

GLOBAL COHORTS · LOCAL LEGENDS UNIT

Your IDU Co-Planning Guide

For your Language & Literature and Language Acquisition (English) teachers, context-specific: only where English is the acquisition language, and only for students at MYP Phase 3 / CEFR A2 or above

This is the planning conversation that makes your Local Legends unit a collaboratively planned MYP interdisciplinary unit, not a program you each run in parallel.

Before you begin

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

It's built with that requirement in mind. It doesn't guarantee any outcome in an IB evaluation; that judgment belongs to your evaluator. The IB asks for everything in each section below.

What's 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 across Banyan's own materials; this guide uses Week 1–4 throughout to avoid that inconsistency)
- Global Context: Personal & Cultural Expression (primary), Orientation in Space & Time (secondary)
- The student artifacts described in Section 2

What you still decide, together

How your two subjects' objectives connect to that core, and how you'll judge students' work together 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. Banyan built this to flex: some schools get through the sections below in one 45 to 60 minute sit-down, others 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 in the room at the same time, in person or on a call. Fill them in separately and stitch them together afterward, and you lose the point: that's the difference between planning your IDU together and each of you adapting a template alone. Draft everything else on your own first, then review it together.

What happens each week

A quick reference so this guide stands on its own. For exact scripts, timing, and facilitator notes for each session, 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 storytelling/legend clips, brainstorm ideas as a group.	A 30–60 second Padlet video naming something in their world (a landform, weather, an animal, a custom) that “needs a legend.”	Classroom management; help during the ~15-minute video-recording segment.
Week 2	Fast-paced rounds building the legend: what it explains, main character/creature, the event or problem, the explanation/lesson, and a title.	A legend outline posted to Padlet: what it explains, main character/creature, the event or problem, the explanation/lesson, and a title.	Classroom management; help groups stay on task during the rounds and during Padlet posting.
Week 3	Reveal of AI-generated visuals of each legend's world; record an oral telling; explore how partner communities explain similar phenomena.	A ~60 second recorded oral telling of the legend, plus one written question posed to a partner classroom. (This pairing adds to the telling; see Section 2.)	Classroom management; help during the ~15-minute recording segment.
Week 4	Premiere of tellings; answer partner questions live by school; post one written comment on a partner legend; reflect as a group.	One written comment on a partner school's legend, and a short cultural reflection on what the legends reveal about each community's world. (This pairing may add to Week 4; see Section 2.)	Classroom management; help during the premiere and comment-posting.

This pairing uses students' own written and spoken work as the evaluative evidence, plus a second written prompt in Week 4. Section 2 explains exactly what and why.

1. Your statement of inquiry

Key Concepts: Perspective (Language & Literature) / Identity (Language Acquisition) · Global Context: Personal & Cultural Expression (secondary: Orientation in Space & Time)

DECIDE TOGETHER

Work through this together before you use the example below. This step makes the unit collaboratively planned, rather than something you each adapted on your own:

- Language & Literature: what does your curriculum emphasize about narrative structure, character, and oral tradition that connects to the legend students write and tell?
- Language Acquisition: at what phase are your students, and what can they realistically produce, unscripted, in the target language in one 45-minute session? (Phase 3 / CEFR A2 is the practical floor for this unit's ~60-second telling.)
- Compare your two answers: where do they overlap, and where do they push against each other? Don't stop at the overlap. Pick one specific choice your students will make (a name, a symbol, an image, a story detail) and ask what changes about its meaning when you look at it through your OTHER subject's lens. That shift, not the shared topic alone, is your real Purpose of Integration.

Example statement of inquiry: *“Telling a story aloud in a language you’re still learning forces choices a written version doesn’t. Comparing what changed between the written and spoken versions reveals how language shapes meaning.”*

Example purpose of integration

Language & Literature: students write an original legend, choosing character, event, and narrative technique in their first language.

Language Acquisition: students retell that legend aloud in the target language, making real-time choices about what to simplify, cut, or add to make the story work as spoken language production.

Synthesis: students compare their own written legend to their own spoken retelling, and evaluate what changed and why, something neither the written task alone nor a generic speaking exercise would surface.

Treat this as a model, not a script, and confirm this pairing only applies where English is your school's Language Acquisition target language, with students at Phase 3 (CEFR A2) or above. Earlier-phase students likely can't produce a ~60-second original retelling independently.

2. Map your subjects onto the artifacts

Artifact	Criterion	Subjects
Legend outline (Week 2)	B – Synthesizing	L&L narrative craft / Language Acquisition target-language planning
Recorded telling (Week 3, ~60 sec)	A – Evaluating	L&L (written legend) / Language Acquisition (spoken retelling)
Reflection (Week 4)	C – Reflecting	L&L / Language Acquisition

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

This pairing only applies where English is the school's Language Acquisition target language, and only for students at MYP Phase 3 (CEFR A2) or above.

HOW YOUR SESSIONS ARE CUSTOMIZED FOR THIS PAIRING

The Week 3 telling asks students to perform their legend aloud in about 60 seconds. For this pairing, Banyan customizes your cohort's sessions to use the students' own written and spoken work as the evaluative evidence, rather than adding a separate script line:

- Students compare their own written legend to their own spoken retelling: what did they have to change, cut, or add to make the story work out loud, in the target language? This comparison is what makes the task evaluative (Criterion A(ii)) for Language Acquisition: it judges a real language choice, instead of just a comprehension or production check (A(i)). It uses only these two subjects' own skills and fits naturally with the telling format already in the unit.
- A change to Week 4: alongside the standard cultural reflection, add a second written prompt posted to Padlet, in the target language for the Language Acquisition half: “Because of this project, I understand something new about telling a story in [target language]: _____. Because of that, one thing I want to practice next time is: _____.” That forward-looking second sentence covers Criterion C's 'future action' strand for Language Acquisition.

3. Your disciplinary grounding

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

Prompt	Language & Literature	Language Acquisition
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 Perspective / Identity? (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 you've both filled in your columns, sit down together and check whether each piece feeds into the other's, or whether you're running two parallel mini-units that happen to share a topic. If it's the latter, spend 10 minutes adjusting it now, before the unit runs.

4. Inquiry questions

Adapt the starting questions below freely. IB expects factual, conceptual, and debatable questions that both subjects can explore.

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

Factual: What changes between a written story and a spoken telling of it? What target-language vocabulary or structures does this legend require?

Conceptual: How does telling a story in a language you're still learning change what the story can say? What is gained or lost when a story is simplified for spoken, in-progress language production?

Debatable: Should a legend told in a new language be judged by the same standard as one told in a first language? Is a simplified, honest telling better than an ambitious one that breaks down?

DECIDE TOGETHER

Keep, cut, or rewrite these together so they 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 joint grading happens later (see Section 7); deciding your approach now makes that step faster.

DECIDE TOGETHER

For the written-vs-spoken comparison (see Section 2): what would a strong answer look like, from both a Language & Literature and a Language Acquisition angle, given your students' actual phase? Sketch a shared, rough sense of what 'fully evaluates' looks like at your students' proficiency level.

6. Record of collaborative planning

Fill this in together, and keep it. 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 to 3 sentences, describe the specific connection you found between your two subjects for this cohort: what you decided, not just that you met. This is your strongest evidence of collaborative planning. 	

7. After the unit: score Criterion A together

Once students finish their work, sit down together with a sample of it (the written-vs-spoken comparisons) and decide together on a best-fit achievement level for Criterion A, calibrated to your students' actual Language Acquisition phase. Budget 20 to 30 minutes for this after the unit ends.

A different pairing?

This guide is written for Language & Literature + Language Acquisition (English, Phase 3+ only), a context-specific alternate pairing for Local Legends. The recommended pairing is Language & Literature + Individuals & Societies; also available: Individuals & Societies + Arts, or Language & Literature + Arts.

Sources

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