

Lesson 3

What rules serve us best?

The students compare and judge their solutions

This matrix sums up the information a teacher needs to plan and deliver the lesson.

Competence training refers directly to EDC/HRE.

The learning objective indicates what students know and understand.

The student task(s), together with the method, form the core element of the learning process.

The materials checklist supports lesson preparation.

The time budget gives a rough guideline for the teacher's time management.

Competence training	Analytical thinking: criteria-guided comparison. Judgment: selecting criteria and goals. Attitudes and values: mutual recognition.
Learning objective	Efficiency, control of power, rule enforcement, feasibility, fairness.
Student tasks	The students compare and judge their drafts. Homework: the students make their decisions on the draft framework and the draft rules for the conference.
Materials and resources	≈ Student handouts 5.3, 5.4; flipcharts (or alternatives).
Method	Presentations. Discussion.
Time budget	1. The students present their solutions. 20 min
	2. The students compare the drafts. 15 min
	3. The students are given two homework tasks. 5 min

Information box

The teacher can roughly anticipate what path the students will take, but no more. The inputs are as new to him/her as to the students. They are dealing with difficult questions that have been answered in different ways, as both history and a comparison of present political systems show. The community members are looking for the solution that serves them best. They agree on the goal, but may have different ideas on how to achieve it.

This lesson is an exercise in democratic political culture.

The teacher should encourage the students to compare and judge the analytical and practical quality of the drafts, and do the same him/herself. The students should realise that preferences for a particular approach in institutional design are often linked to experience and values. These are not open to discussion or reasoning. The students should be encouraged to express them, in a setting of mutual recognition. Whether the community finally adopts their draft is a different question.

Lesson description

1. The students present their solutions

The groups present their drafts in turn. All students use *☞* student handout 5.3 as a tool of comparison.

The order of presentation: groups that share certain basic choices give their presentations following each other, as they can be compared more easily. In this case, two basic alternatives may emerge quickly.

2. The students compare the drafts

☞ Student handout 5.3 gives criteria for comparison. Here are some likely combinations – but the students' creativity may well have produced other results!

A. Basics

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Model of governance	State authority	State authority	Networking	Mixed model
Form of property	Public ownership	Private ownership	Public ownership	Private ownership
Tendency	Centralised planned economy or “green dictatorship”	Competitive market (capitalism) + “strong state” (Western model)	Cantonal model, autonomous co-operative	Semi-autonomous co-operative; rules for delivery of surplus fish to co-operative

B. Rules

There is no clear-cut link from certain models to certain rules. Many different combinations are possible. Some of the most important points are raised in *☞* student handout 5.3:

- Has a goal been defined?
- Who has the power to make decisions?
- Have tools been provided for rule enforcement?
- Have safeguards against the abuse of power been included?
- ...

3. The students discuss the drafts

In the discussion, the students apply their criteria to the models. They will probably prefer models that share the basic approach of their own model, so the reasons for these choices will be debated. There are, however, some criteria that all models can be judged by. If the students do not address them, the teacher can do so:

- Goal of sustainability: does the draft framework support the fishermen in achieving the goals of sustainability? (See *☞* student handout 4.1.)
- Feasibility: is the system of rules simple enough to understand and use in practice?
- Fairness: are the rules fair?
- Democracy and human rights: do the rules meet the standards of democracy and human rights?
- Legitimation: a unanimous decision on the framework of rules is highly desirable. Can the community members agree on one set of rules?

4. Homework: the students make their choice

The teacher ends the discussion some minutes before the lesson closes. He/she acts as game or process manager, and explains to the students that in the final lesson, the members of the community will meet in a conference to adopt a framework.

The students have two tasks to prepare for the conference:

Task No. 1: choosing a draft framework

There will be no more time for a detailed discussion. Therefore the students' homework task is to make up their minds. A decision must be taken, therefore they should be willing to compromise. A framework that meets some key criteria is better than the alternative of carrying on without one.

They may give priority to certain basic designs or criteria and find their choice this way.

They should prepare a short statement to appeal to the other community members to adopt their favourite model.

Task No. 2: accepting or modifying the procedural rules for the conference

The teacher explains:

Not only the community itself, but also an important meeting such as the community conference requires a framework of rules. The members must agree on these rules before they start with the conference itself. Without such an agreement beforehand, difficult situations might arise if the members cannot agree how a vote is to be carried out or counted.

✍ Student handout 5.4 contains a draft set of procedural rules. They will be on the agenda first, as they will be applied immediately afterwards. The students should therefore have formed their opinion: do they accept the draft as it stands, or do they want to change it?