

Case 3: What should a group do after a public mistake?

Content note

The recap caption blames younger attendees for a late start. Keep the discussion on the event in the story, and do not ask students to describe times they were blamed or stereotyped.

Overview

Students read a short story in which the crew’s recap caption blames “the younger crowd” for a late start. They build a timeline from Jordy’s setup log, which shows that a projector failure caused the delay, and compare it with Gia’s first apology draft. They then write a correction that names the error and a repair step with an owner and a way to check it.

Before this case

Students should already be able to:

- summarize what a professional code asks of its members
- write a policy with clear roles and steps
- write a correction for a public audience

Objectives

Students will be able to:

- write a corrections policy that says who writes corrections, where they appear and how quickly
- include a repair step with an owner and a check

Objectives, continued

- write a correction that names the error and states what the log shows
- cite the PRSA or RTDNA code accurately

Materials

- This chapter, one copy per participant
- Evidence A, B, C and D
- The PRSA and RTDNA code cards, and the NPR Public Editor column “That was wrong” (October 21, 2022)
- The policy template

The task in this edition

Task: Write a corrections policy for a student club’s social accounts, then use it to write the correction for the crew’s recap caption.

Students make: Corrections policy, 250—350 words, plus a posted correction of 70—100 words

Pacing

Opener (page 45): 5 min. Short on time: 4 min. Read What happened aloud. Skip the opening question.

Key terms (pages 46 and 47): 5 min. Short on time: skip. Define correction and accountability aloud.

Look at the evidence (page 51): 8 min. Short on time: 7 min. Participants fill in only the “What it shows” boxes.

Pacing, continued

Look at the evidence (page 52): 6 min. Short on time: 4 min. Read Anika’s message and Gia’s draft aloud. Skip the boxes.

Key idea (pages 53 and 54): 10 min. Short on time: 8 min. Skip the In the news section.

Sort the evidence (page 55): 6 min. Short on time: skip.

Practice (page 56): 6 min. Short on time: skip.

Your task (pages 57 and 58): 12 min. Short on time: 10 min. Fill in the first two planner boxes together.

Your draft (pages 59 and 60): 30 min. Short on time: 30 min.

Check your work (pages 61 and 62): 8 min. Short on time: 6 min. Skip the rubric boxes.

Questions to discuss (pages 63 and 64): 10 min. Short on time: 6 min. Discuss question 2 only.

Talk about this case at home (page 65): at home.

Periods: full chapter 106 minutes; one period 75 minutes.

Case 3 plan, continued

Standards

Civic Engagement VALUE Rubric AAC&U’s rubric for taking part in community life, including civic communication and working within community structures toward a civic aim. In this case: Students write a correction that reaches the younger neighbors the caption blamed (Civic Communication).

Written Communication VALUE Rubric AAC&U’s rubric for writing that fits its context and purpose, develops its content and uses sources and evidence. In this case: Students write a corrections policy and a correction that fit a club’s social accounts (Genre and Disciplinary Conventions).

Ethical Reasoning VALUE Rubric AAC&U’s rubric for recognizing ethical issues and applying and weighing different ethical perspectives. In this case: Students weigh the club’s reputation against the harm to the people the caption blamed (Ethical Issue Recognition).

Information Creation as a Process Information is made through a process, and how it was made affects what it can be trusted for. In this case: Students compare how a caption, a setup log and a correction were each produced and what each can show.

Codes of ethics

- **PRSA Code of Ethics:** Free Flow of Information
- **RTDNA Code of Ethics:** Independence and transparency
- **Credo for Ethical Communication:** “We accept responsibility for the short- and long-term consequences of our own communication...” (one of nine unnumbered principles)

Heat map

- ■ □ **Opener (page 45):** Medium
- □ □ **Key terms (pages 46 and 47):** Low
- □ □ **Look at the evidence (page 51):** Low
- □ □ **Look at the evidence (page 52):** Low
- □ □ **Key idea (pages 53 and 54):** Low
- ■ □ **Sort the evidence (page 55):** Medium
- □ □ **Practice (page 56):** Low
- □ □ **Check your work (pages 61 and 62):** Low

Try it at your school

Help a club you’re in write a corrections rule.

- Ask the editor or advisor of a school newsletter, club account or yearbook how they fix mistakes
- Suggest a three-step checklist: name the error, show the evidence, say what changes
- Offer to test it on an old post together

Try it at your school, continued

- Keep any real examples anonymous

Who to ask: School newspaper or yearbook advisor, club advisor, student council secretary

Safety: Don’t repost someone else’s mistake to criticize them. Talk to the club privately first.

Sources

- Public Relations Society of America (PRSA), “PRSA Code of Ethics,” October 2000
- Society of Professional Journalists, “SPJ Code of Ethics,” September 6, 2014
- Critical Media Project, “Zootopia: the press conference,” No date listed

Case 3: What should a group do after a public mistake?

The crew's recap caption blamed younger neighbors for a late start, but the event log shows the projector failed.

On your own Read What happened. Underline the caption and the time the projector failed. About 5 minutes.

Your role: You're the one who checks the log's times before the correction goes up. **New skill:** Correct a public mistake.



Gia and Jordy sit at a table with a laptop and a printed page.

What happened

It is Sunday at the edit desk. Caio, 24, edited a short recap of Friday's screening. The crew posted it on Saturday morning. Gia's caption, "Great night, once the younger crowd finally got organized," sounded believable, because a few people did arrive late.

Then Jordy checks the setup log. The projector failed at 5:40 p.m. The replacement was not running until 6:20, twenty minutes after everyone was seated. The log also says Anika and Dec helped carry chairs before the doors opened.

Anika sends the group a voice note asking why she and Dec are the problem in the post. Gia wants to take responsibility. Her first draft of a correction is mostly about how bad she feels, and the recap caption is still up.

Your question: What should the correction say, and what will the crew do differently next time?

Case 3 | Opener | College educator edition

🕒 Pacing

Full chapter: 5 min.

✂ Short on time: 4 min. Read What happened aloud. Skip the opening question.

💬 Say this

"Imagine a post says your group caused a problem, and you were helping. What should the post say instead?" — Take two answers. Keep the focus on the crew's post.

👁 Watch for

Misconception: Students treat the caption as a harmless joke. **Listen for:** "It's just a caption." **Then:** Ask who the caption names and what it says they did. Point to Anika's message.

📄 Support

- Read What happened aloud while students follow along.
- Write the three times on the board: 5:40, 6:00 and 6:20.

🔥 Heat check

■ ■ □ **Medium.** The caption blames an age group, and students may bring up times they were blamed.

Cool-down: Keep the talk on the crew's post. Nobody needs to share a personal story.

Key terms

On your own Read each key term and its example. Then write your first guess in the box. About 5 minutes.

Claim A claim is a statement that something is true. You can check a claim with evidence.

En español: afirmación

In this case: The caption claims the late start happened because “the younger crowd” was not organized. Jordy’s setup log checks that claim.

Correction A correction is a public statement that replaces wrong information with accurate information.

En español: corrección

In this case: Gia edits the original caption, not just her story, so people who saw it learn what was wrong.

Accountability Accountability is owning a mistake and doing what you said you would do to fix it.

En español: rendición de cuentas

In this case: The crew names who fixes the caption, who contacts Anika and Dec, and who checks the next recap against the log.

Who is involved



Gia

Wrote the recap caption

“I wrote ‘once the younger crowd finally got organized.’ A few people did come in late, so it felt true. I never checked why we started late.”



Jordy

Kept the setup log on Friday

“My log says Anika and Dec were carrying chairs before doors opened. The caption turned them into the reason we started late.”

Case 3 | Key terms | College educator edition

⌚ Pacing

Full chapter: 5 min.

✂ Short on time: skip this page. Skip this page. Define correction and accountability aloud.

💬 Say this

“Write your first guess now. You will come back to it at the end.” — Keep first guesses private unless a student wants to share.

👁 Watch for

Misconception: Students think saying sorry is the same as a correction. **Listen for:** “She apologized, so it’s fixed.”

Then: Reread the definition. A correction replaces wrong information with supported information.

📖 Support

- Pair students who share a language to explain each term.
- Frame: “The claim was _____. The correction says _____.”
- **Cognates:** correction (corrección), evidence (evidencia), error (error), projector (proyector), stereotype (estereotipo), repair (reparación), responsibility (responsabilidad), public (público).

🌡 Heat check

■□□ Low.

🔑 Answer key

Any first guess is fine. Students return to it on the My take page.

Before you look at the evidence, what should Gia's correction say first?

➤ My first guess is an admission that the caption was wrong, because the error was public.

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 is no handwriting or other markings on the paper.

This page continues page 46. The notes for both pages are on the sheet for page 46.

Reading passage

Corrections, repair and responsibility

On your own Read the passage. At each Stop and think box, pause and answer the question in your head or with a partner. About 5 minutes.

Words to know

- **Claim:** A claim is a statement that something is true. You can check a claim with evidence.
- **Correction:** A correction is a public statement that replaces wrong information with accurate information.
- **Accountability:** Accountability is owning a mistake and doing what you said you would do to fix it.

The story: A believable caption

After the crew's first neighborhood screening, the one saved from a cropped clip in Case 1, the crew posted a recap on Saturday at 11:08 a.m. Caio, 24, edited the video, and Gia, 21, wrote the caption: "Great night, once the younger crowd finally got organized." The caption was plausible for an ordinary reason. Some people did arrive late, and the event did start late.

Jordy's setup log from Friday tells a different story. A projector failure was reported at 5:40 p.m. Attendees were seated by 6:00. The replacement was connected at 6:20. The log also records that Anika, 16, and Dec, 17, helped carry chairs before the doors opened. The caption had turned two volunteers into the cause of a delay they had no part in.

Anika responds with a voice note: "We were helping you set up. Why are we the problem in this post?" Gia's unpublished first draft reads, "Sorry if this came across wrong. We love our younger neighbors and would never want anyone to feel excluded." Its conditional "if" shifts responsibility to the reader. It also omits the facts, which leaves the false explanation standing.

Stop and think. Gia's draft uses the word "if." How does a conditional apology shift responsibility?

Anatomy of a repair

The caption contains a causal **claim**, a statement that something is true that can be checked with evidence. Applying the Case 1 skill, finding the original source, the crew checks the claim against the log, and the log refutes it.

Pacing

Reading: about 5 min (730 words). Short on time: read it aloud together, pausing at each Stop and think.

Stop and think

1. **After "The story: A believable caption":** Gia's draft uses the word "if." How does a conditional apology shift responsibility?
2. **After "Anatomy of a repair":** Why should the people harmed by a mistake be kept out of the work of repairing it?
3. **After "Evidence from research and practice":** Choose one of the brand apologies. Using the six-element research, what would count as repair rather than regret?

Anatomy of a repair, continued

A **correction** is a public statement that replaces wrong information with accurate information. Three design choices determine whether it works. The first is placement. Caio insists on editing the original post rather than publishing a new one, so the correction reaches the same audience. The second is content. The correction names the specific error and states the documented cause. The third is order. The facts come before the author's feelings, which may not belong in the correction at all.

Accountability is owning a mistake and doing what you said you would do to fix it. The crew converts that principle into assigned tasks: Gia corrects the post, Caio keeps a visible correction note with the edit and Jordy adds a pre-publication source check. The case also marks the boundary of accountability. The people harmed are not recruited into the repair. Anika is not asked to approve the correction publicly or to reassure Gia. She is offered a private channel and left to decide how she feels. Finally, Jordy defines success by audience understanding rather than reach. If people who saw the original post still attribute the delay to "the younger crowd," the correction has not worked.

 **Stop and think.** Why should the people harmed by a mistake be kept out of the work of repairing it?

Evidence from research and practice

Research on apologies supports the crew's priorities. Lewicki and colleagues identified six elements of an effective apology and found that acknowledging responsibility and offering repair carried the most weight (Negotiation and Conflict Management Research, April 6, 2016). Research on misinformation reaches a compatible conclusion. Walter and Murphy's meta-analysis of 65 studies found that corrections are more effective when they give a clear explanation rather than a bare denial (Communication Monographs, May 15, 2018).

Professional codes translate these findings into obligations. PRSA members commit to "act promptly to correct erroneous communications for which the practitioner is responsible" (PRSA Code of Ethics, October 2000). The RTDNA code requires "giving corrections as much prominence as the error itself had" (RTDNA Code of Ethics, June 11, 2015). The National Communication Association's credo states, "We accept responsibility for the short- and long-term consequences of our own communication and expect the same from others" (NCA Credo for Ethical Communication, 2024).

Corporate cases show the gap between regret and repair. Dove expressed regret after an ad played into a racial stereotype (NPR, October 8, 2017). H&M hired a diversity leader after outrage over its "monkey hoodie" ad (NBC News, January 17, 2018). Whether such steps count as repair is a fair question to put to any organization, including your own.

The film connection shows the same error at a larger scale. In *Zootopia* (2016), Judy tells a press conference that a set of incidents has a biological explanation tied to one group.

This page continues page 48. The notes for both pages are on the sheet for page 48.

Evidence from research and practice, continued

Nick's reaction shows a personal cost that her official answer overlooks. In our reading, good intentions do not erase the effect of an unsupported claim about a group, and the animal groups in the film are not a scientific model of human race. Your job in this case is to check the log's times before the correction goes up.

? **Stop and think.** Choose one of the brand apologies. Using the six-element research, what would count as repair rather than regret?

Sources

Real source | Negotiation and Conflict Management Research (Lewicki et al.) | April 6, 2016

An Exploration of the Structure of Effective Apologies

Real source | Communication Monographs (Walter & Murphy) | May 15, 2018

How to unring the bell: A meta-analytic approach to correction of misinformation

Real source | Public Relations Society of America (PRSA) | October 2000

PRSA Code of Ethics

Real source | Radio Television Digital News Association (RTDNA) | 2015

RTDNA Code of Ethics

Real source | National Communication Association (NCA) | 2024

Credo for Ethical Communication

Real source | NPR | October 8, 2017

Dove Expresses 'Regret' For Racially Insensitive Ad

Real source | NBC News | January 17, 2018

H&M hires diversity leader after outrage over 'monkey hoodie' ad

Real source | Critical Media Project | No date listed

Zootopia: the press conference

This page continues page 48. The notes for both pages are on the sheet for page 48.

Look at the evidence

On your own Read each document. For each one, write what it shows and what it leaves out. About 8 minutes.

Evidence A | Recap caption, posted Saturday 11:08 a.m.

The caption

Great night, once the younger crowd finally got organized.

Look closely: Which group does this caption ask readers to blame, and on what evidence?

What it shows

➤ A published claim that blames an age group without support.

What it leaves out

➤ The recorded cause of the delay, and who saw the post.

Evidence B | Setup log, Friday evening

Jordy's event log

5:40 p.m. Projector failure reported. 6:00 p.m. Attendees seated. 6:20 p.m. Replacement projector connected. Note: Anika and Dec helped carry chairs before doors opened.

Look closely: What happened at 5:40 that the caption never mentions?

What it shows

➤ A record made that night, which contradicts the caption's cause.

What it leaves out

➤ What attendees experienced, and how far the recap spread.

Case 3 | Look at the evidence | College educator edition

⌚ Pacing

Full chapter: 8 min.

✂ Short on time: 7 min. Participants fill in only the “What it shows” boxes.

💬 Say this

“Put your finger on 5:40 in the log. Now find anything in the caption about the projector.” — Wait for “nothing.”

👁 Watch for

Misconception: Students decide Gia is a bad person.

Listen for: “Gia is just rude.” **Then:** Ask what the evidence shows Gia did. The caption made a claim she never checked.

📄 Support

- Give the four documents on separate half-pages.
- Read Anika's message aloud in a neutral voice.
- **Cognates:** correction (corrección), evidence (evidencia), error (error), projector (proyector), stereotype (estereotipo), repair (reparación), responsibility (responsabilidad), public (público).

🔗 Stretch

- Ask which document was written at the time and which were written later, and why that matters.

🌡 Heat check

■□□ Low.

Look at the evidence, continued

Evidence C | Voice note to the crew

Anika's message

"We were helping you set up. Why are we the problem in this post?"

Look closely: What fact does Anika add, and what is she asking the crew?

What it shows

➤ A direct account from someone the caption misrepresented.

What it leaves out

➤ What repair, if any, Anika wants from the crew.

Evidence D | Draft correction, Saturday 2:15 p.m., not posted

Gia's first correction

Sorry if this came across wrong. We love our younger neighbors and would never want anyone to feel excluded.

Look closely: What fact does this correct? Who does the word "if" put the problem on?

What it shows

➤ A conditional apology that centers intent over impact.

What it leaves out

➤ Every checkable fact: the claim, the cause and the fix.

What is still missing from the evidence?

➤ What each attendee actually experienced, whether any latecomers affected the start at all, how far the recap was reshared, and whether Anika wants any public response.

Case 3 | Look at the evidence | College educator edition

⌚ Pacing

Full chapter: 6 min.

✂ Short on time: 4 min. Read Anika's message and Gia's draft aloud. Skip the boxes.

💬 Say this

"Put your finger on 5:40 in the log. Now find anything in the caption about the projector." — Wait for "nothing."

👁 Watch for

Misconception: Students decide Gia is a bad person.

Listen for: "Gia is just rude." **Then:** Ask what the evidence shows Gia did. The caption made a claim she never checked.

📖 Support

- Give the four documents on separate half-pages.
- Read Anika's message aloud in a neutral voice.
- **Cognates:** correction (corrección), evidence (evidencia), error (error), projector (proyector), stereotype (estereotipo), repair (reparación), responsibility (responsabilidad), public (público).

🔗 Stretch

- Ask which document was written at the time and which were written later, and why that matters.

🔥 Heat check

■□□ Low.

Key idea: corrections

On your own Read the key idea and the code of ethics. Then answer the question in the box. About 10 minutes.

Gia's caption did two jobs at once. It explained the late start, and it blamed a group of people for it. A **claim** is a statement that something is true. You can check a claim with evidence. Jordy's setup log checks the caption's claim and shows a projector failure instead.

A **correction** is a public statement that replaces wrong information with accurate information. It should appear where people saw the mistake, so the crew should edit the recap caption itself. A 2016 study of apologies found that taking responsibility and offering to repair the harm mattered most. Gia's first draft talks about loving younger neighbors, and it does neither.

Accountability is owning a mistake and doing what you said you would do to fix it. That means naming who corrects the caption, who contacts the people it blamed and who checks the next recap. Anika does not have to comfort Gia or approve the correction in public. The crew can offer her a private way to respond.

Professional standards

Real source | Public Relations Society of America (PRSA)

PRSA Code of Ethics: Free Flow of Information

"Act promptly to correct erroneous communications for which the practitioner is responsible."

In plain words: Public relations professionals who belong to PRSA agree to fix their own mistakes quickly.

Question: The recap caption went up Saturday at 11:08 a.m. What should the crew change first, and where?

Your answer

The first change is ____, made in ____, because ____.

➡ The first change is the false cause in the caption, edited in place with a visible note. PRSA asks members to correct promptly, and the error was public.

Case 3 | Key idea | College educator edition

⌚ Pacing

Full chapter: 10 min.

✂ Short on time: 8 min. Skip the In the news section.

💬 Say this

"A correction replaces wrong information with supported information. Which document supplies the supported information?" — Wait for the setup log.

"The PRSA code says to act promptly to correct errors. What should the crew fix first?" — Point to the caption.

👁 Watch for

Misconception: Students treat the PRSA code as a law.

Listen for: "The crew could get sued for that." **Then:** Say: "A code of ethics is a standard a profession sets for its own members. The PRSA code is not a law."

📖 Support

- Read the code card aloud. Point out the label: it is a quotation from a real code.

🔗 Stretch

- Read the RTDNA card. Ask whether a new post or an edit to the original would reach more of the same readers.

🔥 Heat check

■□□ Low.

Real source | NPR Public Editor | October 21, 2022
That was wrong
 How a real newsroom corrects mistakes: name the error, fix it on the story and keep a public list.



How a real newsroom corrects mistakes: name the error, fix it on the story and keep a public list.



A real brand apology after an ad played into a racial stereotype; compare the words with what changed afterward.

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 is no handwriting or other markings on the paper.

This page continues page 53. The notes for both pages are on the sheet for page 53.

Sort the evidence

On your own Compare the four accounts. Mark where they agree, where they differ and which one was written at the time. About 6 minutes.

Place the four accounts side by side. Where do they agree, where do they split, and which one was written down at the time?

Account 1

Caption: the night went well once the younger crowd got organized.

Account 2

Event log: projector failed at 5:40; replacement connected at 6:20; Anika and Dec carried chairs.

Account 3

Anika: “We were helping you set up.”

Where they agree

☞ The screening started late.

Where they differ

☞ What caused the delay: a group’s behavior or an equipment failure?

Check: Which account was recorded at the time rather than remembered afterward?

Whose perspective is missing?

Whose view is missing from these documents? What would you ask them?

The view that is missing is _____. I would ask _____.

☞ Viewers who saw screenshots of the caption elsewhere. I would ask how they could learn about the correction.

Case 3 | Sort the evidence | College educator edition

⌚ Pacing

Full chapter: 6 min.

✂ Short on time: skip this page.

💬 Say this

“Put the four accounts side by side. Which one was written down at the time?” — Wait for the log. Model one row together.

👁 Watch for

Misconception: Students trust the caption because Gia was there. **Listen for:** “Gia was there, so her caption counts.” **Then:** Ask which account was recorded at the time. The log was written that night, and the caption came the next morning.

📖 Support

- Let students write A (agree) or D (differ) in each box before writing sentences.

🔥 Heat check

■ ■ □ **Medium.** The missing-perspective question can lead to talk about how younger people are treated.

Cool-down: Keep it about the people in the case. No student speaks for an age group. Return to the log.

Practice: choose a response

On your own Choose what goes first in the correction and explain why. Then fix the two marked lines. About 6 minutes.

What should go first in the correction?

☐ A An explanation of how bad Gia feels about the caption.

☒ B The wrong claim, and what the event log shows.

☐ C Delete the post and stay quiet.

Why I chose it

➤ B. It corrects the record where the harm happened. A and C each leave the false cause standing for the people who saw it.

Improve a draft

A student's first draft

We want to apologize for our last post. We didn't mean to offend anyone and we love having younger people at our events. It was a really stressful night and ① things were hectic so we said something we shouldn't have. Honestly we were all tired and trying to get everything set up on time, and it's been a lot. We are sorry if anyone was hurt. ② We promise it won't happen again and we hope everyone keeps coming! Thank you all for your support and understanding, it means a lot to us.

Rewrite each marked phrase so it says only what the evidence supports.

Rewrite phrase 1

➤ The delay came from a projector failure logged at 5:40 p.m.

Rewrite phrase 2

➤ Every recap now gets a log check before it posts.

Case 3 | Practice | College educator edition

⌚ Pacing

Full chapter: 6 min.

✂ Short on time: skip this page.

💬 Say this

"Gia is ready to post. What goes first?" — Vote first.

👁 Watch for

Misconception: Students choose A because it sounds sincere. **Listen for:** "She should say how bad she feels." **Then:** Ask what A tells Anika about the delay.

🔥 Heat check

■□□ Low.

➤ Answer key

A revised version: Correction: our recap said the screening started late because younger attendees were disorganized. That was wrong. Jordy's event log shows the projector failed at 5:40 p.m. and the replacement was connected at 6:20. Anika and Dec actually helped carry chairs before doors opened. We have edited the original caption and messaged the people it blamed. Starting with the next event, Gia and Jordy will check any claim about causes against the event log before we post. We're sorry we blamed people who were helping us. If you see something we got wrong, message Jordy.

Other notes on the draft:

- "We didn't mean to offend anyone" Talks about intent. It still doesn't say what was wrong.
- "We are sorry if anyone was hurt" "If" puts the problem on readers. Name who was blamed.
- "we hope everyone keeps coming" Good goal, but a repair makes that more likely than a hope.

College

Your task

On your own Read the steps. Fill in the planner boxes before you start your draft. About 12 minutes.

Write a corrections policy for a student club's social accounts, then use it to write the correction for the crew's recap caption.

Use: Case documents: the recap caption, Jordy's setup log, Anika's message and Gia's unposted first draft. Real sources: the PRSA Code of Ethics summary, the RTDNA rule on prominent corrections and the NPR Public Editor's column "That was wrong" (October 21, 2022).

You'll make: Corrections policy, 250—350 words, plus a posted correction of 70—100 words

Time: 75 minutes

- 1 Reread Evidence A, B, C and D. List what the crew's process missed.
- 2 Decide who writes corrections, where they appear and how quickly.
- 3 Choose whether the club edits the original, posts a new one or does both.
- 4 Write a repair step with an owner and a check.
- 5 Draft the policy, 250 to 350 words, on the Your draft page.
- 6 Write the correction for the recap caption, 70 to 100 words.
- 7 Cite the PRSA or RTDNA code and say whom it applies to.



Prefer typing? Scan to open the online workspace.

Who writes corrections

➤ The person who wrote the post, checked by a second officer.

Where corrections appear, and how fast

➤ In the original post, as soon as the error is confirmed.

Case 3 | Your task | College educator edition

⌚ Pacing

Full chapter: 12 min.

✂ Short on time: 10 min. Fill in the first two planner boxes together.

💬 Say this

"Your club's recap just blamed the wrong people. Who fixes it, where and by when?" — Push for named roles and a place, not "we'll be careful."

👁 Watch for

Misconception: The policy is a list of values. **Listen for:** "We value honesty and inclusion." **Then:** Ask what a member does on the day of an error. Write it as a step.

📄 Support

- Policy template: who writes corrections, where they appear, how fast and who owns the repair
- Highlighting key from the workshop: words about intent in one color, facts in another
- Correction frame: what we said, what the log shows, what we changed
- Frame: "When ___, the ___ does ___ by ___."

🔗 Stretch

- Decide whether the club edits the original caption, posts a new one or does both, and defend the choice with the RTDNA prominence rule.

📋 Standards

AAC&U VALUE rubric: Civic Engagement VALUE Rubric; Written Communication VALUE Rubric; Ethical Reasoning VALUE Rubric.

ACRL Framework: Information Creation as a Process. The Case plan sheet gives each code in plain words.

Your task, continued

Edit, new post or both, and why

- Edit the original. RTDNA asks for corrections with as much prominence as the error itself had.

Notes

[illegible]

This page continues page 57.

07 Answer key

A strong response:

- The correction names the error and states what the log shows: a projector failure was reported at 5:40 p.m.
- The policy says who writes corrections, where they appear and how quickly
- The policy includes a repair step with an owner and a check
- Cites the PRSA or RTDNA code accurately
- Repeats no stereotype and names no real person

Your draft

On your own Write your draft in the boxes. Use your planner from the page before. About 30 minutes.

Your corrections policy, 250 to 350 words

✎ Corrections policy for our club's accounts. When we post something wrong, we fix it where people saw it, and we repair any harm. 1. Who writes it: the person who wrote the post drafts the correction. A second officer checks it against the record before it goes up. 2. Where it goes: we edit the original post and add a visible correction note. We do not delete a post that blamed someone, because screenshots can keep spreading. 3. How fast: we correct as soon as the error is confirmed. PRSA asks members to act promptly to correct errors they are responsible for. RTDNA asks that corrections get as much prominence as the error. 4. What it says: the error first, then the checked fact, then what we changed. An apology can follow, but it never replaces the fact. 5. Repair: we message the people the post blamed and offer a private way to reply. We never ask them to reassure us. The officer who wrote the post owns this step. 6. Check: a week later, the second officer asks a few readers what they now understand. If they still repeat the error, we post the correction again. These codes bind their members, not our club, but their standards fit what we publish.

Case 3 | Your draft | College educator edition

⌚ Pacing

Full chapter: 30 min.

✂ Short on time: 30 min.

💬 Say this

“Read your correction as Anika would. Does it name what happened before it says sorry?” — Partners read corrections aloud.

👁 Watch for

Misconception: The correction repeats the stereotype to explain it. **Listen for:** “We said younger people are disorganized, but...” **Then:** Name the error without repeating the label more than once.

✎ Answer key

What to notice in the sample:

1. The policy names who writes and who checks.
2. Defends the choice to edit in place.
3. Keeps the repair off the people who were blamed.
4. The correction states what the log shows.

Your correction, 70 to 100 words

Correction: our recap said the screening started late because the younger crowd was not organized. That was wrong. Jordy's setup log shows a projector failure was reported at 5:40 p.m., and the replacement was connected at 6:20. Anika and Dec helped carry chairs before the doors opened. We have edited this caption and messaged the people it blamed. We are sorry we blamed people who were helping us. If we got anything else wrong, message Jordy.

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

This page continues page 59. The notes for both pages are on the sheet for page 59.

Check your work

On your own Answer the Check your work questions and mark your level in each rubric row. Then write one change you made. About 8 minutes.

Does your policy say who writes corrections, where they appear and how quickly?	☒ Yes ☐ No
Does it include a repair step with an owner and a check?	☒ Yes ☐ No
Does your correction name the error and state what the log shows?	☒ Yes ☐ No
Do you cite a code accurately and repeat no stereotype?	☒ Yes ☐ No

How your work is scored

Mark one box in each row.

Skill	Beginning	Developing	Proficient	Advanced
Evidence	☐ No evidence about the delay.	☐ Mentions “technical issues” vaguely.	☐ Cites the projector failure from the log.	☐ Cites specific times and corrects who actually helped.
Reasoning	☐ Apologizes for feelings only.	☐ Admits error but not what it was.	☐ Names the inaccurate claim and replaces it.	☐ Explains why the claim harmed a group and how the repair prevents a repeat.
Audience & purpose	☐ Does not consider who saw the post.	☐ Speaks to readers in general.	☐ Reaches the people who were blamed.	☐ Reaches the original audience and the blamed group through appropriate channels.

Pacing

Full chapter: 8 min.

 Short on time: 6 min. Skip the rubric boxes.

Say this

“Would Anika recognize what happened in your correction? Mark your level, then make one change.” — Ask for one added fact or one removed excuse.

Watch for

Misconception: Students soften the tone instead of fixing facts. **Listen for:** “I made it sound nicer.” **Then:** Point to the Revision row. Ask for one fact, owner or check added.

Heat check

 Low.

Answer key

How to assess: Score with the case rubric. Add checks that the correction matches Jordy’s setup log and that the policy assigns an owner and a check for the repair.

Proficient looks like:

- **Evidence:** Cites the projector failure from the log.
- **Reasoning:** Names the inaccurate claim and replaces it.
- **Audience & purpose:** Reaches the people who were blamed.
- **Revision:** Adds facts and a repair.

Skill	Beginning	Developing	Proficient	Advanced
Revision	☐ No change.	☐ Softens tone only.	☐ Adds facts and a repair.	☐ Adds facts, an owner, a check and removes shifting of blame.

I changed ___ because ___.

🔍 I moved the apology after the facts, because the error has to be corrected before the apology means anything.

[illegible]

This page continues page 61. The notes for both pages are on the sheet for page 61.

Questions to discuss

On your own Write a short answer to each question. Then finish My take. About 10 minutes.

- 1 The caption felt true to Gia because a few people came in late. Why was that not enough evidence?

➤ A plausible story still has to be verified. Gia generalized from a few latecomers to a group, while the log recorded a different cause at the time.

- 2 What evidence would show that the repair happened?

➤ Check understanding, not views. Ask people who saw the first post what caused the delay, and confirm the next recap went through the log check.

- 3 After the correction goes up, what is still up to Anika and Dec to decide?

➤ Whether to accept the apology and whether to engage at all. The crew can offer a private channel but cannot ask for reassurance.

My take

My claim: ____.

➤ The crew owes a correction in place, a named repair plan and no request for reassurance.

The best evidence is ____, because ____.

➤ The log, because it contradicts the caption with a record made that night.

⌚ Pacing

Full chapter: 10 min.

✂ Short on time: 6 min. Discuss question 2 only.

💬 Say this

“Answer with a detail from the log or the messages, not a story about someone you know.” — Post the question numbers and call on one student per question.

➤ Stretch

- Compare a real newsroom’s published correction policy with the crew’s plan.
- Going further: Ask the people affected what the correction missed, without asking them to forgive anyone. Then decide where the corrected fact should go so the original audience sees it.
- Going further: Correct the record where people can see it. Keep enough of the original caption in a correction note to explain what changed.
- Going further: Write a caption correction and a short script for an accessible video. Use the same facts in both.
- Going further: Ask the editor or advisor of a school newsletter, club account or yearbook how they fix mistakes. Suggest three steps: name the error, show the evidence and say what changes.
- Draft how the crew would measure whether younger neighbors come back
- Compare a real published correction policy from a newsroom with the crew’s plan

My take, continued

Someone who disagrees might say ____.

- ✶ A quiet deletion avoids drawing more attention to the error.

The limit of the evidence is ____.

- 🔑 Nobody knows how far the recap was reshared.

I would change my mind if ____.

☛ Anika and Dec said they preferred no public correction.

Notes

[illegible]

This page continues page 63.

Heat check

Question 1: Medium. Students may repeat age stereotypes or defend the caption.

Cool-down: Ask what the log recorded at 5:40. Keep the talk on evidence, not on what younger people are like.

Question 3 cool-down: Say that Anika and Dec owe the crew nothing. Ask what the crew can offer instead: a private way to respond.

Talk about this case at home

Case 3: What should a group do after a public mistake?

In this case, a group of friends posts a caption that wrongly blames younger neighbors for a late start. Your student compared the caption with an event log and wrote a correction and a plan to repair the harm.

Questions to talk about

- 1 What makes an apology feel complete?
- 2 Where should a correction appear so the people who saw a mistake will see it?
- 3 How can a group check a claim before it posts about an event?

Nobody needs to share personal stories or private information to talk about this case.



See the case online.

Case 3 | Talk about this case at home | College educator edition

🕒 Pacing

At home: this page takes no class time.

💬 Say this

“Take this page home or read it with someone you trust.” —
Nobody needs to share a personal story to complete it.