



7 - Drama Phase 1 Survey – Raw Feedback

32 answers to "Impressions - Drama - What is your overall impression of the Learning Matrix?"

Option	Total	Percent
On the right track	13	1.14%
Needs amendments	19	1.66%
Not Answered	1110	97.20%

30 answers to "Impressions - Drama - What is your overall impression of the Teaching, Learning, and Assessment Guide?"

Option	Total	Percent
On the right track	11	0.96%
Needs amendments	19	1.66%
Not Answered	1112	97.37%

30 answers to "Impressions - Drama - What is your overall impression of the example Course Outlines?"

Option	Total	Percent
On the right track	8	0.70%
Needs amendments	22	1.93%
Not Answered	1112	97.37%

29 answers to "Comments - Drama"

Response ID	Answer
ANON-K9GG-12XY-6	Where is the consultation and development and support for those of us in small schools with multi level classes and small class sizes?
ANON-K9GG-12BZ-H	I am glad to see the techniques (new 1.3 standard) and devising (new 1.2 standard) standards being retained. I am also glad to see the inclusion of theatre form (1.1 new standard) being more consistently woven into the learning matrix. I am however concerned at the lack of distinct 'performance opportunity' standards

Response ID	Answer
<p>ANON-K9GG-12D9-J</p>	<p>(old 1.6 standard) as the skills required to create and perform a scene, can be vastly different to the skills required to be a part of a full scale production. Production level requirements go far and beyond the usual 'scene' requirements, and are much more heavily involved, and I feel the lack of a distinct 'production' standard will discourage many schools from offering a school production as an assessment opportunity, which is arguably the most relevant, enjoyable and standard that requires the most hands on application of the skills learnt in drama.</p> <p>I am also concerned to see a distinct lack of connection to performing arts standards with no mention of where they could fit into the learning matrix for those students who prefer non-performing opportunities.</p> <p>I understand that the performing arts standards are no longer managed by NZQA and are instead managed by Skills Active (and are also undergoing review and restructure to align with this change in drama standards) but it would be great to see these more linked into the learning matrix for drama (even as an 'optional' assessment opportunity or learning skills opportunity) as this current proposed framework further pushes the drama 'on stage performance assessments' away from the performing arts technologies 'backstage skills assessments', which is something that many drama teachers around the country have been trying interweave more tightly to provide more opportunities and flexibility in our programs for all learners and performers.</p> <p>I am concerned about equitable opportunities for both of the external standards. How will the external standard that is performance-based be assessed? Our ākonga deserve to be rewarded for their achievements, but often, live performance cannot be recorded in a manner that allows for a fair assessment of performance skill. They are performing for stage - not for TV or film - and so the camera is usually at distance from the performance (and if the performance is in-the-round or thrust then it can be incredibly difficult to capture all angles). This would significantly limited the style of productions, which can be used as a way to extend students in their performance skills. Additionally, live recordings of performances do not always capture the impact of nuance. My main concern would be around equitable access to recording technology. How will NCEA ensure that all students are captured in the same quality, to ensure that technology does not hamper students' achievement? There are a range of schools across our country where there may not be access to top quality recording devices, and it DOES make a difference - picture and sound quality will absolutely make a difference to how well it can be assessed.</p> <p>With regards to the second external, the current choice of responding to live theatre OR writing about theatre form allows for schools to choose based on what theatre they have access to. As there are only four standards, and the choices are no longer going to be available - a move away from the original intention of NCEA, which was to allow schools to design courses that suited their clientele - how will NCEA ensure that the access to live theatre is equitable? For students in low-decile schools and low socio-economic communities? For students in rural communities? This should not be a burden placed on teachers to find suitable options. This GREATLY advantages students who are in the main centers. UNLESS, NCEA continues to allow recorded performances to be responded to. This would HAVE to be the case if there were no option with regards to choice of standard.</p> <p>So, my biggest concerns are with regards to how we ensure that the opportunities for all students, regardless of their situation (geographical, economic, etc.) are</p>

Response ID	Answer
	<p>equitable, so that no child in our community is hampered by considerations outside of their control. This must be taken into consideration by the development team, and there must be clear, straight-forward solutions IF these standards went ahead.</p> <p>Otherwise, the standards need to be redesigned.</p> <p>One thing that will need clarity is how the performances are being externally marked. Often we see the students in the rehearsal process making improvements over time that end up contributing towards their grade, this evidence is hard to capture so I wonder how the students will prove their mark so to speak.</p> <p>The other concern I have is around ensuring enough "significant roles" for performers in performances. There are very few plays that cater to large classes (the way Drama classes are going) and this means it's hard to make sure everyone has a significant role. We also adjust the roles according to who can manage more lines so this is fair for everyone on their ability. It would be a shame if we went from a holistic way of marking to something standardised.</p>
<p>ANON-K9GG-12F8-K</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Feels like portfolio based. Very vague. Too broad. * Need to be given examples. * 1.2 seems like a traditional Devising standard. * How is it going to be assessed? * 1.4 similar to what we do as an external - live performance. Will it be a written exam or performance? This is not very clear. * Matrix is a combination of too many components. * Also assessment is unclear. * Seems like there is less emphasis on performance and more on theory.
<p>ANON-K9GG-12UV-Z</p>	<p>1.3 really doesn't need to be an external, and frankly makes little sense for it to be one.</p>
<p>ANON-K9GG-18MK-K</p>	<p>Matrix is lacking depth in the curriculum levels.</p> <p>Watch the coining of a phrase that is new. 'Theatre Aotearoa' needs clarity. There is no precedence, research or body of evidence that defines this terminology. Is it theatre that New Zealander's see and make ? Can it be informed by context? Does this include Maori, PI, recent immigrants?</p> <p>What are the significant features of theatre Aotearoa? Check out this resource https://www.playmarket.org.nz/bookshop/playmarket-guideline-series/working-together-cultural-practice-in-the-theatrespace</p> <p>Missing the PURPOSE of Drama. Function is missing as a descriptor.</p> <p>Need to look at access and understanding.</p>
<p>ANON-K9GG-18MW-Y</p>	<p>What are the Drama components noted? There is a huge shortage of terms – we require a glossary or kite of works that are accepted and understood by the sector – fit for the Drama world NOW. Can we continue using elements / conventions / techniques / technologies – use the established language and build the literacy established with theatre making.</p> <p>There is nothing of professional practice – what are the common threads from industry?</p> <p>1.2</p>

Response ID	Answer
	<p>Product MUST be assessed. Drama is a product made for an audience – students need to consider the effect – what they want the audience to see. Don't assess creative process. Teaching and learning and does not have to be assessed. The process is a KEY COMPETENCY not specific to Drama. What is the step up in a creative process. Reflect and refine - every student will get it with one sentence. Come in line with Dance and Music - create and perform. Devising and rehearsal do not work together. Is it directed? Is it devised – these are two very different modes for assessing the creative purpose. Are we assessing both? Is this theatre making or theatre creation?</p> <p>1.3 Should only be scripted – not devised. This is for equity. Ensuring that students have good quality work to be assessed from. Text that allows them to use all the techniques – rather than potentially low quality work that will not allow them to reach the higher grades.</p> <p>1.4 Is this an exam replacement? I worry that we are assessing literacy rather than understandings in a different way. The reality in the classroom is written work will be the fall back. How can I do video responses with my class of 29? This would be a huge teacher work load issue. Yet written work will be failing our Maori and boys – we are not assessing literacy! Performative evidence not written.</p> <p>I am concerned that the external marking standard will become dependent on the quality of filmed footage. We do not teach our students acting for film and to get the most fair marking I feel that this is what we may have to start teaching for this externally marked standard. It is very hard for theatre to have the same impact on video recording. More clarity around how the externally marked standard will need to be submitted is required as with more information about the requirements of filming of this.</p>
ANON-K9GG-18M6-X	<p>I am also weary of standards being restricted to N.Z plays. Whilst it is beneficial to teach N.Z theatre I do not think it should be mandatory to only use N.Z playwrights for certain standards.</p>
ANON-K9GG-18XK-X	<p>It is clear, however, it feels very very restricted in what we can actually teach. Not all students will engage with Toi Maori and New Zealand Theatre. Yes it is important that we teach it, I just don't think it should inform the entire years work. With such a strong NZ theatre focus, there is no room to teach Shakespeare at level one. New Zealand is such a new country that comparing its theatre to theatre around the world is limited to around 300 ish years.</p>
ANON-K9GG-182A-E	<p>There is good opportunity for developments and crossovers in learning, using open assessments. I also like that there is opportunity for practical external assessment, for a practical subject!</p>
ANON-K9GG-182S-Z	<p>I think it will take a lot more PD and time to implement these changes. I know my students will struggle to maintain enthusiasm for what they are learning over an extended period of time. They are used to working for credits - and this is a major pedagogical shift over Level One. It feels limiting and boring to be honest. I hope this will be shown not to be the case with intensive PD.</p>

Response ID	Answer
<p>ANON-K9GG-18J9-X</p>	<p>Thoughts to support the ongoing development of the subject content:</p> <p>Work not completed on Drama standards – makes it really hard to give feedback. Giving one sentence on the assessment task and then saying “Remaining content to be developed” does not give us much to make a worthwhile submission on.</p> <p>Bringing reflective diaries back to the devising process is a curious decision. They were taken out for a reason in the curriculum alignment as they were cumbersome and added a huge amount of work that did not add value to the performance process. Informal feedback from staff and peers and reflection is a natural part of the devising process. Formalizing it for the sole purpose of quantifying ideas for assessment is artificial and detracts for the process.</p> <p>Clarification sought: some outlines indicate assessment as specific performance times, others indicate assessment as portfolio work for the same standards. Which is it?</p> <p>Portfolio work – how much trust will be giving to teacher observations and judgements? For example, in devising a students often come up with a brilliant critique/reflection as part of a group discussion. Does this mean entire class need to be filmed? Will we have to write down everything that every student says in every lesson?</p> <p>Serious concerns about the filming requirements for 1.3. Usually filming requirements state that we must have the whole stage and all actors in shot, no zooming, but that means facial expressions are not clear in order to fit large casts on screen. This is a technique they are marked on. Editing in close ups is usually not allowed. Different schools ability to afford and handle sophisticated filming technology will dis/advantage their students. There are also concerns about NZQA’s ability to handle the data traffic. At the moment the moderation set up can’t handle performances of longer than 5 minutes. It definitely can’t handle class plays and is a significant stressor when it comes to moderation time. Is NZQA going to upgrade their tech to handle what is incoming their way?</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Doing a class play is optional now. Is a significant drawback for the course – usually the highlight of the program. However due to the filming requirements, it will be easier to get better quality film of smaller casts and smaller pieces so will it be a disadvantage to do a class play?</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The new standards place Drama strongly into the NZ context. There are concerns about the fact that there is little reference to a global theatre in which influences from different places and times is fully integrated into the course. Without these</p>

Response ID	Answer
<p data-bbox="224 1010 321 1104">ANON-K9GG-184A-G</p> <p data-bbox="224 1478 321 1572">ANON-K9GG-18CU-K</p>	<p data-bbox="396 264 1138 291">references, there is a danger of isolationism and small vision.</p> <p data-bbox="396 327 1393 512">Regarding 5 credits for the External about Responding to Performance could be very challenging to those students who don't live in a city. For those students who live in more provincial towns, this is severely prohibitive. Making NCEA more accessible is one of the goals/reasons for proposed change - how are they doing that in the regions? Not everyone has the accessibility or experience to draw on to be able plan/deliver/rehearse/perform on an even playing field.</p> <p data-bbox="396 548 1398 827">Fewer standards means less choice for students and less flexibility to account for all the different circumstances of our students. For example, in the current system if a student needs surgery and will miss the bulk of a standard, they can be removed from that standard and offered another one when they are healed so that they don't lose credits. Under the new proposal the many students in this and other situations requiring similar action will just fail. The current system also allows the flexibility to extend students by offering them other standards to complete above those included in the course. Under the new proposal there is no such extension for the many passionate and talented Drama students.</p> <p data-bbox="396 863 1370 953">Overall, there are some good points to the proposed outlines, but many areas of significant concern. The current NCEA system in Drama works far better for our students than this proposal would.</p> <p data-bbox="396 982 1393 1136">These standards indicate consultation with the wider Drama community and show acknowledgement of what standards are providing best opportunity for students in the current curriculum, while also ensuring that development and progress is achieved. I think there is lovely scope for learning and assessment in the programme proposal.</p> <p data-bbox="396 1163 1398 1442">The Drama matrix and guidelines lacks recognition that Drama is a discipline with a 2,500 year history which has important content that should be covered rather than just being used as a social tool for interaction and development. Theatre needs a world view and should be studied as such. Students need to consider themselves part of the Global experience rather than inward gazing and just focusing on a domestic viewpoint. New Zealand theatre has an extremely short history and has very limited recognised practitioners which are the backbone of theatre history both in the Western and Eastern worlds - eg Noh theatre, Kabuki, Meisner, Laban,.</p> <p data-bbox="396 1451 1393 1505">There is no knowledge covered at all in these exemplars or any information on the assessment criteria for any of the four suggested standards.</p> <p data-bbox="396 1514 1382 1667">The limitation of techniques using only NZ based playwrights is problematic from a cultural perspective, much of these plays include content that is not appropriate for teaching at level 1, many of the plays are too complex, and techniques are going to perform to a camera - when drama is actually a LIVE experience and should be experienced as such.</p> <p data-bbox="396 1675 1393 1885">Understanding audience relationship is one thing. Analysing this relationship after live drama adds a whole element or aspect to the assessment process. How is this going to be undertaken - Q and A after performance? Surveys? This would be extremely challenging to carry out effectively . It is also problematic putting value or assessment judgments on opinion - that is audience based. It seems to be a complex idea that is required perhaps by Theatre Companies but not students of Drama - they should understand what they are trying to communicated BUT</p>

Response ID	Answer
<p>ANON-K9GG-18XC-P</p>	<p>analyse the audience response ?- an extremely challenging process and a whole task in itself.</p> <p>Drama should have prescribed knowledge not from a series of beliefs that may or may not be held by all. Drama should be focusing on a world wide view - and focus should be with guidance.</p> <p>Use Drama Techniques 1.3 - Continues to separate the ideas of Drama into little compartments</p> <p>It is unhelpful -</p> <p>when we act we use techniques, conventions, elements and technologies - we should be considering all of these in an holistic approach.</p> <p>We would rather see the standards reflect this holistic approach and enable us to assess the students across these standards.</p> <p>1.1 - Devise work 1.2 - perform work - play text 1.3 - Study of form/practitioners 1.4 - respond to drama</p> <p>ALL of these could relate to the cultural, creative, dramatic, political intentions and focus of NZ and the world.</p> <p>We would then not be compartmentalising skills which reduces Drama to fragments and does not reflect the richness of the discipline.</p> <p>Many schools cannot afford the rights to perform contemporary plays. Plays that do not need rights can still reflect contemporary setting and situation and reflect the theatre of Aotearoa.</p> <p>Eg Shaw's Androcles and the Lion (outside copyright) speaks of propaganda and influence -which we can see in the political framework of NZ and the different parties who vie for power in Wellington.</p> <p>The whole thing needs more guidance, specificity and attention to the knowledge of the discipline through which culture and creative processes can be taught. There is a lack of understanding demonstrated of the uniqueness of Drama as a subject and this generality weakens the subject as a discipline as it stands currently.</p> <p>If you look at the Dance or Music the standards are subject specific and if we do not go towards this we are going to lose the specifics of Drama as a discipline with a rich history and culture.</p> <p>The subject content is unclear in terms of its scope</p> <p>It is a useful framework but needs to take into account not just NZ Drama but the history and richness of World Drama.</p> <p>In Drama students create and perform, reflecting and enriching the cultural life of their school, whanau, communities and understanding of the wider world.</p> <p>There is a heavy emphasis of online platforms which is not the essence of drama. Drama is about responding to human experiences, creating and recreating, communicating and interpreting and performing live. Live theatre promotes conversations and potential social change. It is an art form and it enriches and lives of those who take an active part. While there may be a place for online drama and research, to stress the online may lead to less active engagement and take away from what is learning in Drama.</p> <p>Elements of Drama are best described in the NZ Curriculum online. Please get</p>

Response ID	Answer
ANON-K9GG-18B1-E	<p>the glossary straight. It is confusing when technique of body includes movement. Movement has its separate language (eg: Direction, Weight, Type) from Body (gesture, stance, facial expression etc). The way it is written in the Knowledge section is confusing. Some of the technique descriptors could also include Te Reo. Unsure about isolating conventions as deepening audience engagement" as everything does....so might technologies, or an Epic production on some driving political issue or a Theatre Marae-based performance that may involve a long kōrero post-performance, or a highly skilled use of drama techniques to portray a role Stanislavski-style!</p> <p>LEVEL 1 Assessment Matrix: 1.4 should be a Drama performance they have seen. rather than "experience" as this may lead to writing about a Drama performance they have been in. I personally think also, this should be a response to a professional performance and not a school or class production, for example. Now that students can write about live theatre and have access to National Theatre performances, for example, there is now a more equitable pool of live professional theatre available. Live theatre promotes conversations and potential social change. It enriches the lives of those who take an active part. The value of Drama in the classroom is that learners create art together, become literate in this field, share through performance and get to view and discuss live theatre becoming increasingly critically aware of not just the performance itself but how it can change attitudes and lives.</p> <p>Of the 3 , the 3rd option catches my attention because it is wider ranging and seems at least touch on world theatre including that of Aotearoa. However Melodrama can usefully be taught at year 9 as an exercise for encouraging students to be more expressive physically and vocally. It works for me anyway. Additionally, Commedia has proven a great tool for year 10 for physical theatre and the art of exaggeration., character creation (with stock characters. Admittedly both forms can be used for Level 1 with more in depth teaching. I often do physical theatre for a whole year with devising, texts and form. It is such a physically creative tool. We also use NZ playwrights for this year as well as world writers.</p>
ANON-K9GG-18KH-E	<p>why does dance and drama each get 4 standards when biology and chemistry have to be combined? This is ridiculous! When STEM is a huge priority NCEA deem it more important that DANCE and DRAMA are separate subjects but not BIOLOGY, CHEMISTRY, PHYSICS, EARTH and SPACE SCIENCE. Is this a joke? You are setting us up for a generation of people who have NO IDEA about Science. We'll have more flat earthers, more anti-vaxxers, more climate change deniers - you realise they didn't do Science at school? We need to be promoting Science in schools and it's importance for futures in tech.</p>
ANON-K9GG-18UA-H	<p>I am concerned about the range of things we have freedom to teach/focus on, shrinking.</p>
ANON-K9GG-18UF-P	<p>1.3 "While the performance could be for a live performance ..." We are teaching a performance art. Performance is meaningless without a live audience. This standard MUST include a live audience aspect. 1.4 To understand the reciprocal role of the of audience and actors students need</p>

Response ID	Answer
<p>ANON-K9GG-18DZ-S</p>	<p>to be able to experience and reflect upon a role they have performed themselves in front of an audience.</p> <p>The Credit values do not fairly represent the workload requirements. Clearly 1.2 and 1.3 should be 6 credits as they closely align with the devising and performance standards in the current matrix (1.2 AS90997 Devise a drama performance and 1.6 AS90009 Perform an acting role in a scripted production) There needs to be much more time allocated (and therefore credits allocated) to do these standards justice, compared to the time required for the standards 1.1 and 1.4.</p> <p>I have been a Drama teacher for over 30 years- mainly in Decile 10 schools. Prior to my teaching career I was a professional actress and subsequently a director. Currently I teach part time in pre-service Secondary teacher training as a Drama lecturer and in a Special school as a Drama Specialist on an Arts team.</p> <p>I have several issues with the proposed standards and I see them as flawed and requiring remediation.</p> <p>Issues with 1.1 It is important to understand the place and function of drama in a society. Is there a body of knowledge to draw on for this work? Access to research and quality resources could be an issue here. What will the evidence for this standard look like? It could be a collection of writing and that would mean a loss of the current focus on drama as a performing art.</p> <p>Issues with 1.2 Students will be assessed on their ability to demonstrate understanding of a creative dramatic process and their ability to connect this to their experience of participation in drama. The process of creating is the focus - not the actual creation of drama. The standard needs to be about making drama and I believe the resulting drama should be assessed not the process.</p> <p>Dance has 1.4 Choreograph dance sequences Music has 1.2 Create original music Visual Arts has 1.4 Produce resolved artwork in an authentic context Te Ao Haka has 1.2 Perform an item for a Ao Haka Context These standards are all about 'art making and performing' in their respective disciplines. In answer to that, drama only looks at the process - the art making is missing.</p> <p>Students are learning to work together but where are they learning how performances are created? The language of the curriculum is missing - and so is its application. Where are drama components introduced? This signals a loss of drama literacy. Where will students learn to make theatre? The use of elements and conventions should be the focus of this standard and the quality of the drama produced should be assessed - not the process.</p> <p>The baby has been thrown out with the bath water. This standard reminds me of the early NCEA standards where students could get credits for picking up rubbish - as long as they had a plan for picking up rubbish... This standard needs to be looked at again. In its current state it is an anomaly.</p>

Response ID	Answer
	<p>1.2 harks back to the old 90007 when students wrote perceptively about the process for excellence. It was flawed and added nothing to the creation of fantastic drama.</p> <p>Another issue is that processes for devising should be teacher facilitated, yet student driven. The rehearsal process is very different as it is teacher directed. These two processes are not the same and nor are the outcomes. Students may be able to demonstrate a better understanding of the creative dramatic process and their participation when there is a teacher explicitly guiding that process.</p> <p>Issues with 1.3 If the same work from 1.2 can be submitted for 1.3 which is either devised or scripted, then there will be a great disparity in outcomes. Devised work is not directed; scripted work can be directed. It is fair to say that directed scripted work will be of a higher standard. A weak devised piece is hard to overcome and would not produce fantastic opportunities for great acting. There needs to be better clarity about the student and teacher input into the selection and use of techniques.</p> <p>Issues with 1.4 Again this evidence for this standard could mean the students are creating a collection of writing. If teachers choose to find a way around the written work by interviewing students, there will be issues for teacher workload. There is such a focus on critiquing and analysing and so little on drama making.</p> <p>General The standards seem thin; they need stronger context and clarity in the criteria. It seems such a pity to have lost the focus of making drama in these standards. Drama seems to be an outlier when compared to the other arts. The craft of acting and making drama seems to be completely overlooked in these standards. Drama is about making meaning through both the art and crafts of the theatre for audience reception. The drama making - the use of the art and craft of the theatre is missing.</p> <p>Perhaps some expectations of materials would help. It is difficult to see how the assessment will fit such an open matrix.</p> <p>Questions How will this external work be marked and when? Currently students can have some idea of progress towards the qualification.</p> <p>What training will be available for teachers in assessment for these new standards? They are distinctly different from the current standards. How will grade creep be avoided. How will validity of judgements be assured?</p> <p>How will reliability of the teacher judgment be held to a national standard?</p> <p>Where is the drama making?</p> <p>1.4 will there be an expectation that all areas in nz have access to live performances? How will it be fair?</p>

[ANON-K9GG-1858-8](#)

Response ID	Answer
<p data-bbox="224 890 315 982">ANON-K9GG-124J-K</p> <p data-bbox="224 1703 315 1795">ANON-K9GG-1NXZ-3</p>	<p data-bbox="396 260 1393 352">I am very concerned at the suggested subject content as it appears very limiting in scope. Drama is a very rich subject where students can develop a wide range of both subject-specific and other skills.</p> <p data-bbox="396 386 1365 573">My reading of the material provided shows a limitation of the way that students can develop and apply the skills that are at the heart of drama learning. For example, the information provided about the draft 1.1 assessment (demonstrate understanding of how culture is expressed) is limiting for teachers and students bu focusing on one aspect out of all of those that could be explored through approaching drama texts, roles etc.</p> <p data-bbox="396 606 1377 793">I am also extremely concerned that the (considerable) work required to meet this standard is deemed to be worth only 5 credits, when in the current standards for other arts subjects a standard such as 'perform dance sequences' or 'compose dance sequences' attracts 6 credits. This disparity remains in the suggested new standards for Dance, where the internal standard 'demonstrate understanding of dance performance' attracts 6 credits.</p> <p data-bbox="396 827 1390 919">There should be some consistency across arts subjects otherwise the effort and engagement of Drama students will continue to be under-rewarded in terms of the credits they can achieve.</p> <p data-bbox="396 953 1360 1140">The move to external marking for the 'use drama techniques to perform a role' seems very problematic and smacks of a distrust of teachers o deliver this learning and assessment internally. External moderation has reviewed the outcomes for students and teachers over a number of years and this decision would seem to imply that there is a lack of trust in teachers' ability to deliver fair outcomes.</p> <p data-bbox="396 1173 1393 1360">It is a fact that students gain higher outcomes in internal assessments than those marked externally, yet the nature of the assessment must be considered. Drama attracts students who thrive in practical, hands on learning and who may feel more challenged by the constraints of the written exam format. This change seems designed to penalise students and teachers who are able to create work of great depth and quality through their internal processes.</p> <p data-bbox="396 1394 1393 1612">My final concern around this standard is basing it within an Aotearoa New Zealand context, again limiting chances of engagement for some students and constraining teachers from making choices that best suit the students in front of them. I have very successfully introduced students to a wide range of cultures and contexts through Level 1 standards and the suggestions being made seem designed to stope teachers from making the best decisions for each unique cohort of students.</p> <p data-bbox="396 1646 1393 1864">It seems like so much of the performance focus has been taken away with these new standards and explanations. Most have the same wording as external exam papers "demonstrate understanding'. Only one standard seems to have practical wording "use". There is a Heavy focus on the literacy and process. While process is of course a big component of our programmes, so to should performance. It feels like they have gone backwards to when students had to do huge written portfolios which does not always align with why our students have chosen Drama.</p>

Response ID	Answer
ANON-K9GG-1N7H-G	<p>Must be accessible for low Decile schools with low level literary.no external exam please follow model that music is sending performance samples as external assessment like art portfolio.</p>
ANON-K9GG-1NXR-U	<p>I can see that there is the possibility that devising will get overlooked as it is now a choice inside of the creation process standard and techniques standard. You could have whole groups of students who never create new or original works at level 1 and do a full year focused on scripted performances. It's quite a different skill set to devise and perform something than what it is to rehearse and perform a scripted performance which is most likely directed. I'm concerned some students won't get the opportunities to create that they need.</p> <p>Does 1.3 need to be a NZ text if it's a scripted context? And would devising the work for this standard fully support the confident use of techniques?</p> <p>It has raised many questions and caused concerns. There should be assessment schedules with these for us to fully understand how they will work.</p> <p>I have major concerns how equitable it will be between schools, especially when it comes to videos, spaces, resources.</p> <p>I'm struggling to see how a wide variety of schooling contexts can fit into a very limited number of standards.</p> <p>Further clarification of terms used is needed. Define culture.</p>
ANON-K9GG-1N2Q-M	<p>What about wellbeing and work load of collecting what seems to be a truck load of evidence now.</p> <p>It feels like the trust of the teacher has gone out the window.</p> <p>Group sizes are not expressed. Not enough details have been given.</p> <p>Live theatre is a real worry. Especially regions who can't get to good live theatre. I am guessing they will open it up and say we can watch a live performance via video. That also is detrimental to kids because it never fully translates through the camera.</p> <p>Drama is about live performance with an audience. These standards, the externals in particular, now HALF of the course takes that relationship away from the audience and puts the focus on a recorded aspect which breaks my heart.</p> <p>The content has been clearly presented, however, it is too complex for L1 akonga. What are we actually assessing? Is it their process, their participation or reflection? There is a risk teachers could just teach students what to write to gain M-E. Where are the core Drama skills?</p> <p>Drama is a practical performance subject- learning and assessments should mirror this.</p>
ANON-K9GG-1NM6-M	<p>There are huge gaps in the titles- where is the 'create and perform Drama'. It would be more equitable if the Arts were aligned: if Drama, Dance and Music were all asking for 'Perform' or 'Create' at level one.</p> <p>The standards need to be simplified, in title and in content.</p> <p>We need 3/4 standards to be performance based, not graded around the process, reflection, or discussion. These are import aspects of drama, however part of the process- these standards are saying the outcome isn't important, only the thinking behind it. This will be inequitable for our students and creating hurdles for those who are ELL and have learning challenges. One standard with a focus on this would be sufficient.</p> <p>I like the changes to context for theatre of Aotearoa, however, it needs to be Pacific theatre too, and performance based- this is not apparent. The students are</p>

Response ID	Answer
	<p>level one, and at the moment the proposed standards are worded like external exams.</p> <p>Look at the grades and 1/3 of students who opt out of the external exam currently- this is a reflection of what the students want- practical, creative and performance in a subject. At L3, yes, more analysis is required, yet we will be killing off the inspiration in our at risk students, in the place they need an outlet and a place to succeed.</p> <p>Our students, including Maori & Pacific students, who thrive on performance, will be further left behind with this wording if they are unable to write or verbalise their understanding. We need to see that students understand it through performance skills.</p> <p>1.3 must be scripted to be equitable. It would be unsuitable to use a devised or process drama for this.</p>
ANON-K9GG-1N22-N	Standards have been removed already!
ANON-K9GG-1NG7-F	<p>There will need to be greater clarity around what is expected with the new external components for Drama, as it moves to 4 standards collectively. Will both externals be practical? Has the increase in workload been considered for markers? Will the moderation panel become a part of the external process due to the change in the number of standards being offered to assist with the workload? or will they remain in their current role? It would be fantastic to have a clearer guideline & examples of what is anticipated in this change to support teachers and markers. Will, there be an increase in the number of people marking to support this shift and will the timeline be the same for each school or will this vary (like the current moderation system to help support workload issues) as markers are often teachers?</p>

Mana ōrite mō te mātauranga Māori

32 answers to "Mana orite impressions - Drama - Does the Learning Matrix show mātauranga Māori is appropriately woven throughout?"

Option	Total	Percent
On the right track	24	2.10%
Needs amendments	8	0.70%
Not Answered	1110	97.20%

31 answers to "Mana orite impressions - Drama - Does the Teaching, Learning, and Assessment Guide explain how the subject supports ākonga Māori to succeed as Māori?"

Option	Total	Percent
On the right track	16	1.40%
Needs amendments	15	1.31%
Not Answered	1111	97.29%

32 answers to "Mana orite impressions - Drama - Do the Course Outlines demonstrate how teaching and learning could be grounded in mātauranga Māori?"

Option	Total	Percent
On the right track	16	1.40%
Needs amendments	16	1.40%
Not Answered	1110	97.20%

21 answers to "Mana orite comments - Drama"

Response ID	Answer
ANON-K9GG-12D9-J	I am very supportive of this shift. However, in Drama, this looks like the inclusion of Theatre Aotearoa/Theatre Marae. This is a very specific and culturally-based skill set, and so to teach this as a Pākehā - in a way that is not appropriate, but appreciative - to Pākehā students, I would need up skilling. I am willing to do so, but often, this specific PD is not readily available - in fact, there are very few resources available to support this development (I have looked). How does NCEA propose to provide this upskilling to all Drama teachers? Obviously mātauranga Māori is NOT limited to Theatre Marae (it could be that Māori visionaries are explored in devising, etc.), and actually a lot of Theatre Aotearoa is written from Pākehā perspective, BUT if this is specifically mentioned in a standard/is a specific focus of a standard, then NCEA needs to take responsibility for partnering with groups to provide the necessary PD so that we do this in a manner that upholds tīkanga and te ao Māori, and not just allowing this culturally-grounded theatre form to be colonized for assessment purposes.
ANON-K9GG-12F8-K	I think it's great that Drama is having a focus on Aotearoa. We will need to ensure teachers are supported in this knowledge to have a consistent approach across the country.
ANON-K9GG-12UV-Z	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Examples of assessment schedules required. * Parameters around written evidence needed. Is a larger portfolio needed? * What type of assessment is acceptable? * Templates or checklists for certain standards as evidence of achievement. * Will there be a suitable TKI site to provide examples? * Key Competencies are great in a Drama context. * Are teachers doing less marking or more? * There appears to be an extra layer added to each unit
ANON-K9GG-18MK-K	Again, no explicit expectation for te ao Maori and/or matauranga Maori in the standards. Look at my other answers for the argument as to why that's needed.
ANON-K9GG-18MW-Y	Exploration of 'how te ao Māori is integral to Theatre Aotearoa' requires unpacking
ANON-K9GG-18XK-X	It feels as though it has gone too far the other way, for example each example course outline feels as though the majority of focus is on Matauranga Maori. Drama is an expression of self, story and history. This content does not support all

Response ID	Answer
ANON-K9GG-182A-E	<p>of our students. I feel as though there needs to be options to explore this but it shouldn't be fully prescribed as the only option.</p> <p>The concept of belonging and identity is ideal to create manaungatanga in learning and create deep and engaging performances which students identify with. It looks like this has been woven well into some of the course outlines.</p>
ANON-K9GG-182S-Z	<p>I understand why this approach has been taken, but it seems a lot to come to terms with all in one go. There seems to be a huge emphasis on NZ theatre, and this could be limiting for teachers and students. Is this a true integration, or a forced exercise? It just doesn't feel natural. I look forward to more PD to help understand the kaupapa.</p> <p>Thoughts to support the ongoing development of the subject content:</p>
ANON-K9GG-18J9-X	<p>The most crucial thing needed to make sure these standards are successfully implemented is thorough and fully resourced professional development on the new assessment expectations, how they are to be practically conducted and on how to effectively work within tikanga for those teachers who are not yet at the required philosophical and functional level for this.</p>
ANON-K9GG-18CU-K	<p>There is a resource book using specific Techniques, Elements, Conventions and Technologies in Te Reo and none this has been demonstrated in any of the produced materials - the generality of terminology is unhelpful and not giving specific guidance.</p> <p>Drama has a history but it not about our personal history - making links is important but is more specifically a world view - and larger than story telling.</p> <p>Māori terms are used appropriately however, I feel there needs to be more teasing out of te ao Māori.</p> <p>The Learning Matrix: Drama provides “opportunities to explore “rather than “is influenced by” whakapapa... is a way to respond to issues and ideas, histories, cultures, and share perspectives.</p> <p>Another big idea missed is that Drama draws on a rich history of theatre making across all cultures.</p>
ANON-K9GG-18XC-P	<p>Te ao Māori within course outlines would be better served by an overarching human question- something students can come back to through the year in relation to their kaupapa/ mauri/ whakapapa. If students at Level 1 get this right, and really understand there is a Kaupapa (way of working) that they all understand, that they also have a mutual respect of who each of them is and where they personally come from, then working in Drama as an cohesive ensemble group is more possible. Look to the principles of Theatre Marae as explained by Helen Pearce-Otene (MAI, 2020) where Theatre Marae and Space is explained form a Tea o Maori perspective. It is a very useful model, and one that Level Ones can learn and relate to.</p> <p>Very uncomfortable with the recommendation of plays like "When Sun and Moon Collide" at Level 1. Better served at Level 3, where aspect of eating disorders can be better framed. I feel in the examples that examinations of Maori plays is not fully thought through and quite token in its approach. Example 3 is the best exemplar by far and feels more cohesive. I like the move towards assessment happening as we go and in relation to a range of standards (ie: student agency).</p>

Response ID	Answer
ANON-K9GG-18B1-E	<p>Some course content appears to be exclusive rather than inclusive. Worried that students won't be able extend their skills and knowledge of drama as it is making assumptions that schools are not already integrating Maturanga Maori. 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. Instead of narrowing the focus(which is already covered in primary) and dumbing down the content students could be extending themselves in connecting our identity with world theatre. For example the tribal nature of Maori with Shakespeare - Macbeth and clans. This also highlights the issue around the suggested texts as it may turn into tokenism, doing a play for the sake of it being considered Maori. The texts suggested are also dated when there must be more relevant plays for modern society recognising the identity created for our akonga. Also questioning the suggestion of "Gangsters Paradise" as a NZ focused text as it appears to promote Maori identity as South Auckland and negative for the perception of what is Maori. The texts are missing universal themes which provide opportunities for wide ranging development in the creative process and higher order thinking. Maori have consistently been successful in our rural school which begs the question - is there a need in other schools to be upskilled in Maori concepts as teaching Maori in Drama already reflects good teaching practice in terms of providing success for Maori.</p>
ANON-K9GG-18UA-H	<p>For teachers who are returning to New Zealand, or those not empowered with a deep working knowledge of Te Ao Maori and Maori education, how will we empower them to participate meaningfully in this work? Are we working from an assumption that everyone is fluent in the deep and sometimes divisive nuances of Te Ao Maori?</p>
ANON-K9GG-18UF-P	<p>Good connection to aspects of tikanga and te reo within the Big Ideas and significant learning section.</p>
ANON-K9GG-124J-K	<p>I understand that there is a need to re-balance curricula to ensure all aspects of Aotearoa are represented. The suggestions seem to me a very heavy-handed way of trying to achieve this balance</p>
ANON-K9GG-1NXZ-3	<p>Yes to the above questions but there are concerns in regards how we make this relevant, respectful and more importantly GENUINE with students who haven't had this focus in their education for so long.</p>
ANON-K9GG-1NXR-U	<p>I'm not sure for this one. I'm not convinced it is entirely evident or clearly explained.</p>
ANON-K9GG-1N2Q-M	<p>Terms should be defined for non Maori speakers to be fair. I like the increase of terms and think its an awesome shift but they should be bilingual.</p>
ANON-K9GG-1NM6-M	<p>Yes, there are many excellent changes to apply Aoteroa theatre, and to make matauranga Maori a significant context. I hope Pacific theatre will also be considered or specified to be included. I think the current emphasis away from performance bwill be harmful to our Maori and Pacific akonga as the language used is not apply, create or perform, instead</p>

Response ID	Answer
	<p>it appears too heavy in literacy. We need to assess what success look like for Maori in Drama and apply that for all learners. Performance is the way forward, being able to show core Drama skills, rather than talk or write about them, otherwise we are cutting students off from showing their ability in Drama.</p>
<p>ANON-K9GG-1N22-N</p>	<p>Standards have been removed already!</p>
<p>ANON-K9GG-1NG7-F</p>	<p>I think iwi, mātua and ākonga voice is integral to this feedback to ensure mātauranga Māori is appropriately woven throughout to ensure ākonga Māori succeed as Māori. The changes need to be authentic and meaningful.</p>

Proactively Released