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## Purpose

1. This note reports on the Phase 1 Feedback Survey for 18 RAS subjects and outlines the overall themes in response to the Feedback Survey and recent RAS Focus Groups.

## Executive Summary

1. The Public Engagement RAS Phase 1 Survey closed at 11.59pm 19 April 2021. There are 1142 total responses across 18 subjects in the English language survey. There was one response to te reo survey. There are additional submissions from Subject Associations and occasional additional submissions through other channels. In the period March 23 to April 19, there have been 19,245 unique visitors to NCEA.education, 66.7% of whom were new visitors during the consultation period.
2. A full list of subjects and how many submissions were made is below. Consolidated subjects received the most feedback. Many responses refer to decisions in the Level 1 Subject List, especially relating to the consolidated subjects. The Ministry is developing back pocket key messages around probable recurring queries relating to the Level 1 list.
3. Themes across all subjects continue to show that some need for clarifying messages to the sector, requiring PLD to implement changes – particularly in reference to mātauranga Māori – and a broad sense that Phase 2 subject content will give the public a better sense of the overall package. Kaiako note that they are concerned at this stage how the changes will be implemented in the classroom.
4. There is a mixed set of views on the inclusion of mātauranga Māori and kupu Māori, but there is a noticeable increase in the number of comments which endorse or approve of use in Phase 1 subject content, compared to other similar engagement processes.
5. Recent focus groups (Digital Technologies, Materials and Processing Technologies, Physical Education, Chemistry and Biology, Commerce, Design and Visual Communication, Health Education (with Home Economics), History, Physics Earth and Space Science, Social Studies) largely support those views expressed in the feedback survey.
6. Subjects which have generated significant feedback, through the Public Engagement process, (as assessed by our internal development teams) are: Commerce, Health Education (with Home Economics), and Physics, Earth and Space Science, Chemistry and Biology. Summary details for this are given below.

## Action

1. This a summary report intended for Subject Expert Group (SEG) use and development only. The document is marked confidential and aims to give SEGs an overview across all subjects. Following approvals, this report should also be shared with the wider Ministry to aid the concurrent curriculum refresh work.

## Context

1. Following the development of the Trial and Pilot subjects for RAS in 2020, development began on a further 19 subjects in November 2020. These 19 subjects were split into two development groups, RAS 8 (began November 2020) and RAS 11 (January 2021).
2. These 19 subject have been developed at Phase 1, which includes the Learning Matrix (the underpinning curriculum document), the Assessment Matrix (the new draft standard titles, credit allocations, and modes of assessment), and the first draft of the Teaching, Learning, and Assessment Guide (TLAG). The TLAG explains the subject rationale and unpacks the Learning Matrix and Achievement Standards so that more context is given to the sector for how and why subject content has been developed as it has.
3. The feedback survey is now closed and the development teams have produced subject-specific reports to give more detail. A SEG response to the feedback will be produced, and actions taken to contribute to the development of Phase 2 subject content.

## General themes

1. A full list of subjects and how many submissions were made is below. Respondents were able to give feedback on multiple subjects. Therefore, the total number of responses does not correspond to the total number of unique respondents:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Subject | Number of Responses | Percentage (1 d.p.) |
| Commerce | 163 | 14.3% |
| Chemistry and Biology  | 155 | 13.6% |
| Mathematics and Statistics | 140 | 12.3% |
| Physics Earth and Space Science | 122  | 10.7% |
| Materials and Processing Technology | 111 | 9.7% |
| Geography | 90 | 7.9% |
| Health Education (with Home Economics) | 83 | 7.3% |
| Asian Languages  | 73 | 6.34% |
| Physical Education  | 68  | 6% |
| Digital Technologies | 66  | 5.8% |
| History | 60 | 5.3% |
| Design and Visual Communication  | 54  | 4.7% |
| Music | 53 | 4.6% |
| European Languages  | 47 | 4.1% |
| Drama | 33  | 2.9% |
| Dance | 28 | 2.5% |
| Social Studies  | 23 | 2% |
| Agricultural and Horticultural Science  | 21  | 1.8% |
| **Totals** | **1390** | **121.8%** |

1. The vast majority (982 of 1142) identify as kaiako, including school leaders and classroom teachers, and very few identify as parents or whānau (44 of 1142). 90% of respondents (1028 of 1142) answered as individuals. Those answering in groups were predominantly self-identified as school departments.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Response | Number of responses | Percentage |
| Ākonga / Student | 12 | 1.05% |
| Kaiako / Teacher | 982 | 85.99% |
| Senior School Leader | 107 | 9.37% |
| Tumuaki / Principal | 10 | 0.88% |
| Parent, whānau, or community member | 44 | 3.85% |
| Tertiary employee | 17 | 1.49% |
| NCEA Panel member | 28 | 2.45% |
| Subject Expert Group member | 35 | 3.06% |
| Subject association representative | 36 | 3.15% |
| Other | 42 | 3.68% |

1. Respondents were asked if they had a connection to a school or kura. It is clear that respondents predominantly had a connection to English-medium ‘Secondary’ schools. The complete data list is below:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| School type | Total | Percentage |
| Kura Kaupapa Māori | 1 | 0.09% |
| Wharekura | 2 | 0.18% |
| Composite (Year 1-10) | 0 | 0.00% |
| Composite (Year 1-15) | 55 | 4.82% |
| Contributing | 0 | 0.00% |
| Correspondence School | 9 | 0.79% |
| Full Primary | 1 | 0.09% |
| Intermediate | 3 | 0.26% |
| Restricted Composite (Year 7-10) | 7 | 0.61% |
| Secondary | 970 | 84.94% |
| Special School | 2 | 0.18% |
| Teen Parent Unit | 0 | 0.00% |
| Other NCEA provider | 1 | 0.09% |
| Home School | 0 | 0.00% |
| Other | 45 | 3.94% |
| Not Answered | 46 | 4.03% |

1. Respondents were asked the decile of the schools they were connected to, if applicable. This was a non-compulsory question with 947 responses. The average was 6.88.
2. Overall, some respondents are unsure if they have sufficient information to adequately respond to the survey, suggesting that they need more information before they can make an informed view. This relates to lacking Phase 2 subject content (e.g. the draft Achievement Standards and Assessment Activities), or being unfamiliar with the development process or wider Change Package. Examples of this include discussions on whether individual subjects might be able to have more standards, or fewer external standards. In addition, it is clear from feedback that many respondents were unfamiliar with the development process, and that the Ministry’s intentions of the public engagement process were not clearly understood by respondents.
3. The Ministry needs to further consider how internal “products” are released in public engagements as it is not always sufficiently clear what or where a product is when its content is published on the NCEA.Education website. This is due, in part, to how information is presented on the website. For example, there is no clear articulation on the front end of the website what the TLAG is, despite survey questions referring specifically to it. Work is ongoing within the RAS team to develop mitigations and further clarifications for this.

## Mana ōrite and mātauranga Māori

1. All subjects are reporting a high proportion of comments about the inclusion of mātauranga Māori (MM). The reasons for this are varied, from concerns that MM is included at all, the appropriateness of using MM, and concerns about how MM will be delivered in the classroom. Many comments refer to needing more significant, dedicated PLD to support the changes.
2. However, there is also a relatively high proportion of comments supporting the inclusion of MM and some can see good MM content in the Phase 1 subject content. An example of these comments is “The more we align our teaching practise wil Tikanga Maori the better - all learners benefit. [sic]” and “Love the fact that we are incorporating more Maori language into our curriculum”.
3. Specific references, submissions, and suggestions are contained within the subject-specific reports, and referenced throughout this report, given that there are too many comments to address in one discrete section.

## NCEA Panels

1. The NCEA Panels – Māori, Pacific, Disability and Learning Support, and Pathways – each had the opportunity to give feedback on 18 of the 19 RAS subjects’ Phase 1 subject content. Pacific Languages was not included in this round of engagement. Not every Panel reviewed all subject content. The full Panel reports have been made available to the Technical Writers for synthesis and summary in the subject-specific feedback reports. The full Panel reports are intended as a development report and will not be proactively released.
2. Specific recommendations will be presented to the SEG for consideration in the next round of development.

## NZQA

1. NZQA were not given a formal feedback opportunity in this round of engagement, due to the fact that Phase 1 subject content are predominantly curriculum documents and that NZQA were directly involved in the development process. Some individual NZQA officials shared further feedback with the development teams during the engagement process.
2. Following concerns raised by NZQA about this process, we are working on ways to ensure that NZQA have formally allotted time in future processes to have feedback opportunities prior to publication. At this stage it would not be workable to provide a formal review point at this point in Phase 1 (i.e. for Level 2).

## Out of process feedback

1. The Public Engagement process was intended to give multiple opportunities for people to engage with the Phase 1 subject content. However, there were a number of contributions which were submitted through channels outside of the Feedback Survey and Focus Groups.
2. These submissions are being treated as ‘long form’ submissions. Long form submissions include ad hoc emails from those who have not found ‘official channels’ to give feedback to, Subject Associations, and Teacher Associations. Subjects which have a relatively high number of ‘out of process’ submissions include Asian Languages, Mathematics and Statistics, Commerce, Music, and Social Studies.

## Subject-specific feedback

1. Below is a summary of the feedback across ‘18 RAS’ subjects. Detailed reports are appended, containing specific recommendations to aid the next stage of development.

Commerce

1. Commerce has two themes which cause concern, and some of the comments are combative in nature. Comments refer significantly to the amalgamation of Accounting, Business Studies, and Finance at Level 1. Many comments do not reach beyond this point. However, respondents across the survey and focus groups commented that the consolidated subject is too general and that not enough content can be covered at Level 1. The focus group felt that the subject was unfairly weighted towards one of the previous subjects, but did not agree on which.
2. There is also a concern that the new subject content looks too much like Social Studies and do not reflect the rigour which the sector may have expected in the subject content. This, therefore, may lead to struggles at Level 2 and 3 when specialism will require a thorough grounding in Commerce concepts. With regards to MM, there is a wide divide in those respondents who believe that there is too much MM included, and those who cannot see how it is implementable in a classroom setting. The focus group was generally more positive in this area.

Chemistry and Biology

1. Chemistry and Biology has – of all subjects – the most amount of feedback which is difficult to action because the comments are non-specific and often do not address a particular product.
2. One perceived missed opportunity identified in feedback is not linking Chemistry and Biology enough, for example through Biochemistry or Human Biology. Also there are concerns that the content is quite vague at this stage, which may lead to inconsistencies in teaching and learning across New Zealand. Comments have referred to needing much more material to see the implications of this, and there are wide concerns about whether this will be sufficient knowledge to progress to Level 2 and 3. There are also comments which focus on the use of ‘Western science’ which is seen as unnecessary as Science is a global enterprise.
3. In terms of MM, there are concerns that it has been used inappropriately and in particular does not fit with the chemistry, although the general sense is that respondents are welcoming of the direction of travel. There are also suggestions that the MM links are too limited and need a wider range of concepts other than kaitiakitanga may fit better. Teacher expertise and confidence is a barrier to successful use of mātauranga Māori concepts, these need to be further unpacked in the subject content, and additional resourcing and professional development is required.

Physics, Earth and Space Science

1. Physics Earth and Space Science shares some of the concerns of Chemistry and Biology as a result of having a consolidated subject and fewer standards – specifically it is not clear to the public what the rationale is for having these particular subjects consolidated. The feedback so far is varied, but one theme is how this subject will progress to Level 2, and how enough subject content will be covered in the time that kaiako and ākonga have.
2. There is a definitive split on those who can and cannot see MM in the subject content, and the confidence which they have in teaching it. Furthermore there is concern from a section of respondents that MM has no place within Science in general. Overall, the respondents commenting on Physics components are less happy than those commenting on the Earth and Space components.
3. Some feedback has sought more explicitly prescribed content which would enable them to have more sense of what is expected from the new subject content. However, Phase 1 deliberately does not include draft Achievement Standards as the focus is on teaching and learning, with assessment the focus in Phase 2.

Health Education (with Home Economics)

1. While there is broadly positive feedback on the inclusion of MM, there is concern that the meaning of the concepts could be lost, or misapplied, on delivery in the classroom. There is similar concern about how Pacific values can be delivered, and contextualised, in the classroom in a nuanced and authentic way.
2. There is concern about the capability of teachers from Health Education or Home Economics teaching background to deliver the consolidated subject material, particularly in terms of some sensitive contexts such as sexuality and relationships. Overall, some suggest that the draft subject content is too academic and advanced for Level 1 learners, and there is a perceived imbalance in the standards between learning the theory underlying this subject, and the practical applications of learning.
3. Food and nutrition – the words themselves, as well as learning or concepts related to them – were not visible enough throughout the draft subject content, which would likely be perceived as a significant imbalance between the main concepts taught in Home Economics and Health Education that are being combined in this consolidated subject.
4. There is negative feedback on the current ‘placeholder’ subject name that has “with Home Economics” in brackets, with no consensus on possible alternative subject names, such as ‘Wellbeing Education’. Reasons include the risk of confusion with wider wellbeing aims being promoted throughout schools, parents not wanting their children to enrol in the subject, and the further diminishing of the profile of Health Education and Home Economics within schools. The need for a process to approve changes to the names of subjects is becoming more pressing. Potentially any changes could be socialised as part of Phase 2 public engagement.
5. While not an area of comment for all feedback groups, some stakeholders expressed concern that there will be a gender effect from the consolidation of two subjects – this is based on the view that girls will be disadvantaged because they would commonly choose both health education and home economics, and now they will only have one subject to choose from.

Mathematics and Statistics

1. Despite Mathematics and Statistics having a high number of responses, it is not considered a subject which is ‘of concern’. This is because there are non-contentious development decisions to be made, and they are not currently considered as controversial in the public domain, in contrast to the ‘of concern’ subjects.
2. There are concerns over the breadth of the standards, inclusion of algebra and calculus, and specialisation in Levels 2 and 3. Respondents also feel that emphasis has been made on Statistics. This suggests that the scope of AS 1.2 and 1.3 to assess a broad range of topics has not been made clear in teaching and learning support material.
3. There is feedback about the clarity of the Learning Matrix, with opinions split over its design. There are also questions over what assessment look like and how specific the content is to date. Although MM is broadly welcomed, appropriate incorporation into Teaching and Learning, and using kupu correctly has been raised as a concern.

Physical Education

1. In Physical Education, comments suggest there is little change seen in the subject content compared with the status quo, with concerns that MM will be a significant new element which requires PLD. More Pacific concepts and values need to be added into the subject content.
2. There is a theme supported by survey respondents and the focus group about Standard 1.1, because it is the performance standard. There are mixed opinions about whether this should be a purely performance standard, or whether it should be about engagement, and joy. This is an issue which split the SEG and is representative of the PE community as a whole.

Geography

1. In Geography, the breadth of content is a concern, with some respondents unsure how Geography will look nationwide. Respondents feel there is not enough emphasis on natural geography and a geographic knowledge base, leading to a feeling that the Learning Matrix and TLAG are vague.
2. There is also concern as to how the standards can be assessed as currently drafted. The focus on whenua will need a careful approach in PLD, so that kaiako can deliver content appropriately. Otherwise, MM in Geography has been received positively.

History

1. In History, the issue of the balance between Aotearoa and world histories was a common theme. There were a range of views on this issue, with many respondents understanding the changes at Level 1 as mandating a tight focus on Aotearoa New Zealand History (ANZH) by stealth. Others, however, felt that ākonga risk being overloaded with ANZH. Much of the feedback, overall, centred on the lack of time to deliver quality teaching and learning.
2. Concerns relating to mātauranga Māori focus on the need to have significant PLD to be able to authentically interweave mātauranga Māori though the subject content, with some sense that it has been ‘tacked on’ to the end.

Digital Technologies

1. In Digital Technologies, opinions are split on the content, with some respondents wanting to see more coding in the Achievement Standards, and seeing gaps, such as electronics. This is not universally agreed, however, because some teachers simply do not teach coding. This leads to major concerns about teacher capability should they now have, in effect, compulsory coding. This is replicated in ākonga, who do not necessarily enter NCEA Level 1 at the same level. There is also feedback from practitioners, especially in the focus group, that there are teacher capability issues through an inability to teach concepts sufficiently, such as programming.
2. There are also several mentions that the draft Achievement Standard title 1.3 looks more suited to Social Studies. Feedback has also been given that standard title 1.4 cannot work as an external – this is a ‘known’ issue and will be addressed in the next round of development. Also – giving an exemplar which is applicable to many subjects – kaiako are concerned about the modes of assessment and how to make a coherent course from the information published in Phase 1.
3. In terms of MM there is lots of broad support, but also anxiety that kaiako may struggle to do the concepts justice at the point of implementation. Concern about subject capability – programming needs a subject speciality to teach.
4. A final concern is that electronics, which currently fits well in Digital Technologies, no longer fits as a result of changes made in the Learning Matrix. The same concern is raised in Materials and Processing Technology, raising the question of where Electronics finds a place at NCEA Level 1.

Music

1. Most stakeholder groups were of the opinion that MM is not embedded well enough across the Music subject content, and the subject content needs to be more explicit about how vital music is to Māori (including Cook Island Māori) and Pacific communities, in terms of heritage, culture and identity. There are also concerns that most teachers do not have the experience, training, or knowledge to incorporate MM into their courses.
2. There is concern about explicit inclusion of ‘Māori music’ in Achievement Standard 1.3 ‘Demonstrate understanding of Māori music and music from one other context’. Some stakeholders are concerned that specifying ‘Māori music’ will limit the range of music that ākonga can use as part of their assessment. Adding to this concern are perceptions from a minority of stakeholders that Music is solely a performing arts subject, and the potential for duplication of any Te Ao Haka standards that focus on music.
3. There was concern that external assessment for Achievement Standard 1.4 ‘Perform Music’ would disadvantage many schools in terms of technology and time requirements to submit evidence for external moderation. This concern was coupled with the perceived lack of clarity in the draft subject content about whether the performance would be solo or group work.

European Languages

1. In European Languages, reaction has generally been positive, and may largely be because respondents do not see much change from the current subject content. The Course Outlines have given a bit of a better steer into what is a perceived ‘vagueness’ of the subject content so far, with comments saying that support is contingent on modes and methods of assessment. The speaking component of the new standards is welcomed, especially as it looks at introducing spontaneity. The lack of a specific standard is concerning to some, suggesting that this would enable students to avoid written work altogether. Others would like to see better alignment of Asian and European Languages, as they do not see lots of difference between them as is.
2. In terms of MM, there are further suggestions of contexts through which to teach and learn Learning Languages – this will be outlined in the subject-specific report. Overall, the same common themes on PLD as in other subjects were mentioned, with a particular focus on the difficultly of incorporating MM appropriately into the Target Language’s culture. Some suggested that there was a risk of detracting from the language’s culture and that it would be difficult to appropriately incorporate.

Asian Languages

1. There is widespread concern across Asian Languages that the subject content is different to the European Languages subject content. This gives the perception that Asian Languages will be significantly harder than any of the European ones. In order to aid kaiako to implement the new standards across all languages, it has been suggested that vocabulary and grammar lists be developed.
2. In the comprehension standard (listening and reading) has received the most comments. Respondents are concerned about the level of difficulty if both are combined – the solution is that there may be separate reading and listening section initially with them combined. There is also concern that they are quite different skills and that they should be assessed separately.
3. For the presentation standard, but there are diverse views on whether it should be done in the target language or English, as it is a presentation standard through a cultural context. Overall, the sense is that more clarification is needed around this Standard.
4. Mandarin also had a focus group with the NZCLTA (New Zealand Chinese Language Teachers’ Association). One significant issue arising was requests to change the subject name back to Chinese (current name is Mandarin). Chinese was not recommended in Level 1 as it is not the English name of an official language in countries where it is spoken.
5. In terms of MM, the sector is grappling with how to make the comparison between the target culture and Māori culture. Significant PLD has been requested in this area.

Materials and Processing Technology

1. Materials and Processing Technology has drawn a range of comments from other subjects such as the place of Food Technology and the inclusion of Electronics. Also, there are a number of comments relating to how the reduction in standards may have an impact upon the quality of teaching and learning. Some respondents do not see how the inclusion of MM will affect teaching practice, as they report that the content remains the same regardless.
2. Respondents are worried that they could silo subjects: what needs to be included in assessment, and can teachers pick and choose standards across technology subjects? The focus group expressed more overall satisfaction. The main focus for development needs to be on the standards, as they may be too vague. MM needs to be more explicit and not just implicitly inclusive.
3. There are some broad concerns across the technologies about how students who choose to take a range of ‘hands on’ technologies will still be able to continue to do so as a result of changes made at Level 1. Respondents ask how they are only able to take one ‘hands on’ technology subject, will this reduce their options, and what opportunities will they have to follow a more specific pathway?
4. A final concern is that electronics, which currently can fit Materials and Processing Technology, no longer fits as a result of changes made in the Learning Matrix. The same concern is raised in Digital Technologies, raising the question of where Electronics finds a place at NCEA Level 1.

Design and Visual Communication

1. Overall, the responses in Design and Visual Communication have been positive, with respondents focusing on how broad the subject will look as a result of the Phase 1 subject content. The inclusion of MM was received well, but Course Outlines and expression of MM in the Significant Learning needs to be worked on. This is because some respondents see the inclusion of MM as either tokenistic or implicit.
2. There are also some questions about the appropriateness of credit allocations, which will be referred to the SEG. This is as a result of the credit weightings being perceived to favour the ideation and design thinking strands of the curriculum, opposed to the making and crafting of final products.
3. The focus group suggested strong visual exemplars are developed to help steer the development of standards. They also highlighted the importance of engaging with tangata and mana whenua to get a sense of the hītori of the sites used across standards, so that they are appropriately incorporated into teaching and learning.

Dance

1. Overall, Dance received comparatively less feedback than other subjects. The most significant piece of feedback is how to incorporate MM appropriately, and not in a way which presents a narrow view of MM. There also is concern that inclusion of MM may inadvertently exclude other types of dance.
2. There was some level of concern that there was too much emphasis on theory, rather than performance. Another theme was clarification around the Standards to ensure that they are distinctive.

Drama

1. Drama had few respondents relative to other subjects. Therefore, there are few themes to draw. Of the themes, there was some level of concern that there was too much emphasis on theory, rather than performance. A further set of respondents hoped to see inclusive practice, including equity of access for External Assessment, to ensure that no cohorts are disproportionately advantaged or disadvantaged by access to theatres and other facilities, or equipment.

Agricultural and Horticultural Science

1. Agriculture and Horticulture has very little data, however responses have been broadly positive of the Phase 1 subject content. There are mixed submissions, however, on the role of Agribusiness in Agricultural and Horticultural Science, with some favouring its inclusion because of the importance of the subject area to the New Zealand Economy, noting the lack of viticulture. Others prefer a more traditional scientific approach, noting that Agribusiness has more of a role in economics.
2. A further set of respondents wanted more consideration of land within the subject, opening the discussion of kaitiakitanga and sustainability in Agricultural or Horticultural Science contexts. Respondents would like to see ‘real world’ examples and contexts in the subject content.

Social Studies

1. In Social Studies, there were also very low levels of feedback. Some respondents felt that the link between the draft Achievement Standards and the Learning Matrix is not clear enough, leading to a feeling that the standards are inflexible. Respondents in both the online survey and the focus group were surprised at the omission of human rights and social justice, and asked for consistent use of terminology across the Social Studies subject content. Respondents across all sources of feedback felt Mātauranga Māori and Pacific values and concepts need to be more explicitly included.

## Professional Learning Development

1. During the feedback processes, there was a clear sense across all subjects that PLD was requested on a range of topics in order to manage the transition to the new NCEA Level 1 subject content more smoothly. This feedback ranged from very specific issues to concerns that “significant” general PLD is needed.
2. A list of all the major PLD themes has been sent to the Capabilities team so that they are able to develop possible training opportunities for use in the sector. Much of the feedback relating to professional development involves Change 2 – Mana ōrite mō te mātauranga Māori. The main themes are below:

Frequently commented

1. General sense that more ongoing PLD is needed on mātauranga Māori – developing understanding kupu and concepts Māori. There is some suggestion that this training needs to be carried out by mana whenua. The feedback suggests that respondents cannot make sense of good, profound use and understanding vs tokenistic or appropriated use of mātauranga Māori, and that could be a focus of PLD.
2. For those with consolidated subjects, respondents wanted to know what training will be available to deliver ‘new’ elements effectively. This was particularly in reference to Digital Technology, Commerce, and Health (with Home Economics).
3. In understanding the Phase 1 subject content, respondents were also keen to understand how the new subject content can be applied, or have an effect upon, local curricula and local contexts. There were again references to incorporating mātauranga Māori in local contexts.
4. As a result of seeing Phase 1 subject content, many kaiako respondents reported independently of the inclusion of mātauranga Māori, that they would still need support in developing internal Assessment Activities and Course Outlines due to changes in their subject(s).

Less frequently commented

1. Some respondents raised their concerns of transitions into NCEA Level 1, and that in places there was scope creep from the next set of documents which may affect Year 10 planning. This may require PLD to understand how the new Learning Matrices function. Similar concerns are made in reference to the transition to Levels 2 and 3, particularly in consolidated subjects, or subjects which may specialise at Levels 2 and/or 3.
2. In subjects which work with multiple ways of working, or models – such as Physical Education and Health (with Home Economics) which has multiple models of hauora – more training may be needed to help reinforce understanding and capability in this area.
3. Respondents also reported the need for a more thorough understanding of how the subject content link to the Change Package to ensure that change is promoted and teachers do not go backwards at the point of implementation.

Mentioned only once or twice

1. The need for extra support for incoming teachers to New Zealand, and for those school department wh
2. Consideration needed for how some small cohort classrooms or schools will implement Learning Matrix and Achievement Standards, as well as for those schools with a high transient student cohort.
3. A sense that significant work will need to go into Learning Languages to adequately incorporate mātauranga Māori into the subject content. Viewpoint given in survey is that it will be hard for some languages to do well at level 1, given relative level of language.
4. Need for more support for smaller departments who may have skill shortages in consolidated subjects.

## Survey feedback

1. Respondents were offered the opportunity to give feedback about the online survey process. The questions asked were not compulsory, and around 30% of the total 1142 responded. The qualitative data for this is below:

1. In terms of survey design, an early change was made to reflect significant feedback of survey bias. This change gave the opportunity for respondents to answer “Needs amendments” in place of “Needs minor amendments”. This change was made as a result of comments such as the following: “So the new material is either on track or needs minor adjustments. Pretty confident of our choices aren't we?”
2. There were numerous concerns that the survey was worded to suit the desired response, particularly in the first few days before the change noted above was made. Respondents also commented that they have concerns that their feedback would not be heard, or that it would not be acted upon – this is particularly the case for Commerce, were a small number of individuals commented that they have little faith in the process as a result of no changes being made to the Level 1 Subject List.
3. Although the quantitative data suggests that most were able to find the survey, some respondents still reported issues with accessing the website and survey at the same time. Due to an NCEA Online update on Wednesday 14 April, a small number of people reported limited website accessibility. This issue was fixed by Friday 16 April and we are investigating ways of sending out closed survey links to those affected, following the closing date, to ensure that they are still able to contribute to the Level 1 feedback opportunity.
4. There were several comments, identifying as kaiako, who noted that the timing was problematic because the engagement process ran over school holidays. They would prefer to see this is term time where they can collaborate as a department, and during work time.
5. Many respondents referred to the need to have more consultation on the Phase 1 subject content, and the RAS process more broadly, without offering specifics on what they would like to see. Of those who did offer specifics, predominantly respondents would like to see the addition of more or broader Focus Groups, with the opportunity to interact with SEG members. Respondents also repeated the need for more engagement with industry, tertiary, and the regions when developing and during product consultation. A relatively small proportion of these respondents refer responding to the needs of low decile and rural schools in particular.
6. Some respondents felt that it was difficult to be able to communicate all their feedback in the ‘General Comments’ section at the end of each page. They would have preferred a comment box after each question. A few individuals would have liked the opportunity to comment on each of the Standards.
7. Some respondents commented on subjects which are not part of this process, such as Te Reo Māori, Visual Arts, Whakairo, ESOL, Gateway and Careers, and English.

## Next Steps

1. There are a number of subject-specific recommendations included within the subject-specific reports which will be actioned by the development teams. Some of the detailed feedback can be actioned without further contribution from the SEGs, however some requires further input before development of Phase 2 subject content can continue.
2. In addition, there several themes consistent across the majority or all subjects which need to be considered by the wider RAS team, or be addressed in conjunction with other teams in the Ministry. These issues are detailed below:
3. Ministry to clarify position on addressing PLD concerns above, particularly in relation to:
	1. being able to adequately reflect and competently deliver Mātauranga Māori in classroom settings, especially understanding kupu and concepts Māori. The upcoming Teacher Only Day will focus on Mana ōrite which is one example of planned sector development. The day will provide a way to continue this particular conversation with the education sector.
	2. work with NZQA to prepare student exemplar materials to support the delivery of the new Standards. Exemplar materials are scheduled to be produced through the pilot.
4. Ministry to clarify and consider how unfamiliar terms and concepts, particularly kupu Māori are explained or contextualised to facilitate Change 2, with an expansion and clarification of the glossary content.
5. Ministry to clarify timing of development process and develop sector responses. This may be what the public should be expecting and when; and confirming what is being asked of the public at engagement points. A highlevel timeline has been released recently and shared with peak bodies (link: <https://ncea.education.govt.nz/what-ncea-change-programme>)
6. Ministry to develop messaging around subject content and how to use it in response to concerns and misinterpretations of how to use certain RAS subject content. An example of this may be reminding the public at each consultation point what they are seeing and how it should be developed, and creating a new page on NCEA.education to explain the new subject content.
7. Ministry to further clarify its communications with sector regarding the Change Package, including rationale on why each subject has four standards; why there is 50/50 split of internals and externals; the inclusion of mātauranga Māori. This may be possible to action through the communications plans for O&I responding to Change Package queries. The learning modules developed for onboarding SEG members (internal process) may potentially provide a useful learning for other teachers.
8. Ministry to clarify, alongside NZQA, the ways in which both internal and external assessment are carried out, including confirmation on written assessment plans. This would also include concerns about specifics of assessment (methods, deadlines in year etc).
9. Ministry to develop a process to approve changes to the names of subjects – such as for Mandarin/Chinese and Health (with Home Economics). Potential changes could be socialised as part of Phase 2 public engagement.
10. Ministry to continue to work on messaging about the concurrent curriculum refresh and how that work is complementing the Review of Achievement Standards.

# Annexe A

**Final Subject Lists with current delivery plans**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Learning Area | Final Subjects | Delivery Plan (internal) | Current Status | Released on 23 March |
| English | English | Trial & Pilots (Oct 20) | Pilot | No |
| Te Reo Māori | Te Reo Māori | TMoA RAS (Jan 21) |  | No |
| The Arts | Dance | RAS-8 |  | Yes (1) |
| Drama | RAS-8 |  | Yes (2) |
| Music | RAS-8 |  | Yes (3) |
| Visual Arts | Trial & Pilots (Oct 20) | Pilot | No |
| Te Ao Haka (Māori Performing Arts) | Te Ao Haka  | Pilot | No |
| Science | Science | Trial & Pilots (Oct 20) | Pilot  | No |
| Chemistry and Biology | RAS-11 |  | Yes (4) |
| Physics, Earth and Space Science | RAS-11 |  | Yes (5) |
| Agricultural and Horticultural Science | RAS-8 |  | Yes (6) |
| Social Sciences | Religious Studies | Trial & Pilots (Oct 20) | Pilot | No |
| Social Studies | RAS-11 |  | Yes (7) |
| History | RAS-11 |  | Yes (8) |
| Geography | RAS-11 |  | Yes (9) |
| Commerce | RAS-11 |  | Yes (10) |
| Technology | Materials and Processing Technology | RAS-11 |  | Yes (11) |
| Digital Technologies | RAS-11 |  | Yes (12) |
| Design and Visual Communication | RAS-11 |  | Yes (13) |
| Health and Physical Education | Physical Education | RAS-11 |  | Yes (14) |
| Health Education (with Home Economics) | RAS-11 |  | Yes (15) |
| Learning Languages | Cook Islands Māori | Languages 3 (RAS-11) | Deferred to May | No |
| French | Languages 2 (RAS-8) |  | Yes (16) |
| German | Languages 2 (RAS-8) |  | Yes [17] |
| Japanese | Languages 1 (RAS-8) |  | Yes (17) [18]  |
| Korean | Languages 1 (RAS-8) |  | Yes [19] |
| Tongan | Languages 3 (RAS-11) | Deferred to May | No |
| Mandarin | Languages 1 (RAS-8) |  | Yes [20] |
| Samoan | Languages 3 (RAS-11) | Deferred to May | No |
| Spanish | Languages 2 (RAS-8) |  | Yes [21] |
| NZ Sign Language |  | To be initiated 2021 | No |
| Mathematics and Statistics | Mathematics and Statistics | RAS-8 |  | Yes (18) [22] |

# Annexe 2

The complete qualitative data sets for each of the 18 subjects, by percentage and number.