

Evidence Under Cover

Construct an evaluation whose recommendation fits its evidence.

9.P.EICC.2.d "Interpret and construct texts to aid the analysis and evaluation of texts and ideas. (I/C)"

NAME _____

DATE _____

1 READ AND MARK _____ Read it twice

YOUR JOB Underline the immediate request and two supporting details. Circle a limitation of the count or survey. Box the competing spending priority. Explain how each affects the strength of a recommendation.

Evaluating a Covered-Walkway Proposal

A proposal, not a completed project

In this fictional Northgate High case, a student committee proposes a cover over the route between the bus loop and the main entrance. Members think shelter could make rainy arrivals easier, but they have not measured injuries, delays or whether a cover would resolve crowding. Their immediate request is permission to obtain detailed bids and an accessibility review.

Evidence and its scope

Across two rainy weeks, the committee logged 146 instances of students waiting in the open. The same student could appear on multiple mornings; this is not a count of 146 unique students. Of 210 surveyed bus riders, 143 reported wet notebooks or clothing at least once that semester, about 68%. A contractor supplied a preliminary \$38,000 estimate. These fictional details suggest a reason to investigate shelter, not proof of injury reduction or a final project price.

A competing priority

Some students prefer spending on classroom materials. The committee suggests investigating a facilities grant, but no grant is confirmed. A fair evaluation would compare needs, accessibility, costs and possible alternatives before deciding. The proposed bid process could improve the information available; it does not commit the school to construction.

2 ANSWER WITH EVIDENCE _____ Use the passage

1 What decision is requested now, and why is it narrower than building the walkway?

2 What do 146 and about 68% mean in this case?

3 How should the competing priority and unknown grant affect an evaluation?

3 YOUR TURN

Your own words

Construct an evaluation for the principal about this separate fictional study-room proposal: all 24 library seats were full during 31 of 40 observed lunch periods; 102 of 160 surveyed students said noise made independent work difficult; converting a storage room has a preliminary \$12,000 estimate; the robotics team uses it twice each week. Interpret what these details support and what they leave uncertain, then recommend a proportionate next decision.

1. Build an evidence map

Connect two details to a possible claim. For each, note a limitation. Include the robotics team's competing need and the cost uncertainty.

2. Write the evaluation

Develop a recommendation in paragraphs. Use the figures accurately, assess a limitation or alternative, and request an action that fits the evidence rather than promising an outcome.

3. Test your reasoning

Identify one claim in your draft that goes beyond a raw count. Explain what supports it and what evidence would change your recommendation.

PART 1 • READ AND MARK

Underline the immediate request and two supporting details. Circle a limitation of the count or survey. Box the competing spending priority. Explain how each affects the strength of a recommendation. Accept any marking that follows this job and points at the right text.

PART 2 • ANSWERS

#	QUESTION	ANSWER
1	What decision is requested now, and why is it narrower than building the walkway?	Permission to obtain detailed bids and an accessibility review. Costs, access and alternatives still need evaluation, and no grant or construction approval is confirmed.
2	What do 146 and about 68% mean in this case?	146 counts waiting instances across mornings, potentially including repeat students. About 68% is the rounded share of 143 out of 210 surveyed bus riders reporting wet materials or clothing; neither measures injuries.
3	How should the competing priority and unknown grant affect an evaluation?	Classroom materials are another use of resources and must be considered. An unconfirmed grant is a possible funding source, not money the school can assume it has. A recommendation should remain conditional.

PART 3 · YOUR TURN (SAMPLE ANSWER)

Evidence map

Full library seats in 31 of 40 observed periods suggest repeated demand, not that every student lacked a seat. Noise reports identify a concern among respondents, not proof that this room will solve it. The robotics schedule and preliminary cost are constraints on the proposal.

Recommendation

The school should investigate an additional quiet study space before deciding to convert the robotics storage room. All 24 library seats were occupied in 31 of 40 observed lunch periods, and 102 of 160 surveyed students reported difficulty working in noise. These details support examining options, although they do not show how many students would use this particular room.

Conversion has a preliminary \$12,000 estimate, and the robotics team uses the room twice each week. Ask for a plan comparing conversion with other available spaces, confirming costs and protecting the robotics team's needs. A shared schedule might be worth exploring, but its practicality has not been established.

Please request that comparison and student-use information before authorizing a conversion. If another suitable space meets the need with fewer conflicts, the recommendation should change. The goal is to evaluate a way to provide quiet study, not to defend one room regardless of the evidence.

Reasoning check

"Repeated demand" is an inference from frequent full occupancy, not a claim that everyone was turned away. Counts of unmet demand and likely use of each option would strengthen or change the recommendation.

TEACHER ASSESSMENT NOTES

Assess interpretation and construction of evaluative text, using accurate evidence and proportionate requests. 143/210 rounds to about 68%; waiting instances are not unique students. The study-room task uses a different fictional data set. Preserve competing needs and preliminary cost status. Look for developed reasoning that distinguishes observations from inferences and allows evidence to change the recommendation.