

Shade Plan Decisions

Analyze how evidence and options shape a public recommendation.

11.P.EICC.2.e "Consume and produce texts in order to solve problems or influence decisions. (I/C)"

NAME _____

DATE _____

1 READ AND MARK _____ Read it twice

YOUR JOB This is a fictional school-board case; all local counts and costs are invented for analysis. Underline evidence supporting the proposal, circle the requested decision, and number responses to concerns about cost, timing or alternatives.

A Shade Plan for Bus Riders

- ① The fictional Student Transit Council reports that riders at four busy stops wait in direct sun for up to 25 minutes during August and September. In its case records, 121 of 146 surveyed riders reported no shaded waiting place. The school nurse recorded 18 heat-related visits involving students from those routes, although those records do not establish where the illnesses began. The council recommends shade canopies, beginning with the stops serving the most riders. Its case depends on several kinds of evidence, with different limits.
- ② For this case, facilities staff estimate \$8,000 per canopy, including installation: \$32,000 for four. The current budget contains \$20,000. The council proposes spending \$16,000 on two canopies now and seeking a \$16,000 grant for two more. The unused \$4,000 would remain in the budget. Earlier bus times might reduce some morning exposure, but would not provide shade during afternoon delays. Trees offer another possibility, yet new plantings need time and care. The phased proposal addresses an immediate need without assuming that the grant will arrive.
- ③ The council asks for a vote in May so staff can check suppliers, delivery dates and site requirements before summer. August completion is a target, not a confirmed promise. If the grant is not awarded, the board could reconsider the second stage in its next budget process. Meanwhile, staff would check whether the first two canopies actually shade waiting riders at pickup times. The requested decision is specific: approve \$16,000 for the first two canopies and authorize a separate \$16,000 grant application, subject to checking the estimates.

2 ANSWER WITH EVIDENCE _____ Use the passage

1 What specific decision does the Student Transit Council want the board to make?

2 Identify two pieces of evidence the council uses to show that riders need shade soon. Explain how each piece supports the recommendation.

3 Why does the passage discuss earlier bus times and planting trees? How does that comparison support the canopy plan?

4 How does the plan for an unawarded grant address a possible concern about spending?

3 YOUR TURN

Your own words

Write a 100–130-word recommendation to the board using this fictional case. Support, modify or reject the proposal. State a decision, connect two specific pieces of case evidence to it, address one cost, limit or alternative, and propose a realistic next step. Treat the case numbers as invented practice data, not facts about your school.

Write your board recommendation

Use the space below to complete the full task. Check the required elements before finishing.

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal blue or grey ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There are approximately 20 lines visible. The paper has a slight shadow on the right side, suggesting it's resting on a surface.

PART 1 • READ AND MARK

This is a fictional school-board case; all local counts and costs are invented for analysis. Underline evidence supporting the proposal, circle the requested decision, and number responses to concerns about cost, timing or alternatives. Accept any marking that follows this job and points at the right text.

PART 2 • ANSWERS

#	QUESTION	ANSWER
1	What specific decision does the Student Transit Council want the board to make?	Approve \$16,000 for two canopies and authorize a separate \$16,000 grant application for two more, subject to checking the estimates.
2	Identify two pieces of evidence the council uses to show that riders need shade soon. Explain how each piece supports the recommendation.	For example, waits up to 25 minutes show prolonged exposure, and 121 of 146 surveyed riders reporting no shade indicates a need among respondents. Nurse visits suggest concern but do not prove where illnesses began.
3	Why does the passage discuss earlier bus times and planting trees? How does that comparison support the canopy plan?	The comparison considers alternatives and their limits: earlier schedules do not create afternoon shade, while young trees require time and care. It supports canopies as an immediate, staged response.
4	How does the plan for an unawarded grant address a possible concern about spending?	The first stage costs \$16,000 of the available \$20,000. If the grant fails, the second stage returns to budget review rather than becoming an unsupported spending commitment.

PART 3 · YOUR TURN (SAMPLE ANSWER)

The board should approve \$16,000 for two canopies while authorizing the separate grant application. In this case, 121 of 146 surveyed riders reported no shaded waiting place, and waits can reach 25 minutes. Together, these details justify testing a practical improvement at the busiest stops. The nurse visits raise concern, but they do not prove that the bus stops caused every illness. Spending \$16,000 fits the current \$20,000 budget; the other two canopies should depend on confirmed funding. Before ordering, staff should verify costs, site requirements and delivery dates. After installation, they should check shade at actual pickup times and gather rider feedback before requesting the second stage.

All local counts, costs and organizations in the case are fictional teaching data. Accept different defensible recommendations if they meet the word range and use two case details with reasoning, a limitation and a next step. Cost check: $2 \times \$8,000 = \$16,000$; four total \$32,000. The unused \$4,000 is not a hidden project expense. Do not infer causation from nurse-visit counts or present a target date as a supplier guarantee.