

Design Thinking: A Human-Centred Approach

60 minutes

Strand 2.1: Appreciating my Community

Participating

Outcome LCW.M2.S1.CPS.2

WHAT THIS LESSON DOES

You annotate a youth-hub worked case for user, observation, prototype and result, then write the miss into your Strand 2.1 Design Thinking Case Study so the human-centred method is something you have practised, not only defined.

CURRICULUM OUTCOMES

Outcome	What the specification asks for
LCW.M2.S1.CPS.2	describe the process of design thinking and how it has evolved over time.

WHAT STUDENTS SHOULD BE ABLE TO DO

- Define design thinking as a human-centred response to open problems
- Annotate a worked case for user, observation, prototype and result
- Name one thing the model annotation caught that you missed, and why

KEY TERMS

Term	What it means here	For example
Design thinking	A human-centred way of tackling problems that have no single right answer: you start with the people affected, test rough ideas early, and loop back when the evidence says you should.	A youth service redesigning how teenagers book support so the process fits how they actually live, not how adults assumed they would
Human-centred	Built around the real needs, habits and barriers of the people who will use the thing, rather than around what the organisation finds convenient.	Watching how young people actually arrive at a drop-in desk before redrawing the booking form
Prototype	A rough, testable version of an idea, cheap enough to change or throw away, used to learn what works before anyone invests in a finished version.	A paper mock-up of a new appointment card tried with five users for one afternoon

BEFORE THE BELL

- Open the Coastal Youth Hub worked case on the board in the document annotator (guided mode).
- Check Strand 2.1 folders: every student needs a Design Thinking Case Study document (create now if missing, with headings Labels / What made it work / One miss).
- Put the four labels on the wall or board: user, observation, prototype, result (names only, no model phrases).
- Have the document annotator open on the board in guided mode. Students annotate on their own devices in parallel. Do not model a label on the case before Part 1; students place all four labels first, then you reveal the model.
- On screen this lesson: document annotator.

Design Thinking: A Human-Centred Approach

HOW THE LESSON RUNS

5 min	introduction	Getting Started
5 min	content	Key Terms
35 min	activity	Annotate the Design-Thinking Case
10 min	content	Think About It
5 min	summary	What you covered

STEP BY STEP

5 min Getting Started

Open by asking: *When was the last time something was redesigned for you without anyone asking what you needed?* Take two or three answers, then land the lesson: today they mark the case up themselves before they see the model.

Design Thinking Case Study document: if the blank does not yet exist, students create a short document called **Design Thinking Case Study** in their Strand 2.1 folder now, with three headings: Labels / What made it work / One miss. Confirm every student has that document ready before step 3. Keep this filename through the rest of the lesson and the later collaborative task.

5 min Key Terms

Keep this tight. The pedagogy lives in the annotation, not in a long definition. Check that students can say the four labels out loud before you open step 3: **user, observation, prototype, result**. Rehearse the four names only; do not place any label on the case yet.

35 min Annotate the Design-Thinking Case

On screen: document annotator

SUGGESTED TIMING

- 0-3 min: read the case silently once
- 3-18 min: place all four labels; circulate and push anyone who is tagging whole paragraphs instead of precise phrases
- 18-25 min: reveal the model on the board; hear two agreements and two misses out loud
- 25-35 min: write the Design Thinking Case Study in the portfolio document

TEACHING TIPS

The hard miss is usually **observation**: students tag the problem statement instead of the moment the team watched real behaviour. Pause on that region when you reveal the model.

Look-fors in the portfolio write-up: labels tied to quoted phrases; argument built from labels rather than a warm summary; a concrete reason for the miss (e.g. "I read past the waiting-room note because it looked like background").

DIFFERENTIATION

Support: offer label definitions only (what user / observation / prototype / result mean), never candidate phrases from the case. Allow paired work for the annotation step if needed.

If a student finishes early, ask them to find a fifth phrase that could carry a second observation or a second prototype and add it under their main four.

10 min Think About It

About two minutes on prompt 1, two on prompt 2, then four minutes for the two-line portfolio note. The second prompt is the bridge into the collaborative task: students should leave slightly suspicious of their own first framing of a community issue.

If a student has no prior Strand 2.1 notes, the fallback (school, club, or a local service they use) is enough; do not stall the pair talk hunting for a missing file.

5 min What you covered

Spot-check three portfolio documents before dismissal: labels present, miss named, argument tied to labels rather than a plot summary of the case, and the two-line "Where I might be assuming" note started.

Flag anyone still without a Strand 2.1 folder; the collaborative task will not wait for catch-up filing.

ANSWERS AND LOOK-FORS

- "16- to 18-year-olds coming alone after school, often unsure whether..." - User: who it was really for - The user is named with age, situation and a specific fear, not "young people" in general. Design thinking narrows to a real person in a real moment.
- "many turned back at the glass hatch when two adults were already..." - Observation: seen or heard, not assumed - This is watched behaviour, not a survey answer and not staff opinion. The hatch moment is what the poster plan would never have fixed.
- "Several checked their phones, waited near the door, then left" - Observation: seen or heard, not assumed - A second observation of the same barrier. Stacking concrete moments is stronger than one vague claim that "people felt unwelcome".
- "a simple greeter desk in front of the hatch, staffed by one youth..." - Prototype: rough version they tried - Cheap, time-bounded, and changeable. A prototype is not a finished service redesign: it is a test you can reverse in a fortnight.
- "adjusted the board wording twice, and dropped a fourth question that..." - Prototype: rough version they tried - Iteration inside the test. Changing the prototype from live evidence is the method working, not the plan failing.
- "The Hub kept the greeter desk, cut the hatch-first routine on busy..." - Result: what actually changed - The result is a changed practice and a killed idea. Ending the original poster plan is as important as keeping the greeter desk: evidence overruled the first assumption.

WHAT TO WATCH FOR

- See step 3 teacher notes. If a support list is needed, use label definitions only (user / observation / prototype / result meanings), never candidate phrases from the Coastal Youth Hub case.

DIFFERENTIATION

- See step 3 teacher notes. If a support list is needed, use label definitions only (user / observation / prototype / result meanings), never candidate phrases from the Coastal Youth Hub case.

WHAT STUDENTS ARE LEFT WITH

- Design Thinking Case Study: your annotations, argument from labels, and one miss versus model