



8 - French, German, and Spanish (European Languages) NCEA Level 1 Phase 1 Survey – Raw Feedback

44 answers to "Impressions - European Languages - What is your overall impression of the Learning Matrix?"

Option	Total	Percent
On the right track	30	2.63%
Needs amendments	14	1.23%
Not Answered	1098	96.15%

43 answers to "Impressions - European Languages - What is your overall impression of the Teaching, Learning, and Assessment Guide?"

Option	Total	Percent
On the right track	17	1.49%
Needs amendments	26	2.28%
Not Answered	1099	96.23%

43 answers to "Impressions - European Languages - What is your overall impression of the example Course Outlines?"

Option	Total	Percent
On the right track	23	2.01%
Needs amendments	20	1.75%
Not Answered	1099	96.23%

41 answers to "Comments - European Languages"

Response ID	Answer
ANON-K9GG-12MC-5	It is definitely too wordy and doesn't really tell you what to teach, so that it is consistent for each level.
ANON-K9GG-12QD-A	I like the openness of 1.2 internal, allowing for student choice. It also looks like the Assessment guides are emphasising that students don't need to aim for perfection - as this is not natural
ANON-K9GG-122U-V	I am encouraged by the 4 proposed assessments for students for French. The sample course outline features themes / topics that would normally appear at Year 11, which I think is positive from a planning perspective for teachers. It's also

Response ID	Answer
<p data-bbox="224 1402 321 1497">ANON-K9GG-12BX-F</p> <p data-bbox="224 1570 321 1665">ANON-K9GG-12BU-C</p> <p data-bbox="224 1738 321 1833">ANON-K9GG-129M-U</p>	<p data-bbox="393 260 1377 321">appropriate for the language level that students are at when they come into Year 11.</p> <p data-bbox="393 354 1382 510">Will we still continue to teach topics that interest our students? Or will things become more prescribed? It is hard to tell at this stage from the samples. I think flexibility with internal assessment is great, and perhaps more guidance / prescription would be good for externals. Vocabulary lists and grammatical structures would be helpful and could help guide some of the subject content too.</p> <p data-bbox="393 543 1377 638">I like that the speaking focus is on spontaneous language for 1.1 as I think this is one of the most important skills to develop for language learners. It also helps develop resilience and risk taking skills which is great.</p> <p data-bbox="393 672 1372 827">I think the idea of having the choice between speaking and/or writing for 1.2 is a good change and allows for some individual student flexibility. There will need to be some clear guidance as to what the rules are for capturing these 'snapshot' texts. I think it is a good idea, and hope there will be additional allowance for errors in student work if perfection is not the aim.</p> <p data-bbox="393 861 1393 1079">1.3 doesn't seem to differ too much from the current reading external. Greater guidance on what 'decode' means would be beneficial. For example, will the expectation be that students need to show just understanding of the texts? (i.e. more translation based) Or will they have to infer extra information like they currently need to? I am not sure how valuable it is for students to infer information, rather I think the focus should be on showing that students have an accurate and precise understanding of a text.</p> <p data-bbox="393 1113 1393 1331">It looks like the plan for the listening component (1.4) is to feature shorter listening passages. I hope my interpretation is correct, as I think the current format of 3 long passages is not good, and having more of a 'DELTA style' to the questions would be much better (i.e. lots of short passages with shorter answer style questions to show understanding). I think it would also allow students to show their understanding of French in a range of contexts (e.g. in a cafe, with family, making plans etc) which is more practical and useful for them going forward.</p> <p data-bbox="393 1365 1369 1541">It looks like nothing is going to change except we will no longer be doing the speech standard. Literally everything else is the same, except harder because you can't tailor a course for a student anymore. They must do all 4 standards, which therefore makes languages impossible for some students. I also don't like the split with European languages and Asian languages, it will cause a rift in schools.</p> <p data-bbox="393 1575 1349 1669">How the assessment will look is unclear. Will translation into English still be required rather than showing comprehension by other means. I'm worried we'll have another 20 years of English-based foreign language learning.</p> <p data-bbox="393 1703 1393 1879">Great course outline, but hugely demanding in terms of what most students can actually master in the time frame given. The preterit tense alone takes students 2-3 years to use effectively. The introduction of formulaic language to include more advanced grammatical structures is worthwhile and can be done from teaching even very young akonga, but to actually master this range of tenses - preterit, imperfect, perfect, conditional, immediate future and future forms - places so</p>

Response ID	Answer
	<p>much stress and demands on 15 year olds that many abandon the subject, even after a successful year.</p> <p>communication areas outlined so far are great, but could we not leave grammatical structures to one side and focus on real communication without the pressure to teach, learn and apply specific structures? Anyone attempted this themselves while trying to have a spontaneous conversation in a second language?</p>
ANON-K9GG-12RZ-1	<p>This does not work and does not reflect the current curriculum. The website is also not user friendly, and provides minimum information.</p>
ANON-K9GG-12KM-D	<p>I really like the idea of 1.2 being open to the students to choose it as a written or a spoken (or maybe even other presentation. I was not 100% clear on if 1.2 is a one off assessment or also can be used more as a portfolio - by that I mean that students can contribute, redraft their work over terms 1-3 before finalising it. Adding ideas later as students are exposed to more complex language should be a feature for all our internal assessments, I believe.</p>
ANON-K9GG-12FH-3	<p>1.2 is not clear. Is this a one-off written or spoken text or is it the writing portfolio that already exists?</p>
ANON-K9GG-123N-P	<p>separation of curriculum level 7 and 8 is a positive development. however, without concrete details of what grammar structures each level refers to - there is little to comment on. Overgeneralisation has left the window too far open in the past. Combining one standard of production skills and leaving a choice between speaking and writing dumbs down the language too much - learning a language needs all 4 macroskills to be developed and pursued and without assessment, where is the drive and value placed on this skill?</p> <p>Learning Matrix - it's helpful to have more distinction between the levels. It would be even more helpful to have actual grammatical structures, verb tenses, expressions, etc, listed under these levels as a guide.</p> <p>Teaching Guide - again, really great to have this guide. It would be good to have a detailed sample outline for all levels. Obviously it's a sample so we wouldn't have to stick to it exclusively, but it would be nice to have some kind of outline to follow to know we're teaching the same concepts/content as the rest of teachers in the country. (Like those really old blue books that had so much detail. A revamp and detailed update of those would be amazing)!!</p>
ANON-K9GG-123E-D	<p>Assessment - I like that there are now 4 standards to bring it into line with the rest of the NCEA subjects. I do NOT like that the writing standard has been revised so much so as to potentially not need to write at all. I can appreciate why this has been changed, ie, to encourage inclusivity and that more students can achieve. BUT, this is a fundamental language skill important to communication (a Big Idea of the new programme). Learning to write in the language helps improve overall ability and builds independence in the language. Also, students who go on to study at a university level will need to be able to write as part of their course; if they've been allowed to complete all productive tasks orally they will be behind their peers. And finally, although languages are not included when assessing literacy, it has always been an integral part of our course. We do not expect</p>

Response ID	Answer
ANON-K9GG-18MF-E	<p>perfection in writing but it is a great indicator of a student's ability to apply their knowledge and craft it until they are happy with it.</p> <p>To me this is certainly on the right track. I would be interested in seeing further detail in hpw the various assessments will work in practice. Are we looking at significant change in the way "interaction" is assessed? Will there be any change to the exisiting externals. The most important issue for me is to increase engagement in languages beyond Y10 to ensure that languages are given value as a subject and to change the perception that languages are too hard.</p>
ANON-K9GG-18MC-B	<p>I'm happy with both the content and direction of the guides. My only concern is the way the external skills will be measured. The time has come to move away from assessing understanding of German in English. I hope the assessments will be more towards the proficiency test style of assessment as done by the Goethe Institute where one of a range of choices in German are selected to show comprehension rather than a translation style assessment. It defeats the purpose of teaching using German as the medium of instruction to then assess and have English as the dominant assessment language. One would not assess English as a second language comprehension by translating into German or Japanese. It's absurd. The assessments need to be in German.</p> <p>Assessment: Considering how important literacy is generally, I find it strange that students could get NCEA L1 German without showing that they can write in German. The 1.2 Standard that allows for multiple formats should include at least one compulsory written piece (range of topics presented by school supervisor and written under school supervision to ensure authenticity).</p>
ANON-K9GG-1828-5	<p>In Course outline, Switzerland should be mentioned here as well:</p> <p>Meine Freizeit My Freetime</p> <p>How to talk about what sport and leisure activities you engage in</p> <p>Differences and similarities between popular sports and leisure activities in Germany/Austria (and put in Switzerland here, too) with those in New Zealand</p> <p>Awareness of how to apply previously introduced structures in new contexts</p>
ANON-K9GG-18GR-M	<p>Although the information provided to date is a good start, it is still very hard to know what the expectations will be without seeing exemplars of the actual assessment standards. It would be very useful to have an exemplar of both external exams provided, to see if indeed the texts are shorter than they currently are, or if it just sounds that way from reading the standard descriptor. The provision of exemplar marking schedules will also be very important for us to understand how much detail will be required for different grades, especially in regard to demonstrating understanding of Matauranga Maori.</p> <p>A lot more clarification is also required in regard to the interaction standard. My understanding of "in the moment" language is language that is very short and basic - "yes" answers instead of "I would like to go to the party because it is very fun". Is the need for variety of language therefore gone from the new interaction</p>

Response ID	Answer
	<p>standard? How much will accuracy of language matter, or is it just about being able to maintain communication?</p> <p>Matrix - looks promising Assessment guide- assessment schedules needed course outlines- interesting</p>
ANON-K9GG-18GT-P	<p>1.1- focus on "on the spot" and "in the moment" language seems to make this standard more authentic, but I need to see actual assessment schedules to validate 1.2- is this going to be a portfolio? 1.3/ 1.4- actual topics named as part of the standard - focus on simple language in everyday situations- texts currently used in assessment wouldn't fit this criteria anymore</p> <p>We agree and support the big ideas for European Languages. We like the way it is prioritising communication over accuracy in the target language and that it fosters perseverance and risk-taking.</p>
ANON-K9GG-18TV-5	<p>The significant learning links to the big ideas and emphasises the key aspects of learning a language - risk-taking, wide exposure, and practising the language. There is a logical progression as the curriculum levels increase. Although the bullet point at level 8 re navigating the expression of figurative or idiomatic meaning is very sophisticated and not all language teachers will be familiar with idiomatic language, especially with overseas travel being on hold in the current Covid environment.</p> <p>I am happy overall however if the assessments flow on to Level 2 and Level 3 there will be less flexibility when choosing the appropriate assessments for the students.</p>
ANON-K9GG-184E-M	<p>I personally have stopped offering the listening assessments to my students for a number of reasons, namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - in Levels 2 and 3 I think that the current assessments are too long (having done NZQA marking before this is feedback I always give back). Students to get Excellence currently really have to be able to translate automatically to produce the amount of detail required and don't actually have time to use skills such as decoding meaning which we should be promoting. - The implicit meaning needed for Excellence is often superficial. - The nature of the assessment disadvantages students who have writing difficulties. ie. to get Excellence or even Merit students really need to transcribe practically a whole script. Dyslexic students, for example, who have good listening skills are disadvantaged (and pauses between recordings or extra time are not meaningful solutions as they are still required to listen to a recording without pauses. - The assessment load of doing the internals plus a reading external is sufficient
ANON-K9GG-181M-S	<p>I would actually prefer a listening exam to more so resemble the DELF or DELE exams. Writing down every single detail (which is often required for high grades in listening) is not a relevant skill.</p> <p>Bring back Latin!</p>

Response ID	Answer
<p data-bbox="224 436 318 527">ANON-K9GG-186K-V</p> <p data-bbox="224 1262 318 1352">ANON-K9GG-186G-R</p>	<p data-bbox="394 260 1386 699">The production standard being more integrated is a good change to allow more flexible ways of demonstrating communicative competence from the individual perspective. The matrix is useful by providing elaboration for the significant learning relative to each level. However, the outline for Level suggests that the progression that still being understood as subordinate to grammar progressions. Although there is a good use of lexical chunks that makes it more productive and flexible, the expectation that students should master some of these topics in such a short period implies that the focus is still less on how they grasp and communicate ideas and more on whether they "know" certain structures. It will be interesting to see how much of this is reflected in external resources. How anchored they are in having mastered complex structures (preterite versus imperfect) as opposed to cognitive skills to do with decoding context clues, predicting, cultural clues, or higher order thinking (identifying opinion, implications, assumptions, and so on).</p> <p data-bbox="394 726 1224 819">Learning Matrix: I would suggest the following addition: "Learning languages is about communicating with people across cultures AND ACROSS TIME "</p> <p data-bbox="394 852 1382 976">I think that some of the statements in the Learning Matrix could be clearer. For example, in the last point, what is meant by "simple linguistic strategies" and "physical and digital resources" ? Maybe there could be some examples. The same goes for "physical and visual cues". What exactly is being referred to here?</p> <p data-bbox="394 1010 1373 1039">On a more pedantic note, one makes meaning from a text, not from a text type...</p> <p data-bbox="394 1073 1373 1134">Having sample course outlines is a great idea. I think teachers will find this really helpful.</p> <p data-bbox="394 1167 1390 1480">Re the Assessment matrix, it's good to see that students will be asked to "show understanding of...." rather than the current "respond to..." It's also good to see that the 1.1 and 1.3 exams will use different types of texts. Please could the reading exam also be more varied in the types of texts it includes and the questions that are asked, so that it better reflects the types of reading that people do in real life. For example, there could be a question which requires students to scan for information from a text that is beyond their reading ability (as in the DELF exams, for example). Please could we also move away from the current long-answer format, as it seriously disadvantages students who have understood the text well but are not good at expressing their ideas in writing.</p> <p data-bbox="394 1514 1398 1856">in the 1.1 and 1.2 it's good to see an acknowledgment that students should be showing what they can do with their existing skills rather than aiming for perfection. However, I can't see the 1.2 working well unless strict rules are put in place regarding the use of on-line translation tools. I no longer get my students to do the writing portfolio because a) it's too difficult to guarantee that their work is authentic, b) it's time-consuming and the students don't learn a lot from it since the teacher can't give much feedback, and c) the availability of editing tools and electronic translation means that students become obsessed with producing a perfect piece of work. I would like to go back to an external writing exam. I don't think that the proposed 1.2 will give valid information about students' ability to write in French.</p>

Response ID	Answer
<p data-bbox="224 890 318 982">ANON-K9GG-189M-1</p> <p data-bbox="224 1717 318 1810">ANON-K9GG-18ZT-9</p>	<p data-bbox="394 260 1393 445">I think it is positive that students can submit a variety of evidence. This promotes their independence and personal preferences. It makes the assessment more attractive for students. If they are able to submit songs, videos or multi-media presentations it needs to be with clear guidelines and expectations for the assessment. In this case it makes sense that students can produce a combination of spoken and written language.</p> <p data-bbox="394 451 1393 604">Another positive change is the fact that students will submit a piece of work which demonstrates their language ability at the time. We would need more clarifications how many pieces students have to submit. If they need to submit two pieces, it could be done during two different terms and their language progress would be obvious.</p> <p data-bbox="394 638 1393 791">This standard paves the way for UDL within assessments, which will make it more accessible for a wider range of students. It will reduce assessments done during the year, which will lead to more teaching time. However, it could penalise students who work better doing coursework, rather than under pressure at a particular point in time.</p> <p data-bbox="394 827 792 856">Is it a one-off or portfolio based?</p> <p data-bbox="394 890 1393 1075">Why can't this have a cultural aspect, like the Japanese one? The name of the standard is different to the Asian languages - these need to be in line - there is no need to completely change the context. Both should look at cultural aspects. However, it is good that the outcome of the standard will suit the learning preference of the student and that the outcome is more focused ie. Either written or spoken.</p> <p data-bbox="394 1081 1360 1140">Because this is more focused it will mean that the assessment schedule will be easier to navigate. This is something that is missing in Japanese.</p> <p data-bbox="394 1146 1369 1234">The only issue with giving students the choice of writing or speaking means that some students will not produce any written work at all throughout their qualification.</p> <p data-bbox="394 1268 1393 1392">It is a positive change that the listening task is based on short, authentic text types. At the moment the text types are quite long and similar to reading texts. It needs to be ensured that the text types are still having known vocabulary which is on the NCEA vocabulary lists.</p> <p data-bbox="394 1428 1393 1612">I think it's a great idea to have short texts – we need to make it more relevant to the students. The different texts should be texts that they will hear in everyday life. It is good that they recognise that the listening texts should be different to the reading texts due to trying to understand the information more urgently. I do think that the topics should be similar though as it will help students understand better having already seen some of the vocabulary in the reading exam</p> <p data-bbox="394 1646 670 1675">1.1 Internal interaction</p> <p data-bbox="394 1682 1360 1791">There have not been major changes compared to the previous standard. It has always been a spontaneous interaction and the teachers have to ensure that students don't have the opportunity to memorise and rote-learn role-plays or conversations.</p> <p data-bbox="394 1797 1360 1856">European and Asian languages should be in line and have the same amount of credits available for interaction.</p> <p data-bbox="394 1862 1360 1892">I think the interaction should be delayed until further up the school in Level 2 or</p>

Response ID	Answer
<p>ANON-K9GG-184V-5</p>	<p>Level 3 when the students have more language to draw from. At level 1, students only have a very limited vocabulary and some find it quite daunting. Is it a one-time thing or a portfolio based standard? Is this still portfolio based though or is it a one off like the Japanese? Asian and European should have the same credits available ie. 5</p> <p>1.2 Internal This standard paves the way for UDL within assessments, which will make it more accessible for a wider range of students. It will reduce assessments done during the year, which will lead to more teaching time. However, it could penalise students who work better doing coursework, rather than under pressure at a particular point in time.</p> <p>Is it a one-off or portfolio based?</p> <p>Why can't this have a cultural aspect, like the Asian language one? The name of the standard is different to the Asian languages - these need to be in line - there is no need to completely change the context. Both should look at cultural aspects. However, it is good that the outcome of the standard will suit the learning preference of the student and that the outcome is more focused ie. Either written or spoken. Because this is more focused it will mean that the assessment schedule will be easier to navigate. This is something that is missing in Asian languages. The only issue with giving students the choice of writing or speaking means that some students will not produce any written work at all throughout their qualification.</p> <p>Also the complexity with the marking and moderation considering the range of types of submissions are allowed.</p> <p>1.4 External It is a positive change that the listening task is based on short, authentic text types. At the moment the text types are quite long and similar to reading texts. It needs to be ensured that the text types are still having known vocabulary which is on the NCEA vocabulary lists.</p> <p>I think it's a great idea to have short texts – we need to make it more relevant to the students. The different texts should be texts that they will hear in everyday life. It is good that they recognise that the listening texts should be different to the reading texts due to trying to understand the information more urgently. I do think that the topics should be similar though as it will help students understand better having already seen some of the vocabulary in the reading exam</p> <p>1.1 (Internal) Interact using simple spoken Spanish to exchange information, ideas, and opinions related to immediate contexts There have not been major changes compared to the previous standard. It has always been a spontaneous interaction and the teachers have to ensure that students don't have the opportunity to memorize and rote-learn role-plays or conversations. European and Asian languages should be in line and have the same amount of credits available for interaction. It is not clear why there should be a difference.</p>

Response ID	Answer
	<p>1.2 (Internal) Produce simple Spanish to communicate information, ideas, and opinions related to an immediate context</p> <p>I think it is positive that students can submit a variety of evidence. This promotes their independence and personal preferences. It makes the assessment more attractive for students. If they are able to submit songs, videos or multi-media presentations it needs to be with clear guidelines and expectations for the assessment. In this case it makes sense that students can produce a combination of spoken and written language.</p> <p>Another positive change is the fact that students will submit a piece of work which demonstrates their language ability at the time. We would need more clarifications how many pieces students have to submit. If they need to submit two pieces, it could be done during two different terms and their language progress would be obvious.</p> <p>1.3 (External) Show understanding of simple written Spanish related to immediate contexts</p> <p>Students should be aware of and be able to reflect on aspects of Spanish culture. However, I don't see the relation to the Spanish standards that students have to be aware of Maori and Pacific perspectives. That should not have an impact on their mark for Spanish. They should be able to relate texts to the context of learners within New Zealand. There needs to be more clarification about that aspect and how it should be implemented in teaching.</p> <p>1.4 (External) Show understanding of simple spoken Spanish related to immediate contexts</p> <p>It is a positive change that the listening task is based on short, authentic text types. At the moment the text types are quite long and similar to reading texts. It needs to be ensured that the text types are still having known vocabulary which is on the NCEA vocabulary lists.</p> <p>Overall, having just 4 standards leaves the qualification really limited, whereas there is so many other parts of the language that can be explored. I feel overall that the assessments will lead to a narrow curriculum.</p> <p>1.1 Interaction</p> <p>I think the interaction should be delayed until further up the school when the students have more language to draw from. At level 1, students only have a very limited vocabulary and some find it quite daunting. Is it a one-time thing or a portfolio based standard? Asian and European should have the same credits available ie. 5.</p> <p>1.2 Internal</p> <p>This standard paves the way for UDL within assessments, which will make it more accessible for a wider range of students. It will reduce assessments done during the year, which will lead to more teaching time. However, it could penalise students who work better doing coursework, rather than under pressure at a particular point in time.</p> <p>Is it a one-off or portfolio based? Needs to be clearer.</p> <p>Why can't this have a cultural aspect, like the Japanese one? The name of the</p>

[ANON-K9GG-1849-8](#)

Response ID	Answer
	<p>standard is different to the Asian languages - these need to be in line - there is no need to completely change the context. Both should look at cultural aspects.</p> <p>The only issue with giving students the choice of writing or speaking means that some students will not produce any written work at all throughout their qualification.</p> <p>The complexity of the marking and moderation also needs to be addressed, considering the range of types of submissions are allowed.</p> <p>1.3 External Students should be aware of and be able to reflect on aspects of the TL culture. They should be able to relate texts to the context of learners within New Zealand. There needs to be more clarification about that aspect and how it should be implemented in teaching. The relevance between TL culture and Maori makes it more difficult. Why can't it be students' own culture?</p> <p>It's a good idea to have language and text types that are useful within everyday life, rather than long texts that we have at the moment. It would be good to have some realia in the texts?</p> <p>1.4 External It is a positive change that the listening task is based on short, authentic text types. At the moment the text types are quite long and similar to reading texts. It needs to be ensured that the text types are still having known vocabulary which is on the NCEA vocabulary lists.</p> <p>I think it's a great idea to have short texts – we need to make it more relevant to the students. The different texts should be texts that they will hear in everyday life.</p> <p>It is good that they recognise that the listening texts should be different to the reading texts due to trying to understand the information more urgently. I do think that the topics should be similar though as it will help students understand better having already seen some of the vocabulary in the reading exam.</p> <p>Its NOT making it easier for students its NOT making it more attractive for NZ children to choose learning a language but it creates more work for the teachers</p> <p>ANON-K9GG-18R3-Z At Curriculum Level 8: its very unrealistic to learn figurative or idiomatic expressions in German; it will be very hard to engage with extended authentic text types in German subscribed topics feel like going back to the old curriculum 10 years ago</p> <p>the credits for Asian languages should be the same</p> <p>ANON-K9GG-18RA-E I whole-heartedly disagree with the proposed assessments. The Interact standard has always been flawed - students too often memorise a script. The 1.2 "produce" is far too open and broad. I believe the standards need to be more defined and give specific guidance both to teachers and to learners.</p>

Response ID	Answer
<p>ANON-K9GG-189V-A</p>	<p>Overall, I don't understand why we have to do things differently for European languages and Asian languages to start with. Indeed there are differences between Asian languages and European languages. But it doesn't necessarily mean the differences between French(phonetic) and Korean(also phonetic) will definitely be greater than the differences between French and German. To say that they are that different that we have to follow 2 different assessment systems is all very subjective to me. I don't see Maori on the Languages list. Which assessment structure does Maori have to follow? European? Asian? Or has its stand alone assessment structure? The world's languages are more than just Asian and European. Just because at the moment the languages in our national curriculum can be categorize into those 2 doesn't mean we should be putting out a guideline with only these 2 categories. Why can't we just keep everything consistent as just "Languages"?</p> <p>1.1</p> <p>The new proposal still doesn't answer or put forward proposals of how to solve the key issue in the interaction standard, which is on "how to conduct" the assessment to avoid students from rehearsing or rote learning. Agree with the reducing workload part, but if it is a one-off assessment, how can we ensure it is a true reflection of students' proficiency?</p> <p>1.2</p> <p>I don't understand why the word "cultural practice" needs to be in the title of this standard to start with. It's a bit misleading because if you look at the actual content of the standard, the assessment actually covers a whole lot of different topics.</p> <p>It can include culture as social customs, such as information about the family, home life, interpersonal relations, school, leisure activities, traditions, and celebrations. It can also involve culture as culturally-laden words and concepts, or culture as information about countries, art, entertainment, history etc.</p> <p>I understand that they put "cultural" here as a very wide concept, but it will cause confusing among teachers and students.</p> <p>It also allows the learner to present evidence individually or in teams and in multiple forms, including performance, presentation, visual, verbal, or written.</p> <p>Have we considered about the complexity with marking if all these forms are allowed as evidence. In addition to that, what's the difference between this "written" and the writing standard? And what's the difference between "presentation" and "verbal"? And what does it mean by "visual"? What's the difference between "visual" and "written"? I know I start to sound like that I'm nitpicking things here but I'd appreciate further explanation on these.</p> <p>1.3</p> <p>The 2 skills being assessed separately will still give students who are strong in listening and speaking a better chance to pass and gain credits in the listening paper but combining these 2 will discourage those students as it will be harder for them to pass the whole thing. Is it still going to be a 3-hour long exam if they are combined? Or it is shortened? Were this and the writing external planned to be carried out in the same exam session?</p>

Response ID	Answer
<p data-bbox="224 701 329 793">ANON-K9GG-18HM-G</p> <p data-bbox="224 1528 329 1621">ANON-K9GG-18HS-P</p>	<p data-bbox="394 260 1382 415">While on the right track I am surprised by the amount of content that has been suggested in the course outline. This does not take into account the real lie of a school where there are constant interruptions and time lost from academic learning as well as the fact that students have so little time before NCEA Level 1. Some students may have had only the equivalent of a year of learning.</p> <p data-bbox="394 449 1398 1234">I am generally pleased with what the panel has come up with for European Languages but am appalled that there has been a split between Asian and European languages. Firstly, where is the parity between a 1 recording, 6 credit assessment for Asian Language interaction and a 5 credit, 2 recording assessment for European languages, It is my VERY firm belief that Asian and European languages need to retain the SAME standards with the SAME credit levels and that differences in challenge (eg. writing Asian script) can be addressed through the conditions of assessment. One should surely consider this in regard to how differing standards would look within a school. Currently non subject experts (eg. a French teacher HOD) can support an Asian language teacher because we understand the intent of the standard. If the Ministry continues with the idea of splitting the languages, then there will be an absolute reduction in collaboration possibility, which goes against current educational best practice and puts increasing stress on teachers who are often sole teachers in their kura. The split of the languages is the absolute single change that must occur to the proposed review. Conditions of assessment absolutely need to be CLEAR and PRESCRIPTIVE as this is a NATIONAL qualification for which there needs to be rigour that has been missing from the current NCEA. I do question what the 1.2 will look like and believe it needs more teasing out - as to what that might look like and requirements / expectations. I would also like to know what the 2 externally assessed standards will look like as there needs to be a vast overhaul of what student are expected to be able to do in these exams. Since the last change (2011?) exams have become unfeasible in this subject as evidenced by the decline in students taking languages. This was never the intent of course but it has become the reality.</p> <p data-bbox="394 1262 1398 1577">1.1=> There's always been issues with this standard with students "overpreparing", no matter how much you tell them not to (especially when they do an interaction with another student, authenticity is even more of an issue). I really like the idea of combining the speech and the interaction like AS and A Level do. Students would have prepared their speech thoroughly and would be familiar with the vocabulary necessary to address the following questions asked by the teacher but they wouldn't be over-prepared as they couldn't predict what questions would come up. It could be a one off exam but students would get practice in class as they would regularly answer questions in class about the other topics explored during the year.</p> <p data-bbox="394 1577 1382 1793">Or, I really like one of the ideas suggested by a colleague of mine which is to use a format similar to the IGCSE role play (for Level 1 specifically). While the students can get familiar with the format in class, when they are assessed, the spontaneity is preserved to an extend as the question and topics will be different, requiring them to adapt to various real-life situation. Practical language is something that students can relate to and see themselves using in the more immediate future.</p> <p data-bbox="394 1793 1382 1892">Also, "immediate contexts", what does that mean? Are they just gonna be asked to use the present tense to pass? Their work would be very much one dimension if they are not talking about past and/ or future events.</p>

Response ID	Answer
<p>ANON-K9GG-188Y-C</p>	<p>1.2=> I do feel that a more "controlled" environment (access to less resources so students can look up words but showcase their ability to use the grammar correctly and create complex sentence structures on their own) when doing the writing would be beneficial as it would prevent authenticity issues.</p> <p>Also, "immediate contexts", what does that mean? Are they just gonna be asked to use the present tense to pass? Their work would be very much one dimension if they are not talking about past and/ or future events.</p> <p>1.3 Thanks to the French Polynesian culture, it is easily possible to compare and contrast, and make it an integral part of the program. However, while I feel it is important to include appropriate awareness of Maori and Pacific cultures, valuing all the other cultures present in our classroom is just as important for the students' development of their own identity. This should be reflected in the standard.</p> <p>Also, "immediate contexts", what does that mean? Are they just gonna be asked to understand the present tense to pass? Designing the exam would be quite difficult if all the situations are anchored in the present. It's very limiting.</p> <p>1.4=> Listening is quite challenging comparing to the reading and needs to be adapted accordingly. The length of the passages at the moment is quite long and students feel overwhelmed with information.</p> <p>However, "immediate contexts", what does that mean? Are they just gonna be asked to understand the present tense to pass? Designing the exam would be quite difficult if all the situations are anchored in the present. It's very limiting.</p> <p>1. I am glad the the proposed 1.3 (Reading) mentions "short text types" & "everyday situations". Over the last 8-10 years the length of the passages that pupils need to read for this type of standards have been FAR TOO LONG and sometimes far too UNFAMILIAR. This is a huge burden on students of French (my area) and makes success at this level unnecessarily difficult, French NCEA exams have almost become elitist (i.e. accessible to the minority) . Also, as a teacher in a Decile 4 school, many of our students were not born or brought up in NZ which means that reading passages based on a NZ context provides a further unnecessary barrier. I am pleased however that the proposed passages will be shorter.</p> <p>2. It is good keeping Listening and Reading separate as it is currently. Our Asian language teacher colleagues want the same thing.</p> <p>3. I like the 1.1 Interact (Conversation). This is surely the number 1 aim of learning a language.</p> <p>4. I also like the the proposed 1.2 and the flexibility it contains regarding production "types" - i.e. Talk / Writing - or mixture.</p> <p>5. ALL standards for French LEVEL 1 should have predictable and familiar contexts. The assessments need to send this signal to pupils that after 2½ - 3 years of French they WILL succeed and will not be thrown by strange / weird / unfamiliar contexts or the pet topics or expressions of an examiner or moderator. The BEST contexts are those to do with travelling to France / Hosting French/NZ pupils in France/NZ / school trips in France / everyday activities in a French city / etc as French Culture is part of the learning process.</p> <p>6. (All standards) For many students, the following expression (very political in my opinion and unnecessary) will be a barrier to success ;"..will include appropriate cultural awareness of matauranga Maori and Pacific perspectives...". The WHOLE POINT of learning another language is that we learn to accept the fact and be tolerant of the fact that other people have a DIFFERENT view of the world to us. Forcing an "appropriate" way of thinking from non-European cultures seems untenable and at odds with what we are doing. It seems that this comment implies</p>

Response ID	Answer
<p>ANON-K9GG-188F-S</p>	<p>that we need to teach EXTRA cultural knowledge or ASSUME extra cultural knowledge (Maori / Pacific) that our pupils may not possess - i.e. yet again, an extra barrier to success.</p> <p>The big ideas is a good concept and the significant learning makes sense.</p> <p>The level 6 curriculum makes sense and the work asked of students is reasonable. While I believe students will be able to recognise connections and contrasts, I doubt they will be able to verbalise this in French so would think that this part would not be assessed but rather become a building block for future levels.</p> <p>The level 7 curriculum is well worded as it is an elaboration on information and ideas of familiar topics.</p> <p>However, I do not agree with Level 8. To ask students to make meaning from a variety of extended authentic text types is not realistic. Far too often the language is too advanced and there is far too much unfamiliar language in authentic texts. I believe they should be extended and that students should be exposed to some authentic text, however often these would not be the sort of text that French students their age would engage with. So this part should be reworded – it should be extended text types (including some authentic).</p> <p>In terms of their communicative skills, it would be very difficult for students to analyse and actively sustain interactions on ‘authentic’ text types that may include societal topics. A second language learner would not engage in such conversations without them being quite predictable.</p> <p>Furthermore, figurative and idiomatic meaning is difficult in English and should not be asked of a second language learner.</p> <p>Course Outlines Feedback:</p> <p>The learning Focus is good except for the film study – I believe this is quite difficult for NCEA level 1 – I think there is a place for this but at Level 2 or 3 when students have a lot more language and understanding of culture.</p> <p>Not sure if comparing is appropriate for level 1 especially in regards to routines – simple ones would be appropriate but not sure how developed this would be at level 1. Some rather difficult language is required to discuss one’s own culture and the French culture which I don’t think is something that should be done at level 1.</p> <p>Again doing comparative research on youth health issues in France and NZ is not level 1 appropriate.</p> <p>In terms of assessment, I would like to see a change in the external assessments across all levels. I find it utterly unfair and unrealistic to ask second language learners to inference meaning – this is not about ‘reading between the lines’ in a second language but making meaning of what is being said. Understanding the vocabulary and the grammar structures. Many of the students who struggle with inferencing in the English curriculum are being penalised in the language exams not for their lack of understanding but for their lack of inferencing.</p> <p>It is also not realistic to ask students to listen to a passage 3 times and then give them only 3 minutes to answer questions before giving them the next passage.</p> <p>The task at hand becomes: how well can you listen and write at the same time.</p>

Response ID	Answer
	<p>Again I don't think this is realistic, nor does it gives students a chance to write down all the detail. And then the way the current format is, they are asked to inference meaning. As a fluent speaker, I would struggle to gain excellence at level 3 due to these problems.</p> <p>Other</p> <p>It would be most helpful to have a shared curriculum where all teachers across Aotearoa would be able to teach the same – same vocabulary, same grammatical structures, same topics – there is far too much variation and interpretation especially at level 2 and 3 – this makes it very difficult to teach. Teachers are unsure if they have covered enough complex structures. There are no exemplars and as it currently is, is very vague.</p> <p>1. The numbering of the standards will be very confusing. For example, we have used 1.1 to mean External Listening since NCEA inception. By all means change the title and the AS number but please leave 1.1 = listening , external, 1.2 internal, etc.</p>
ANON-K9GG-18R2-Y	<p>2. Will the emphasis now be on proficiency rather than inference in the externals? The present emphasis on inference has been very detrimental to external results, leading to frustration, and students giving up French. Boys especially have suffered from this emphasis on inferring, rather than proficiency.</p> <p>3. We would like to see examples of Big Ideas. What exactly does this mean for French?</p>
ANON-K9GG-18E6-P	<p>I am concerned that students may never be assessed on 'writing' in a foreign language now that the standard is removed and writing may become optional.</p>
ANON-K9GG-18K7-W	<p>It would be good to discuss this with other teachers to get a better vision of what this would be like. It seems to be on the right track but I need to see it in practice to see how it will go.</p> <p>This response is submitted on behalf of a Faculty comprising approximately 15 languages teachers. We have the following concerns:</p>
ANON-K9GG-18N6-Y	<p>1.2 - This production standard is completely flawed. It means that students might never be assessed in writing, one of the fundamental skills of language learning. This will reinforce the inequities currently plaguing NCEA where student learning is compromised with big gaps because of the design of the standards allowing students or teachers to miss significant learning. Worse still, "learners can choose whether to produce spoken language, written language or a combination of the two." Presumably schools can set the conditions so that students would have to do a writing assessment? If so, then some schools will insist that students must do a writing assessment. But students in other schools might miss out on writing completely. The idea that the standard should increase "learner agency and be reflective of individual preferences and interests" is exactly the problem. It seems typical of the Ministry's approach where a teacher's professional knowledge and pedagogy is diminished in favour of letting a student do what they want, even if it's not in the best interests of their learning. This standard should be a writing standard, period. A speech is an artificial and fake language skill anyway.</p>

Response ID	Answer
<p>ANON-K9GG-18F1-J</p>	<p>Furthermore, why is it an internal? Schools across the country have faced so many problems in regards to authenticity by assessing writing as an internal standard. This is not going to change! If the writing is meant to be "authentic examples" not "extensively honing the same pieces over extended periods of time," then this would be the perfect grounds for assessing it as an external. Nothing will change in regards to authenticity with this internal standard.</p> <p>Could the standards also be renamed to include the key skill being assessed? At the moment, you see the word "written French" and so it assume it's a writing standard but it is actually a reading standard. Likewise you see "spoken French" and so assume it's a speaking standard but it's actually a listening standard. This is so counterintuitive.</p> <p>It's an absolute scandal that Latin is not being included. The Ministry's consultation process wrecks of tokenism with a predetermined outcome which does not even fit with your own seven changes underpinning the changes.</p> <p>1.1 - if the emphasis is on authentic and spontaneous communication (as opposed to rehearsed exchanges), the assessment criteria will need to reflect this and there will need to be more room for errors. Students may not be able to show evidence of communicating past/future events as they do currently.</p> <p>1.2 - interesting that students will be able to choose between written and spoken communication. Will this be the case for Levels 2 and 3 as well? Will a student be able to get Level 3 without having to do any written assessments in Spanish at all? While appreciate that having a choice will suit some students, I am concerned that this does not show a well rounded development of their skills.</p> <p>1.4 and 1.3 - Good that there will be a variety of text types. For too long there has been a focus on longer reading/listening texts. It would be good to see a more authentic variety (radio adverts, train announcements etc.). It would be good to see a variety of question types (true/false, gap fills, one word or short sentences in Spanish) as opposed to the detailed summaries that they currently have to do. I am concerned about the mātauranga Māori that students will be required to know for 1.3/1.4. I think that ensuring that students have that knowledge, so that they can compare it with Spanish cultures, will detract from the actual teaching about Spanish cultures.</p> <p>Not much has changed in these standards apart from removing the compulsory written component. i agree that the standards are of equal weighting.</p> <p>1.1 (Internal) Interact using simple spoken French to exchange information, ideas, and opinions related to immediate contexts</p>
<p>ANON-K9GG-18KG-D</p>	<p>This is not clear whether it is portfolio based or not. if so, then not much has changed in terms of what is required of this standard.</p> <p>1.2 (Internal) Produce simple French to communicate information, ideas, and opinions related to an immediate context</p> <p>Why can't this have a cultural aspect, like the Japanese one? The name of the standard is different to the Asian languages - these need to be in line - there is no need to completely change the context. Both should look at cultural aspects. However, it is good that the outcome of the standard will suit the learning</p>

Response ID	Answer
	<p>preference of the student and that the outcome is more focused ie. Either written or spoken. Because this is more focused it will mean that the assessment schedule will be easier to navigate. This is something that is missing in Japanese. The only issue with giving students the choice of writing or speaking means that some students will not produce any written work at all throughout their qualification in French due to their being no stand alone writing standard.</p> <p>1.3 (External) Show understanding of simple written French related to immediate contexts not much has changed in this standard</p> <p>1.4 (External) Show understanding of simple spoken Spanish related to immediate contexts It is good that they recognise that the listening texts should be different to the reading texts due to trying to understand the information more urgently. I do think that the topics should be similar to the reading texts though as it will help students understand better having already seen some of the vocabulary in the reading exam</p>
ANON-K9GG-18F6-Q	<p>Currently the assessment guide is too vague. How many tasks/examples are needed for each assessment? Is it two examples for the internals and externals? Will students still be offered 3 hours to complete the externals? How many texts will there be?</p>
ANON-K9GG-1N2P-K	<p>The Learning Matrix and the Assessment Matrix for the European Languages are on the right track. The choice allowed in 1.2 is particularly apt for learning language students, where they can make the choice of doing an oral or written presentation. The example Course Outlines vary greatly over the various European Languages. There needs to be greater consistency and more realistic expectations about how much can be covered in a term, particularly term 4, given the number of interruptions now in a school year.</p>
ANON-K9GG-183W-5	<p>Learning Outlines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The topics covered across the 3 languages look interesting but it's very unrealistic to cover 2-3 topics per term - 1-2/ term would be more realistic to be covered. - The course outlines show a big variation across all three languages and need to be more consistent. - Is there flexibility in topics and learning activities? Some languages are more precise in language skills/ features covered and others less so. They vary across all three languages and need to be more consistent. Outlines are very prescriptive in language feature uses/ topics for assessment and they pose the danger of covering only those language features mentioned in the course outlines. - Some of the topics are very dense and content-rich, which will be difficult to be completely covered. Future plans in Spanish looks more like a Level 2 topic. - It's great to see language learning skills mentioned (e.g. dictionary skills, vocabulary learning etc.). <p>Assessment: The new 1.2 looks like an interesting way of assessment to replace both 1.5 and</p>

Response ID	Answer
	1.2. What is going to happen to the current vocabulary lists? Will there be more guidance around assessments?

Mana ōrite

43 answers to "Mana orite impressions - European languages - Does the Learning Matrix show mātauranga Māori is appropriately woven throughout?"

Option	Total	Percent
On the right track	25	2.19%
Needs amendments	18	1.58%
Not Answered	1099	96.23%

43 answers to "Mana orite impressions - European languages - 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	20	1.75%
Needs amendments	23	2.01%
Not Answered	1099	96.23%

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

Option	Total	Percent
On the right track	21	1.84%
Needs amendments	21	1.84%
Not Answered	1100	96.32%

29 answers to "Mana orite comments - European Languages"

Response ID	Answer
ANON-K9GG-122U-V	I think this is the area where more resources need to be developed so that we can make better connections between French and mātauranga Māori. At the moment, I think links are often superficial and/or are limited.
ANON-K9GG-129M-U	The course outline provided could make better use of particular features of mataurange Maori which relate to Spanish for some topics - these include comparing Matariki with Las hogueras de San Juan(seasons, customs, star movement), comparing the horerros of northern Spain with patakas(food, buildings), exploring Los Paniora (family) or Polynesian explorers and colonizers with Spanish conquistadores, comparing proverbs etc. Language needs to be embedded in culture and suggested course outlines could be more effectively grounded in Maori concepts and thus provide support to akonga Maori to succeed AS Maori.

Response ID	Answer
ANON-K9GG-12KM-D	I think we are moving in the right direction. I can see the use of Te Reo terms and concepts in the course outline and applaud that. It is a real challenge to find a balance between teaching another language than Te Reo and include as many Te Reo terms as possible - but it is the thinking and living Maori culture in the classroom - to use these terms such as whanau, ako, mana, etc because they make sense and explain concepts that we as a bicultural country aim to achieve in our classroom, whanau and society. So it is really up to us teachers how we can include these ideas and language into our teaching - they become easier to not forget in a multicultural classroom.
ANON-K9GG-123E-D	It's hard to have a foreign language grounded in mātauranga Māori. When we're in the language classroom, we're trying our best to only use the target language, we don't want to introduce another language and culture. Yes, Māori language and culture are naturally part of our environment, but I'm not planning to explicitly teach them. I don't teach pakeha culture in my language class.
ANON-K9GG-18MF-E	An intercultural approach is already embedded in the language curriculum and this seems to be reflected in the proposed course outline with a focus on the French speaking world (not just France) and Aotearoa.
ANON-K9GG-18MC-B	This is a difficult area to assess.
ANON-K9GG-18GR-M	As mentioned above, the documents already provided are a good start, but the most helpful thing will be to see exemplars of the assessment standards to provide clarification of what it will actually look like.
ANON-K9GG-18GT-P	would like to see what it actually looks like
ANON-K9GG-18TV-5	There is opportunity for Māori students to communicate about their culture and compare and contrast with other French-speaking countries. We don't feel, however, that this is explained in the subject content but rather implied through the suggested course outline and significant learning.
ANON-K9GG-181M-S	Exactly how is Māori relevant to European language?
ANON-K9GG-186K-V	It is not clear how this related to the Spanish matrix or outline.
ANON-K9GG-186G-R	Can't think of anything to add
ANON-K9GG-189M-1	Asian and European languages should be in line and provide the same standards considering the cultural component. European languages would benefit from having a cultural component which students can work on in English to provide in-depth answers. Languages is not only about proficiency but culture should play an important part which should be reflected in the assessments. Students can only

Response ID	Answer
<p>ANON-K9GG-18ZT-9</p>	<p>examine cultural context of the target language and their own cultural background in the target language (1.2) which will be superficial due to their limited language ability at level 1.</p> <p>I think having a cultural/history standard would allow more students to access and want to take a language at senior level. I'm really disappointed that it is different for Asian and European languages here – I think they should be more aligned.</p> <p>Overall, having just 4 standards leaves the qualification really limited, whereas there is so many other parts of the language that can be explored. I feel overall that the assessments will lead to a narrow curriculum.</p> <p>1.3 External “It is also anticipated that the related text learners will be called on to show understanding of will include appropriate cultural awareness of mātauranga Māori and Pacific perspectives and relate to the context of learners within Aotearoa, where possible, as well as reflect aspects of the target culture.” Students should be aware of and be able to reflect on aspects of target culture. However, I don't see the relation to the European language standards that students have to be aware of Maori and Pacific perspectives. They should be able to relate texts to the context of learners within New Zealand. There needs to be more clarification about that aspect and how it should be implemented in teaching.</p> <p>It's a good idea to have language and text types that are useful within everyday life, rather than long texts that we have at the moment. It would be good to have some realia in the texts?</p> <p>The relevance between French culture and Maori makes it more difficult. Why can't it be students' own culture.</p> <p>Cultural standard is missing in European languages (like the 1.2 Asian languages one)</p> <p>Asian and European languages should be in line and provide the same standards considering the cultural component. European languages would benefit from having a cultural component which students can work on in English to provide in-depth answers. Languages is not only about proficiency but culture should play an important part which should be reflected in the assessments. Students can only examine cultural context of the target language and their own cultural background in the target language (1.2) which will be superficial due to their limited language ability at level 1.</p> <p>I think having a cultural/history standard would allow more students to access and want to take a language at senior level. I'm really disappointed that it is different for Asian and European languages here – I think they should be more aligned.</p> <p>Overall, having just 4 standards leaves the qualification really limited, whereas there is so many other parts of the language that can be explored. I feel overall that the assessments will lead to a narrow curriculum.</p>

Response ID	Answer
ANON-K9GG-184V-5	<p>Cultural component</p> <p>Asian and European languages should be in line and provide the same standards considering the cultural component. European languages would benefit from having a cultural component which students can work on in English to provide in-depth answers. Languages is not only about proficiency but culture should play an important part which should be reflected in the assessments. Students can only examine cultural context of the target language and their own cultural background in the target language (1.2) which will be superficial due to their limited language ability at level 1. I think having a cultural/history standard would allow more students to access and want to take a language at senior level. Knowing about Maori and Pacific culture should not be part of the language assessment.</p> <p>I think more PD is going to be needed in order for this to be a success.</p>
ANON-K9GG-1849-8	<p>Asian and European languages should be in line and provide the same standards considering the cultural component. European languages would benefit from having a cultural component which students can work on in English to provide in-depth answers. Languages is not only about proficiency but culture should play an important part which should be reflected in the assessments. Students can only examine cultural context of the target language and their own cultural background in the target language (1.2) which will be superficial due to their limited language ability at level 1.</p> <p>I think having a cultural/history standard would allow more students to access and want to take a language at senior level. I'm really disappointed that it is different for Asian and European languages here – I think they should be more aligned.</p> <p>Overall, having just 4 standards leaves the qualification really limited, whereas there is so many other parts of the language that can be explored. I feel overall that the assessments will lead to a narrow curriculum.</p>
ANON-K9GG-18R3-Z	<p>there is NO connection whatsoever between German and Reo or Tikanga Maori visible</p>
ANON-K9GG-18RA-E	<p>This is not specified in the French learning matrix.</p>
ANON-K9GG-189V-A	<p>Would definitely appreciate if we could get more clarification on this, especially in how exactly is this going to be incooperated in our teaching and learning. Many of our teachers do not come from a Maori background. These are really the wrong questions to ask us.</p>
ANON-K9GG-18HS-P	<p>Currently, I feel the standards cater specifically for students performing well with the language but not for the students who have a great interest for the culture and/ or history of the target country. A cultural and/ or historical component (done in English) would allow us to cater for students who have different interests and may help with retention too. It would allow for opportunities to compare and contrast. A lot of students come in Junior years highly motivated to discover the language but also learn about the culture/ history. While this is easily addressed in junior courses, there is not as much room for it in senior years since the current</p>

Response ID	Answer
ANON-K9GG-188F-S	<p>standards don't really value this knowledge, even though it is just as important as the linguistic learning.</p> <p>I also don't understand why Asian languages is looking into integrating cultural practice in their standards while European languages doesn't. Is it because European cultures are not as drastically different from NZ culture. If so, as a language teacher, I feel that it is our duty to emphasize on what is not necessarily obvious in cultural practices. Fantastic class conversations have emerged out of comparing and contrasting everyday life aspects that most students always assumed are "the same as theirs".</p> <p>Is matauranga Maori woven throughout the matrix: While I believe it is, lots more PD and support would need to be given in that aspect as we are not teachers of Maori and so an assumption that we all know what this is, is not realistic.</p> <p>Do TLAG explain how subject supports akonga Maori: Yes it does, but we do not all identify as Maori, so when one doesn't it is very difficult to teach this to our students without prior knowledge and teaching on our part.</p> <p>Do Course Outlines demonstrate how teaching and learning could be grounded in matauranga Maori:</p> <p>To some degree yes, but at level 1 this is very difficult to do – learning the language through simple texts is the focus.</p> <p>Professional learning needed: *Knowledge/learning content on Matauranga Maori *Learning how to embed Matauranga Maori into content and delivery of the French curriculum *What does it look like so to ensure we are successfully fulfilling the requirements.</p>
ANON-K9GG-18R2-Y	<p>We needs some example on how to incorporate the cultural awareness to our teaching and learning. Not every teacher will have that awareness, especially those not from NZ</p>
ANON-K9GG-18K7-W	<p>For the reading standard, it says that it will include "appropriate cultural awareness of matauranga Maori and Pacific perspectives" but this risks diminishing the cultural location of the actual subject - in France, Spain or Germany. The integrity of the subject must be upheld and for one which is based in a foreign country, then this needs to be accepted and embraced on its own terms.</p>
ANON-K9GG-18N6-Y	<p>There is no mention of mātauranga Māori in the Learning Matrix. It does mention that students will grow awareness of aspects of their own culture - but Māori culture may not be the culture of many of the students.</p>
ANON-K9GG-18F1-J	<p>I am concerned about the mātauranga Māori that students will be required to know for 1.3/1.4. I think that ensuring that students have that knowledge, so that they can compare it with Spanish cultures, will detract from the actual teaching about Spanish cultures.</p>

Response ID	Answer
ANON-K9GG-18KG-D	<p>As a non-maori speaker it is difficult for me to say if Maori is used correctly.</p>
ANON-K9GG-18F6-Q	<p>It would be good to see some examples of how much Maori context will be needed. Will the student be expected to have prior knowledge of Maori concepts or will it be explained in the texts? The diversity of our students in NZ is quite broad, as is their experience in NZ experiences and understanding. I would assume there would be a relevant glossary with an explanation and/or image.</p>
ANON-K9GG-1N2P-K	<p>There was little evidence in most of the European Course Outlines and only some evidence in the external standards of the Assessment Matrix around matauranga Maori.</p>
ANON-K9GG-183W-5	<p>The course outlines or guides don't seem to use Māori terms or show Māori contexts. There is some (very little) reference to Māori culture, which may give Māori an opportunity to include some their own culture. The references vary across all three languages.</p> <p>I do not see Māori contexts and approaches to teaching and learning explained - it needs to be more included and clear.</p> <p>The course outlines show how a year could be taught but not in relation to Mātauranga.</p> <p>Where are the concepts grounded in te ao Māori mentioned?</p>