

# READioACTIVE™ — Systems Literacy Framework

Pilot Case Pack • Grades 6–8

## **Students will practice in one class period:**

- Identifying wording shifts
- Separating claims from evidence
- Recognizing incentive influence
- Proposing small, testable improvements

This pilot introduces a structured, repeatable method for teaching systems literacy without political framing or institutional blame. The framework emphasizes process clarity, evidence discipline, and redesign thinking.

## **This pack includes:**

- Case 001 — The Harbor Signal
- Structured comparison templates
- Evidence discipline tool
- Incentive mapping model
- Redesign protocol
- 2-page implementation guide

Version: 2026-02-26

# CASE 001 — The Harbor Signal

A contained case file from the town of Crescent Harbor.

Rowan Hale noticed the correction because she paid attention to how something was said, not just what was said.

It was the last ten minutes of class. The projector glowed at the front of the room.

“In 1984,” Mr. Delaney said, “a reported interference event near Crescent Harbor was determined to be environmental fluctuation. The matter was resolved within days.”

Rowan did not feel angry. She felt something slightly out of place — like a chair leg that does not sit flat.

She raised her hand.

“The public summary called it environmental,” she said. “But the original report labeled it unresolved.”

“That distinction is not necessary right now,” Mr. Delaney replied.

It was not an argument. It was a difference in wording.

After class, a new poster caught Rowan’s attention.

Misinformation & Media Literacy Policy — In Effect

Students are encouraged to rely on approved archival summaries when discussing civic events.

Rowan wrote one question in her notebook:

Who decides when uncertainty becomes environmental?

Two days later, a municipal relay log recorded a brief alignment at 06:33:12.

Two days after that, another appeared at 06:33:58.

Two data points are not a pattern. Rowan underlined that rule.

On day seven, the timestamp shifted to 06:34:02.

“East,” Avery said, marking the map.

“It’s drifting,” Rowan said.

That night, a federal advisory logged: transient alignment detected.

Two systems. Two words. Same timestamp.

Not a mystery.

A mismatch.

And mismatches are something you can test.

# Structured Templates

Printable tools for Case 001 and future case files.

## Template A — Compare Versions

Claim	Version A (exact wording)	Version B (exact wording)	Effect of change

## Template B — Evidence Log

Item	Source	Exact wording	What it shows	Supported / Unclear / Not supported

## Template C — Incentive Map

Person / Group	What they want	What they risk	Why wording might shift


**Template D – Redesign Proposal**

<b>Problem</b>	<b>Small change to test</b>	<b>Who benefits</b>	<b>Possible side effect</b>	<b>How to measure success</b>

# Implementation Guide

Case 001 • 35–50 minutes • Grades 6–8

Objective: Students compare wording, track evidence, and propose measurable improvements.

## Standards Alignment (General)

- Media literacy competencies
- Evidence-based reasoning
- Argument writing foundations
- Systems thinking
- Civil discourse norms

This framework teaches process literacy. It does not require political alignment and does not promote institutional distrust.

## Lesson Flow

- Warm start (5 min): Discuss how wording can change meaning.
- Read case excerpt (10–12 min).
- Complete Template A in pairs (10 min).
- Log evidence using Template B (10 min).
- Propose a small redesign using Template D (10 min).