

Accuracy Before Publication

Build a technical argument from test results and operating constraints.

CCSS.ELA-Literacy.WHST.11-12.1 "Write arguments focused on discipline-specific content."

NAME _____

DATE _____

1 READ AND MARK _____ Read it twice

YOUR JOB These records describe a simulated archive, not a real software test. In A, underline the two groups of entries and their error counts. In B, circle the reason names and dates matter. In C, underline review capacity and circle either sentence explaining a limit on applying this test elsewhere.

Which Transcriptions Need Review?

- ① **A. Test record, archive analyst Chen, May 4.** Software converted 120 short printed catalog entries into searchable text. Reviewers checked every result against the original. The software flagged 24 entries: 18 contained errors and six were correct. Of the 96 unflagged entries, four contained errors and 92 were correct. A flag therefore indicated a possible error, not a confirmed one. These counts describe this simulated test only.
- ② **B. Curator memo, Patel, May 5.** Visitors use names and dates to find records, so an unnoticed transcription error may make a relevant entry harder to find. The archive is considering two release policies: review only flagged entries, then publish the batch; or review every entry before publication. Faster access is useful, but a clean flag status does not prove accuracy. The original scans will remain available under either policy.
- ③ **C. Work plan, coordinator Ruiz, May 6.** Staff can review 40 entries per session of the type tested. Assume that rate for this exercise: reviewing 24 flagged entries takes one session, while reviewing all 120 takes three. The collection also contains longer handwritten entries, which were not tested. Future performance and review speed may differ. Choose a policy for the tested batch and explain what further testing is needed before using it more broadly.

2 ANSWER WITH EVIDENCE _____ Use the passage

- 1** How many errors were found in all, and how many would reviewing only flagged entries leave unchecked?

- 2** What is the strongest practical reason for reviewing only flagged entries, and what concern does the curator raise?

- 3** Why should the archive avoid treating these results as proof about every future batch?

3 YOUR TURN _____ Your own words

Write a 200-240-word technical argument for the archive committee choosing one of the two review policies for this tested batch. Use A-C, explain your reasoning, address the strongest counterclaim fairly, and qualify what the evidence establishes. No outside facts are needed for this simulated case.

1. Organize the argument

State your precise policy claim. Select evidence from A-C and explain how each source supports or limits your case. Identify the strongest opposing reason and a reasoned response. Decide an order that will help committee members compare accuracy, access and workload.

2. Write and check

Write 200-240 words in several paragraphs, using a formal, objective tone. Attribute source details to A, B or C; distinguish test results from predictions. Connect your claim, reasons, counterclaim and response with clear transitions. Conclude with the policy and a justified next step. Check every number against the records. Count only the argument, excluding your planning notes.

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal blue ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There are no margins, text, or other markings on the paper.

PART 1 • READ AND MARK

These records describe a simulated archive, not a real software test. In A, underline the two groups of entries and their error counts. In B, circle the reason names and dates matter. In C, underline review capacity and circle either sentence explaining a limit on applying this test elsewhere. Accept any marking that follows this job and points at the right text.

PART 2 • ANSWERS

#	QUESTION	ANSWER
1	How many errors were found in all, and how many would reviewing only flagged entries leave unchecked?	There were 22 errors in all: 18 flagged plus four unflagged. Reviewing only flagged entries would leave the four unflagged errors unchecked.
2	What is the strongest practical reason for reviewing only flagged entries, and what concern does the curator raise?	It permits publication after one review session instead of three. The curator warns that unnoticed errors in names or dates can make records harder to find.
3	Why should the archive avoid treating these results as proof about every future batch?	Only short printed entries were tested. Longer handwritten entries may have different error rates and take different amounts of time to review.

PART 3 · YOUR TURN (SAMPLE ANSWER)

Technical argument: The archive committee should review every entry in the tested batch before publication. In this simulated case, a software flag helps prioritize attention but cannot certify that unflagged text is accurate. The proposed policy gives accuracy greater weight than immediate release while keeping the delay limited.

Source A records twenty-two errors across 120 entries. Eighteen were flagged, but four were not. Reviewing only flagged entries would leave those four errors unchecked. Source B explains why this matters: visitors search by names and dates, so an unnoticed error may make a record harder to find. The available scans provide another way to check information, but they do not automatically correct searchable text.

Supporters of selective review reasonably favor faster access and less work. Source C estimates one session for flagged entries compared with three for the whole batch. That difference is meaningful. However, a delay of two sessions is a defensible cost for checking entries that the software missed, given the curator's concern about discoverability.

Full review still does not guarantee perfect future results. The test covers short printed entries, while the collection also includes longer handwriting. Before adopting a wider rule, the archive should test those materials and measure review time. For this batch, completing three sessions of review offers a stronger basis for publication than treating the absence of a flag as proof.

TEACHER ASSESSMENT NOTES

Accept either policy when accurately supported and qualified; the model is one defensible position. Require a precise technical claim, substantive use of all three supplied records, fair counterclaim/response, coherent transitions, formal tone and a supported conclusion. Check $18+4=22$ errors, $24+96=120$ entries, and one versus three review sessions. Scans remain available under either policy; neither flags nor future human review guarantee perfection. All records are simulated and self-contained.