

One Report, Two Paths

Compare how opposing writers shape the same evidence.

ELA.10.R.2.4 "Compare the development of two opposing arguments on the same topic, evaluating the effectiveness and validity of the claims and analyzing the ways in which the authors use the same information to achieve different ends."

NAME _____

DATE _____

1 READ AND MARK _____ Read it twice

YOUR JOB In paragraphs 2 and 3, underline each writer's recommendation and circle how each uses the 38-second delay. Write B or O beside the corresponding argument.

The Market Street Pilot - Fictional Report and Arguments

- ① Riverton's fictional six-month pilot replaced one car lane with a protected bicycle lane. Its simulated report compares April-September with the same months one year earlier: average weekday bicycle trips rose from 420 to 610, and the average afternoon car trip across eight blocks took 38 seconds longer. Reported crashes declined from 14 to 9. The report counts bicycle trips, not distinct riders, and does not establish what caused the changes. It contains no winter observations or long-term sales figures. The council must decide whether to make the lane permanent or extend the trial.
- ② Council member Dana Bell favors making the lane permanent. Bell begins with the rise in bicycle trips, arguing that the street now serves more bicycle travel. Bell then points to the crash decline as encouraging, while acknowledging that the report alone cannot prove the lane caused it. To Bell, an extra 38 seconds across eight blocks is a modest trade-off for the apparent gains. Bell proposes adjusting traffic lights to reduce delays and reviewing safety after another year. The argument moves from access to safety, then answers the concern about slower car trips.

- ③ Business owner Leo Ortiz favors extending the pilot before making a permanent decision. Ortiz accepts the numbers but questions their reach: more trips may include the same riders or travel shifted from nearby streets. The 38-second average, Ortiz argues, does not reveal whether delivery hours experienced longer delays. Ortiz also notes that five fewer crashes in one comparison does not settle long-term safety. Winter use and sales remain unknown. By testing each conclusion against missing information, Ortiz argues that the same report justifies more observation, not permanence. Neither writer claims the delay figure itself is false.

2 ANSWER WITH EVIDENCE Use the passage

- ① Trace how each argument develops from its recommendation through evidence and reasoning to a response or next step.

- ② How do Bell and Ortiz use the same 38-second figure toward opposing ends?

- ③ Identify two limitations of the report and explain how each limits a conclusion a reader might draw.

- 4

For an audience most concerned about safety, which argument is more persuasive? Separately, judge whether its safety reasoning is justified by the report.
-

3

YOUR TURN

_____ Your own words

Write a 100-130 word memo recommending permanence or an extended trial. Use two numerical facts, compare how both writers use one shared fact, and distinguish persuasive effect from what the evidence proves.

Decision memo

Name your recommendation and address the opposing reasoning fairly. Explain one report limitation and a useful next step. Keep the numbers accurate; write in your own words.

PART 1 • READ AND MARK

In paragraphs 2 and 3, underline each writer's recommendation and circle how each uses the 38-second delay. Write B or O beside the corresponding argument. Accept any marking that follows this job and points at the right text.

PART 2 • ANSWERS

#	QUESTION	ANSWER
1	Trace how each argument develops from its recommendation through evidence and reasoning to a response or next step.	Bell recommends permanence, links trip growth and fewer crashes to gains, weighs the delay as modest, then proposes signal adjustments and review. Ortiz recommends extension, questions what the shared numbers establish, identifies missing context, and seeks more observation.
2	How do Bell and Ortiz use the same 38-second figure toward opposing ends?	Bell frames it as a modest trade-off supporting permanence. Ortiz focuses on what the average hides about delivery hours, supporting a longer trial.
3	Identify two limitations of the report and explain how each limits a conclusion a reader might draw.	Accept any two explained limits: trips are not distinct riders; before/after counts do not establish causation; crash numbers alone do not settle long-term safety; no winter data limits year-round claims; no long-term sales data limits business-impact claims; mean delay hides time-specific differences.
4	For an audience most concerned about safety, which argument is more persuasive? Separately, judge whether its safety reasoning is justified by the report.	Either with evidence: Bell emphasizes a promising crash decline but fairly limits causation; Ortiz stresses uncertainty from one comparison. Persuasive emphasis is not proof: neither can infer a lasting causal safety effect from these counts alone.

PART 3 · YOUR TURN (SAMPLE ANSWER)

The council should extend the trial before making the lane permanent. Bicycle trips rose from 420 to 610, an encouraging sign, but the count does not show how many distinct riders benefited. Both writers accept the 38-second delay: Bell calls it a modest trade-off, while Ortiz asks whether delivery hours suffered more. Bell's positive framing may persuade residents eager for change, yet an overall average cannot resolve Ortiz's question. Similarly, the crash decline is promising without proving a lasting safety effect. The extension should collect winter observations and delays by time of day, so the council can judge benefits and costs using more complete information.

All Riverton data and speakers are fictional instructional material. Accept either recommendation with accurate shared evidence and justified analysis. For Q3 accept any two valid limits with their implications, not an obligatory list of every omission. Assess development, effectiveness, and validity separately.