

LESSON 25

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, and that it is worth writing a comment down before deciding whether you agree with it.

Missing or incomplete drafts: if a student has been out of school and has fallen behind, or simply has no draft to swap, give them a sanitised sample ALT 3 draft to review. They still complete a full review for their partner, or for a partner in a trio. Their own redraft and three-line change note become homework, so the ALT 3 checkpoint is not lost. If you have an odd number in the room, run one trio in which A reviews B, B reviews C and C reviews A, on a slightly tighter clock.

5 min Key Terms

A minute on the table is enough, because the real work of the period is the rubric that comes next. Flag **depth of reflection** as you go, since it is the criterion where most first drafts stall at plot summary and the one pairs will find hardest to judge.

35 min Peer Review and Redraft

On screen: peer review

ACCESS AND PAIRING

Decide before the bell how partners will read each other's work, whether that is a shared link in Strand 2.1, two devices side by side, or printed copies on the desk. Tell the class the one method you have chosen, because if you leave it open three different arrangements appear in the room and the first five minutes go on sorting them out.

If you have an odd number, run a single trio in which A reviews B, B reviews C and C reviews A, and keep their review clock a little tighter. A student with no draft to swap reviews the sanitised sample instead and does their own redraft for homework, as set out in the Getting Started notes.

SUGGESTED TIMING

- For the first minute, model one comment on the board yourself: one criterion, one line pointed at, one concrete change. That minute is what stops "needs more detail" becoming the standard for the whole room.
- Then, from about minute one to minute fifteen, pairs work through the peer review activity on each other's drafts, roughly seven minutes each way. Shorten that if the class is large.
- Around minutes fifteen to seventeen, partners hand the written review over to each other. Check that every student is holding a written priority change before anyone opens their own draft, because that sentence is what the redraft works from.
- From about minute seventeen to minute thirty-five, the room redrafts in silence into ALT 3 Collaborative Reflection v2 and adds the three-line change note under the same Strand 2.1 artefact. Aim to protect a full fifteen minutes of actual rewriting.

WHAT TO LOOK FOR AS YOU CIRCULATE

- Comments that name a line or a paragraph rather than saying "needs more detail".
- Depth comments that push past what happened into what the moment showed about the writer.
- Files saved as v2 that visibly differ from the first draft, rather than 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 the redraft rather than inventing a second round of comments. Watch for students who want to argue feedback away before they have written it down, and ask them to record it first and decide about it second, so they still have the comment in front of them when they redraft. When comments stay generic, send the reviewer back to the line with the prompt on the activity. This same 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 link to the workplace is what matters here: this reflection is practice for the feedback loop ALT 4 will ask for after placement. If pairs stall, offer lighter handles as prompts only, such as how you ask for feedback, how you record it, or how you decide what to change. Do not let the talk turn into another full written task, because the two written lines under v2 are the only writing this step needs.

Those two lines are expected rather than optional: they are how each student's thinking about the coming workplace reflection shows up inside the ALT 3 folder, where you can see it later. Check that they exist before the class moves on to the last step.

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?
- 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