

LESSON 19

Reflecting on the Process

60 minutes

Strand 2.1: Appreciating my Community

Reflecting

Outcome LCW.M2.S1.CPS.3

Outcome LCW.M2.S1.ALT3.1

WHAT THIS LESSON DOES

In this lesson, students reflect on their collaborative design-thinking work by rating each stage with named evidence from their process. They discuss rating differences with their group and pinpoint their personal contribution.

CURRICULUM OUTCOMES

Outcome	What the specification asks for
LCW.M2.S1.CPS.3	collaborate to respond to a real-life community issue, using a design thinking problem-solving approach.
LCW.M2.S1.ALT3.1	reflect on the role they played during the collaborative problem-solving task to address a real-life community issue, demonstrating the development of a broad range of transferable skills.

WHAT STUDENTS SHOULD BE ABLE TO DO

- Rate each design-thinking stage with a named moment as evidence
- Compare ratings and learn from where the group disagrees
- Identify which stage you personally carried
- Write a Collaborative Task Process Reflection in your Strand 2.1 portfolio folder for later ALT 3 use

KEY TERMS

Term	What it means here	For example
Process reflection	Looking back at how your group worked through a task stage by stage, using real moments as evidence rather than vague verdicts like 'we worked well as a team'.	Rating clarifying as a 2 because the group kept changing the problem statement three times in one period
Disagreement	A real difference in how members of the same group rate or remember the same stage. In this lesson, disagreement is the useful part of the reflection, not a problem to smooth over.	One member rates developing at 2 while three others rate it at 4
Contribution	The stage of the process you personally carried most: where your effort, decisions or presence made the biggest difference to what the group produced.	You kept the ideation rounds timed and stopped the group judging ideas too early

BEFORE THE BELL

- Pre-check Collaborative Task Ideation, Solution and Implementation Plan documents so incomplete arcs are visible before the audit starts.
- Ensure all students have their collaborative task notes from the clarifying, ideating, developing and implementing stages, or a clear fallback (pair notes, observe-only compare).
- Pre-check Collaborative Task Ideation, Solution and Implementation Plan documents. Students need their collaborative-task notes from clarifying through implementing. If a group is incomplete today, pair the missing member's notes with a peer who can still compare two honest views. Name that fallback to the class so students are not improvising.
- On screen this lesson: self-audit.

Reflecting on the Process

HOW THE LESSON RUNS		
5 min	introduction	Getting Started
5 min	content	Key Terms
35 min	activity	Rate, Compare, Write
10 min	content	Think About It
5 min	summary	What you covered

STEP BY STEP

5 min Getting Started

Open by asking for a show of hands: who thinks their group would give the same rating to every stage? Most will. Tell them that is almost never true once ratings are private and evidenced.

Groups stay together for the compare later. If a student worked alone on catch-up, they rate from their own notes and write the reflection against what they observed, naming where they cannot compare.

Before the lesson, spot-check that Collaborative Task Ideation, Solution and Implementation Plan documents exist so incomplete arcs are visible early.

5 min Key Terms

Keep this tight. The table is the scaffold for the audit language students need five minutes later.

35 min Rate, Compare, Write On screen: self-audit

SUGGESTED TIMING

- Private self-audit: 10 minutes (students also open the three-heading template before this part ends)
- Group compare: 8 to 10 minutes with a hard stop
- Portfolio write-up: 15 minutes (protect this window; cut compare rather than write-up)

TEACHING TIPS

Circulate during the private audit. Push back on empty evidence: "*Ideating went well*" is not a moment. Ask "*What happened on the day, and who did it?*"

During compare, stop groups that are negotiating a shared score. The point is the split, not consensus. Ask the outlier to speak first. Enforce the hard stop so Part 3 keeps its full write-up time.

Look-fors in the write-up: four evidenced ratings; a named disagreement stage; a clear personal contribution with one transferable skill tied to the same moment. Weak scripts sound like "communication could have been better". Strong ones name a moment and a person.

Exit ticket if time collapses: a started Collaborative Task Process Reflection with at least two evidenced ratings under the first heading is the minimum leave-class standard; unfinished sections become homework before the next lesson so ALT 3 still has source material.

DIFFERENTIATION

Students who struggle to recall moments can reopen their Collaborative Task Ideation, Solution and Implementation Plan documents and pull one concrete line from each stage.

10 min Think About It

Keep this as paired talk. Prefer the second prompt if time is short: it stress-tests the skill claim already written in Part 3 and sets up later ALT 3 evidence work.

If a group became defensive in the compare, use the first prompt to normalise disagreement as useful data.

5 min What you covered

Spot-check that every student has a document started in the Strand 2.1 folder. Four ratings with empty evidence boxes means the audit did not finish: send them back to add moments before they leave. If time collapsed, enforce the exit ticket of at least two evidenced ratings and set the rest as immediate follow-up.

Flag that this reflection is source material for ALT 3, not the ALT itself.

TEACHING MOVES

- Model the use of specific moments as evidence during the introduction.
- Circulate the room during the private audit to support students struggling to recall details.
- Enforce a hard stop on group compare so the write-up keeps its full window.
- Encourage open discussion of rating disagreements as a learning opportunity; protect outlier ratings rather than forcing consensus.
- Facilitate paired talk for the reflection questions so students stress-test the skill claim already in the document.

WHAT TO WATCH FOR

- Using vague statements without named moments: prompt students to specify a particular day or event.
- Flat scores across all four stages from one student: ask which stage actually cost the group time or quality, and push for a differentiated rating with evidence.
- Groups forcing consensus during compare: protect the outlier rating and make that split the write-up focus under Disagreement stage.
- Failing to identify a personal contribution stage: ask targeted questions about where their input had the most impact, and require one transferable skill tied to the same moment.
- Leaving ratings only on the interactive: nothing on the page is saved; exit ticket is a started Collaborative Task Process Reflection with at least two evidenced ratings.

DIFFERENTIATION

- Support: offer sentence starters for writing evidence-based ratings and the three-heading template opened before Part 1 ends.
- Extension: challenge students to propose ways to improve the lowest-rated stage in future tasks.
- Support: pair students with peers who can help recall specific moments from the process, or reopen Collaborative Task Ideation, Solution and Implementation Plan documents.

WHAT STUDENTS ARE LEFT WITH

- Collaborative Task Process Reflection: four ratings, biggest disagreement, learning, stage you carried