

## LESSON 20

# Presenting Your Collaborative Response

60 minutes

Strand 2.1: Appreciating my Community

Applying

Outcome LCW.M2.S1.CPS.4

Outcome LCW.M2.S1.ALT3.1

### WHAT THIS LESSON DOES

You will present your collaborative community proposal to another group in five minutes. Using an agreed rubric you will score their presentation and receive scores in return. Finally you will note one change to improve it for a real audience. This is formative Strand 2.1 Digital Portfolio evidence you can draw on later for Portfolio in Action.

### CURRICULUM OUTCOMES

| Outcome                 | What the specification asks for                                                                                                                                                              |
|-------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>LCW.M2.S1.CPS.4</b>  | present an overview of their collaborative response to a real-life community issue.                                                                                                          |
| <b>LCW.M2.S1.ALT3.1</b> | 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

- Agree what a strong five-minute community proposal must hit
- Synthesise five lessons of work into a five-minute presentation
- Receive paired-group scores and name one change before a real audience

### KEY TERMS

| Term               | What it means here                                                                                                                                                             | For example                                                                                                                         |
|--------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Presentation       | A short, spoken proposal that puts your group's community response in front of an audience, usually with a few slides, notes or a short video to support it.                   | A five-minute pitch of your group's solution to another LCW group, then swapped so both sides present                               |
| Rubric             | A short list of named criteria and levels used to judge a piece of work fairly, with a written comment on each criterion rather than a single mark out of ten.                 | Clarity, evidence behind every claim, and a clear ask of the audience, each judged Not yet / Nearly / There                         |
| Community proposal | A realistic suggestion for how a community issue could be tackled, written so a stakeholder outside school could recognise it as credible rather than as a classroom exercise. | A timed proposal on a local issue that names who is helped, what the solution does, and what you are asking the audience to support |

#### **BEFORE THE BELL**

- Pair groups in advance so no time is lost on logistics.
- Ensure groups have their Strand 2.1 problem definition, developed solution, implementation plan and a draft presentation outline ready.
- Arrange the room for paired simultaneous presentations, with a staggered single-room fallback if needed.
- Pair groups in advance. Confirm each group can open its Strand 2.1 problem definition, developed solution, implementation plan and draft presentation outline. If the Collaborative Task Presentation document does not yet exist, students create it in this lesson with three headed sections: Presentation link or file; Peer scores and comments; One change before a real audience.
- On screen this lesson: peer review.

# Presenting Your Collaborative Response

| HOW THE LESSON RUNS |              |                                           |
|---------------------|--------------|-------------------------------------------|
| 5 min               | introduction | Getting Started                           |
| 5 min               | content      | Key Terms                                 |
| 40 min              | activity     | Build, present, score and bank one change |
| 5 min               | content      | Think About It                            |
| 5 min               | summary      | What you covered                          |

## STEP BY STEP

### 5 min Getting Started

Pair groups before the lesson starts so no time is lost on logistics. Aim for groups that have not worked together on the collaborative task, so the audience is genuinely new. Confirm every group has its Strand 2.1 problem definition, developed solution, implementation plan and a draft presentation outline ready to open. Flag that scoring is against shared criteria, not a popularity contest, and that every group both presents and reviews in the same period.

### 5 min Key Terms

Keep this brisk. The three criteria for the rubric land fully in the main step; here students only need the vocabulary. If you want one modelled comment, use a single 30-second example of a Not yet / Nearly / There note on clarity, then move on. Do not open a whole-class feedback clinic in this slot.

### 40 min Build, present, score and bank one change On screen: peer review

#### ROOM LAYOUT AND SOUND

Decide layout so paired groups can present without drowning each other out. Prefer opposite ends of the room, a corridor or adjacent classroom with a named supervising arrangement, and cap how many pairs speak at once so reviewers can actually hear claims and the ask. **Single-room fallback:** stagger pairs. Half the pairs present while the listening groups take silent notes against the three criteria on a first pass; then swap roles so the other half presents. Do not run every pair aloud at full volume in one small room if scores will be unusable.

#### SUGGESTED TIMING

- **0-3 min:** Confirm the three rubric criteria on the board. Do not invent extra criteria mid-lesson.
- **3-18 min:** Final cut of the brought-in draft and one timed five-minute rehearsal. Circulate for groups still writing essays instead of cutting to a proposal. If a group has no draft, give them a one-page outline template (issue, who is affected, solution, evidence, ask) and keep them on that skeleton only.
- **18-28 min:** Paired presentations, five minutes each way (or staggered first-pass / second-pass if using the single-room fallback). Keep time visibly.
- **28-35 min:** One device per reviewing group; one scribe; single shared rubric review; every criterion needs a comment if below top level; one priority change named; review shared, exported or screenshotted into the presenting group's document.
- **35-40 min:** Bank presentation support, peer scores and the one pre-audience change line in the shared Strand 2.1 Collaborative Task Presentation document.

#### LOOK-FORS

- Presentations that open with the issue and who is affected, not with a tour of the group's process.
- Comments that point at a moment in the five minutes, not "good overall".
- The one-change line names something a real community audience would notice (jargon, missing cost, unclear ask), not only classroom polish.

#### DIFFERENTIATION

Groups stuck on format: default to spoken plus a single one-page outline (issue, solution, ask). Groups racing ahead: pressure-test the ask against a sceptical stakeholder ("why should we fund this?").

### 5 min Think About It

Keep this to about five minutes as a paired or group check, not a second full reflection. Push past "make it neater" toward audience-facing changes. If the change line is already strong, groups only need to test the one-sentence ask against a named Irish community audience. No whole-class tour of surprising scores unless presentations finished early and you have two spare minutes.

### 5 min What you covered

Quick scan that each group has a shared Collaborative Task Presentation document saved under Strand 2.1 before dismissal. Note any groups whose change line is still only about slides; flag for a one-line rewrite next time you see them.

### ANSWERS AND LOOK-FORS

- Clarity in five minutes - Could a stranger follow the issue, who is affected, and what the solution is without prior knowledge of the group?
- Evidence behind every claim - Find a claim they made. Was there a fact, example or figure underneath it, or only the claim?
- A clear ask of the audience - By the end, did you know what they wanted you to do, support or decide? Could you repeat the ask in one sentence?

### TEACHING MOVES

- Optional: one 30-second modelled Not yet / Nearly / There comment at the end of Key Terms only. Do not run a full feedback clinic there.
- Circulate during final cut and presentations; keep the visible timer honest on the five-minute deliveries.
- Emphasise audience-facing changes in the short Think About It check.
- Whole-class share of surprising scores only if presentations finished early and you genuinely have about two spare minutes.

### WHAT TO WATCH FOR

- Focusing on slide appearance rather than clarity of content. Redirect to the three agreed criteria.
- Suggesting only superficial changes like more slides. Prompt for specific audience needs.
- Not actively listening while scoring peers. Remind groups they present immediately after (or on the staggered second pass).
- Every student trying to submit a separate rubric review. One device, one scribe, one shared group review.

### DIFFERENTIATION

- Support: Offer a one-page outline template (issue, who is affected, solution, evidence, ask) and sentence starters for the change line.
- Extension: Ask groups to pressure-test the ask against a sceptical stakeholder or multiple named audiences.
- Support: Pair less confident presenters with encouraging peers inside the same group speaking roles.

### WHAT STUDENTS ARE LEFT WITH

- Collaborative Task Presentation plus peer scores and one pre-audience change