

GLOBAL COHORTS · FESTIVALS UNIT

Your IDU Co-Planning Guide

For your Language & Literature and Arts teachers

This is the planning conversation that makes your Festivals unit a collaboratively planned MYP interdisciplinary unit — not just a program you're each running in parallel.

Before you begin

This guide is the planning conversation between the two of you — the thing that turns Banyan's four-week Festivals program into a unit your school can point to as a collaboratively planned MYP interdisciplinary unit (IDU).

It's built with that requirement specifically in mind. It doesn't guarantee any particular outcome in an IB evaluation — that's always your evaluator's judgment — but every section below exists because of something specific the IB asks for, not as busywork.

What's already built for you

Banyan provides all of this — you don't need to plan or recreate any of it:

- Four weekly, facilitator-led live sessions (~45 minutes each), run by Banyan, with no homework for students
- Your partner classroom match, the platform, and all session materials
- The four-week arc (session names vary slightly across Banyan's own materials — this guide uses Week 1–4 throughout to avoid that inconsistency)
- Global Context: Personal & Cultural Expression (primary), Identities & Relationships (secondary)
- The student artifacts described in Section 2

What's still yours to decide — together

How your two subjects' specific objectives connect to that core, and how you'll jointly judge students' work against the MYP interdisciplinary criteria. That's everything from here on.

How much time this takes

As little or as much as you both want — this is designed to flex. Some schools will get through the sections below in one 45–60 minute sit-down. Others will find it easier as two or three shorter check-ins.

How to use the “Decide together” boxes

Sections marked DECIDE TOGETHER need both of you present at the same time — in person, on a call, whatever works — not filled in separately and stitched together afterward. That's the difference between planning your IDU together and each of you independently adapting a template. Everything else below can be drafted on your own first, then reviewed together.

What happens each week

A quick reference so this guide stands on its own. For the full session-by-session detail — exact scripts, timing, facilitator notes — use the four Teacher Overviews you already have for this unit.

Week	Focus	What students create	Your role
Week 1	Meet partner schools, watch three short festival clips, brainstorm ideas as a group.	A 30–60 second Padlet video answering “My festival idea is ____ because ____,” plus short Padlet posts (a word, a food, a local festival) and 1–2 questions for partner schools.	Classroom management; help during the ~15-minute video-recording segment.
Week 2	Five fast-paced rounds building the festival's story, name, food, main event, and symbol.	A complete festival concept — story, name, food, main event, and symbol — posted to Padlet, plus partner questions.	Classroom management; help groups stay on task during the rounds and during Padlet posting.
Week 3	Reveal of an AI-generated video of their own festival concept; record a pitch video; explore real festivals near partner cities.	A pitch video (about 30–60 seconds) answering three set questions: What is your festival called? What makes it special? Why should someone come? Plus 1–2 partner questions. (This pairing adds to the pitch task — see Section 2.)	Classroom management; help during the ~15-minute pitch-recording segment.
Week 4	Watch pitch videos from the whole cohort; “Culture Detective” activity finding patterns across schools; post a Cultural Claim; reflect as a group.	A written Cultural Claim posted to Padlet — “Festivals reveal the culture of the people who create them because ____” — plus a spoken (not retained) reflection on what students will remember, and the end-of-unit survey. (This pairing may add to Week 4 — see Section 2.)	Classroom management; help during Culture Detective and Cultural Claim posting.

This pairing adds a peer-evaluation task in Week 3 and a short closing question in Week 4 — see Section 2 for exactly what and why.

1. Your statement of inquiry

Key Concepts: Communication (Language & Literature) / Creativity (Arts) · Global Context: Personal & Cultural Expression (secondary: Identities & Relationships)

DECIDE TOGETHER

Before you use the example below, work through this together — it's what actually makes the unit collaboratively planned, not just individually adapted:

- Language & Literature: what does your curriculum emphasize about audience, purpose, or storytelling that connects to the concept document and pitch students produce?
- Arts: what does your curriculum emphasize about visual identity, symbol, or design choices that connects to the festival's name, symbol, main event, and AI visualization?
- Where do your two answers overlap or push against each other? Don't stop at the

overlap — pick one specific choice your students will actually make (a name, a symbol, a food, a story detail) and ask: what changes about its meaning when you look at it through your OTHER subject's lens? That shift — not just the shared topic — is your real Purpose of Integration.

Example statement of inquiry: *“A festival communicates a community's identity through the story it tells and the symbols it shows, and evaluating how well those two things work together — in your own work and someone else's — sharpens both the writing and the design.”*

Example purpose of integration

Language & Literature: students craft the festival's story and pitch, choosing language and narrative technique that give the festival concept meaning and momentum.

Arts: students design the festival's visual identity — its symbol and visual presentation — making deliberate choices about color, imagery, and form.

Synthesis: students combine storytelling choices with visual-design choices, and evaluate how well the two reinforce each other, to create a festival concept whose story and symbol communicate the same meaning together — something neither lens fully tests alone.

Treat this as a model, not a script — your own students' festival ideas may point somewhere more specific.

2. Map your subjects onto the artifacts

Artifact	Criterion	Subjects
Festival concept document & pitch storytelling (Weeks 2–3)	B – Synthesizing	L&L storytelling / Arts visual-identity choices
Peer-evaluation task (Week 3, added)	A – Evaluating	L&L writing / Arts visual half
Closing reflection (Week 4, added)	C – Reflecting	L&L / Arts jointly

Week 1's festival-idea video is a warm-up — it isn't mapped to a criterion and shouldn't be cited as evidence of collaborative planning.

Week 4's standard Cultural Claim and reflection close still happen as usual — the added closing question below is on top of it, not a replacement.

HOW YOUR SESSIONS ARE CUSTOMIZED FOR THIS PAIRING

The Week 3 pitch already asks students to answer three questions in about 30–60 seconds: What is your festival called? What makes it special? Why should someone come? This pairing doesn't add lines to that pitch the way the other two Festivals pairings do, since there's no Individuals & Societies research to draw on — instead, Banyan customizes your cohort's sessions with a separate task in the same session, so Criterion A (Evaluating) has real joint evidence instead of a loose thematic connection:

- A peer-evaluation task in Week 3, alongside the pitch above: each student picks another team's festival from the AI gallery (the same gallery students already browse that week) and evaluates how well that team's story and symbol work together, then does the same for their own — then, in one sentence, says what looking at the story and symbol together showed them that looking at just one wouldn't have. That last sentence is what makes this genuine evaluation (Criterion A(ii)) instead of just a quality check on the pairing (A(i)).

- A short written closing question in Week 4, posted to Padlet, on top of the standard Cultural Claim and spoken close: as a team, name one other festival, story, or artwork (real, or seen in the AI gallery) you'd want to explore further using what you noticed about how story and symbol work together. This gives the pairing real Criterion C evidence — both reflecting on understanding and connecting it to future exploration — where previously there was none.

3. Your disciplinary grounding

This is the part IB cares about most when it comes to why two teachers are involved at all — it protects the integrity of what each of you actually teaches. Draft your own column, then review both together.

Prompt	Language & Literature	Arts
What factual, conceptual, or procedural knowledge from your curriculum will students need for this unit?		
Which of your subject-group objectives does this unit address?		
What related concept(s) from your subject connect to Communication / Creativity? (name 1–2 from each of your subjects' official concept lists that fit)		
How will you help students weigh the benefits and limits of your discipline's perspective on this topic?		
DECIDE TOGETHER Once both columns are filled in, sit down together and check: does each of your pieces actually feed into the other's, or are you just running two parallel mini-units that happen to share a topic? If it's the latter, that's worth 10 minutes of adjustment now rather than after the unit runs.		

4. Inquiry questions

Starting questions below — adapt freely. IB expects factual, conceptual, and debatable questions that both subjects can genuinely explore.

DRAFT LANGUAGE — a starting point, not an approved or required version

Factual: What elements — story, name, symbol — make up a festival concept? What choices do real festival stories and visual symbols make to communicate meaning?

Conceptual: How does combining a story with a visual symbol change how an audience understands a festival's meaning, compared to either alone? What is gained or lost when a

story's meaning is translated into a visual symbol?

Debatable: Can a symbol ever fully capture what a story means? Should a festival's visual identity match its story exactly, or is some creative distance valuable?

DECIDE TOGETHER

Keep, cut, or rewrite these together so they genuinely work for both subjects — a question only one of you could teach into isn't doing its job here.

5. Agree now on how you'll assess together

This section is about agreeing on your approach before the unit runs — the actual joint grading happens later (see Section 7). Deciding your approach now makes that step much faster.

DECIDE TOGETHER

For the Week 3 peer-evaluation task (see Section 2): what would a strong answer actually look like, from both a Language & Literature and an Arts angle? Sketch a shared, rough sense of what 'fully analyses' and 'fully evaluates' (the top band's command terms) would look like in a student's actual answer — you don't need a polished rubric, just a shared mental picture so you're not calibrating from scratch after the unit ends.

6. Record of collaborative planning

Fill in together. Keep this — it's your evidence of collaborative planning if a school is ever asked for it during an IB evaluation.

Teachers (name, subject)	
Date(s) you met	
Format used (one session / two check-ins / other)	
Statement of inquiry — final wording	
Key adjustments you made to the starting materials in this guide	
YOUR CONNECTION, IN YOUR OWN WORDS This matters more than the checkboxes above: in 2–3 sentences, describe the specific connection you found between your two subjects for this cohort — not just that you met, but what you actually decided. This is your strongest evidence of genuine collaborative planning.	

7. After the unit: score Criterion A together

Once students finish their work, sit down together with a sample of it — specifically the peer-evaluation responses, including the added evaluative sentence — and jointly decide a best-fit achievement level for Criterion A, not each of you grading your own slice separately. Budget 20–30 minutes for this after the unit ends; it's required regardless of how the unit was planned.

A different pairing?

This guide is written for Language & Literature + Arts. If your school is using a different pairing instead, ask Banyan for the matching guide: Individuals & Societies + Language & Literature (recommended), or Individuals & Societies + Arts.

Sources

This guide is built directly on “Interdisciplinary teaching and learning in the MYP” (International Baccalaureate Organization, updated through October 2023) — specifically its guidance on the purpose of integration, statement of inquiry, disciplinary grounding, and the Criterion A joint-assessment requirement. The Criterion A/A(ii) and Criterion C/C(ii) framing was additionally checked against real IB ID eAssessment preparation materials (M25 cycle) to confirm what genuine interdisciplinary evaluation and reflection actually require. This guide does not claim to guarantee IB evaluation outcomes for any specific school.