

Claim inventory and assistance disclosure

Topic 11: verify one exact claim, preserve a traceable source trail, and explain a project without turning polish into proof. Most fields begin in class; use the LMS calendar for the exact deadline, time zone, late rule, and resubmission rule.

Name 	Date mm/dd/yyyy	Accepted routes HTML, LMS text, DOCX/export, five-page PDF, scanned paper, speech-to-text, projected/transcript evidence, or approved accessible equivalent.
----------------------------	--------------------------------------	--

Equal-credit starting points: own class-safe project, recreated project claim, supplied Study Sprint record, personal/projected Study Sprint run, or paper route. No Topic 10 packet, public URL, live web, AI account, Git history, resume, job application, or external certificate is required.

Directly observed You personally ran or observed the bounded artifact behavior.	Source-supported An identified source or supplied record supports the wording.	Inference A limited interpretation, labeled as such.	Unsupported Available evidence does not support it.
---	--	--	---

Blocked is a check condition, not a fifth claim status: name what could not be accessed/performed and the next check; keep the claim status calibrated to the evidence you do have, and do not upgrade it because a check was blocked. Use one or two specific sentences per box unless a prompt asks for a list or story.

Project and exact evidence route used Own artifact, supplied record only, personal/projected run, or approved route.	Exact claim before verification
Evidence currently available 	What this evidence does not establish
Initial claim status Choose a status	Final claim status after checks Choose a status
Material AI/person assistance: tool or person + type of help 	What I accepted, changed, rejected, and personally verified

Privacy boundary: your own name is allowed only in the header and is never draft-saved. Do not enter names inside evidence, private resumes, applications, contact details, grades, health/identity data, consent/assent records, private paths, account/device screens, full chats, restricted files, or unpublished peer work.

Build a traceable source trail.

Record what each source or artifact directly supports. A citation and an AI-use disclosure answer different questions; include both when both apply.

Citation/source record: where the information came from. Assistance disclosure: how a tool or person shaped your work and what you verified.

Trail field	Your record	Calibration check
Exact claim		One sentence; no hidden outcome claim.
Source identity		Author/organization, title, date/access date when live, type/route.
Exact support		Paraphrase what the source actually establishes.
Missing evidence		What the source/artifact cannot establish.
Additional check		Comparison, repeated run, instructor observation, or blocked reason.
Status + decision		Keep, narrow, remove, or investigate.

Revised exact claim

Limitation or next check

Blocked additional check: name what could not be accessed or performed and the next check. This can earn full credit. Keep the claim status calibrated to the evidence you do have; do not upgrade it because a check was blocked, and do not invent a title, author, year, statistic, quotation, test result, or access record.

Route-dependent Study Sprint baseline: record-only route → “the supplied record reports 2/20/3” is Source-supported. Personal/projected run → the bounded app behavior is Directly observed. The 35%/Qu & Lee (2025) claim is always Unsupported here. **Privacy-safe evidence unit:** a short input/action → output transcript, class-safe excerpt, or instructor-observed check inside this packet is enough; do not attach the private archive.

Leave, investigate, compare, return.

Lateral reading means leaving the original page or draft to investigate source identity and compare independent evidence before returning to the claim.

1 • LEAVE Pause the polished page or AI draft.	2 • INVESTIGATE Who is behind the source and why?	3 • COMPARE What does independent evidence say?	4 • RETURN What exact wording survives?	5 • RECORD Status, disclosure, and limit.
Original page/draft and claim 			Source identity, purpose, and relevant expertise 	
Independent source/card/artifact compared 			Agreement, difference, or conflict found 	
What I can now say 			What I must narrow, remove, or still investigate 	

Research-route decision

Question	Your answer	Status
Did the task need background knowledge, current web information, or multiple perspectives?		Not checked ▼
Did I inspect source identity and exact support rather than trusting a summary?		Not checked ▼
What remains uncertain after the comparison?		Not checked ▼

No-live-web route: use the course-owned synthetic source cards and identify them as supplied records. Full external lateral-reading lessons, paid assessments, and account-based courses are optional and never core-credit gates.

Map project evidence to a career lens.

Use one selected NACE competency (NACE is the National Association of Colleges and Employers) as an interpretation lens. A map can show relevant practice; it does not certify mastery, measured impact, employment readiness, or production deployment.

Communication Exchange information clearly for an audience and purpose.	Critical Thinking Analyze needs and make reasoned decisions.	Technology Use technology ethically and effectively for a task.	Career + Self-Development Reflect, seek feedback, and identify next growth.
Action I performed 		Inspectable artifact or record 	
Selected competency lens + why it fits 		Human judgment I retained 	
Material assistance and my review decision 		Limitation: what this does not prove 	

Credible project story • 90-130 words

Include purpose, action, evidence, human judgment, material assistance, and limitation. Do not include private contact or application details.

0 words • target 90-130; manual counting is acceptable in non-browser routes.

Evidence pattern: “I [action] to address [bounded purpose]. The [artifact/test/source trail] showed [specific evidence]. I personally [judgment or verification]. [Tool/person] assisted with [material help], and I [accepted/changed/rejected/checked]. This demonstrates practice relevant to [one lens], but it does not establish [limit].” Adapt the pattern; do not copy unsupported language.

Explain, protect privacy, and hand off to Topic 12.

Practice explanation through a partner, private writing, projected/transcript route, speech-to-text, or approved accessible equivalent. Public speaking and partner disclosure are not required.

1 • What exact problem and boundary did the project address? 	2 • Which artifact or source supports the strongest claim?
3 • What did I verify or reject, and what remains untested? 	Listener/self-review: strongest evidence + one claim to narrow

Privacy and submission check

☐ I used only class-safe evidence and removed private resumes, applications, contact details, grades, health/identity data, consent/assent records, private paths, account/device screens, full chats, restricted files, and unnecessary identity evidence.

☐ I separated source citation from assistance disclosure and named what I personally verified.

☐ I recorded an unavailable check as Blocked, left the claim status where the evidence puts it, and named the next check rather than guessing.

☐ My competency statement describes evidence-backed practice, not mastery, measured impact, job readiness, or deployment.

Topic 12 prompt-strategy handoff

Weak sentence that needs revision 	Evidence the next prompt must preserve 	
Non-invention/privacy boundary 	Human evaluation rule 	
Complete Traceable evidence supports the claim, disclosure, career map, limit, and handoff.	Developing Core work exists, but one evidence link or calibration decision is incomplete.	Incomplete Polish, access proof, or unsupported outcomes replace the required evidence trail.

Submission boundary: maximum five pages. Submit the packet—not full source archives, private underlying files, public identity proof, access screenshots, or complete AI chats.