stoic works by Marcus Aurelius, Epictetus and Seneca; then Peterson, Frankl and Rand; then work on attention and craft by Newport, Crawford and Pirsig; then Sowell and fiction by Dostoevsky and Wilde. The proposed sequence depends on the learner's question: foundations of a good life, order in conduct, work and achievement, wider institutions, or the interior drama of evasion. These are the author's recommendations and interpretations, not a claim that the course has independently verified every description of those works.

The list combines very different genres. A novel can make a conflict vivid without estimating how often it occurs. A philosophical argument can clarify reasons without establishing a clinical effect. A historical or autobiographical account requires attention to its particular circumstances. An economic analysis concerns institutions and incentives that cannot be reduced to a person's ledger. In particular, accounts of extreme suffering should not be used to dismiss another person's constraints or infer that survival and dignity are determined by willpower alone. Reconstruct the source's intended lesson while examining the limits of the comparison.

Turn a reading lead into a responsible inquiry

A serious reading note identifies the exact passage, the claim being made, the kind of support offered and an alternative interpretation. If you consult a recommended work, distinguish what that work actually says from this manuscript's description of it. If you cannot access or verify a reference, say so. The course does not supply unlicensed copies of the recommended books or pretend that an endnote has been independently checked. The supplied manuscripts are the core readings; further works are optional avenues for investigation.

Test the bridge from reading to action. A passage may suggest a practice, but the suggested practice still needs a purpose, a feasible scope and a review criterion. A literary warning about concealment might prompt an honest correction log. That does not prove that a particular notebook format improves character. A study of attention might inform a bounded work session, but its population, outcomes and limitations matter before making a broad claim. Preserve the distinction between a useful idea, evidence that supports it and a strong general conclusion. An assessment can reward a learner who identifies where the book's interpretation overreaches.

Continue with a plan that can change

The index is a navigation aid and the glossary a conceptual aid. The author biography provides background claims, not a substitute for evaluating an argument. The value statement makes the author's priorities explicit: reason, responsibility, work, coherence and outcomes. Those priorities help explain the book's choices, while leaving the reader responsible for examining competing values and difficult cases. State where your continuation follows the source, where it adapts a method and where you disagree. Honest disagreement is preferable to a portfolio that imitates the language while hiding its real assumptions.

For the next ninety days, retain only practices with a clear job. Set review dates, evidence to examine, a restart procedure and criteria for retiring or changing a measure. Include a contrary-evidence question: what observation would make you conclude that this arrangement is ineffective, unfair or no longer useful? Use both process records and quality evidence from the work itself. The aim is a sustainable capacity to notice and correct, not permanent dependence on a score. End with a reasoned commitment that can survive ordinary disruption and also change when better reasons appear. That is a more demanding test of the architecture than a declaration that the book was inspiring.

Original course example: from a literary image to a testable practice

Invented for this course.

A fictional learner is struck by the manuscript's comparison between a ledger and Dorian Gray's portrait. They claim that keeping a daily record will necessarily make people honest.

1. Identify the literary function: the image makes hidden consequences visible in the argument.
2. Separate the causal leap: a vivid analogy does not establish that any daily record necessarily changes honesty.
3. Design a bounded practice: record corrections to one work product and preserve the earlier version.
4. Review evidence after two weeks, including whether corrections were actually made and whether the record encouraged concealment or performance.
5. State the limited conclusion and compare an alternative explanation, such as increased attention from the review itself.

The analogy can motivate a useful inquiry. The inquiry earns its conclusion from observations and reasoning, not from the force of the image.

Practice and evidence

1. Audit a further-reading claim

Choose one recommendation in the supplied section and analyse the kind of support its proposed lesson would need.

Deliverable: A 600-word reading inquiry with a verification-status statement.

1. Quote or paraphrase the manuscript accurately.
2. Classify the proposed lesson and identify the genre.
3. State what you have and have not checked, plus a strong alternative interpretation.

Source handling · 3 points

Separates manuscript, recommended work and own inference.

Evidence standard · 4 points

Matches support to claim type.

Critical fairness · 3 points

Offers a serious alternative without caricature.

2. Write the continuation contract

Create a ninety-day continuation plan for the portfolio developed in this course.

Deliverable: A two-page plan with review dates, evidence and change criteria.

1. Retain a small set of purposeful practices.
2. Add a restart procedure and a legitimate stopping or redesign condition.
3. State one disagreement or uncertainty and how it will be investigated.

Coherence · 4 points

Practices support the chosen purpose without unnecessary overload.

Evidence and review · 4 points

Specifies observations, dates and decision criteria.

Intellectual honesty · 2 points

Preserves uncertainty and permits reasoned revision.

Reflection

What would count as a fair reason to revise this framework, rather than merely a reason to defend it more strongly?

Formative self-check

Choose an answer before looking at the answer key. These questions are open practice, not a secure assessment.

1. What can a compelling literary analogy establish by itself?

- A. A universal causal effect.
- B. An illustrative way of understanding a concern.
- C. The accuracy of every empirical claim in the chapter.
- D. A guaranteed result from a practice.

2. A learner has read the manuscript's recommendation but not the recommended work. What should their note say?

- A. The recommended work has been verified.
- B. The manuscript presents this interpretation; the original work has not yet been checked.
- C. The recommendation must be false.
- D. No distinction is necessary.

3. Which continuation plan best supports honest correction?

- A. Keep every row forever regardless of usefulness.
- B. Erase records that make the plan look unsuccessful.
- C. Set evidence-based reviews and prospective redesign criteria.
- D. Treat disagreement as lack of effort.

Answer explanations

1. B — An illustrative way of understanding a concern.

An analogy can illuminate a concern. It does not by itself estimate or prove the effect of an intervention.

2. B — The manuscript presents this interpretation; the original work has not yet been checked.

Transparent attribution distinguishes what was actually read from a reading lead. Lack of verification is not proof of either truth or falsity.

3. C — Set evidence-based reviews and prospective redesign criteria.

Review and redesign criteria let evidence change the system while preserving the history of what was tried.

Module assessment

Defend a sustainable continuation

A fictional learner completed the course but now has less available time and a new caring responsibility. Their ledger contains six overlapping rows, two unknown weeks and an impressive average calculated by treating blank cells as successes. Design a fair continuation that reconstructs the source's methods, corrects the evidence problem and preserves useful work.

Required evidence

- A diagnosis of the measurement and workload problems.
- A revised three-row ledger with definitions and uncertainty rules.
- A four-week transition and ninety-day review plan.
- A 1,000-word defence citing the afterword, both appendices, glossary and further-reading section.

Assessment criteria

Source understanding · 5 points

Accurately uses the sequence, domain-selection advice and conceptual distinctions.

Evidence repair · 5 points

Preserves unknown data and does not invent a corrected historical score.

Feasible design · 5 points

Fits responsibilities and includes justified limits and restart opportunities.

Evaluation · 5 points

Includes quality evidence, a serious objection and criteria for changing the system.

Model response: consult after your attempt

A strong answer first withdraws the unsupported average rather than replacing every blank with failure. It retains the original entries and describes which weeks are unknown. It reduces duplicate rows and connects the remaining criteria to feasible responsibilities. The month follows observation, morning planning, environment support and value review at an appropriate pace. The caring responsibility is part of the design rather than evidence of weak character. The ninety-day review examines work quality as well as adherence and asks whether the ledger remains useful. The defence treats the source's recommendations as arguments and tools, acknowledges uncertainty and explains any adaptation. Full credit does not require adopting every method or reaching a predetermined philosophical conclusion.

Source cautions and interpretation

- Appendix A offers three to five starting rows and also six defaults. These are alternative starting choices; the course does not silently treat them as one instruction.
- The appendix's short administration estimate does not include time spent doing the underlying practices. Course schedules budget both.
- Retrospective entries are labelled and uncertainty retained. This is an explicit course extension to the source's backfilling instruction.
- The appendix references a fuller list of afterword rules than appears in the supplied short afterword. No missing prose has been invented.
- The source's health-related domains are examples, not individual medical advice; low-risk and fictional alternatives meet the course objectives.
- Further-reading descriptions and biography claims are attributed to the supplied manuscript and are not independently verified by this course.

Source coverage

Afterword — Continuing the Work Once the Book Ends

Developed teaching, assigned source reading, worked case and rubric-based practice in the linked lesson.

[Read source section: full-book PDF page 420](#)

Appendix A — The 30-Day Architecture Challenge

Developed teaching, assigned source reading, worked case and rubric-based practice in the linked lesson.

[Read source section: full-book PDF page 421](#)

Week 1: Foundation (Days 1-7)

Developed teaching, assigned source reading, worked case and rubric-based practice in the linked lesson.

[Read source section: full-book PDF page 421](#)

Week 2: Load (Days 8-14)

Developed teaching, assigned source reading, worked case and rubric-based practice in the linked lesson.

[Read source section: full-book PDF page 421](#)

Week 3: Order (Days 15-21)

Developed teaching, assigned source reading, worked case and rubric-based practice in the linked lesson.

[Read source section: full-book PDF page 422](#)

Week 4: Integration (Days 22-30)

Developed teaching, assigned source reading, worked case and rubric-based practice in the linked lesson.

[Read source section: full-book PDF page 422](#)

Appendix B — Ledger Domains Catalogue

Developed teaching, assigned source reading, worked case and rubric-based practice in the linked lesson.

[Read source section: full-book PDF page 424](#)

Character Virtues

Developed teaching, assigned source reading, worked case and rubric-based practice in the linked lesson.

[Read source section: full-book PDF page 424](#)

Daily Practices

Developed teaching, assigned source reading, worked case and rubric-based practice in the linked lesson.

[Read source section: full-book PDF page 424](#)

Relationships and Responsibility

Developed teaching, assigned source reading, worked case and rubric-based practice in the linked lesson.

[Read source section: full-book PDF page 425](#)

Body and Health

Developed teaching, assigned source reading, worked case and rubric-based practice in the linked lesson.

[Read source section: full-book PDF page 425](#)

Mind and Craft

Developed teaching, assigned source reading, worked case and rubric-based practice in the linked lesson.

[Read source section: full-book PDF page 426](#)

Glossary of Key Terms

Developed teaching, assigned source reading, worked case and rubric-based practice in the linked lesson.

[Read source section: full-book PDF page 427](#)

Further Reading / Recommended Works

Developed teaching, assigned source reading, worked case and rubric-based practice in the linked lesson.

[Read source section: full-book PDF page 452](#)

Index

Developed teaching, assigned source reading, worked case and rubric-based practice in the linked lesson.

[Read source section: full-book PDF page 456](#)

About the Author

Developed teaching, assigned source reading, worked case and rubric-based practice in the linked lesson.

[Read source section: full-book PDF page 460](#)

Author's Value Statement

Developed teaching, assigned source reading, worked case and rubric-based practice in the linked lesson.

[Read source section: full-book PDF page 462](#)