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## Purpose

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

## Background

1. The Ministry received 68 responses to the Ministry’s online survey about the subject content developed for Physical Education. These included both multiple choice answer questions and long form, written response questions.
2. The Ministry also conducted online Focus Group meetings with members of the education sector who provided feedback on the draft subject content.
3. Feedback was also provided by the four NCEA panels. Each panel did not review every subject or product – for Physical Education, feedback was received from the Māori, Pacific, Disability and Learning Support NCEA Panels.
4. There was also feedback from the Physical Education National Assessment Moderator (NAM), which will be summarised below.
5. This report is divided into the following:
	1. General Overview and Themes
	2. Analysis of Feedback by source
		1. Online
		2. Focus Group
		3. NCEA Panels
	3. Next steps
6. Please note that the content in this report does not reflect the opinions of the authors. The report aims to thoroughly and accurately reflect the views presented by those who fed back on the draft subject content.

## General Overview and Themes

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

In the feedback survey data and Focus Group, it was noted that it is important to have a much more in-depth understanding of the new subject content before being able to adequately comment on them. The wider issue is that currently many respondents think that there is too little information given in the Phase 1 subject content to give adequate feedback on them. Many respondents comment on needing more information on the Achievement Criteria, specifics on internal and externals assessment – with these, delivering the new subject content may be difficult. They are generally considered too vague and hard to see at this stage how they may be able to be implemented in classrooms.

It was noted consistently that without a more thorough understanding of the intent of the Achievement Standards, through Explanatory Notes and Assessment Activities, it is difficult to respond to how fit-for-purpose the standards are. A small percentage of people recognised that more open standards would lead to more flexible teaching, learning, and assessment opportunities. This, in turn, has led to concerns about what impact there may be on teacher workload as a result of the changes.

Specific examples of how to clarify content are improving messaging around which subject content are expected at what stage of the development process; editing the Unpacking the Big Ideas section to clarify how Significant Learning will link to assessment; more links to show how these subject content can be linked to the wider community.

In addition to this, some clarification may be required that the Course Outlines are not compulsory and should be used as a guide as to how the new learning subject content *may* be used.

1. ***Further Explanation of External Assessment***

As there have not been any external standards in Physical Education to date, there is some general concern in the Physical Education community about what this would look like. To date, much of the feedback across all feedback sources suggests that further messaging is required relating to how external assessment *might* look, as perception currently is that this would be a written exam. It would also be useful to give clarifications of when external assessment will occur across the year.

In addition, there is low-level concern that the external standard titles are too vague, or try to cover too much material. This is particularly true of 1.4, where comments refer to the fact that biophysical and sociocultural factors are too wide to cover off effectively in Level 1, and that each factor does not necessarily apply to individuals in their local contexts.

Addition of exemplars may also show how “lower attaining” can access these standards, because they are currently perceived to be too theoretical.

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

Broadly, across the Physical Education subject content, the inclusion of te reo has been warmly received by the sector, with many respondents seeing how te ao Māori has been incorporated into the new draft subject content. An example comment is “Awesome to see the inclusion of Te ao Maori.” This is particularly true of Course Outline 2, which has been viewed positively – the same usage might be replicated across other subject content, in particular the Learning Matrix. There are some concerns in relation to the amount of kupu Māori used in the subject content, with extended Glossaries across all subject content. In addition, some respondents across the Feedback Survey and Focus Group are concerned how te ao Māori will be implemented in the classroom.

Concerns were expressed about implementing te ao Māori concepts by teachers who may not have sufficient knowledge to adequately teach them, acknowledging that the barrier is not a lack of will. In addition, there is concern that there is no connection to the concept, just a superficial understanding. This is particularly of concern when considering local curricula and several suggestions relate to the need for PLD to be provided by tangata whenua – by iwi, hapū, and other community leaders.

There is also some concern that words are used as a token, and definitions are limited and Eurocentric. This leads to concerns of superficiality or cultural appropriation, with many respondents pointing to the need for significant national PLD to address this. A specific point is that hauora has different models and that the draft subject content do not take that into account, as well as noting that wellbeing and hauora are not interchangeable.

A further comment described how important community is in te ao Māori and therefore should be more explicitly woven throughout all parts of the draft subject content, rather than being used as progressions in or across Curriculum Levels.

1. **Inclusions of Pacific values and concepts**

All feedback sources pointed to several opportunities to include more Pacific values and concepts. Feedback was consistent in saying that although PE content was not prohibitive of Pacific values and ideas, it was not made explicitly clear when and how to incorporate fundamental concepts into teaching, learning, and assessment. There were a number of detailed recommendations made which aim to respond to these concerns.

1. ***General additions to the Learning Matrix***

Although many of the additions suggested in the Learning Matrix are in relation to making Māori and Pacific concepts more explicit, such as whenua, there are also more discrete suggestions. Each of the below were mentioned five times or fewer – clarification of place and space; the addition of self and wider society; listing capabilities for clarity; more focus on developing and improving movement; more focus on quality movement; consideration into changing the whakataukī to a more PE-specific one.

1. ***Suitability of the PE subject content for Outdoor Education***

There is wide concern amongst that Outdoor Education community about the development of Physical Education at Level 1. Although these submissions are small in number (12), they refer to the need to ensure that there are ways to continue to run an Outdoor Education course through these subject content. Specific additions include a closer relationship with taiao.

1. ***Achievement Standard 1.1 – Performance Standard***

There has been, across the feedback sources, concern about Achievement Standard 1.1 as a ‘performance’ standard. There is some disagreement over whether this should be a pure performance standard, or whether it should involve participation and enjoyment. In the feedback, particularly the Focus Group, consensus formed broadly around having a clear emphasis on participation and enjoyment, but leaving it open for pure performance, should ākonga choose. Others, more strongly in the feedback survey, would like a specific performance standard with performance criteria.

A further addition to this theme is the question of getting the right balance between theoretical and practical components right. Broadly, it is agreed that practical elements need to be present throughout all levels, though the extent of this is subject to debate, with some preferring more theoretical content in Levels 2 and 3. This is contrasted with the view that sport and pure performance is perceived to be alienating and therefore discouraged, which they argued should not be the case. There are also concerns that PE would become too literacy-focused and make the subject less accessible for those who are more practically minded.

1. ***Achievement Standard 1.4***

There has been, in both the Focus Group and the Feedback Survey, some mention of the concepts being either too complicated for Level 1, or confused in relation to the Learning Matrix. This standard asks for interrelationship between biophysical and sociocultural issues, whereas the Learning Matrix does not ask this.

In addition, there is a broader theme that the PE community has differing views on how and whether these factors should be prescribed, and to what extent this should be introduced at Level 1. As a result, some respondents suggest that a rethink of credit allocation would be appropriate if the intent of the standard remains the same.

1. ***Progression from Level 1 to Levels 2 and 3***

Much of the discussion related to progression in Physical Education is related to not having enough information to understand the intended progression to Levels 2 and 3. However, there are a range of views on whether the Phase 1 subject content are too theoretical or not theoretical enough at Level 1. This will be for SEG consideration.

Specific recommendations have been made to ensure that there is sufficient progression shown within the Learning Matrix, and to understand if there are inconsistencies in what is being asked in the assessment subject content. Changes can be made to reflect these specific comments.

##

## Sources of Feedback

#### Online

Below are the quantitative data questions summarised in graphs.

In general, the quantitative data suggests that Physical Education is broadly considered to be developing fairly smoothly, with no major issues with the intent and content of the Learning Matrix, and no significant issues with the intent of the Achievement Standards. This is reflected in the following comments: “Nothing really new which is good because the 2007 NZC is already conducive to great teaching and learning opportunities.” And “I really like the learning foci and the way that they allow for important ideas to be conceptualised in a way that is relevant to teaching and learning in a contemporary Aotearoa context. They seem to reflect and uphold TOW principles. Ka rawe!”

However, as suggested above in the general themes, there are more complicated issues relating to specific elements in the subject content. This is frequently reported as requiring clarification of the subject content in the TLAG, for example, better links to the Learning Matrix’s Significant Learning and the Standards, and more explicit use of Pacific and Māori concepts and values.

Solutions offered to these specific issues are provided below.

#### Focus Group

The focus group consisted of eight participants, external of MOE officials. There was a mix of participants – predominantly kaiako, but also university academics – including the current president of Physical Education New Zealand (PENZ). The Physical Education Critical Friend led the meeting and discussion.

The focus group was able to be more targeted in its feedback, due to the specific nature of the questions asked in that forum. In general, the feedback was more forensic in its recommendations, and added much needed detail to the general concerns outlined in the Feedback Survey data. Generally, the issues raised in the focus group were similar to those raised in the Feedback Survey data.

In terms of feedback which has also come through the NCEA Panels and Feedback Survey, the Focus Group centred heavily on clarity of message in subject content. This included specific recommendations which will help to ensure that better links are made to the Achievement Standards and Course Outlines from the Learning Matrix, and that the Unpacking the Big Ideas and Unpacking the Standards sections really show how teaching and learning can drive assessment. These specific recommendations are captured separately and are suggested to be actioned internally, with no need for further SEG consultation.

For Standard-specific feedback, the Focus Group overwhelmingly commented on Achievement Standards 1.1 and 1.4. Generally, they were very positive about Achievement Standards 1.2 and 1.3. This is somewhat supportive of NZQA, the SEG, and the Feedback Survey’s view.

In relation to Standard 1.1, the focus group respondents had similar conversations to the SEG in that they did not form an initial consensus on what it means to have a ‘performance’ standard. Some wanted performativity to have the major focus, whilst others preferred emphasising the experience and joy of movement. It was noted that standards-based assessment encourages a focus on performativity, although the group overall came to the view that it would be better to assess movement and not performance.

In addition to this, and as a way of circumnavigating the performativity vs joy/experience of movement issues, the idea of co-constructing or self-selecting criteria to be assessed against, with teacher verification, was suggested. It was acknowledged that this would require a lot of work with NZQA to get right, but would allow a range of outcomes and situations could be done through a standards-based assessment.

As the conversation progressed, though, it became clearer that focus group members were unsure of how ‘joy’ could be assessed through this potential framework. It was suggested that the SEG needs more time to discuss how to get this criteria or set of rubrics right.

For Standard 1.4, a discrepancy between the Learning Matrix and the standard was found. This relates to the fact that the Standard asks how sociocultural and biophysical factors interrelate, whereas the interrelationship only appears in the Learning Matrix at Level 8. The intent of this may require SEG clarification. This is similar to the Feedback Survey, which focuses on the fact that Standard 1.4 asks a lot of ākonga at Level 1.

#### NCEA Panels

The NCEA Panels have raised some important issues which complement some of the themes in both the Feedback Survey and Focus Group data.

The Māori Panel noted that some of the subject content, in particular the Course Outlines, could have more authentic use of concepts Māori. These suggestions may require more input from the SEG so that the subject content is not inadvertently lost. In general, the Māori Panel were concerned about the use of kupu and concepts Māori, and whether they were being used authentically or tokenistically.

The Pacific Panel offered a series of implementable suggestions around further inclusion of Pacific concepts across the subject content. This reemphasises concerns raised within the SEG and feedback from the Focus Group. This raises the same theme in Physically Education that although the Learning Matrix has not been perceived to be explicitly prohibitive to Pacific and Māori students, there can be some inclusions made which would improve the subject content.

Whilst the Disability and Learning Support Panel noted some good use of inclusive language, there are some clarifications which may be made. For example, it may be useful to include spatial awareness in the Learning Matrix. However, there is some advice which may be difficult to implement as it goes against other RAS policies (for example kupu Māori in bracket, or contextualisations in brackets).

## Next Steps

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

**Ministry Actions**

The actions to be undertaken by the Ministry – the RAS teams and wider Ministry groups – are largely communication actions aimed at supporting the sector.

* Ministry to clarify position on addressing PLD concerns relation to:
	+ being able to adequately reflect and competently deliver Mātauranga Māori in classroom settings, especially understanding kupu and concepts Māori
	+ preparing sample or exemplar subject content to support the delivery of the new teaching, learning, and assessment subject content. These will be included in the Pilot subject content.
* Ministry to clarify timing of development process and develop sector responses. This may be what the public should be expecting and when; and confirming what is being asked of the public at engagement points.
* Ministry to clarify communication with sector regarding the Change Package, including rationale on External Assessment for Physical Education. This may be possible to action through the communications plans for O&I responding to Change Package queries.
* Ministry to clarify, alongside NZQA, the ways in which both internal and external assessment are carried out, including confirmation on written assessment plans. This would also include concerns about specifics of assessment (methods, deadlines in year etc).
* Ministry to continue to work on messaging about the concurrent curriculum refresh and how that work is complementing the Review of Achievement Standards.

**SEG actions**

* Addressing concerns about how Unpacking the Standards links to the Learning Matrix, with specific recommendations contained in NCEA Panel and Focus Group documents.
* SEG to work on Standard 1.1 – the feedback to date has not provided any consensus on the way forward for the ‘performance’ standard. The PE community has been split on whether this is an adequate performance standard and if and how ‘engagement’ and ‘enjoyment’ could be credentialled to meet the SEG’s intention. We recommend that the SEG reconvenes before Phase 2 development to address this issue.
* SEG to be given recommendations on progressions from Level 1 to Levels 2 and 3 to consider, including discussing ‘interrelatedness’ of biophysical and sociocultural issues, currently in Standard 1.4.
* SEG to discuss inclusion of mātauranga Māori concepts and whether they are appropriate or not in a subject context. We recommend that the SEG work more closely with representatives from the Ākonga Māori team to ensure that kupu such as ‘ako’ are being used appropriately in subject content.
* SEG to work through Māori and Pacific Panel feedback recommendations, prioritised by the SEG Facilitator and Technical Writer, and make appropriate additions to the Learning Matrix are made so that the subject content more appropriately and explicitly reflect all ākonga
* SEG to consider all other relevant feedback as highlighted by the SEG Facilitator contained in this report.