

Peer Review and Revision

60 minutes

Strand 2.1: Appreciating my Community

Reflecting

Feeds ALT 3

Outcome LCW.M2.S1.ALT3.1

WHAT THIS LESSON DOES

You will review a partner's ALT 3 draft against clarity, evidence, depth of reflection and skill range. Then revise your own reflection using the feedback and connect the process to workplace feedback in Strand 2.2.

CURRICULUM OUTCOMES

Outcome	What the specification asks for
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

- Review a partner draft against ALT 3 rubric criteria
- Revise your reflection based on specific feedback
- Connect ongoing skill reflection to workplace work coming in Strand 2.2

KEY TERMS

Term	What it means here	For example
Peer review	A structured judgement of someone else's draft against named criteria, with a specific comment on each criterion and one priority change the author can act on today.	Reading a partner's ALT 3 reflection for clarity, evidence, depth and skill range, then handing over one clear change
Depth of reflection	How far a reflection goes beyond what happened into why it mattered, what it showed about the writer, and what changes next.	Not 'we disagreed while choosing an approach' but what the disagreement revealed about how you listen under pressure
Revision	Changing the draft itself because of feedback, not logging what you intend to change later.	Draft said we disagreed while choosing an approach; v2 names what the disagreement showed about how you listen under pressure and what you will try next time

BEFORE THE BELL

- Pair students in mixed-ability groups before the lesson begins.
- Set the draft-access method (share link, side-by-side devices, or printouts) and have a sanitised sample draft ready for anyone without their own.
- Confirm the Strand 2.1 filename students should already have: ALT 3 Collaborative Reflection Draft .
- On screen this lesson: peer review.

Peer Review and Revision

HOW THE LESSON RUNS		
5 min	introduction	Getting Started
5 min	content	Key Terms
35 min	activity	Peer Review and Redraft
10 min	content	Think About It
5 min	summary	What you covered

STEP BY STEP

5 min Getting Started

Pair students before the period starts so nobody is left waiting. Mixed-ability pairs work well here: a strong drafter still benefits from a fresh reader. Confirm every student has opened **ALT 3 Collaborative Reflection Draft** from Strand 2.1 (Digital Portfolio) before the activity begins. Remind the room that receiving feedback is the harder half: write it down before deciding whether you agree.

Missing or incomplete drafts: if a student is absent-behind or has no draft to swap, give them a sanitised sample ALT 3 draft for the review half only. They still complete a full review for their partner (or a trio partner). Their own redraft and three-line change note become homework so the ALT 3 checkpoint is not lost. Odd number in the room: run one trio with a rotate-once pattern (A reviews B, B reviews C, C reviews A) on a tighter clock.

5 min Key Terms

Spend under a minute on the table. The live work is the rubric. Flag **depth of reflection** as the criterion where most first drafts stall at plot summary.

35 min Peer Review and Redraft

On screen: peer review

ACCESS AND PAIRING

- Decide the access method before the bell: share link in Strand 2.1, side-by-side devices, or printed copies on the desk. Tell the class once so pairs do not invent three different methods.
- Odd number: one trio with a single rotate (A→B, B→C, C→A) on a tighter review clock.
- Missing draft: sanitised sample for the review half; own redraft as homework (see Getting Started notes).

SUGGESTED TIMING

- **0-1 min:** 60-second model comment on the board (one criterion, one line pointed at, one concrete change) so "needs more detail" never becomes the room standard.
- **1-15 mins:** pairs run the peer review interactive on each other's drafts (about seven minutes each way; tighten further if the class is large).
- **15-17 mins:** hand over the written review; check every student has a written priority change before anyone opens their own draft.
- **17-35 mins:** silent redraft into ALT 3 Collaborative Reflection v2, including the three-line change note under the same Strand 2.1 artefact (aim for a full 15 minutes of actual rewrite time).

LOOK-FORS

- Comments that name a line or paragraph, not "needs more detail".
- Depth comments that push past plot summary into what the moment showed about the writer.
- v2 files that visibly differ from the first draft, not a save-as with the same text.
- The three-line change note sitting under v2 in the same Strand 2.1 / ALT 3 Digital Portfolio artefact.

TEACHING TIPS

If a pair finishes the review early, send them straight into redraft rather than inventing a second round. Watch for students who want to explain away feedback before writing it down: the discipline is record first, decide second. When comments stay generic, send the reviewer back to the line with the prompt on the interactive. This review pattern returns for ALT 4 and for the Portfolio in Action brief, where nobody reviews the work for them.

10 min Think About It

Keep the pair share to about five minutes. The workplace bridge is the point: ALT 3 reflection is practice for the feedback loop ALT 4 will demand after placement. If pairs stall, offer lighter handles only as prompts: how you ask, how you record, or how you decide what to change. Do not turn the talk into another full written task. The two-line add-on under v2 is expected, not optional: it is how LO3 (Strand 2.2 connection) becomes visible in the ALT 3 folder. Spot-check that those two lines exist before summary.

5 min What you covered

Spot-check that v2 exists and differs from the first draft, and that the three-line change note plus the two-line Strand 2.2 bridge sit under the same artefact. Log the ALT 3 checkpoint: peer feedback received and acted on. Next lessons move toward final ALT 3 banking, so weak evidence sections need a flag now while there is still time to fix them.

ANSWERS AND LOOK-FORS

- Clarity - Could a stranger follow who did what, when, and what role this writer played without rereading twice?
- Evidence - Find a claim about a skill. Is there a named moment underneath it, or only the claim?
- Depth of reflection - Does it stop at what happened, or does it say why it mattered and what it showed about them?
- Transferable-skill range - Is more than one skill evidenced, and do the moments actually differ, or is it the same story retold?

TEACHING MOVES

- Model one 60-second line-referenced comment before pairs start.
- Circulate during the peer review activity to encourage depth over summary.
- Remind students that revision means changing the draft based on feedback.
- Keep the discussion section brief; the Strand 2.2 bridge lands in the two lines under v2.

WHAT TO WATCH FOR

- Students give general praise instead of criterion-based judgements: Require comments tied to each of the four criteria.
- Drafts remain unchanged after feedback: Insist on visible revisions with a change note in the same artefact.
- Focus stays on surface errors rather than depth: Prompt for why events mattered to the writer.

DIFFERENTIATION

- Support: Provide sentence starters for writing specific feedback comments.
- Extension: Ask students to identify changes in two criteria and explain their impact.
- Support: Pair weaker writers with stronger readers to model effective review.

WHAT STUDENTS ARE LEFT WITH

- ALT 3 Collaborative Reflection v2 after peer review