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## Purpose

This report outlines the feedback received from a Public Engagement Survey by the Ministry of Education (the Ministry) on the Phase 2 development of Level 1 products for **Design and Visual Communication**. This report will present the quantitative data collected from the survey as well as summarising the common themes and trends appearing in the qualitative data. This report will be used to inform any necessary changes to the products before they go forward for piloting as part of the Review of Achievement Standards (RAS).

## Background

1. As at 23 August 2021, the Ministry received **25** responses to the Ministry’s online survey about the subject content developed so far for **Design and Visual Communication**. These included both multiple choice answer questions and long form, written response questions.
2. This report is organised into sections based on the questions in the survey:
   1. Summary of feedback as a whole
   2. General impressions of the subject content
   3. Course Outlines
   4. Individual Achievement Standards
      1. AS 1.1 and Assessment Activities
      2. AS 1.2 and Assessment Activities
      3. AS 1.3
      4. AS 1.4
   5. Impressions of the Achievement Standards as a suite
3. 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.
4. **Summary of Design and Visual Communication**

There were 25 responses to the Design and Visual Communication products. Respondents could choose any number of questions (quantitative or qualitative) to answer. As such, while there were a total of 25 responses, not all questions had the full 25 responses.

Quantitatively, responses about the products were generally quite positive. Results showed that most respondents felt that the products were either clear/useful/ready for piloting or needs some smaller amendments. Of all the products, there were more concerns over AS 1.1.

Qualitatively, responses about the products were also quite positive. This included positivity about the standards, the activities, big ideas, achievement criteria and, course outline 2. There were also some concerns expressed, and these concerns can be categorized into 4 broad parts: (1) Concerns regarding the difficulty of AS1.1, (2) concerns about tokenism and inauthentic cultural representation (particularly about AS1.1), (3) concerns regarding the many modes in which students could submit their work and, (4) the need for clarification of certain terms in the products.

1. **General impressions of the subject content**

**Questions**

***Do you think the draft materials for this subject are ready for testing with students in pilot schools/kura?***

CHART B

***Do you have any further feedback on the draft materials? If there was one thing you think would help make these materials easier to test in the pilot, what would it be?***

There were 15 responses to this question.

* Many expressed positivity regarding the published draft materials, particularly with the standards and the activities. In that, the materials published were thorough and helpful for both teachers and students. One respondent expressed positivity over the subject description and big ideas.
* Many expressed that it would be helpful if different schools piloted different modes to garner some information on how the various modes can be fairly assessed.
* Some expressed a need to clarify the meaning of kupu Māori and to have resources packages to better support teachers who are not as confident with their understanding of Māori culture.

1. **Course Outlines**

***Do the sample Course Outline(s) exemplify how the Significant Learning can form a coherent years’ programme with opportunities to assess the 4 Standards?***

CHART C: 1.1

***Do the Course Outline(s) demonstrate how teaching and learning could be grounded in mātauranga Māori?***

CHART C: 1.2

***Do you have any further feedback on the Course Outline(s)?***

There were 7 responses to this question.

* Many expressed concerns regarding the many modes in which students could be assessed on/submit their work. This included a concern over how the different modes would be properly assessed, how the different modes could realistically be taught, and other concerns regarding logistics. Some expressed a need to limit modes.
  + *“The course outlines seem to give a wide range of scope to learners to choose how they will submit work. This could be problematic teaching wise, moderation wise, material wise, assessment wise. Can teachers refine the brief to be more specific i.e., choosing mode?”*
* Many expressed positivity towards the workability of course outline 2.
* Many expressed concerns that there needed to be more clarity for outline 3. Some expressed that compared to outline 2, outline 3’s timeframe was too short and unrealistic in terms of generating work for assessment. Some respondents found outline 3 unclear and difficult to follow.
  + *“Course Outline 3 has some good content, though the programme structure makes teaching and learning DVC a lot more challenging and unclear. There is quite a separation between some of the context related knowledge and appropriate specialist DVC knowledge, that might be detrimental to students understanding what evidence they should be producing for specifically assessing to DVC.”*
  + *“As a teacher, I found outline 3 hard to follow in terms of the flow/progression of the years learning. It is a new approach compared to the traditional way of teaching DVC, but if not, familiar it feels overwhelming to wrap one's head around.”*
* One respondent expressed a need for stronger teaching guides and resources to support teachers in conveying mātauranga Māori in an authentic way.

1. **Individual Achievement Standards**
   1. **AS 1.1 and Assessment Activities**

***Is this Achievement Standard ready for piloting?***

CHART D: 1.1

***Are the Achieved, Merit and Excellence criteria clear enough to support consistent assessment judgments?***

CHART D: 1.2

***Does the unpacking of the Standard and the Conditions of Assessment provide sufficient and clear guidance on the use of the standard?***

CHART D: 1.3

***Internal Assessment Activities***

***Could the activities for AS1.1 be used or adapted in your local context?***

CHART D: 1.4

***Do the Internal Assessment Activities exemplify how mātauranga Māori can be recognised and valued in assessment?***

CHART D: 1.5

***Do the activities for AS1.1 support the engagement, access, understanding and participation of all learners?***

CHART D:1.6

***Do you have any further feedback on this standard and its activities?***

There were 12 responses to this question.

* Many expressed that while the inclusion of te ao Māori is admirable, there were worries over cultural safety. In that, AS 1.1 could potentially result in inauthentic cultural representation and cultural appropriation. Some worry that the outcomes of AS 1.1 might be tokenistic if executed carelessly.
* Some expressed concerns that AS 1.1 might be too challenging for students, and that certain skills were too advanced and better left to higher levels.
  + “In the assessment criteria for a student to achieve excellence they need to be able to demonstrate precise execution of suitable modes and media or techniques to communicate the form, materiality, and surface details of the design of the design outcome with visual impact. This is asking a lot of a year 11 student, not to mention load on a teacher who could have 30 students doing all different things.”
* Some express confusion over the word choice “response” and whether students were expected to be “responding towards a need or an opportunity.”
  + *“I was unclear as to whether or not this was referring to a "response to a need" in regard to specific design heritage from te ao Māori and another design heritage or was the response the starting point for gathering inspiration for design ideas.”*
* One respondent expressed a need for more guidance and resource support to teach AS 1.1 to ensure that mātauranga Māori is taught accurately.
  1. **AS 1.2 and Assessment Activities**

***Is this Achievement Standard ready for piloting?***

CHART D: 2.1

***Are the Achieved, Merit and Excellence criteria clear enough to support consistent assessment judgments?***

CHART D: 2.2

***Does the unpacking of the Standard and the Conditions of Assessment provide sufficient and clear guidance on the use of the standard?***

CHART D: 2.3

***Internal Assessment Activities***

***Could the activities for AS1.2 be used or adapted in your local context?***

CHART D: 2.4

***Do the Internal Assessment Activities exemplify how mātauranga Māori can be recognised and valued in assessment?***

CHART D: 2.5

***Do the activities for AS1.2 support the engagement, access, understanding and participation of all learners?***

CHART D: 2.6

***Do you have any further feedback on this standard and its activities?***

There were 8 responses to this question.

* Some expressed concerns that there were too many mode options. In that, it would be difficult for students to choose which modes best suited them without fully understanding each mode properly. In addition, some expressed concern that the many mode options would lead to problems with time management, equipment availability and teaching capacity.
* Some expressed that more clarity was needed regarding assessment criteria regarding how student should be graded for each of the modes.
* Some expressed issues with the word “materiality” in that, the word placed too much emphasis on rending but not so much on physical models.
* Some expressed concerns over resource equity, highlighting that different schools would have varying resource capability and that this would lead to unfairness during assessment.
  1. **AS 1.3**

***Is this Achievement Standard ready for piloting?***

CHART D: 3.1

***Are the Achieved, Merit and Excellence criteria clear enough to support consistent assessment judgments?***

CHART D: 3.2

***Does the unpacking of the Standard and the Proposed Assessment Approach provide sufficient and clear guidance on the use of the standard?***

CHART D: 3.3

***Do you have any further feedback on this standard?***

There were 4 responses to this question.

* A few respondents expressed that certain words could have been phrased better to aid in students’ understanding of the assessment such as “visual presentation” instead of just “presentation”. One respondent expressed that *“When I mention presentation to my students, they automatically assume that they are required to stand up and talk about their design ideas or outcomes.”*
* One respondent expressed that having some example activities would help teachers generate tasks better.
* One respondent expressed that amending the term “end user” to “possible user” would widen the inclusiveness of potential users.
* One expressed positivity that AS 1.3 provided clear and useful step-ups and that the unpacking statement was well written and expressed ideas clearly.
  1. **AS 1.4**

***Is this Achievement Standard ready for piloting?***

CHART D: 4.1

***Are the Achieved, Merit and Excellence criteria clear enough to support consistent assessment judgments?***

CHART D: 4.2

***Does the unpacking of the Standard and the Proposed Assessment Approach provide sufficient and clear guidance on the use of the standard?***

CHART D: 4.3

***Do you have any further feedback on this standard?***

There were 5 responses to this question.

* A few respondents expressed confusion over whether the submission could be in 2D or 3D, or both.
* One respondent expressed a need for orthographic projection, allowing teachers who have strengths in 3D to be successful with working drawings.
* One respondent expressed positivity on the achievement criteria and unpacking statement.
  + *“The Achievement criteria and step ups are very clear and are suitable for assessing the standard. The unpacking statement for the standard is very well written and clarifies the intent of the assessment.”*
* One respondent expressed the need for clarification on the phrase “related drawings”.

1. **Impressions of the Achievement Standards as a suite**

***Do the four Achievement Standards as a group credential the most important knowledge and/or skills for this subject as illustrated by the Learning Matrix?***

CHART E: 1.1

***Do the Achievement Standards support ākonga Māori to succeed as Māori? (select all that apply)***

CHART E: 1.2

***Are the Achievement Standards appropriate to Level 6 of the curriculum? (Approximately Year 11)***

CHART E: 1.3

***Do you have any further feedback on the Achievement Standards?***

There were 3 responses to this question.

* One respondent expressed that overall, the standards were at a suitable level except for AS 1.1 which might be overly challenging.
* One respondent expressed positivity over a “great set of standards with appropriate broad coverage for DVC teaching and learning.”