

Handout 4 – Class Agreement and Two-Week Review

Select four to six routines.

Include at least one routine for understanding, one for responding and one safety boundary.

Human dignity, accessibility and safeguarding cannot be removed by majority vote.

☐ Listen to the full point before responding; redirect interruptions.	☐ Ask one genuine question before challenging a view.
☐ Check understanding through a neutral paraphrase.	☐ Give a reason, example, evidence or honest uncertainty when responding.
☐ Address ideas and actions; do not label, mock or diagnose people.	☐ Name shared ground and remaining disagreement; consensus is not required.
☐ Pause and verify factual claims when the source or accuracy is uncertain.	☐ Use a visible pause/pass-and-return option without penalty.
☐ Allow written, supported or assistive communication routes.	☐ Stop and refer comments that are threatening, humiliating or discriminatory.

Our respectful disagreement agreement

Routine/boundary	Who enables it?	Where/date tested	Evidence it was used

Two-week implementation log

Date/topic	LACE/routines used	What worked	Barrier/problem	Adult action/fact-check	Adjustment next time

Anonymous starting and follow-up pulse

Circle one number for each statement.

1 = not yet true for me;

5 = very true for me.

Use the same statements before the session and after the two-week trial.

Do not collect names.

Statement	1	2	3	4	5
In this class/group, students can express a different opinion without being mocked or personally attacked.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
When students disagree, they usually try to understand the other view before responding.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
I know how to disagree using reasons and respectful language.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Adults intervene when disagreement becomes discriminatory, threatening or unsafe.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Two-week review questions

- Which LACE stage was used most consistently? Which was often skipped?
- Were different views expressed more safely, or did students simply avoid disagreement?
- Did paraphrasing improve accuracy, or become formulaic/sarcastic?
- Were factual claims checked appropriately rather than treated only as opinions?

- Did adults apply boundaries consistently and explain why a discussion was paused?
- Were written, supported and slower contributions treated as equally valid?
- Which routine will continue, who is responsible and when will it be reviewed again?