

Listening Changes Plans

Respond to contrasting views and refine a proposal through discussion.

CCSS.ELA-Literacy.SL.9-10.1d “Respond thoughtfully to diverse perspectives, summarize points of agreement and disagreement, and, when warranted, qualify or justify their own views and understanding and make new connections in light of the evidence and reasoning...”

NAME _____

DATE _____

1 READ AND MARK _____ Read it twice

YOUR JOB Read the fictional brief. Mark the shared goal, contrasting concerns and limits of the evidence. Use these to prepare for an actual discussion.

Cafeteria choices: waste, cost and access

- ① The student council must recommend whether to test reusable utensils. Alina and Ben both say the cafeteria should reduce unnecessary waste while giving every student enough time to eat. Alina supports reusable utensils because disposable ones become waste after one use. Ben worries about washing capacity and delays. Neither knows whether the current dishwashing system can handle the extra items. They agree that a decision should use local evidence.
- ② For this fictional exercise, the manager can offer a five-day trial at one lunch period, with reusable utensils collected separately. During a practice wash of forty extra utensils, staff needed four additional minutes. That practice did not include a full lunch service. The cafeteria serves two hundred students during the proposed trial period, but no trial has occurred. Do not treat a small practice as a prediction of the full workload or assume that every student will use a reusable utensil.
- ③ Discuss whether to recommend the trial and what safeguards or evidence it needs. You may favor it, oppose it or make support conditional. Respond to the strongest reasoning behind other views, not an exaggerated version. Summarize actual agreements and disagreements; ask peers to confirm your summary. Revise, qualify or justify your position when the evidence warrants it, and make a new connection between concerns. Agreement on a goal does not require agreement on a plan.

2 ANSWER WITH EVIDENCE Use the passage

1 What do Alina and Ben explicitly agree on, and what concern distinguishes their positions?

2 Why can the forty-utensil practice not establish the full trial workload?

3 After the discussion, explain one new connection you made between two concerns and the reasoning that led to it.

3 YOUR TURN Your own words

Work in groups of three or four, with a worksheet each. Complete every round so each learner summarizes, responds, and explains their final view. Do not merely read the passage aloud as a script.

1. Prepare your position

State your initial recommendation with one source detail, one limitation and a question for the group. Prepare a contrasting position fairly even if you disagree with it.

2. Discuss and check understanding

Opening round: everyone presents a view. Response round: each learner summarizes one agreement and one disagreement from the discussion, asks a peer to confirm or correct the summary, and responds to that peer's reasoning. If everyone agrees on the plan, test the contrasting position prepared in Stage 1 and label it a possible objection. Record your exchange with the peer's name.

3. Connect and qualify

In a final round, each learner states a final view, explains whether and why it changed, and connects two concerns using evidence or reasoning heard. A justified unchanged view is acceptable. Record your own final statement and the peer contribution that influenced it. Answer Question 3 last.

PART 1 • READ AND MARK

Read the fictional brief. Mark the shared goal, contrasting concerns and limits of the evidence. Use these to prepare for an actual discussion. Accept any marking that follows this job and points at the right text.

PART 2 • ANSWERS

#	QUESTION	ANSWER
1	What do Alina and Ben explicitly agree on, and what concern distinguishes their positions?	Both want less unnecessary waste, enough eating time and a decision based on local evidence. Alina emphasizes disposable waste; Ben emphasizes washing capacity and possible delays.
2	Why can the forty-utensil practice not establish the full trial workload?	It involved forty extra utensils outside a full lunch service; the proposed period serves two hundred students with unknown utensil uptake. Staffing and simultaneous tasks may differ.
3	After the discussion, explain one new connection you made between two concerns and the reasoning that led to it.	Accept a connection grounded in the actual discussion, such as linking washing delays to adoption: a system students avoid because of delays may not achieve the intended reduction in disposable waste.

PART 3 · YOUR TURN (SAMPLE ANSWER)

Illustrative response: "We both want less waste and enough time to eat, but I favor a trial while you think the washing limit should be tested first. Have I described your concern fairly?" After the peer confirms or corrects, the speaker addresses that actual concern.

Illustrative final position: "I still favor a limited trial, but I now want staff to check washing capacity first. Your point about the forty-utensil practice shows that we cannot assume it represents a full lunch. Washing delays connect to the waste goal: if delays lead students to choose disposables instead, the trial may fail to reduce waste. We should record utensil use, wash time and students' eating time before extending it."

These are possible exchanges, not a required consensus or a substitute for actual peer listening. A learner may reasonably oppose the trial or defend the original view with evidence.

Observe each learner responding thoughtfully, summarizing confirmed agreement/disagreement, and qualifying or justifying a view with new connections. If views converge, the explicit possible-objection route creates a fair reasoning contrast without inventing disagreement among named peers. Assess fidelity to what peers actually said and distinguish observation, inference and prediction. Do not require a changed opinion, exact sentence count or predetermined policy. The numbers and people are fictional.