

WHAT CHANGED?

Assessment and reflection book

Five new unit scenarios test whether the evidence habits transfer. Educator keys are collected after all student assessments.

Reusable student and educator materials for After School

The Why Files · Case Notes · The Receipts · Save This · Make It · What Changed? · Behind the Case

In this edition

Assessment and reflection book	1
Student assessment pages	3
Unit 1 / Before you run with it	4
Unit 2 / Read the fine print	7
Unit 3 / Find who's responsible	10
Unit 4 / Put it to the test	13
Unit 5 / Take it public	16
Educator answer key	19
Key / Unit 1 Before you run with it	20
Key / Unit 2 Read the fine print	21
Key / Unit 3 Find who's responsible	22
Key / Unit 4 Put it to the test	23
Key / Unit 5 Take it public	24

Student assessment pages

These are new situations. Read the source set before you answer. The task is to use the evidence habits in a different context, not to remember the wording from a lesson.

All source sets are fictional NPW practice documents. You may write, type, dictate, or use an annotated diagram when the assigned format is not itself the skill being assessed.

The educator answer key begins after all five student assessments. Keep that section separate when distributing student copies.

Unit 1 / Before you run with it

Essential question: How do you know enough to share, judge, or decide?

The scholarship is not the bill

New transfer scenario. Read the source set before answering. Do not assume that a familiar word such as “policy,” “law,” “ban,” “scholarship,” or “petition” tells you who has authority or what happened.

Source set

SOURCE A - Scholarship notice

NPW fictional practice document. Use as case evidence, not as a real institution’s record.

NPW practice document. “Congratulations. You have been selected for a \$12,000 annual university scholarship, renewable for up to four years if renewal conditions are met.”

What it establishes: Shows the scholarship amount and that renewal has conditions.

What it cannot establish: Does not show the full cost of attendance or other aid.

SOURCE B - Renewal terms

NPW fictional practice document. Use as case evidence, not as a real institution’s record.

NPW practice document. “Renewal requires full-time enrollment and satisfactory academic progress under the scholarship policy. Housing status does not change the scholarship amount.”

What it establishes: Shows the scholarship’s stated renewal conditions.

What it cannot establish: Does not establish the student’s future eligibility before future grades/enrollment exist.

SOURCE C - Student account estimate

NPW fictional practice document. Use as case evidence, not as a real institution’s record.

NPW practice document. Tuition/fees \$34,800; housing/meal plan \$15,200; grants/scholarships -\$27,000; estimated amount due \$23,000 before optional charges and pending outside aid.

What it establishes: Shows an estimated institutional bill after listed aid.

What it cannot establish: Does not include every indirect cost or guarantee pending aid.

Part A - Check

1. What does the \$12,000 figure describe?
 - A. The entire cost of college
 - B. One annual scholarship
 - C. The final bill
 - D. A loan balance
2. Which document answers “What might I owe the university right now?” most directly?
 - A. Source A
 - B. Source B
 - C. Source C
 - D. A social post
3. Which statement is too certain?
 - A. The scholarship has renewal conditions.
 - B. The estimate lists \$23,000 due before some pending items.
 - C. The student is guaranteed four years of the award no matter what.
 - D. Housing does not change this scholarship amount.
4. What is missing before comparing two colleges?
 - A. Comparable net-price/aid information from the other college
 - B. A campus meme
 - C. The mascot
 - D. A ranking screenshot alone
5. “Financial aid offer” and “cash in my bank account” are...
 - A. the same thing
 - B. not the same thing
 - C. always loans
 - D. always refunds

Part B - Explain

Using all three sources, explain why “I got a \$12,000 scholarship” does not answer “What will college cost me?” Name one figure you would compare across institutions.

Part C - Use it

Build a one-page comparison box with four rows: direct charges, grants/scholarships, loans/work options, and estimated amount due. Add a note identifying anything pending or conditional.

What changed?

What was your first interpretation? Which receipt changed or strengthened it? What question would you investigate next?

Unit 2 / Read the fine print

Essential question: What does the paper actually say, and what can you ask before you sign, share, or post?

The “unpaid learning opportunity”

New transfer scenario. Read the source set before answering. Do not assume that a familiar word such as “policy,” “law,” “ban,” “scholarship,” or “petition” tells you who has authority or what happened.

Source set

SOURCE A - Internship offer

NPW fictional practice document. Use as case evidence, not as a real institution’s record.

NPW practice document. “Unpaid learning opportunity, 20 hours/week, June 10–August 16. Intern will shadow staff, attend two workshops, and assist with social-media scheduling. Academic credit available if arranged by the student.”

What it establishes: Shows the employer’s description, schedule, and duties.

What it cannot establish: Does not by itself establish whether the arrangement complies with wage laws or school-credit rules.

SOURCE B - Weekly schedule

NPW fictional practice document. Use as case evidence, not as a real institution’s record.

NPW practice document. Monday–Thursday, 1–6 p.m. Repeated tasks: schedule posts, answer inbox, prepare weekly analytics; shadowing listed once per month.

What it establishes: Shows how the work is actually scheduled.

What it cannot establish: Does not show supervision quality, training content, or the employer’s full business context.

SOURCE C - General federal guidance excerpt

NPW fictional practice document. Use as case evidence, not as a real institution’s record.

Instructional paraphrase of current U.S. Department of Labor guidance: whether an unpaid intern at a for-profit employer is an employee depends on the economic reality of the relationship and multiple factors; no single label decides the question.

What it establishes: Establishes that the label “intern” or availability of academic credit is not automatically decisive.

What it cannot establish: Does not decide this individual situation; legal questions may require qualified advice and current jurisdiction-specific review.

Part A - Check

1. Which document best shows what the intern would actually do each week?
 - A. Source A only
 - B. Source B
 - C. Source C
 - D. A school brochure
2. Does “academic credit available” automatically settle whether the position can be unpaid?
 - A. Yes
 - B. No
 - C. Only if the employer says so
 - D. Only if the student wants it to
3. Which next question is most useful?
 - A. “Is this internship prestigious?”
 - B. “Who supervises the work, what training is provided, and how are the duties structured around learning?”
 - C. “Can I post about it?”
 - D. “Do other students want it?”
4. Which statement is safest and most accurate?
 - A. “This internship is definitely illegal.”
 - B. “This internship is definitely legal because it offers credit.”
 - C. “The documents raise questions about the balance of training and productive work; current rules and the full facts still need to be checked.”
 - D. “Unpaid internships never exist.”
5. What should the student save before deciding?
 - A. Offer, schedule, duties, supervision/training details, and any school-credit requirements
 - B. Only a screenshot of the logo
 - C. Nothing in writing
 - D. A friend’s opinion

Part B - Explain

Compare the offer language with the weekly schedule. What does each document add, and what question remains unanswered?

Part C - Use it

Draft a five-question email-prep sheet for the student before they contact the employer or career center. Questions must seek facts about duties, supervision, learning, schedule, pay/expenses, and school-credit requirements without accusing the employer of wrongdoing.

What changed?

What was your first interpretation? Which receipt changed or strengthened it? What question would you investigate next?

Unit 3 / Find who's responsible

Essential question: Who has authority here, and how do you know?

The creator code and the recurring charge

New transfer scenario. Read the source set before answering. Do not assume that a familiar word such as “policy,” “law,” “ban,” “scholarship,” or “petition” tells you who has authority or what happened.

Source set

SOURCE A - Creator video caption

NPW fictional practice document. Use as case evidence, not as a real institution’s record.

NPW practice document. “Use code STUDY for 50% off. Not sponsored, I just like it.”

What it establishes: Shows the creator’s public claim and discount code.

What it cannot establish: Does not establish whether the creator has a financial/material connection.

SOURCE B - Checkout screen

NPW fictional practice document. Use as case evidence, not as a real institution’s record.

NPW practice document. “\$4.99 today. Then \$14.99/month until canceled. By selecting Start, you agree to recurring billing.”

What it establishes: Shows the recurring-charge term at checkout.

What it cannot establish: Does not show whether the creator earns commission.

SOURCE C - Affiliate-program terms

NPW fictional practice document. Use as case evidence, not as a real institution’s record.

NPW practice document. “Approved creators receive 15% commission on purchases attributed to their code.”

What it establishes: Shows that approved creators can earn commission through tracked codes.

What it cannot establish: Does not prove that this specific creator is enrolled without confirming their status.

SOURCE D - Bank statement

NPW fictional practice document. Use as case evidence, not as a real institution’s record.

NPW practice document. Charges: \$4.99 Aug 3; \$14.99 Sep 3; \$14.99 Oct 3.

What it establishes: Shows recurring charges on this account.

What it cannot establish: Does not show whether the user canceled or disputed them.

Part A - Check

1. Which document establishes the recurring price?
 - A. A
 - B. B
 - C. C
 - D. D only
2. Which documents together raise a question about the “not sponsored” claim?
 - A. A and C
 - B. B and D only
 - C. A and D only
 - D. None
3. What does Source D establish?
 - A. That the creator committed fraud
 - B. That three charges appeared
 - C. That the subscription was canceled
 - D. That the code caused the charge
4. Who can clarify/cancel the subscription terms first?
 - A. The platform/service billing support under its cancellation procedure
 - B. A random commenter
 - C. The school board
 - D. The creator’s friend
5. What is the most precise public correction if affiliate status is later confirmed?
 - A. “Creators are liars.”
 - B. “The video said ‘not sponsored,’ but the code is an affiliate code that can generate commission; that material connection should be disclosed clearly.”
 - C. “All discount codes are scams.”
 - D. “Subscriptions are illegal.”

Part B - Explain

Explain what each of Sources A-D can establish and identify the one fact that still must be confirmed before calling the creator's statement inaccurate.

Part C - Use it

Create a "Before You Buy From a Creator" card with five checks: price today, recurring price, cancellation, material connection/affiliate disclosure, and what record to save.

What changed?

What was your first interpretation? Which receipt changed or strengthened it? What question would you investigate next?

Unit 4 / Put it to the test

Essential question: What counts as proof that something works, is allowed, or is legal?

The student-news story was pulled

New transfer scenario. Read the source set before answering. Do not assume that a familiar word such as “policy,” “law,” “ban,” “scholarship,” or “petition” tells you who has authority or what happened.

Source set

SOURCE A - Adviser email

NPW fictional practice document. Use as case evidence, not as a real institution’s record.

NPW practice document. “Pause publication until we verify the quoted budget number and give the activities office a chance to respond. This is an editing hold, not a final ban.”

What it establishes: Shows the adviser’s stated reason and temporary status.

What it cannot establish: Does not establish whether every aspect of the hold is permitted under law or school policy.

SOURCE B - Student-media policy

NPW fictional practice document. Use as case evidence, not as a real institution’s record.

NPW practice document. “Editors are responsible for accuracy. Corrections and source verification are required. Administrative prior review is limited to circumstances listed in district policy.”

What it establishes: Shows internal rules about accuracy and references a separate district policy.

What it cannot establish: Does not identify whether this situation falls within a listed circumstance.

SOURCE C - District policy excerpt

NPW fictional practice document. Use as case evidence, not as a real institution’s record.

NPW practice document. “School-sponsored student media procedures must distinguish editorial fact-checking from administrative censorship and follow applicable state/federal law.”

What it establishes: Shows a district-level requirement to distinguish processes.

What it cannot establish: Does not decide the facts of this particular dispute.

SOURCE D - Reporter’s notes

NPW fictional practice document. Use as case evidence, not as a real institution’s record.

NPW practice document. The quoted budget number came from a draft slide; the adopted budget document lists a different amount.

What it establishes: Shows a concrete accuracy problem in the draft story.

What it cannot establish: Does not settle every speech/press question about the hold.

Part A - Check

1. Which fact most directly supports a temporary accuracy hold?
 - A. The school dislikes criticism.
 - B. The draft used a number that differs from the adopted budget.
 - C. Students are young.
 - D. The office asked for praise.
2. What does Source A explicitly say the hold is not?
 - A. An editing step
 - B. A final ban
 - C. A request to verify
 - D. A chance to respond
3. Which source tells you that another district rule may matter?
 - A. A
 - B. B
 - C. C
 - D. D
4. Which conclusion is too broad?
 - A. The budget number needs checking.
 - B. The process should distinguish fact-checking from censorship.
 - C. Any pause in student publication is automatically illegal censorship.
 - D. The adopted budget is stronger evidence than a draft slide for the final amount.
5. What should the students do first to strengthen their position?
 - A. Correct/verify the budget number and document the reason for any continued hold
 - B. Delete all notes
 - C. Post accusations without the policy
 - D. Assume the adviser controls the law

Part B - Explain

Separate the accuracy problem from the authority/speech question. Use at least three sources and state what is still unknown.

Part C - Use it

Build a paper trail with four rows: draft number, adopted-budget number, adviser hold, governing policy. Then write a 100-150 word neutral status update that says what has been corrected and what process question remains.

What changed?

What was your first interpretation? Which receipt changed or strengthened it? What question would you investigate next?

Unit 5 / Take it public

Essential question: How do you take a question public so that people can trust it and act on it?

The lease, the petition, and the inspection notice

New transfer scenario. Read the source set before answering. Do not assume that a familiar word such as “policy,” “law,” “ban,” “scholarship,” or “petition” tells you who has authority or what happened.

Source set

SOURCE A - Lease summary

NPW fictional practice document. Use as case evidence, not as a real institution’s record.

NPW practice document. “Tenant responsible for monthly rent and utilities. Alterations require written owner approval. Building rules are incorporated by reference.”

What it establishes: Shows contract obligations stated in the lease summary.

What it cannot establish: Does not show every incorporated building rule or local housing law.

SOURCE B - City inspection notice

NPW fictional practice document. Use as case evidence, not as a real institution’s record.

NPW practice document. “Owner must correct blocked fire-egress condition by November 15. Reinspection scheduled.”

What it establishes: Shows a city-issued correction order and deadline.

What it cannot establish: Does not cancel the lease or resolve unrelated tenant disputes.

SOURCE C - Tenant petition

NPW fictional practice document. Use as case evidence, not as a real institution’s record.

NPW practice document. “We, 63 residents, demand 24-hour roof access and lower parking fees.”

What it establishes: Shows residents’ demands and support signatures.

What it cannot establish: Does not itself change the lease, building rules, or city order.

SOURCE D - Building rule

NPW fictional practice document. Use as case evidence, not as a real institution’s record.

NPW practice document. “Roof closed 10 p.m.-7 a.m. due to noise/safety plan; requests for events require management approval.”

What it establishes: Shows the current building rule.

What it cannot establish: Does not show whether the rule complies with every applicable law or whether management will change it.

Part A - Check

1. Which source carries city-government authority in this set?
 - A. A
 - B. B
 - C. C
 - D. D
2. Does the petition automatically change roof hours?
 - A. Yes
 - B. No
 - C. Only if it has 50 signatures
 - D. Only on weekends
3. Which issue is covered by the city inspection notice?
 - A. Parking fees
 - B. Blocked fire egress
 - C. Roof-event approvals
 - D. Rent amount
4. Which documents would you compare before arguing that management violated its own contract?
 - A. Lease/building rules plus any relevant communication
 - B. Petition only
 - C. A social post
 - D. Inspection notice about a different issue only
5. What is the best next move if residents want roof hours changed?
 - A. Find who can amend the building rule, submit a specific request, and keep the petition as evidence of support
 - B. Assume the city inspection order changed roof hours
 - C. Stop paying rent without advice
 - D. Post everyone's lease online

Part B - Explain

Explain how contract, city enforcement, building rule, and petition differ in this scenario. Give one sentence for the role of each source.

Part C - Use it

Create a “What can actually change this?” decision map for roof hours. Include current rule, decision-maker, evidence of support, request, response record, and any legal/safety question that needs qualified review.

What changed?

What was your first interpretation? Which receipt changed or strengthened it? What question would you investigate next?

Educator answer key

EDUCATOR USE / KEEP SEPARATE FROM STUDENT COPIES

Use the keys to evaluate source use and scope. Equivalent answers can earn full credit. The learner's opinion of the institution or policy is not part of the score.

Four things to look for

Score each area from 0 to 3. A score of 0 means missing or unsupported work; 1 means partial or imprecise; 2 means accurate with a gap; 3 means accurate, supported, and clear. Use the case-specific model as an example, not a required script.

Accuracy and scope

The response matches the records and marks what remains unknown.

Evidence

The learner connects a claim to an appropriate receipt and explains why that receipt helps.

Authority and next step

The response identifies the actor who can clarify or decide the question and suggests an action within that actor's role.

Communication and revision

The product fits its audience, is understandable in the chosen format, and revises an earlier interpretation with a reason.

Key / Unit 1 Before you run with it

1. Correct answer: B. Source A identifies it as one scholarship.
2. Correct answer: C. The student-account estimate combines institutional charges and listed aid.
3. Correct answer: C. Source A says renewable if conditions are met; it is not unconditional.
4. Correct answer: A. A meaningful comparison requires comparable cost and aid data.
5. Correct answer: B. Aid may be applied to institutional charges before any refund exists.

Strong constructed/performance response: Strong responses separate award amount, renewal conditions, and student-account balance. They do not treat loans as discounts or assume a scholarship equals the full cost.

Score Part B and Part C with the master analytic rubric. Do not award or remove points for a learner's political, institutional, or personal preference. Score the quality of source use, reasoning, authority/process understanding, scope, and communication.

Key / Unit 2 Read the fine print

1. Correct answer: B. The schedule contains recurring assigned tasks.
2. Correct answer: B. Source C says no single label/factor decides the issue.
3. Correct answer: B. The question seeks facts relevant to the actual relationship.
4. Correct answer: C. It accurately reflects the limits of the documents.
5. Correct answer: A. The paper trail matters for understanding the arrangement.

Strong constructed/performance response: Strong work compares stated learning goals with actual recurring duties, avoids making a legal conclusion from incomplete facts, and directs the learner to current official/qualified guidance for an individual situation.

Score Part B and Part C with the master analytic rubric. Do not award or remove points for a learner's political, institutional, or personal preference. Score the quality of source use, reasoning, authority/process understanding, scope, and communication.

Key / Unit 3 Find who's responsible

1. Correct answer: B. The checkout screen states the recurring billing term.
2. Correct answer: A. The public claim and affiliate terms are the relevant pair; specific enrollment still needs confirmation.
3. Correct answer: B. A bank statement establishes charges, not motives or affiliate status.
4. Correct answer: A. The service controls its subscription account and procedure.
5. Correct answer: B. It corrects the specific claim without overgeneralizing.

Strong constructed/performance response: Strong responses distinguish the recurring subscription contract from the creator's potential affiliate relationship and do not infer specific enrollment from general affiliate terms alone.

Score Part B and Part C with the master analytic rubric. Do not award or remove points for a learner's political, institutional, or personal preference. Score the quality of source use, reasoning, authority/process understanding, scope, and communication.

Key / Unit 4 Put it to the test

1. Correct answer: B. Source D identifies a verification problem.
2. Correct answer: B. The email calls it an editing hold, not a final ban.
3. Correct answer: B. Source B references a separate district policy.
4. Correct answer: C. The sources do not support an automatic legal conclusion.
5. Correct answer: A. Fixing the documented accuracy issue clarifies what dispute remains.

Strong constructed/performance response: Strong responses do not treat fact-checking and censorship as synonyms. They recognize the documented number problem while preserving the separate question of what authority/process governs any continued hold.

Score Part B and Part C with the master analytic rubric. Do not award or remove points for a learner's political, institutional, or personal preference. Score the quality of source use, reasoning, authority/process understanding, scope, and communication.

Key / Unit 5 Take it public

1. Correct answer: B. The inspection notice is city-issued.
2. Correct answer: B. A petition is a request, not the rule change itself.
3. Correct answer: B. Source B is specific to egress.
4. Correct answer: A. A contract question starts with the contract/rules and the specific conduct/communication.
5. Correct answer: A. The path follows authority and protects private records.

Strong constructed/performance response: Full-credit responses keep the egress order separate from the roof-access request, treat the petition as participation rather than authority, and identify management/contract processes as relevant to the building rule.

Score Part B and Part C with the master analytic rubric. Do not award or remove points for a learner's political, institutional, or personal preference. Score the quality of source use, reasoning, authority/process understanding, scope, and communication.