

Peer Review and Feedback

60 minutes

Strand 1.1: Understanding Myself

Reflecting

Feeds ALT 1

Outcome LCW.M1.S1.ALT1.1

WHAT THIS LESSON DOES

Review a partner's personal statement draft using criteria of clarity, voice, evidence and fit for purpose. Then revise your own draft based on feedback so it differs from the original version.

CURRICULUM OUTCOMES

Outcome	What the specification asks for
LCW.M1.S1.ALT1.1	create and develop a personal statement.

WHAT STUDENTS SHOULD BE ABLE TO DO

- Peer-review a draft against clarity, voice, evidence and fit for purpose
- Name the one change that would most improve a partner's statement
- Revise your own draft so the version leaving the room differs from the one that came in

KEY TERMS

Term	What it means here	For example
Peer review	A structured read of someone else's work against named criteria, ending in specific comments and one priority change they can act on today.	Reading a partner's personal statement for voice and evidence, then naming the single edit that would most strengthen it
Fit for purpose	Whether the statement tells the intended reader what they need to know about you for that opportunity, not everything about you in general.	A statement aimed at a childcare apprenticeship that foregrounds safeguarding and real sessions with children, not a long sports biography
Revision	Changing the draft itself because of feedback, not filing the feedback for later. The document that leaves the room must differ from the one that came in.	Replacing 'I am a hard worker' with a specific café shift you held through Junior Cycle exam week, after a reviewer flagged the vague claim

BEFORE THE BELL

- Pair students in advance, preferring those likely to give honest feedback.
- Agree one hand-over route for the room (activity copy/export, screenshot/PDF share, or half-page slip) so digital comments are not trapped on the reviewer's device.
- Prepare half-page slips or sticky notes if any pairs will work on paper.
- Ensure all students have access to their first draft.
- Confirm every student has Personal Statement Draft 1 open and shareable. No draft means they cannot review or be reviewed, sort that first. Agree the hand-over route for the room (copy/export, screenshot/PDF share, or half-page slip) so the receive window does not stall on mixed devices.
- On screen this lesson: peer review.

Peer Review and Feedback

HOW THE LESSON RUNS		
5 min	introduction	Getting Started
4 min	content	Key Terms
38 min	activity	Review, Then Revise
8 min	content	Think About It
5 min	summary	What you covered

STEP BY STEP

5 min Getting Started

Pair students before the lesson starts so nobody is left waiting. Prefer pairs who will be honest rather than only polite. If numbers are odd, run a triad where each person reviews one draft fully.

Remind the room that ALT 1 is live: Draft 1 from Lesson 25 is the input; Personal Statement v2 is today's banked output.

4 min Key Terms

Spend under a minute on the table. The live distinction is revision versus filing feedback. Say it once: *disagreeing is allowed; ignoring is not*.

38 min Review, Then Revise

On screen: peer review

SUGGESTED TIMING

- **0-2 min:** pair up, swap drafts, read the four criteria aloud once
- **2-17 min:** silent or low-voice rubric review (about 15 min); circulate for vague comments ("good" / "needs work" are not comments)
- **17-19 min:** copy or write the review, hand over so the partner can read it without the reviewer's device; thirty seconds of receive-only (no defending yet)
- **19-38 min:** revise own draft to Personal Statement v2 (protected rewrite time) and write the three lines; gate the checkpoint on a body change, not only the footer

LOOK-FORS

- Comments point at a line or phrase, not the whole page
- One priority change is named as a sentence the author could act on today
- v2 differs from Draft 1 in the body (at least one paragraph or opening rewritten), not only in a footer note
- Declined feedback has a reason, not a shrug

TEACHING TIPS

The guided rubric carries the modelling load: criteria look-fors and forced comments replace a separate sample-draft demo. Head off the two classic fails: all ticks with no comment, and a list of eight fixes. The interactive keeps lower judgements open until a comment exists, and forces one priority. If a pair finishes early, they swap and do a second pass on one weaker criterion only.

Sensitive feedback: if a review turns personal or harsh, pause the pair and follow the school's pastoral procedures. Coach the process, never the content of someone else's identity or values.

8 min Think About It

Keep this to a short pair-share. Prompt once: *the instinct is to explain; the discipline is to write it down first*. Do not force public sharing of declined feedback.

5 min What you covered

Spot-check that Personal Statement v2 exists and is not identical to Draft 1. A three-line footer with no body changes does not meet the checkpoint. Note pairs who need a short catch-up next lesson if a draft was missing today.

ANSWERS AND LOOK-FORS

- Clarity - Can you follow who they are and where they are going without rereading? Flag any sentence that makes you stop.
- Voice - Read it aloud in your head. Could this have been written by anyone in the room, or only by them?
- Evidence - Find a sentence that claims something about them. Is there a real occasion underneath it, or only the claim?
- Fit for purpose - Who is going to read this, and would it tell them what they need to know for that opportunity?

TEACHING MOVES

- Circulate during the review block to prompt specific, line-referenced comments; the guided rubric look-fors carry the modelling load so you do not need a separate sample-draft demo.
- Protect the revise window: do not let review overrun past about 17 minutes of the activity block.
- Emphasise that revision means actual body changes to the document (at least one paragraph or opening), not only a three-line footer.
- Use whole-class discussion briefly if common issues arise in the reflection step.

WHAT TO WATCH FOR

- Students provide vague feedback without referencing specific lines: Require comments to point to exact parts of the text.
- Students make no changes to their draft: Check that the revised version differs meaningfully in the body from the original.
- Students are overly polite and avoid critical feedback: Remind them that constructive criticism helps improve the work.
- Hand-over stalls on mixed devices: insist the partner can read the full review without the reviewer's screen.

DIFFERENTIATION

- Support: Offer sentence starters for writing feedback comments.
- Extension: After the one priority change is named, run a second pass on the single weakest criterion only, or rewrite the partner's weakest evidence sentence as a short model line (keep the single priority intact).
- Support: Pair less confident writers with those who can model effective review.

WHAT STUDENTS ARE LEFT WITH

- Personal Statement v2: revised draft plus reviewer change, what you did, and any feedback declined with reasons