

Two Writing Clocks

Complete a quick update and a longer researched proposal.

CCSS.ELA-Literacy.W.9-10.10 "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.

Mara Uses Two Schedules

- ① Mara 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, Mara 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, Mara asked a classmate to read from the principal's viewpoint. The reader wanted a way to judge the trial. On a later day, Mara 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 two weeks, research, draft and revise a 180-220-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. Week 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. Later in week 1: first draft

Date this session. Draft 180-220 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. Week 2: revised proposal

Date this later session. Reread sources and draft; seek feedback or evaluate from the reader's viewpoint. Write the complete revised 180-220-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 (Thursday, week 2): Our library should try a quiet study area at lunch for two weeks. I recommend reserving the four tables near the reference shelves while leaving the entrance tables for group work. This would give students a choice without changing the entire library.

Two invented classroom records help explain the proposal. A librarian's six-day log reports that all reference-area tables were occupied on four days and that students requested quieter seating on three days. Three later student comments include two requests for quiet space and one request for group space. The records suggest different needs, but three comments do not tell us what most students prefer.

Some students may worry that the quiet area would leave too few group tables. During the trial, the librarian could tally occupied tables in both areas and collect brief comments. If either area is repeatedly full, the arrangement should change. Temporary signs could explain where conversation is welcome and where students should work quietly.

After two weeks, compare the tallies and comments with the original log. Ask the librarian to decide whether to keep, adjust, or end the trial. A small test would give the school more useful evidence than assuming that one seating rule works for everyone.

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 180-220-word first and revised drafts, dates across two weeks, and two reflection sentences outside the word count. Assess audience, evidence and substantive revision. Provide source access. Repeat with another task, purpose and audience.