

Handout 5 – Class Communication Agreement and Two-Week Review

Select four to six routines.

Human dignity, privacy, accessibility, safeguarding and non-discrimination cannot be removed by majority vote.

□ Pause before sending or speaking when activated; return to the issue at an agreed time.	□ Describe the situation or behaviour; avoid labels about a person's worth or identity.
□ Give feedback privately when public discussion is unnecessary.	□ Ask permission before sharing photos, messages, personal information or screenshots.
□ Use a specific request or boundary rather than sarcasm, threat or humiliation.	□ Check how a message landed and listen before explaining intention.
□ Use the five-part repair after harm; do not pressure for immediate forgiveness.	□ Bystanders may pause, redirect, support privately or seek adult help.
□ Repeated, discriminatory, sexualised, threatening or coercive behaviour goes to an adult/procedure.	□ Written, slower, supported and assistive communication routes are equally valid.

Our class agreement

[illegible]

Two-week implementation log

Date/context	Routine used	What worked	Harm/barrier	Adult action	Adjustment

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, difficult messages are usually expressed without humiliating the person.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Students consider tone, timing, audience and privacy before speaking or posting.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
I know how to give feedback or set a boundary using	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Statement	1	2	3	4	5
specific and respectful language.					
When communication causes harm, students know how to acknowledge it and take a repair action.	○	○	○	○	○
I know when peer repair is not enough and a trusted adult should be involved.	○	○	○	○	○

Two-week review questions

- Were difficult messages more specific and less personal?
- Were students still able to disagree, correct and set boundaries clearly?
- Which feature caused the most difficulty: words, tone, timing, audience, privacy or online forwarding?
- Did students acknowledge impact without immediately defending intention?
- Were repair actions concrete and proportionate?
- Did bystanders and adults respond consistently to serious or repeated harm?
- Which routine will continue, who will support it and when will it be reviewed again?