

Feedback From Others: Why Self-Reflection Has Limits

60 minutes

Strand 1.1: Understanding Myself

Participating

Outcome LCW.M1.S1.SKL.6

WHAT THIS LESSON DOES

Discover why self-reflection alone misses some of your strengths. Participate in giving and receiving specific feedback on Situation Action Result entries using named criteria, and record comments before deciding if you agree.

CURRICULUM OUTCOMES

Outcome	What the specification asks for
LCW.M1.S1.SKL.6	reflect on feedback received from others on their strengths that may not be identified by self-reflection.

WHAT STUDENTS SHOULD BE ABLE TO DO

- Explain why self-reflection alone misses some strengths
- Give written criterion-based feedback on a partner's SAR entries
- Receive feedback by recording it before deciding whether you agree

KEY TERMS

Term	What it means here	For example
Peer feedback	Specific comments from someone working at your level, given against named criteria rather than a vague overall opinion.	A classmate marking whether your Situation/Action/Result entry names a real occasion, then writing one change you could make today
Criterion	A single, named thing you judge work against, one at a time, instead of reacting to the whole piece at once.	Was the situation specific enough that a stranger could picture the day?
Receiving feedback	Writing down what was said in the words it was given, before you decide whether you agree or start explaining yourself.	Copying your reviewer's one priority change into Feedback Entry 1 before you rewrite anything

BEFORE THE BELL

- Pair students before the period starts so nobody is left waiting.
- Have students without completed SAR entries draft one quick example on teamwork or communication.
- Have the Strong Skills Evidence documents open on screens before you begin, so that no time is lost hunting for files later. Let students commit to true or false on each statement first and hold back any explanation until the end of the step, when a quick show of hands on the two contested claims will be far more useful than a commentary that has already given the answer away.
- On screen this lesson: peer review, document annotator.

Feedback From Others: Why Self-Reflection Has Limits

HOW THE LESSON RUNS		
5 min	introduction	Getting Started
8 min	activity	What You Already Believe About Feedback
12 min	activity	Annotate a Feedback Note
25 min	activity	Give, Receive, Record
10 min	summary	What you covered

STEP BY STEP

5 min Getting Started

Pair students before the period starts so nobody is left waiting. Anyone without Lesson 18 SAR entries drafts one quick Situation/Action/Result on teamwork or communication in two minutes so they still have material to review.

Say at the start what kind of lesson this is, because it changes how the room behaves: today is structured peer feedback with a partner rather than a quiet reflection lesson, so students should expect to write about someone else's work and to have someone write about theirs.

8 min What You Already Believe About Feedback On screen: peer review

LOOK-FORS

- Watch for students who mark every statement as the 'virtuous' answer without thinking about it, and ask them for a real example behind one of their answers.
- Push the room on the claim that feedback which stings must be wrong, because the sting often comes from accuracy rather than unfairness.
- Push the room on the claim that you should explain yourself before writing feedback down, since that habit is exactly what the receiving work in the next steps is designed to break.

12 min Annotate a Feedback Note On screen: document annotator

SUGGESTED TIMING

Five minutes labelling alone, four minutes reveal and compare, three minutes on what a useful comment looks like before pairs start.

TEACHING TIPS

- Stress that 'great attitude' style praise is the trap
- The actionable-change line is the one receivers can use
- Keep the four labels as a way of reading feedback quality; the three SAR criteria are what pairs will judge against next
- If anchors fail to highlight, check the document body still contains each phrase verbatim

25 min Give, Receive, Record On screen: peer review

HOW TO RUN IT

Keep pairs stable for the whole 25 minutes, and split the time roughly as follows: eight minutes to review with line-specific comments, two minutes to hand the reviews over, ten silent minutes for the receiver to set up Feedback Entry 1 and fill the core fields, and five minutes at the end to check that files are actually started and to name the homework clearly.

The one thing to hold firm on is the order: receivers write the words down before they defend themselves, because once a student starts arguing the point the wording gets softened as it is copied. If an explanation starts too early, ask them to finish writing first and to come back to the argument afterwards.

Three things must be in the document before the bell, namely the wording as given, the one priority change and the take-it decision with a short why. If the list of three people outside the class and the question they will use is unfinished, set that explicitly as homework rather than letting it drift.

DIFFERENTIATION

- If a pair finishes the core work early, they can review a second SAR entry or start the list of three people outside the class.
- If a review is only ticks with no words, send the pair back to add comments that point at particular lines.

When you spot-check the started lists, make sure Feedback Entry 1 names people by role rather than carrying full personal stories that the student would not want shared.

10 min What you covered

Exit check: every student has a Feedback Entry 1 document with at least the three core fields (verbatim feedback, one priority change, take-it decision with why). Unfinished outside-three lists are homework; blank files or missing core fields are not.

Note pairs who only exchanged compliments. Those SAR entries will need a firmer criterion pass next time.

ANSWERS AND LOOK-FORS

- Peer review: It sounds like them - Read it aloud in your head. Could this have been written by anyone in the room, or only by them?
- Peer review: Claims have evidence - Find a sentence that claims something about them. Is there anything underneath it, or is it just the claim?
- Peer review: Specific, not vague - Underline the vaguest sentence you can find. Could a stranger picture what actually happened?
- Peer review: Fits what it is for - Who is going to read this, and would it tell them what they need to know?
- Document annotator: "overall this is a strong start and you clearly care about the group" - Vague praise - Warm, but it would fit almost anyone. No line pointed at, nothing to fix.
- Document annotator: "the October fundraiser when three people dropped out the night before" - Specific evidence - A dated occasion with a concrete problem. This is what 'situation is a real occasion' looks like.
- Document annotator: "you helped organise everything, but a stranger still cannot see what..." - Criterion hit - Judged against the action-shows-the-skill criterion, and the gap is named.
- Document annotator: "the night still raised the posted target and two first-years stayed..." - Specific evidence - Checkable result: a target and a visible outcome, not 'it went well'.
- Document annotator: "rewrite the action so it names two concrete moves you made that..." - Actionable change - One priority change, specific enough to do today. This is the line the writer needs most.
- Peer review: Situation is a real occasion - Could a stranger picture the day, place or problem, or is it still generic?
- Peer review: Action shows the skill - Does the action name concrete moves, or only claim the skill with words like helped or supported?
- Peer review: Result is checkable - Is there a target, number, visible outcome or other check a reader could verify, or only 'it went well'?

TEACHING MOVES

- Run the beliefs activity in predict mode and reveal after a show of hands.
- Enforce hard timing in the pair step with silent recording time before any agreement talk.
- Circulate during pair work to ensure comments are criterion-based rather than vague.
- Emphasise labelling vague praise versus actionable change during annotation.
- Keep one stable SAR criterion set across annotation and pair review: situation is a real occasion; action shows the skill; result is checkable.

WHAT TO WATCH FOR

- Providing vague praise instead of criterion-based comments; remind to name one criterion and reference a line.
- Immediately explaining or disagreeing with feedback; require writing it down first in silence.
- Rushing the recording step; allocate dedicated silent time before discussion.
- Leaving Feedback Entry 1 blank and treating the whole artefact as homework; protect the core three fields in class.

DIFFERENTIATION

- Support: Provide a model labelled feedback note for the annotation activity.
- Support: Allow additional time for the recording phase if needed.
- Extension: Challenge students to identify two priority changes for their partner, or start the outside-three list in class.

WHAT STUDENTS ARE LEFT WITH

- Feedback Entry 1: feedback received in the words given, the one change named, and three people to ask next
- Students file Feedback Entry 1 in the Digital Portfolio next to Strong Skills Evidence. Name any strand or folder codes in your own filing routine if your school's tree differs; do not require a strand label students have not been taught on the platform.