



LEAF CONTENT INTEGRATION DASH

Facilitator Guide

A rapid, collaborative curriculum-redesign activity that helps educators enrich existing disciplinary content through sustainability perspectives without increasing curriculum overload.

Core rule

Do not add another sustainability topic. Reframe something students already need to learn.

Designed for educators, programme teams, curriculum committees and professional-development workshops.

Recommended group size: 3-4 participants | Duration: 60 or 90 minutes

Process inspiration: Design Dash, created by Molly Wilson at the HPI School of Design Thinking. This adaptation is released under CC BY-SA 2.0. GREENUS logo and GREEN LEAF framework content are used for this project resource.

1. What the Dash is designed to do

The LEAF Content Integration Dash turns curriculum enrichment into a concrete design process. Teams start with one topic already taught, protect its disciplinary core, identify a meaningful sustainability connection, prototype a revised learning experience and test it with peers.

By the end of the activity, each team produces a completed Content Reframing Card that can be transferred into the LEAF Content Integration Canvas or used in course and programme review.

Learning objectives

- Distinguish curriculum enrichment from the addition of sustainability content.
- Use LEAF metaconcepts as interpretive lenses for disciplinary knowledge.
- Recognise authentic contexts, affected groups and knowledge held beyond the classroom.
- Prototype and test a feasible redesign of one existing learning experience.
- Make an explicit no-overload decision by identifying what is replaced, shortened or reinterpreted.

What the Dash does not do

- It does not redesign an entire course in one session.
- It does not require every topic to address every metaconcept or SDG.
- It does not replace later work on pedagogy, assessment, partnerships or implementation.

2. Preparation

Participants

Form teams of three or four. Mixed-discipline teams often generate richer questions; same-discipline teams may move faster into detailed redesign.

Materials

- One printed participant deck per team, preferably single-sided on A3 paper.
- One printed set of LEAF metaconcept cards per table.
- Pens, markers and sticky notes.
- A visible timer and an audible signal for transitions.
- Optional prototyping materials: blank paper, index cards, tape and scissors.

Room setup

- Provide one working surface per team.
- Leave enough space for one participant to move temporarily to another group during the interview and testing stages.
- Project the current activity page if possible, while teams work on printed pages.

Before participants arrive

- Choose whether teams will work on their own course topics or on examples supplied by the facilitator.
- Decide whether to use the 60-minute or 90-minute schedule.
- Print pages 1-14 as the main packet. Pages 16-17 contain cut-out metaconcept cards; page 18 is the peer-feedback card.
- Review the worked example on page 15, but do not show it before participants frame their own ideas unless they are stuck.

3. Timing options

Keep the pace visible. Participants should know how much time remains, but they should not be responsible for timing themselves.

Stage	Pages	60 min	90 min
Welcome and teams	1	4	6
Choose topic	2	4	6
Protect core and notice assumptions	3-4	7	11
Interview another perspective	5	6	9
Choose lens and frame opportunity	6-7	8	12
Generate and prototype	8-9	9	14
Test and no-overload check	10-11	7	10
Iterate and capture	12-13	7	10
Share and debrief	14	8	12

Facilitation rhythm

A useful transition is: What you just did... / Now you will... / Here is how and why.... Explain the next page only when teams reach it. Do not preview the entire process.

The activity should feel unfinished at several points. That is intentional. The pace interrupts habitual curriculum planning and creates space for experimentation.

4. Facilitation notes: opening the inquiry

01 - Form the team

Ask participants to add their names and quick self-portraits. Introduce the central rule and explain that the final output is a testable curriculum redesign, not a finished syllabus.

02 - Choose one existing topic

Each participant proposes one topic already taught. The team selects one concept, theory, method, professional practice, case or learning resource. Reject topics that are too broad, such as "sustainability in engineering" or "the green curriculum."

Useful prompt

What is small enough to change, but important enough to matter?

03 - Protect the disciplinary core

Teams identify what students must understand and be able to do. Help them distinguish the disciplinary core from the examples, readings or routines traditionally used to teach it.

04 - Notice what is implicit

Participants examine what the current version assumes about valid knowledge, affected groups and visible or absent perspectives. Keep this diagnostic; teams do not need to solve the omissions yet.

Watch for

- Treating the existing lecture format as part of the non-negotiable disciplinary core.
- Choosing a sustainability theme first and then searching for a disciplinary connection.
- Describing students only as recipients rather than interpreters, investigators or actors.

5. Facilitation notes: making the connection

05 - Discover another perspective

One participant from each team temporarily joins another group as an interviewee. Teams ask where the topic appears outside the classroom, who holds practical or lived knowledge, and what consequences or trade-offs might be overlooked.

Remind teams to listen 80 percent of the time and talk 20 percent. The visitor is a source of perspective, not a consultant expected to design the curriculum.

06 - Choose a LEAF lens

Teams select one primary metaconcept. A second lens is allowed only if it changes the inquiry rather than decorating it.

Metaconcepts are lenses, not coverage requirements

07 - Frame the learning opportunity

Teams complete: Students currently learn [disciplinary content], but they rarely examine [sustainability dimension]. The statement should explain why the neglected dimension matters for disciplinary understanding or professional judgement.

Weak framing

Students need more awareness of sustainability.

Stronger framing

Students learn supplier selection criteria but rarely examine how purchasing decisions redistribute labour, resource and end-of-life consequences across the supply system.

6. Facilitation notes: prototyping and testing

08 - Generate reframing options

Teams create several possible changes: replace the case, alter the central question, introduce another voice, use different evidence, move into an authentic context or examine long-term effects. They circle one idea to prototype.

09 - Make it tangible

The prototype should be concrete enough for another person to respond to. It may be a revised prompt, a three-step student activity, a case opening, a role-play outline, a data comparison or a simple storyboard.

10 - Test with another team

Reviewers identify where the connection is authentic, where it feels forced, what perspective remains absent and one practical improvement. Ask them to review the design on the page rather than the intentions behind it.

11 - Run the no-overload test

Teams must be able to name what is replaced, reframed or shortened. If the only change is an additional lecture, reading or SDG label, return to page 8.

The test

- The disciplinary core remains explicit.
- The sustainability connection changes the inquiry, not only the vocabulary.
- Students do something with the connection.
- The activity fits existing teaching time.
- The team can identify what is no longer taught in the same way.

7. Facilitation notes: iteration and closure

12 - Revise the prototype

Teams decide what to keep, change and remove, then create a visible second version. Encourage revision of the learning experience itself, not only a list of intended future improvements.

13 - Complete the Content Reframing Card

The card records the existing topic, disciplinary core, LEAF lens, authentic context or perspective, revised learning experience, expected learning shift and no-overload decision. This is the main workshop output.

14 - Share in 60 seconds

Teams describe the redesign using four sentences:

- We started with...
- The LEAF lens revealed...
- We replaced or reframed...
- Students will now...

Debrief the process

After sharing outputs, move the conversation from products to process. Useful questions include:

- What was hardest to protect?
- Which lens changed your thinking?
- When did sustainability integration begin to feel forced?
- How did another perspective affect the redesign?
- What would you test with students, colleagues or community partners?

8. Quick reference: LEAF metaconcepts

Systems and interdependence	Relationships, feedback, dependencies, trade-offs and unintended consequences.
Justice, equity and responsibility	Distribution of benefits and burdens, power, accountability and fairness.
Futures and anticipation	Plausible futures, uncertainty, long-term effects and alternative pathways.
Sustainable production and consumption	Resources, materials, labour, use, waste, repair and circularity.
Human-nature relationships	Ecological dependence, care, planetary boundaries and more-than-human consequences.
Agency, governance and collective action	Participation, institutions, decisions, collective capacity and routes to change.

Selection principle

The best lens is not the one that mentions sustainability most explicitly. It is the one that helps students understand the disciplinary topic more accurately, critically or responsibly.

9. Worked example

Supply-chain management

Existing topic	Supplier selection and procurement
Disciplinary core	Evaluate suppliers using operational and financial criteria.
LEAF lenses	Systems and interdependence; justice, equity and responsibility.
Authentic context	University procurement of electronic devices.
Learning opportunity	Students learn supplier selection criteria but rarely examine how purchasing decisions distribute labour, resource and end-of-life consequences across a supply system.
Prototype	Students trace the lifecycle of one device and compare purchasing options using cost, labour conditions, repairability, resource use and end-of-life consequences.
No-overload decision	Replace the conventional procurement case with the sustainability-enriched case.
Learning shift	Students evaluate trade-offs and justify responsibility across a supply system.

Why the example works

The redesign preserves supplier evaluation as the disciplinary core, changes the case through which it is learned and asks students to make a more complete professional judgement. Sustainability is integrated into the inquiry rather than appended as additional information.

10. Troubleshooting and adaptation

Teams choose topics that are too broad

Ask them to name one lesson, case, concept or assignment that could realistically change next semester.

The sustainability connection feels forced

Return to the disciplinary core and the interview notes. Try another metaconcept or accept that this topic may not be the strongest integration point.

Participants keep adding content

Use the no-overload test early. Require the sentence: We will replace or reinterpret...

No external stakeholder is present

Peer interviews still broaden perspective, but teams should mark assumptions that later require validation with students, practitioners or community knowledge holders.

Participants want to redesign assessment or pedagogy

Capture those ideas in a parking area. This Dash focuses on content integration; assessment, partnership and pedagogical design can follow through other GREENUS tools.

Attribution and licence

The rapid, staged process is inspired by the Design Dash created by Molly Wilson at the HPI School of Design Thinking. The original encourages adaptation under Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 2.0. This LEAF adaptation should retain the original attribution and be shared under CC BY-SA 2.0 or a compatible ShareAlike licence.

Suggested attribution

LEAF Content Integration Dash, developed within the GREENUS GREEN LEAF Framework.
Inspired by the Design Dash created by Molly Wilson at the HPI School of Design Thinking.
Licensed under CC BY-SA 2.0.

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/2.0/>