

Write, Return, Revise

Complete a quick update and a longer researched proposal.

CCSS.ELA-Literacy.W.11-12.10 "Write routinely over extended time frames (time for research, reflection, and revision) and shorter time frames (a single sitting or a day or two) for a range of tasks, purposes, and audiences."

NAME _____

DATE _____

1 READ AND MARK _____ Read it twice

YOUR JOB Read this fictional example. Underline actions in the longer writing project; circle actions completed for the short task. Star one choice that addresses a specific reader's need. If an action serves both projects, use both marks. Then use a dated writing cycle of your own.

Maya Uses Two Schedules

- ① Maya needed two pieces about a crowded school library. In one sitting, she wrote an update telling students where to study that afternoon. She checked the room information with the librarian, drafted a clear opening, and corrected a confusing sentence. Her immediate purpose was to help students find a place to work.
- ② For a longer proposal to the principal, Maya returned on several dates. She read the library's seating log and collected student comments. The log showed when tables were full; the comments described different needs. She noted that a few comments could not represent everyone, then drafted a recommendation for a quiet-area trial.
- ③ Before revising, Maya asked a classmate to read from the principal's viewpoint. The reader wanted a way to judge the trial. On a later day, Maya added a comparison of seating tallies before and during the trial. Her final proposal addressed a decision-maker's concern, while her brief update focused on students' immediate need.

2 ANSWER WITH EVIDENCE _____ Use the passage

- ① How did the two pieces differ in audience and purpose?

2 Name one accuracy check for the update and one evidence limitation for the proposal.

3 What changed after feedback, and how did that change help the proposal's reader?

3 YOUR TURN _____ Your own words

Choose a real school issue. Write a 45-60-word update for students in one sitting. Over at least three separate days, research, draft and revise a 250-300-word proposal for a school decision-maker. Use the dated stages below and submit both versions. Repeat this cycle later for a different purpose and audience.

1. One sitting: student update

Record the date and start/finish time. Write 45-60 words for students; exclude the heading from the count. Make immediate information clear. Check a detail and edit once before stopping.

2. Day 1: research and reflect

Gather two actual sources: documents, interviews or observations. For each, record creator, title or topic, date, location or URL, and a finding. Explain one limitation. Date this work and set your next work date. Attach extra notes if needed; do not invent research.

3. Day 2 or later: first draft

Date this session. Draft 250-300 words in several paragraphs for a named school decision-maker. Explain the issue, attribute both sources, and consider a concern about your recommendation. Keep this version. Return on a later day to reconsider your evidence and audience.

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There are no margins, text, or other markings on the paper.

4. Day 3 or later: revised proposal

Date this later session. Reread sources and draft; seek feedback or evaluate from the reader's viewpoint. Write the complete revised 250-300-word proposal. Below it, add two reflection sentences: identify a substantive change and compare this process with the one-sitting task. Submit all five products.

[illegible]

PART 1 • READ AND MARK

Read this fictional example. Underline actions in the longer writing project; circle actions completed for the short task. Star one choice that addresses a specific reader's need. If an action serves both projects, use both marks. Then use a dated writing cycle of your own. Accept any marking that follows this job and points at the right text.

PART 2 • ANSWERS

#	QUESTION	ANSWER
1	How did the two pieces differ in audience and purpose?	The update helped students find a place to study that afternoon. The proposal asked the principal to consider a quiet-area trial.
2	Name one accuracy check for the update and one evidence limitation for the proposal.	She checked room information with the librarian. She recognized that a few student comments could not represent everyone.
3	What changed after feedback, and how did that change help the proposal's reader?	She added a comparison of seating tallies before and during the trial, giving the principal a way to judge it.

PART 3 • YOUR TURN (SAMPLE ANSWER)

Teacher model: Invented case records; students use actual sources and submit full drafts. The model draft is an excerpt.

Update (52 words; Monday, 12:10-12:25): The library will host a student discussion about quiet study space on Thursday at lunch. Meet beside the circulation desk and bring one example of when you needed a quieter place to work. We will collect suggestions for a short trial and share them with the librarian before any change is made.

Monday research: Case A, librarian's six-day log: all four reference-area tables full on four days; quiet requested on three. Case B, next week's three comments: two request quiet, one group space. Limits: repeat requests possible; comments are not representative. Return Wednesday.

Wednesday draft excerpt: Everyone wants silence. Make four tables permanently quiet. Three comments prove this will work; group projects can go elsewhere.

Revised proposal (Friday): Our library should test a quiet study area for two weeks before making a permanent change. Students need places for both conversation and concentrated work. A limited trial would let the librarian compare those needs without assuming that one arrangement serves everyone. I recommend using the four tables nearest the reference shelves during lunch, while keeping the entrance tables available for group work.

Two classroom case records support trying this arrangement. In the librarian's six-day log, every reference-area table was occupied at lunch on four days, and students asked for quieter seating on three days. These observations suggest demand, but they do not show whether the same students made repeated requests. In three student comments collected the following week, two writers wanted quiet space and one needed room for a group project. Those comments identify competing needs; three comments cannot represent the whole school.

A reasonable concern is that a quiet area could displace useful conversation. Keeping a separate group area addresses that concern, but the trial should also record whether either area becomes full. The librarian could post temporary signs and tally occupied tables in each area at the same time each lunch. Students could leave a brief comment about whether they found suitable seating. Before the trial, the librarian should confirm that the arrangement fits existing supervision and access requirements.

At the end of two weeks, compare the tallies and comments with the original log. Keep, adjust, or end the arrangement based on that evidence. This proposal asks for a reversible test, not a claim that quiet seating will solve every student's difficulty.

Separate reflection: I replaced an unsupported claim with qualified evidence and an evaluated trial. Returning later helped me consider competing needs; the update needed immediate information and a quick check.

TEACHER ASSESSMENT NOTES

For the star, accept checking room information for students or adding a tally comparison for the principal. Require a 45-60-word update, two actual attributable sources, complete 250-300-word first and revised drafts, dates across at least three separate days, and two reflection sentences outside the word count. Assess audience, evidence and substantive revision. Provide source access. Repeat with another task, purpose and audience.