

Substitute Guide: Synthesizing Across Sources

Course: English III (Grades 9–12) **Subject:** English Language Arts & Reading **Time:** ~50-min period or ~90-min block RLA

5-minute guide (plain language)

Students read **two** short original informational texts — **Text A** ("Let the Grass Go") and **Text B** ("Not So Fast") — that take **different angles** on one debatable, non-partisan question: *should cities replace public grass lawns with native, water-wise plants?* Students find each text's **central claim** and strongest **evidence**, mark where the texts **agree** and **disagree**, judge each source's **credibility**, and then write a short **synthesis response** that takes a position and supports it with evidence from **both** texts (Claim–Evidence–Reasoning). On a block period, they also address a **counterpoint**. **You do not need an English background to run this.** Everything students need — both full texts and the definitions of every term — is printed in their packet, and every question can be answered directly from those two texts. Hand out the packet, read the opening script, let students work independently in pencil, help by reading aloud and pointing to text and paragraph numbers (never by giving answers), and collect every packet at the end. The answer key is a separate file for the teacher only.

Standards alignment

Framework: 19 TAC §110.38 (English III).

- **Synthesizing sources:** synthesize information and ideas from multiple texts to build and support a position across sources.
- **Evaluating evidence & credibility:** evaluate the relevance, sufficiency, and credibility of evidence and its sources.
- **Composing an argument:** compose an argument that states a clear position and supports it with well-chosen evidence and reasoning, including a response to a counterpoint.

Provisional — pending educator verification against the current official TAC source.

(Standards are paraphrased here, not quoted. Please confirm codes and wording against your official source.)

Setup Before class (5 min)

- Count and hand out one **student packet** per student.
- Confirm each student has a **pencil**. No devices or other materials are needed.
- Write the date on the board and remind students to fill in the name line.
- Keep the **answer key** with you — it is a separate file and is **not** in the student packet.
- Check the plan: is this a **standard ~50-minute period** or a **~90-minute block**? (Pacing for both is below.)

Materials What's needed

- Printed student packet (5–6 pages) per student.
- Pencil per student.
- This guide and the separate answer key (teacher only).
- No technology, no calculator, no special materials.

Timing Standard period vs. block

On a ~**50-minute period**, do Q1–Q9 and ACE (skip Q10). On a ~**90-minute block**, add Q10 (address a counterpoint) and allow deeper work on Q5–Q9.

Segment	~50-min period	~90-min block	What students do
Start — Predict & warm up	5 min	7 min	Q1–Q2 (predict the two angles + synthesis-move match)
Build — Read both texts	14 min	18 min	Read Text A and Text B, word bank; Q3
Apply — Compare & evaluate	18 min	26 min	Q4–Q8 (claims, strongest evidence, agree/disagree, credibility, best-evidence choice)
Explain — Synthesis response	10 min	16 min	Q9 synthesis using both texts (C-E-R)
Explain (block) — Counterpoint	—	9 min	Q10 address and answer a counterpoint
Close — ACE	5 min	7 min	Articulate / Connect / Extend
Continue — early finishers	optional	optional	Sketch a "both/and" middle-ground plan

Script Read aloud to start

"Today's assignment is a reading and synthesis activity called *Synthesizing Across Sources*. You will work by yourself with just a pencil — no computers. First read **two** short informational texts about the same question: should cities replace public grass lawns with native, water-wise plants? *Text A* makes the case for the change; *Text B* raises cautions about doing it too fast. Your job is to find each text's main point and strongest evidence, notice where the two agree and where they disagree, decide which sources you trust more and why, and then take your **own** position — supporting it with evidence from **both** texts, not just one. Every question can be answered from the two texts, so if you're unsure, go back and reread. Answer in order; if one is tricky, skip it and come back. Write in complete sentences where it asks you to explain, and always name the text and paragraph you're using — like 'Text A, [2].' You may quietly read the texts aloud to yourself. Put your name, class period, and date at the top now. [On a block: You'll also answer a counterpoint in Question 10.] Raise your hand if you need a word read to you or explained."

Support When students ask for help

- **You may read any part aloud** — either text or any question — to a student or the class.
- If they are stuck, point them to the **text and paragraph numbers** (Text A [1]–[4], Text B [1]–[4]); every answer is in the two texts.
- Remind them: a **claim** is a text's main position; **synthesis** means combining *both* sources into a new position (not summarizing each); **credibility** is how trustworthy a source is (all defined in the packet word bank).
- For "which is more credible," prompt: "Who is speaking, what is their expertise, and is their claim backed by *tracked data* or just an impression?"
- For Q9, remind them to **synthesize, not summarize** — take a position and pull evidence from **both** texts, don't retell each text in turn. Encourage the printed **sentence stems**.
- Do **not** give answers; prompt with "Which text and paragraph shows that?" or "Does this point come from Text A, Text B, or both?"
- It is fine if a student cannot finish the optional early-finisher task, or Q10 on a short period.

Access Accommodations & language support

- **Read-aloud** of either text or any question is allowed for all students.
- Point students to the **sentence stems** and the **word bank** (definitions provided for all five terms).
- Extended time is fine; the core can stop after Q9 if time runs short.
- Students may answer in phrases if writing full sentences is a barrier, as long as the idea is clear and cites a text and paragraph.
- The packet is grayscale-safe — it prints and reads clearly in black and white.

Tools Allowed & not allowed

Allowed: pencil, the printed packet, quiet self-read-aloud. **Not needed / not allowed:** phones, computers, outside sources (everything is in the two texts).

Collect at the end: Collect every packet, whether finished or not, with names on them. Stack them for the teacher. Note on a sticky how far most students got, whether it was a period or a block, and any questions that caused confusion.

Answer key: The **answer key is a separate file** (answerkey.html) and is for the teacher only. Please do not hand it to students.

Teacher follow-up (for the returning teacher)

Watch for two common patterns: students *summarizing one source instead of synthesizing both* on Q9 (retelling Text A, then Text B, rather than weaving evidence from both into one position) and *using only the source they already agree with*. A quick next-day mini-lesson contrasting a two-paragraph summary with a single synthesized argument that cites both texts would reinforce this well. Q4 and Q5 show who can pull each text's claim and strongest evidence; Q6 and Q7 show who can map agreement/disagreement and weigh credibility; the Q9 response — and the Q10 counterpoint on block days — show who can build and defend a position across sources.

HS_ENG3_Synthesis_01 — Synthesizing Across Sources Substitute Guide

Synthesizing Across Sources

Course: English III (Grades 9–12) **Subject:** English Language Arts & Reading **Time:** ~50-min period, or a ~90-min block (adds a counterpoint paragraph + deeper analysis) **Work mode:** Independent · pencil only RLA

Start Here

This is a **reading and synthesis task**. You will read **two** short original informational texts — **Text A** and **Text B** — that take **different angles** on the **same debatable question**: *Should cities replace grass lawns on public land with native, water-wise plants?* Your job is not to pick which text is "nicer." It is to **synthesize**: find each text's **central claim** and strongest **evidence**, notice where the two texts **agree** and **disagree**, weigh how **credible** each is, and then build **your own position** using evidence from **both**. Work with a pencil only; you do **not** need a computer or any device. Every question can be answered **from the two texts** — the evidence is on the page. Write in complete sentences where asked, and always name the **text and paragraph** you are drawing from (for example, "Text A, [2]"). If a question is hard, skip it, keep going, and come back. Reading quietly aloud to yourself is encouraged.

Start Predict & Warm Up 5 min

Look only at the two titles below before you read the full texts.

1**Text A** is titled "**Let the Grass Go: The Case for Native Landscaping.**" **Text B** is titled "**Not So Fast: The Hidden Costs of Ripping Out the Lawn.**" From the titles alone, **predict** how these two texts will differ. Which one likely **favors** the change, and which one likely **raises doubts**?

2**Synthesis warm-up.** Match each move a reader makes to its name. Write the letter (A, B, or C) on each blank.

A. summarize — restate what *one* source says · **B. synthesize** — combine ideas from *two or more* sources into a new position · **C. evaluate credibility** — judge how trustworthy a source's evidence is

___ "Text A cites a city water utility's data, while Text B cites an unnamed blog, so I trust A's numbers more."

___ "Both texts agree water use matters, but they disagree about cost, so overall a phased approach makes sense."

___ "Text B says removal is expensive up front."

Build Read Both Texts 14 min

Words to know (for synthesizing across sources)

claim

the central position a text is trying to establish.

evidence

facts, data, examples, or expert statements a text uses to support its claim.

synthesis

combining ideas from two or more sources to build a new, supported position — not just summarizing each one.

credibility

how trustworthy a source is, based on its expertise, sourcing, and freedom from obvious bias.

counterpoint

a reasonable objection from the other side that a strong position must address.

Text A — "Let the Grass Go: The Case for Native Landscaping" — an original informational text

[1] Across the Southwest, cities plant thousands of acres of thirsty turf grass along medians, parks, and office lawns — green ribbons that few people ever walk on. A growing number of planners argue that public land like this should be replanted with **native, water-wise species** that evolved to survive local heat and drought. The core case is simple: on land the public already pays to maintain, native landscaping saves scarce water, cuts long-term cost, and supports local wildlife.

[2] The water savings are documented, not guessed. According to the Riverbend Municipal Water District's 2023 usage report, ornamental turf on city property consumed about 40% of all water the city used for landscaping, while covering less than a fifth of its green space. In the district's pilot medians, replacing turf with native plantings cut outdoor water use on those strips by roughly half within two years. A utility that measures its own pipes has little reason to inflate those numbers.

[3] Cost follows water. Native plantings need less mowing, fertilizer, and irrigation once established, so the ongoing maintenance bill drops even though the plants cost more to put in. Dr. Lena Ortiz, a landscape ecologist who has studied municipal conversions for over a decade, notes that "most cities recover their conversion costs in irrigation savings within five to eight years." Her estimate is based on tracked spending across multiple real conversions.

[4] There is also an ecological gain that turf cannot match: native plants feed native bees, butterflies, and birds that a mowed lawn starves. Supporters do not claim the change is free or instant. They argue that on public land the city already tends, the long-run savings outweigh the up-front cost — so cities should begin converting now.

Text B — "Not So Fast: The Hidden Costs of Ripping Out the Lawn" — an original informational text

[1] No one disputes that the Southwest is running short on water, and native plants clearly use less of it. But some city officials and residents warn that **tearing out public lawns too quickly can backfire**. Their central point is not that native landscaping is bad — it is that **a rushed, one-size-fits-all mandate ignores real costs** that fall unevenly on communities, and that cities should move carefully rather than all at once.

[2] Start with the up-front bill. A 2023 review by the Regional Parks Coalition found that full turf removal and native replanting cost between \$4 and \$8 per square foot — meaning a single mid-sized park could run into the hundreds of thousands of dollars before a single plant is watered. Cities with tight budgets, the review notes, often defer the work, leaving half-dead lawns that look worse than either option.

[3] Cost is not only about money. Maria Delgado, a parks director quoted in the same review, points out that "established native gardens need skilled weeding and pruning our crews aren't trained for, and in the first two years they can look bare and brown to residents who expected a green park." Neighborhoods with the least political pull, she adds, tend to wait longest for the follow-up care that makes conversions succeed — so the burden lands unevenly.

[4] Text B does not call for keeping every lawn. It argues that cities should convert **gradually**, budget for maintenance and training first, and let each neighborhood weigh in — rather than mandate removal everywhere at once. Done well, the writers say, the change can work; done in a hurry, it wastes money and public trust.

3Both texts accept one fact about the region. In one sentence, state the point that **Text A [1]** and **Text B [1]** both agree on. Answer using details from the texts.

Apply Compare & Evaluate the Sources 20 min

Every answer in this section is in the two texts. Name the text and paragraph in your head before you write (for example, "Text B, [2]").

4Identify each central claim. In one sentence each, state the **central claim** of Text A and of Text B — the position each text is really trying to establish.

Text A — central claim (paragraph #)

Text B — central claim (paragraph #)

5Find each strongest evidence. For each text, **copy the single strongest piece of evidence** (a fact, figure, or sourced statement) and name its paragraph.

Text A — strongest evidence + paragraph #

Text B — strongest evidence + paragraph #

6Agree / disagree. The two texts do not fully oppose each other. Name **one point they agree on** and **one point they disagree on**, citing a paragraph from **each** text for both.

Where they AGREE (cite Text A and Text B)

Where they DISAGREE (cite Text A and Text B)

7Evaluate credibility. Both texts use a named expert. Compare the **quality** of the evidence each expert offers — think about their expertise, whether their claim is backed by tracked data, and how relevant it is. Which text's expert evidence do you find **more credible**, and why? (A defensible case can be made for either.)

Text A's expert (Dr. Ortiz, [3]) — how credible?

Text B's expert (Maria Delgado, [3]) — how credible?

8Which single piece of evidence is strongest? Across **both** texts, which piece of evidence most strongly supports its own text's claim? Fill in the circle for ONE choice.

- Text A [4]: native plants feed native bees, butterflies, and birds that a mowed lawn starves.
- Text A [2]: the water district's 2023 report shows turf used about 40% of landscaping water on under a fifth of the green space, and native plants cut that use by about half.
- Text B [4]: done in a hurry, the change wastes money and public trust.
- Text B [1]: native plants clearly use less water.

8b. In one sentence, explain why the evidence you chose is stronger than the others.

Explain Synthesis Response 10–15 min

Question 9. Now **synthesize**. The question is: *Should cities replace grass lawns on public land with native, water-wise plants?* **Take a position** and support it with **evidence from BOTH texts** — not just the one you agree with. Do **not** summarize each text one at a time; weave them together into a single argument. Use the C-E-R frame below, and name the **text and paragraph** for each piece you cite.

Sentence stems you may use: "Cities should (convert / convert gradually / not convert) public lawns because..."
· "Text A shows ____ (Text A, ____), which supports my position because..." · "Even Text B, which raises doubts, provides ____ (Text B, ____), and this actually strengthens my view because..." · "Putting both sources together, the best answer is..."

Claim (your position on the question)

Evidence (at least one piece from Text A AND one from Text B, with text + paragraph #)

Reasoning (how the two pieces, combined, support your position)

Block period only (~90-min class): Address a counterpoint.

Question 10. A strong synthesis answers the other side. Identify one **counterpoint** — a reasonable objection to *your* position, drawn from whichever text argues against you — and then **respond** to it without ignoring it.

Name the text and paragraph your counterpoint comes from, state it fairly, and explain why your position still holds (or how it can be adjusted to account for the objection).

Close ACE Wrap-Up 5 min

Articulate

In one sentence, say **your own position** on the question in your own words, as if telling a friend where you landed.

Connect

Name **one piece of evidence from EACH text** (A and B) that you used, and point to the paragraph.

Extend

Name **one question you would still want answered** before a city decides — something neither text fully settles.

Continue Early Finisher optional

If you finish early (no new materials needed):

Write a "both/and" plan. On the back of this page, sketch a **middle-ground policy** that honors evidence from **both** texts — for example, where a city should convert first, how it should pay for maintenance, and how neighborhoods get a say. Cite at least one piece of evidence from Text A and one from Text B to justify a choice in your plan.

Turn in: Hand in this whole packet with your name, class period, and date filled in. Make sure questions 1–9 and the ACE box are answered. Question 10 (counterpoint) is for block periods; the early-finisher plan is optional — turn either in if you did it.

HS_ENG3_Synthesis_01 — Synthesizing Across Sources Student Packet



TEACHER ANSWER KEY FOLLOWS

Do not copy the pages after this divider for students.

Answer Key: Synthesizing Across Sources

Course: English III (Grades 9–12) **Subject:** English Language Arts & Reading **For teacher use only** RLA

How to use this key

Answers are grouped by section and question number. Many items are open-ended; accept any response that shows correct reasoning and cites the texts, even if the wording differs. Notes flag where more than one answer is defensible and list common misconceptions to watch for. References below use the bracketed markers [1]–[4] within **Text A** and **Text B**. Estimated grading time: ~6–8 min per packet.

Start Predict & Warm Up grade for effort · ~2 min

1 Predict how the two texts differ from their titles.

Text A ("Let the Grass Go") likely **favours** replacing lawns with native landscaping; **Text B** ("Not So Fast") likely **raises doubts / cautions** about doing it too quickly. Full credit for any prediction that assigns the pro-change angle to A and the cautionary angle to B. Accept close wording ("A is for it, B is worried about the costs").

2 Synthesis warm-up (match the reader's move).

"Text A cites a city water utility's data, while Text B cites an unnamed blog..." → **C (evaluate credibility)** — judging trustworthiness of sources.

"Both texts agree water use matters, but they disagree about cost, so... a phased approach makes sense." → **B (synthesize)** — combining both into a new position.

"Text B says removal is expensive up front." → **A (summarize)** — restating one source.

All three correct = full credit; grade for reasonable effort on this warm-up.

Build Read Both Texts ~1 min

3 Point both texts agree on ([1] of each).

Both texts accept that **the Southwest is short on water and that native plants use less of it**. Text A [1] frames native landscaping as a way to "save scarce water"; Text B [1] states plainly that "no one disputes that the Southwest is running short on water, and native plants clearly use less of it." Accept any answer naming the shared water-scarcity / native-plants-use-less-water point.

Apply Compare & Evaluate the Sources ~3 min

4 Identify each central claim.

Text A ([1], also [4]): cities **should replace public turf with native, water-wise plants now** because the long-run water, cost, and ecological benefits outweigh the up-front cost.

Text B ([1], also [4]): cities should **not rush a one-size-fits-all removal mandate**; they should convert **gradually**, budgeting for maintenance and letting neighborhoods weigh in, because a hurried change carries hidden costs.

Accept accurate restatements. **Note:** Text B's claim is *not* "keep every lawn" — it explicitly says it does not call for that ([4]); reject that misreading.

5 Strongest evidence in each text.

Text A ([2]): the Riverbend Municipal Water District's 2023 report — turf used ~40% of landscaping water on under a fifth of the green space, and native pilots cut outdoor water use ~half within two years. (Dr. Ortiz's 5–8-year payback in [3] is also acceptable as "strongest.")

Text B ([2]): the Regional Parks Coalition's 2023 review — full removal/replanting costs \$4–\$8 per square foot, running a mid-sized park into the hundreds of thousands of dollars. (Delgado's maintenance/equity point in [3] is also acceptable.)

Full credit for any sourced fact/figure correctly paired with its paragraph. Accept the expert-quote evidence as an alternative to the data figure in each text.

6 Agree / disagree.

Agree: both accept that water is scarce and native plants use less (Text A [1] / Text B [1]); both also accept that native conversion *can* work and is not inherently bad (Text A [4] / Text B [4]). Either shared point earns credit.

Disagree: chiefly on **pace and cost emphasis** — Text A ([3]–[4]) argues the savings justify converting **now**; Text B ([2]–[4]) stresses the high up-front cost and uneven burden and argues for converting **gradually** with budgeting and community input.

Full credit for one valid agreement and one valid disagreement, each citing a paragraph from **both** texts.

7 Evaluate credibility of the two experts.

A defensible case exists for **either**. **Dr. Ortiz (Text A [3])** is a landscape ecologist with 10+ years studying municipal conversions, and her 5–8-year payback claim is "based on tracked spending across multiple real conversions" — expertise plus data make her credible. **Maria Delgado (Text B [3])** is a parks director speaking from direct operational experience about crew training and equity; her testimony is credible on *implementation* but is more experiential/anecdotal than quantified.

Full credit for a judgment that weighs **expertise, sourcing (tracked data vs. impression), and relevance** — e.g., "Ortiz is more credible because her estimate rests on tracked data across many cities," OR "Delgado is credible because she has firsthand operational knowledge the data can't capture." Reject answers that pick a source only because they agree with its conclusion.

8 Which single piece of evidence is strongest?

8a — B. Text A [2]: the water district's 2023 report (turf ≈ 40% of landscaping water on under a fifth of the space; native pilots cut use ~half). It is specific, quantified, sourced to a body that measures its own pipes, and directly supports A's claim.

Why the others are weaker: **A** (native plants feed pollinators) is a real benefit but general and unquantified; **C** ("wastes money and public trust") is a conclusion/opinion, not evidence; **D** ("native plants clearly use less water") is a shared premise both texts grant, not distinctive support.

8b: Accept any sentence explaining that B is strongest because it is concrete, sourced, quantified data tied directly to its text's claim, while the others are general, opinion, or an agreed premise.

Explain Synthesis Response (Q9) ~2–3 min

9 Synthesis — take a position, support it with evidence from BOTH texts (C-E-R).

This is **synthesis, not summary**. A strong response states a position on the question and defends it using evidence from **both** Text A and Text B, woven together — not retold one text at a time. Any defensible position (convert, convert gradually, or do not convert) earns full credit if it is supported from both sources. **Model response:**

"Cities should replace public lawns with native plants, but **gradually**. Text A shows the payoff is real: the water district found turf used about 40% of landscaping water on under a fifth of the space, and native plants cut that use in half (Text A, [2]). That savings is too large to ignore. But Text B is right that the up-front cost is steep — \$4 to \$8 per square foot, and hundreds of thousands for one park (Text B, [2]) — and that rushed jobs land unevenly on neighborhoods without follow-up care (Text B, [3]). Putting both together, the best answer is to convert, but on a funded, phased schedule: the water and cost savings A documents justify acting, while B's evidence shows *how* to act so the benefit is real instead of a half-dead lawn."

Full credit for: (a) a clear **position** (the Claim), (b) **at least one piece of evidence from Text A AND one from Text B**, each cited by text and paragraph, and (c) **reasoning that combines them** to support the position. A response that summarizes each text in turn, or that uses only one text, has *not synthesized*; score it low on evidence/reasoning.

10 (**Block period only**) Address a counterpoint.

The response should (a) name a **counterpoint** from whichever text argues against the student's position, stated **fairly** and cited by text/paragraph, and (b) **respond** without dismissing it. **Model (for a "convert gradually" position):**

"A counterpoint from Text A [3]–[4] is that waiting costs money — Ortiz's data shows cities recover conversion costs in five to eight years, so delay just postpones the savings. That is fair. But my phased plan does not mean *never*; it means budgeting for the maintenance and training Text B [3] shows are missing, so conversions actually succeed instead of stalling into brown, half-finished parks. A slower start that finishes beats a fast start that fails."

Full credit for a fairly stated, correctly cited counterpoint **and** a reasoned response that either defends or adjusts the position. Reject responses that only restate the student's own side or that caricature the objection.

Synthesis scoring rubric (3 points, Q9)

Score	Claim (position on the question)	Evidence (from BOTH texts)	Reasoning & synthesis
3	Clear, defensible position on whether cities should convert.	At least one specific piece from Text A AND one from Text B, each cited by text + paragraph.	Weaves both sources into one argument, explaining how they combine to support the position — true synthesis.
2	Position present but vague or barely defended.	Evidence from both texts but one is weak, mislocated, or thin.	Some combining, but partly slips into summarizing each text separately.
1	No real position; mostly restates the texts.	Uses only one text, or evidence is vague/not from the texts.	Summary of one source; no synthesis.
0	No position / off-task.	No evidence.	No reasoning.

Close ACE ~1 min

ACE Articulate / Connect / Extend.

Articulate: accept any clear one-sentence statement of the student's own position (convert, convert gradually, or do not convert), consistent with their Q9.

Connect: credit requires **one piece of evidence from EACH text** (A and B) with paragraphs — e.g., the water-savings data (Text A [2]) and the cost figure (Text B [2]). A response naming evidence from only one text is incomplete here.

Extend: accept any reasonable open question neither text settles — e.g., "How much does upkeep actually cost after year two?", "Do residents in surveyed neighborhoods support it?", or "What happens to water bills long term?" More than one answer is defensible.

Watch Common misconceptions

- **Summary vs. synthesis.** On Q9, students often *retell Text A, then Text B* instead of building one position from both. Synthesis states a claim and weaves evidence from **both** sources to support it; summary just reports what each text says. Push for a stated position plus combined reasoning.
- **Using only one source.** Many students support their position using *only* the text they agree with. A synthesis must draw on **both** — including the one that pushes back — even to argue against it. Require a citation from A and from B.
- **"Which is more credible" = "which do I agree with."** On Q7, students often rate a source credible because they like its conclusion. Credibility depends on *expertise, sourcing (tracked data vs. impression), and relevance* — not on whether the reader shares the view.
- **Misreading Text B's claim.** Text B ([1], [4]) does *not* argue to keep every lawn; it argues for **gradual, funded, community-informed** conversion. Watch for students on Q4 casting B as simply "against native plants."
- **Evidence vs. conclusion.** On Q8, statements like "done in a hurry it wastes money and public trust" (choice C) are *conclusions*, not evidence. The sourced, quantified data (choice B) is the true evidence. Weigh sourcing and specificity, not how forceful a sentence sounds.

Teacher follow-up based on likely errors

If many students summarize instead of synthesize on Q9, run a 5-minute mini-lesson contrasting two summary sentences ("Text A says convert; Text B says be careful") with a single synthesized one ("Because A documents large water savings and B documents the up-front cost, the best move is a funded, phased conversion"). If credibility judgments on Q7 are shaky, sort the two experts aloud by expertise, sourcing, and relevance. The Q4, Q5, and Q8 items quickly reveal who can pull each text's claim and strongest evidence; the Q9 response — and, on block days, the Q10 counterpoint — show who can build and defend a position *across* sources.

HS_ENG3_Synthesis_01 — Synthesizing Across Sources Teacher Answer Key