

Participate in an Evidence-Based Discussion

L12 · v0.1.2 · Learner copy

Learners will use an accurate detail from one or both paired texts, explain what it supports and what remains uncertain, and make a fair response or question that engages a different idea. They may contribute through speech, writing, typing, dictation, AAC or another established communication method, or a facilitator-read note. The rubric scores evidence and reasoning, not speaking frequency or agreement.

A discussion move: detail → reason → limit

Use a three-part chain. Name a detail accurately and identify which text it comes from. Explain how it bears on the question. Then name a limit: what the detail does not show, or what more you would need to know. A detail is not a complete argument by itself. You may support, question, or revise a proposal; the rubric scores how you use evidence and reasoning, not which proposal you choose.

Paired text A — Keep a choice window

Fictional instructional scenario; people, setting, slips, counts, and observations are invented.

A fictional student note from Talia

Ridgeview Middle School is deciding how to use the final 10 minutes of one weekly 30-minute Grade 6 reading block. The first 20 minutes are quiet reading. In 24 fictional anonymous choice slips from one advisory group, 12 students selected quiet reading for the last 10 minutes, 8 selected a partner book talk, and 4 said either option was fine. The slips asked what students preferred; they did not ask which routine helped students understand or remember a book.

I would keep the last 10 minutes as a choice: continue reading quietly or use a short partner talk. The slips show that students in this one group did not all choose the same option. A single routine for everyone could miss that range. In notes from one Wednesday trial, at least one partner in 8 of 10 observed pairs used a book detail while recommending a book. That suggests a talk can make room for text details, but it does not show that every pair did this or that the talk improved reading.

Try the choice window for four Wednesdays. Ask the group the same anonymous question afterward and collect one example of a book detail students used. That would help the group see how the options were used. It still would not prove which routine caused better understanding; the slips and brief notes answer different, limited questions.

Paired text B — Try a guided book talk

Fictional instructional scenario; people, setting, slips, counts, and observations are invented.

A fictional student note from Jordan

Ridgeview Middle School is deciding how to use the final 10 minutes of one weekly 30-minute Grade 6 reading block. The first 20 minutes are quiet reading. In 24 fictional anonymous choice slips from one advisory group, 12 students selected quiet reading, 8 selected a partner book talk, and 4 said either option was fine. The slips show stated choices in this group; they do not tell us what students learn from each routine.

I would use the last 10 minutes for a guided partner book talk, with a written response or quiet-reading option for anyone who does not want to talk. In notes from one Wednesday trial, at least one partner in 8 of 10 observed pairs used a book detail while recommending a book. That is a reason to test a prompt such as, “Which part of the book led you to that recommendation?” The note is closer to the question of whether pairs can refer to a book than the choice slips are.

The observation covers only 10 pairs on one day. It does not show that all students prefer a talk, that every partner contributed, or that talking improves reading. Try the guided prompt for four Wednesdays and invite each student to share by voice, note, or another available route. Then review whether students used accurate details and ask which format helped them take part. A short trial would give the group more information, not a final proof.

Model: detail, reason, and limit

Read the model response. Mark the exact detail, the reason it fits the question, and the limit. Then name one question the model could ask before the group decides.

The notes say that at least one partner in 8 of 10 observed pairs used a book detail during one Wednesday trial. That is relevant to whether a guided talk can create an opportunity to refer to a book. It does not show that every partner contributed or that talking improved reading. I would test a short guided prompt and ask each student which response route helped them contribute.

Guided comparison

With a partner or in writing, compare the two texts. Choose the best detail for (a) what this advisory group said it preferred and (b) whether pairs referred to books during one trial. Explain why each detail fits that question. Name one limit for each detail. A different defensible comparison is welcome if you explain it.

Record, dictate, or sketch your evidence and reasoning

Choose a participation route

Every route has the same learning goal: use a detail from a text, explain your reasoning, and engage with another idea. Choose a route that lets you contribute both an idea and a reply or question. You may speak with a partner or small group; write or type two linked notes; dictate or use AAC or another established communication method; or ask the facilitator to read your exact note with your permission. You may listen first, record a detail from another person, and then respond by voice or note.

You do not have to make eye contact, speak quickly, or speak more often than anyone else. None of those is scored. If you choose a written or facilitator-read route, your notes are your discussion contribution. You may disagree with a proposal while treating its author respectfully.

Discussion prompts

Main question: How should Ridgeview use the final 10 minutes: keep a choice window, try a guided book talk with alternatives, or test another plan? Use one or both texts to explain your thinking.

Prompts to move the discussion:

- Which detail best fits the question you are answering? What does it support?
- What can the choice slips tell us? What can the one-day observation tell us?
- What does a piece of evidence not establish?
- What is a fair question or response to a different proposal?
- What could the group try or check next, and what result would matter?

You may keep, change, or qualify your view. Agreement with either writer is not scored.

Prepare and take part

Prepare one idea for the main question and one reply or question that engages a different idea. Use your preparation sheet. In the discussion, use your chosen route to contribute both. Then complete the reflection on the sheet: name a detail and explain whether another idea changed or qualified your thinking. You may keep your view if you explain why. Do not count turns; make the quality of the evidence and reasoning visible.

Discussion preparation and response sheet

Before the discussion, read both texts, then prepare one point and one reply or question using evidence from one or both texts. During the discussion, listen for one different idea and make your response visible through your chosen route. Afterward, complete the reflection. Notes, typing, dictation, AAC, or a facilitator-read note count as contributions when they contain your own thinking. Continue on extra paper or use your chosen communication route if you need more space.

My route: speak / write or type / dictate / AAC or other established method / facilitator reads my note / another agreed route

My idea or recommendation for the final 10 minutes

Specific detail and text it comes from

Why this detail matters; what it does not prove

A different idea I heard or read

My fair reply, connection, or question with a reason

Afterward: Which detail or idea did I reconsider? Did my view change, stay, or become more qualified? Explain why and name what evidence might matter next.

Discussion rubric — 0 to 2 points per criterion

Your teacher will use the same rubric for spoken, written, dictated, AAC, and facilitator-read contributions. The score reflects the quality of evidence, reasoning, engagement with another idea, and clarity in the chosen route. Turn count, volume, speed, accent, eye contact, posture, and agreement are not scored. A missing contribution is marked “not enough evidence yet,” not treated as proof that a learner cannot do the skill. If your reply was not captured or you had no chance to give it, ask for another opportunity. A submitted response that does not engage another idea can receive 0 for engagement.

Evidence use

- 2 — Names an accurate, specific detail and its text/source.
- 1 — Gives a relevant detail that is partly accurate, broad, or incompletely attributed.
- 0 — Gives no relevant detail or substantially misrepresents the evidence.

Reasoning and limits

- 2 — Accurately explains the detail's link to the question and names a relevant limit.
- 1 — Gives only one of those two elements accurately.
- 0 — Gives neither accurately.

Engagement with another idea

- 2 — Responds to, builds on, questions, or fairly challenges a different idea with a relevant reason or detail.
- 1 — Acknowledges or repeats a different idea but adds little response.
- 0 — No identifiable response to another idea yet, or misrepresents it.

Clear contribution in the chosen route

- 2 — The idea and connection are clear to the intended reader or listener.
- 1 — The main idea is partly clear; a prompt or clarification is needed.
- 0 — The contribution cannot yet be interpreted from the available evidence.

Fictional paired text created for L12; scenario and numbers are invented.

Fictional paired text created for L12; scenario and numbers are invented.