

Standards with the work attached

Selected Common Core targets and course adaptations for the No, Pero Why? casebook.

These are independently designed practice tasks. Collect the work named for each target. A selected answer is not evidence of writing proficiency, and a solo voice note is not collaborative discussion. Use the exact grade standard and local course expectations.

Where it fits

English language arts, writing, journalism and communication are the strongest fit. Civics and sociology courses add appropriate disciplinary sources. Honors is a locally defined extension. Pre-AP, AP and IB routes practice selected skills without replacing official course requirements.

Program	What changes
Common Core	Exact grade-level source analysis, writing and discussion evidence.
Pre-AP English 1 and 2	Close noticing and a developed paragraph in English 1. Sustained source comparison and analysis in English 2.
AP English Language	Rhetorical analysis or sourced argument, defensible thesis, commentary, counterargument and qualification.
IB MYP	Analysing, organizing, producing text and using language, using the teacher's MYP year descriptors.
IB DP	Guided nonliterary textual analysis. The task is not an assessed individual oral or literary Paper 2.
Honors	Independent corroboration, competing explanations, transfer and a revision condition.

Grade targets and collected evidence

Grade 6

RI.6.1, RI.6.8, W.6.2, W.6.1.b, SL.6.1.c, SL.6.1.d

Mark claim versus source fact; cite the omitted line; explain the correction and give a reason for the repair.

Grade 7

RI.7.1, RI.7.8, RI.7.9, W.7.1.a, W.7.1.b, SL.7.1.c, SL.7.1.d

Use several details, compare authors' emphasis and acknowledge a plausible alternative reading.

Grade 8

RI.8.1, RI.8.8, RI.8.9, W.8.1.a, W.8.1.b, W.8.1.c, SL.8.1.c, SL.8.1.d

Select strongest evidence; locate exact disagreement; distinguish a mistaken factual claim from interpretation.

Grade 9-10

RI.9-10.1, RI.9-10.6, RI.9-10.8, W.9-10.1.a, W.9-10.1.b, SL.9-10.1.c, SL.9-10.1.d

Analyze caption rhetoric, test the inference and defend a proportionate response against a fair counterclaim.

Grade 11-12

RI.11-12.1, RI.11-12.7, W.11-12.1.a, W.11-12.1.b, SL.11-12.1.c, SL.11-12.1.d

Integrate text and timeline/visual record; identify missing evidence and explain which uncertainty affects the recommendation.

Revision and discussion travel with the product

Keep the annotated record, first draft, peer question or discussion observation, and revision. Apply matching W.4/W.5 only when audience-fit writing and revision are actually collected. A planned target is not a claim of attained mastery.



Course variations

Pre-AP English 1 / 2

E1: close annotation of crop, caption and two pivotal word choices, then one analytical paragraph and correction. E2: a multi-paragraph analysis comparing emphasis across three sources and a revision memo.

Look for: Every meaning claim points to wording/layout; commentary explains the effect rather than naming a device; correction preserves scope; E2 integrates rather than lists sources.

AP English Language

Rhetorical analysis of how caption and omission invite a conclusion, followed by two audience-specific corrections and a defensible rationale.

Look for: Situates audience/purpose; explains two choices with textual evidence; commentary links choice to likely effect; qualification distinguishes likely response from proven impact. Skills 1.A, 2.B, 3.A, 4.C, 6.A, 7.A, 8.A.

IB

MYP: compare post/original (A), organize an evidence note (B), create correction (C), adapt register (D). DP Lang/Lit: guided textual analysis of the post's wording, image/crop and layout.

Look for: MYP: supported comparison and intentional audience choices. DP Paper 1 practice: interpreted meaning with references (A), evaluated authorial choices (B), focused argument (C), clear analytical language (D).

Honors

Independently corroborated evidence dossier plus two plausible interpretations, a correction policy and a revision-trigger note.

Look for: Traceable independent source; tests strongest rival interpretation; separates uncertainty from indecision; repair policy is feasible and proportional.



Grade targets and collected evidence

Grade 6

RI.6.1, RI.6.7, W.6.2, W.6.1.b, SL.6.1.c, SL.6.1.d

Identify the circuit goal and at least one format barrier with source details; explain why the proposed response still tests the goal.

Grade 7

RI.7.1, RI.7.8, W.7.1.a, W.7.1.b, SL.7.1.c, SL.7.1.d

Use several observations, acknowledge another explanation for the mismatch and justify a next information-gathering step.

Grade 8

RI.8.1, RI.8.7, W.8.1.a, W.8.1.b, W.8.1.c, SL.8.1.c, SL.8.1.d

Compare benefits and limits of written, spoken and diagrammed demonstrations without claiming one always works best.

Grade 9-10

RI.9-10.1, RI.9-10.8, W.9-10.1.a, W.9-10.1.b, SL.9-10.1.c, SL.9-10.1.d

Evaluate the claim that one poor response proves lack of knowledge; compare a supported redesign and a fair objection.

Grade 11-12

RI.11-12.1, RI.11-12.7, W.11-12.1.a, W.11-12.1.b, SL.11-12.1.c, SL.11-12.1.d

Integrate performance records and regulation; distinguish design judgment from IDEA evaluation requirements and identify unresolved facts.

Revision and discussion travel with the product

Keep the annotated record, first draft, peer question or discussion observation, and revision. Apply matching W.4/W.5 only when audience-fit writing and revision are actually collected. A planned target is not a claim of attained mastery.



Course variations

Pre-AP English 1 / 2

E1: unpack a dense task sentence, compare it with oral evidence, explain a redesign in one evidence paragraph. E2: synthesize task/performance/regulation in a recommendation with a counterclaim and revision note.

Look for: Sentence/format analysis tied to evidence; explanation does not lower the goal; E2 treats the regulation's scope accurately and answers a real objection.

AP English Language

Analyze how the assignment and a policy explainer construct competence, then write a qualified argument for a design response using all three evidence types.

Look for: Identifies audience assumptions; develops a defensible claim, not a diagnosis; synthesizes records/regulation; commentary evaluates rival explanation. Skills 1.B, 2.B, 3.A, 4.B-C, 6.A, 8.B.

IB

MYP: compare task/transcript and create an accessible explainer with design commentary. DP Lang/Lit: guided analysis of how task/policy language positions its reader; supporting source note on legal scope.

Look for: MYP A-D: source-based comparison, organized rationale, purposeful text, accurate register. DP A-D: interprets reader positioning; evaluates language/structure; sustains textual focus; avoids turning analysis into a medical/legal conclusion.

Honors

Mini assessment-design brief specifying construct, possible confounds, two equivalent demonstrations and evidence that would challenge the preferred redesign.

Look for: Operational definition of the goal; comparisons preserve demands; limitations acknowledged; no causal claim from one performance; no diagnosis.



Grade targets and collected evidence

Grade 6

RI.6.1, RI.6.8, W.6.2, W.6.1.b, SL.6.1.c, SL.6.1.d

Cite the log entry that contradicts the recap; separate group label from verified action; support a repair choice.

Grade 7

RI.7.1, RI.7.8, RI.7.9, W.7.1.a, W.7.1.b, SL.7.1.c, SL.7.1.d

Compare several details across accounts and acknowledge an alternative explanation without excusing the unsupported allegation.

Grade 8

RI.8.1, RI.8.8, RI.8.9, W.8.1.a, W.8.1.b, W.8.1.c, SL.8.1.c, SL.8.1.d

Locate factual conflict; reject irrelevant group generalization; distinguish correction from an unproven claim about intent.

Grade 9-10

RI.9-10.1, RI.9-10.6, RI.9-10.8, W.9-10.1.a, W.9-10.1.b, SL.9-10.1.c, SL.9-10.1.d

Analyze wording and causal reasoning; justify a repair plan that addresses affected audiences and counterarguments.

Grade 11-12

RI.11-12.1, RI.11-12.7, W.11-12.1.a, W.11-12.1.b, SL.11-12.1.c, SL.11-12.1.d

Reconcile record/account discrepancies, preserve unresolved uncertainty and distinguish sufficient grounds for correction from proof of intent.

Revision and discussion travel with the product

Keep the annotated record, first draft, peer question or discussion observation, and revision. Apply matching W.4/W.5 only when audience-fit writing and revision are actually collected. A planned target is not a claim of attained mastery.



Course variations

Pre-AP English 1 / 2

E1: annotate verbs/group labels and write an evidence-based correction paragraph. E2: compare recap/log/account, produce analysis and rewrite for two audiences.

Look for: Explains how diction assigns responsibility; cites precise entries; distinguishes chronology from causation; audience changes do not change facts.

AP English Language

Analyze the recap's causal reasoning and group framing; compose a public correction plus private repair proposal and commentary on rhetorical choices.

Look for: Defensible thesis; evidence-to-claim commentary; addresses counterargument; demonstrates audience awareness without evasive wording. Skills 1.B, 2.B, 3.A/C, 4.C, 5.A, 6.A, 7.A, 8.A.

IB

MYP: supported comparison, organized correction, original repair message and register reflection. DP Lang/Lit: focused textual analysis of how diction, quotation and sequencing construct responsibility.

Look for: MYP A-D: justified perspective, coherent references, purposeful new text, audience-fit language. DP A-D: supported interpretation; evaluates authorial construction of blame; coherent focus; precise language.

Honors

Competing-cause audit, source-reliability memo, correction/repair protocol and criteria for evaluating whether the repair reached affected participants.

Look for: Tests a rival cause; weighs each source's limits; separates intent/impact/responsibility; defines checkable follow-up without claiming guaranteed trust.



Grade targets and collected evidence

Grade 6

RI.6.1, RI.6.7, RI.6.8, W.6.1.a, W.6.1.b, SL.6.1.c, SL.6.1.d

Connect budget figures to each option and support a recommendation with a calculation and textual detail.

Grade 7

RI.7.1, RI.7.8, RI.7.9, W.7.1.a, W.7.1.b, SL.7.1.c, SL.7.1.d

Compare stakeholder emphases, test sufficiency of evidence and acknowledge an opposing option.

Grade 8

RI.8.1, RI.8.8, W.8.1.a, W.8.1.b, W.8.1.c, SL.8.1.c, SL.8.1.d

Select strongest evidence, reject non-comparable totals, connect an access claim to a budget choice and distinguish a counterclaim.

Grade 9-10

RI.9-10.1, RI.9-10.8, W.9-10.1.a, W.9-10.1.b, SL.9-10.1.c, SL.9-10.1.d

Assess a proposed causal claim, compare costs and limitations fairly and anticipate the board's practical concerns.

Grade 11-12

RI.11-12.1, RI.11-12.7, W.11-12.1.a, W.11-12.1.b, SL.11-12.1.c, SL.11-12.1.d

Synthesize numerical/textual records, test one changed assumption, qualify the recommendation and specify what new data could reverse it.

Revision and discussion travel with the product

Keep the annotated record, first draft, peer question or discussion observation, and revision. Apply matching W.4/W.5 only when audience-fit writing and revision are actually collected. A planned target is not a claim of attained mastery.



Course variations

Pre-AP English 1 / 2

E1: annotate proposal language and budget labels; write a claim-evidence-commentary paragraph. E2: synthesize budget and stakeholder comments into a cohesive argument with a fair counterclaim.

Look for: Figures interpreted accurately; commentary connects cost/access; distinguishes stakeholders' priorities from established effects; conclusion follows the argument.

AP English Language

Synthesis argument recommending one option or amendment, using budget and competing perspectives; revise into a concise board comment.

Look for: Thesis takes a defensible position; sources interact in reasoning; fair counterargument; qualification reflects the budget's limitations; audience-focused revision. Skills 2.B, 3.A/C, 4.A-C, 6.A-C, 8.A.

IB

MYP: compare proposal/budget/comment, organize an options note and create a public comment. DP Lang/Lit: analyze how the proposal's wording, visual hierarchy and data display frame access/fairness; optional separate comment.

Look for: MYP A-D: evidence-based comparison, source organization, audience-conscious text and precise terms. DP A-D: interpretation supported by exact design/text details; evaluates how form constructs the issue; focused structure; effective analytical register.

Honors

Decision memo with explicit criteria, a budget sensitivity check, distributional effects, strongest opposing option and a monitoring/revision plan.

Look for: Reproducible comparison; justified criteria; changed-assumption test; identifies who benefits/bears cost; conditional recommendation and measurable follow-up.



The wider case collection

Each case has exact grade codes, task prompts and six course routes at /curriculum/alignment/. Archive practice requires the additional submitted work shown there. Source-based explanation, written revision and observed discussion are the baseline, with argument demands added explicitly.

Your first paycheck has a few surprises.

An annotated fictional pay statement with reproducible arithmetic and a source note separating categories from actual rates.

Your parents can pay tuition. What can they see?

A rule/process comparison citing the federal source and the university guide separately.

Who decides what stays on the shelf?

A source trail from an invented shelf-access concern to the policy, decision-maker and a precise records question.

Is it a recommendation or an ad?

A before/after invented sponsored post annotated against official disclosure guidance.

Your ballot is more local than your feed.

A dated source guide recording jurisdiction, office, official url and facts still needing a check.

A city you can actually reach

A labeled fictional route map with evidence, barriers and questions at every stage.

Same work. Different pay. Why?

An invented comparison table distinguishing known facts, missing comparators and questions for an appropriate source.

A protest is not one legal question

A comparison of source facts, legal holding, scenario facts and limits of the analogy.



The wider case collection

Each case has exact grade codes, task prompts and six course routes at /curriculum/alignment/. Archive practice requires the additional submitted work shown there. Source-based explanation, written revision and observed discussion are the baseline, with argument demands added explicitly.

Before it reaches the bin

An event-options table citing the epa source, stating a recommendation and showing how its effect would be checked.

Credit is not the whole copyright answer

An original remix plan with source-based rationale, uncertainty and an alternative that obtains permission.

Internship, or someone's unpaid job?

An annotated invented offer and prioritized questions tied to the relevant source framework.

'It's our policy' is not the end

An annotated invented restriction, official-source note and precise question about the rule.

A good choice for whom?

A comparison assigning ten places under two approaches with declared criteria and a supported recommendation.

Follow the school money

A reproducible fictional budget comparison with denominators, source labels and a limits statement.

Give your comment a destination

An annotated fictional proposal and a written comment linking the requested change to evidence.

Looks real. What proves it?

An evidence note that separates verified records from visual impressions and identifies a revision trigger.



Official frameworks and boundaries

Common Core ELA Literacy

Selected grade-specific reading, writing and discussion targets. The crosswalk names the work needed to assess them.

<https://www.thecorestandards.org/ELA-Literacy/>

College Board AP and Pre-AP

Selected course-skill extensions. Not official tasks, score predictions or authorized-course claims.

<https://apcentral.collegeboard.org/courses/ap-english-language-and-composition>

IB Language and Literature

MYP and DP use different descriptors. DP extension is textual-analysis practice, not an assessed IO or Paper 2.

<https://ibo.org/programmes/middle-years-programme/curriculum/language-and-literature/>

Pre-AP English 1 guide

Pre-AP English 2 guide

IB DP Language and Literature

Three alignment boundaries

Upper-band Common Core historical-document standards require qualifying texts. The fictional room proposal does not meet that requirement. Media-comparison standards vary by grade. Two screenshots do not automatically establish a cross-medium comparison. Oral rehearsal can support writing, but does not itself meet a writing target.

