Review of Achievement Standards Level 1, Phase 1

Feedback Report Drama

Feedback provided on draft, Phase 1 subject content as of 19th April 2021
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## Purpose

This report outlines the feedback received by the Ministry of Education (the Ministry) on the Phase 1 development of Level 1 subject content for Drama. It aims to identify common themes and trends across the feedback. This report will be used to inform any necessary changes to the subject content developed so far as well as the further development of Phase 2 subject content by the Subject Expert Groups (SEGs) as part of the Review of Achievement Standards (RAS).

## Background

1. As at 20 April 2021, the Ministry received 33 responses to the Ministry’s online survey about the subject content developed so far for Drama. These included both multiple choice answer questions and long form, written response questions.
2. The Ministry also conducted Focus Group meetings with members of the education sector who provided feedback on the draft subject content.
3. Feedback was also provided by the four NCEA panels. Each panel did not review every subject. For Drama, feedback was received from the NCEA Pacific panel.
4. This report is divided into the following:
   1. General Overview and Themes
   2. Analysis of Feedback by source
      1. Online
      2. NCEA Panels
   3. Next steps
5. Please note that the content in this report does not reflect the opinions of the authors. The report aims to thoroughly and accurately reflect the views presented by those who fed back on the draft subject content.

## General Overview and Themes

1. ***General Clarification and Refinement of Subject Content***

Several of the online responses expressed a desire for further clarification, both of terms used in the subject content as well as of the specific requirements and expected forms of assessment. Respondents requested a more extensive glossary as well as more specific guidance and examples of how to implement particular teaching and learning, particularly with regard to mātauranga Māori.

Further detail was also requested on the form assessments, particularly externals would take and how these are intended to be managed and administered.

It was also noted that material from the Drama curriculum needs to be made more explicit in the subject content. It is suggested that subject content make more use of discipline specific terms and concepts (such as “drama components”) in order to ensure the subject retains its uniqueness and learners gain disciplinary literacy.

1. ***Interaction with te reo Māori and inclusion of te ao Māori***

Many respondents support the incorporation of mātauranga Māori and tikanga Māori in Drama teaching and learning, with several comments suggesting that this is currently taking place as part of good teaching practice in parts of the sector.

Several respondents requested that the requirement for engaging with mātauranga and tikanga Māori be made more explicit in the subject content. There were also requests for further examples and explanations for how to engage with this kaupapa effectively and authentically, including requests for PLD to assist with this.

It was also noted however that some examples of Māori texts in the subject content appeared tokenistic and/or stereotyping. Several respondents also commented that the incorporation of mātauranga Māori was at times done in such a way as to be narrowing rather than broadening the outlook of the subject content and encourage the exploration of concepts Māori while also looking at drama culture more globally; “Drama is already an effective subject for Maori in its universal themes that already link to culture, whakapapa and tikanga. The options are creating limitations when the teachers could link Maori concepts to themes evident in Drama globally.”

This reflects several comments concerned that the subject content focuses too heavily on New Zealand theatre, thus missing out on the richness of other traditions around the globe. This was mentioned particularly with reference to the Pacific, a point echoed by the NCEA Pacific panel.

1. ***Emphasis on performance versus theory***

A number of responses raised concerns that the subject content indicates a course that focuses too heavily on literacy and theory requirements and not enough on performance for a practical, performance-based subject.

The impression for several respondents was that at least 2 or 3 of the standards would default to evidence provided in the form of written work which detracts from the main draw and focus of the subject; “Drama is a practical performance subject- learning and assessments should mirror this.”

It should be noted however, that some respondents expressed concern at a lack of literacy requirement; “Paperwork is rarely mentioned. This is an important part of the course as it adds rigor, clarifies and internationalizes the students work for themselves. It does not need to be onerous - the current amount for each standard is perfect. It adds value to the course due to the literacy credits and validates the subject through giving UE and academic status.”

Concern was also raised that there is no obvious place for learners to focus on making drama. Several respondents noted that they would prefer standard 1.2 to focus on the making of a product that would then be assessed, rather than reflection on a process.

1. ***Equity and access for externals***

Several responses raised concerns about equity issues for both standard 1.3 and 1.4.

For 1.3, the concerns were related to the quality of recording available for a performance standard to be externally marked; “Instead of filming external work it would be much preferred if there was an external moderator who came to view the performances as so much energy, connection, micro expression, subtlety and depth is lost in the transfer to screen.”

There were also concerns about whether the performance piece used for this standard would be scripted or devised as this might lead to great variation in quality of the work, meaning that learners are not all on an even playing field.

For 1.4, a major concern was that not all learners had the same access to live theatre and this would disadvantage rural students as well as those from lower socio-economic backgrounds. This was also one of the standards for which there was a concern about the literacy requirement, expressing that, especially for larger classes, recording other kinds of responses is time consuming and logistically difficult.

1. ***Flexibility of course design***

A number of respondents expressed concern that the draft subject content reduces the ability of Kaiako to design flexible and varied courses. The point is made that the new standards do not allow for the same flexibility of content or course construction as the old ones and this might make the subject more limiting and less engaging. In some instances, this is related to the fact that a full years course must use all four standards where previously there were options to mix and match. In other cases, this related to the impression that certain content might be required by particular standards, for instance, the focus on Aotearoa New Zealand.

## Sources of Feedback

#### Online

Below are the quantitative data questions summarised as graphs.

From these data, we can see that there is need for improvement across all subject content as we move into the next phase of drafting. Most in need of improvement appear to be the course outlines to help teachers see how they can create flexible, coherent, relevant courses with the new subject content.

The data suggests that mātauranga Māori has been more successfully woven into the Learning Matrix but this needs to be carried through more consistently into the other subject content.

#### NCEA Panels

Feedback on the Drama subject content was provided by the NCEA Pacific Panel. The Panel raised a concern with the use of terms such as “theatre” and “ensemble culture” as archaic and colonial.

The Panel also raised the issue that more needs to be made in the subject content of empowerment and student agency, they noted that the Significant Learning could be written to centre the learner more thoroughly and emphasise the connection of their voice and background in the learning.

The Panel noted that more explicit mention needs to be made in the subject content of Pacific values and voices as well as Pacific artist models, for instance actors and playwrights.

The Panel also requested further unpacking of some standards and clarification of certain terms.

## Next Steps

There are several recommendations which will be undertaken prior to reengaging the SEG. Some are too specific to detail in this report, but the overall themes are:

**Ministry Actions**

* Ministry to clarify position on addressing PLD concerns relation to:
  + being able to adequately reflect and competently deliver Mātauranga Māori in classroom settings, especially understanding kupu and concepts Māori
  + working with NZQA to prepare sample or exemplar materials to support the delivery of the new teaching, learning, and assessment content.
* 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.
* Ministry to clarify communication with sector regarding the Change Package, including rationale for the number of standards and division of internal and external credits. This may be possible to action through the communications plans for O&I responding to Change Package queries.
* Ministry to clarify, alongside NZQA, the ways in which both internal and external assessment are carried out. This would also include concerns about specifics of assessment (methods, deadlines in year etc).

**SEG actions**

* As part of the next phase of development the SEG will undertake to review all subject content to more explicitly include tikanga Māori and exemplify the richness and scope of Māori and Pacific Drama practices and communities. The SEG will also explore where subject content can be opened up to allow for the exploration of the diversity of drama cultures throughout the world.
* The next phase of development involves the full drafting of all Achievement Standards as well as Assessment Activities and Conditions of Assessment. While drafting the standards, the SEG will ensure that the literacy requirements of the suite of standards are both appropriate to Level 6 of the curriculum and for a primarily practical subject centred around performance. The Assessment Activities for internal standards will identify performance opportunities for assessment.
* The SEG will work closely with NZQA and the Ministry in the development of External Assessment Specifications to ensure that equity issues are identified and addressed.