

Pages That Change

Produce, publish, test, and update a scientific writing product.

CCSS.ELA-Literacy.WHST.9-10.6 "Use technology, including the Internet, to produce, publish, and update individual or shared writing products, taking advantage of technology's capacity to link to other information and to display information flexibly and dynamically."

NAME _____

DATE _____

1 READ AND MARK _____ Read it twice

YOUR JOB Read the fictional field notes. Underline a limit on the evidence and circle the correction. You will publish an actual online explanation with linked evidence and an updateable display.

Riverwatch data desk - a classroom simulation

- ① A student club counted visible litter items on the same short North and South creek-bank sections on two visits a week apart. Each visit lasted twenty minutes. The table is the first data entry, not water-quality testing. The club cannot tell from these counts whether litter was removed, moved away, newly deposited, or overlooked. All counts and places here are invented for this writing task.

ORIGINAL ENTRY: COUNTED LITTER ITEMS

Location	Week 1	Week 2
North	18	11
South	12	8

- ② The intended readers are classmates deciding what the records show and what questions remain. Create two explanatory paragraphs: describe the comparison with accurate numbers, then explain the method limits and a reasonable next observation. Publish to the teacher-approved class audience using an Internet-based writing tool. Make a separate online source workbook containing the table and method note, and link it from descriptive words in your writing.
- ③ Correction to apply AFTER first publication: A recount of the same recorded North visit changes Week 2 from 11 to 9 items. The South count stays 8. Update the workbook, display, comparison and any affected totals. Add a dated note explaining this correction; it is not a new cleanup or a new visit. Save evidence of both versions so a reader can tell what changed.

2 ANSWER WITH EVIDENCE Use the passage

1 What comparison can the first table support, and what can it not establish?

2 After the correction, what numerical claims and display values need checking?

3 How will your reader verify the evidence and recognize the newer version?

3 YOUR TURN Your own words

Pairs need Internet access, a teacher-approved online document or webpage tool, and a cloud spreadsheet that can supply a linked, refreshable chart. The teacher must confirm these features and class sharing access before starting. Produce the actual digital items; the lines below record work, not a substitute paper draft.

1. Build the evidence and writing

Create a cloud workbook with the original table, method note, and clear simulation label. Make a labeled chart; try column and line views and choose the clearer one for your readers. Draft the two explanatory paragraphs in an online document/page. Link descriptive words to the workbook and insert its linked, refreshable chart, not a screenshot. Record the view you chose and why.

2. Publish and test with a reader

Publish or share the document and workbook to the approved class audience. Open the published reading view from a classmate's account. Test the workbook link, chart visibility and a narrow window. Fix access or layout problems. Record the product location and the actual reader test result.

3. Correct and update the live product

Save the first version using version history or an exported copy. Apply the supplied correction to the workbook. Refresh the linked chart and revise every affected numerical statement in the published writing. Add today's date and a clear correction note. Record the changed value and one affected sentence.

4. Verify the update

Have the reader reopen the published product and source. Check the corrected count, chart, text and correction note against one another. Show the teacher both versions and the working links. Each partner explains a writing contribution, the display choice, and how updating the source changed the product. Record any final fix or the checks that passed.

PART 1 • READ AND MARK

Read the fictional field notes. Underline a limit on the evidence and circle the correction. You will publish an actual online explanation with linked evidence and an updateable display. Accept any marking that follows this job and points at the right text.

PART 2 • ANSWERS

#	QUESTION	ANSWER
1	What comparison can the first table support, and what can it not establish?	The recorded counts fall from 18 to 11 at North and 12 to 8 at South; combined, 30 to 19. Counts alone cannot establish cleaner water, a cause, or effects of a cleanup.
2	After the correction, what numerical claims and display values need checking?	North Week 2 becomes 9; its decrease is 9 rather than 7. Combined Week 2 becomes 17 rather than 19, a decrease of 13 rather than 11. South stays 8. Check every affected table cell, chart and sentence.
3	How will your reader verify the evidence and recognize the newer version?	A working descriptive link opens the source workbook and method note. The refreshed display and revised text match it. A dated correction note identifies the old/new North value, while saved first-version evidence shows the change.

PART 3 · YOUR TURN (SAMPLE ANSWER)

Illustrative first-version writing: In this fictional Riverwatch record, North counted 18 items in Week 1 and 11 in Week 2; South counted 12 and 8. The combined recorded count decreased from 30 to 19. The linked Riverwatch source workbook contains the counts and method note. A column chart compares both places across the two visits.

Each count covered the same short section for twenty minutes. These records do not measure water quality or explain why counts changed. A later visit should repeat the method and record conditions that could affect visibility. This would give readers more context without proving a cause.

Illustrative update: Change North Week 2 to 9, the combined count to 17, and the combined decrease to 13. Refresh the linked chart. Add the actual date and: "Corrected North Week 2 from 11 to 9 after a recount of the same record; South remains 8. This is a correction, not a new visit."

Product check: The reader can open the writing and linked workbook, see the corrected chart and text, and compare saved first-version evidence. A column view makes the four counts easy to compare; a line view may show change but must not imply measurements between the two visits.

Assess the live digital writing, Internet publication to the approved audience, functional evidence link, flexible display choice, source-linked chart update, accurate correction and both-version evidence. A described or bracketed link and a picture of a chart do not meet those requirements. Both partners must contribute and demonstrate the workflow. Tool controls differ; confirm the chosen tools can embed and refresh a linked chart before assigning. No public posting or personal account is required; school-managed class access is sufficient. Counts are simulated; do not infer water quality or a causal intervention.