## Mandarin Phase 2 Survey – Raw Feedback

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

[No responses]

**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?**

[No responses]

**Do the sample Course Outline(s) exemplify how the Significant Learning can form a coherent years’ programme with opportunities to assess the 4 Standards? (Do they show how a course could be taught across a year in the subject? Remember these can be adapted to your own context.)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Option | Total | Percent |
| The Course Outline(s) are useful examples | **7** | **0.74%** |
| The Course Outline(s) are unclear or do not contain enough information | **6** | **0.63%** |
| The Course Outline(s) are too similar to show multiple ways a course could be constructed | **0** | **0.00%** |
| The Course Outline(s) are not useful | **0** | **0.00%** |
| Not Answered | **938** | **98.63%** |

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Option | Total | Percent |
| The course outline(s) demonstrate this clearly | **4** | **0.42%** |
| The course outline(s) demonstrate this to some extent | **8** | **0.84%** |
| The course outline(s) do not demonstrate this | **1** | **0.11%** |
| Not Answered | **938** | **98.63%** |

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ANON-767U-4E7K-M | Too much to complete in one year. |
| ANON-767U-41XG-W | 1. Too much information that it would be hard for students to achieve and hard for teachers to organise the teaching material and further develop students' language knowledge and abilities in Level 2 and Level 3 (including mātauranga Māori aspect). 2. In the MD L2 Course Outline, it gives the sample teaching duration is 32 weeks. However, we only have 10 weeks per term, you also want students to complete the 1.4 Writing assessment at the end of Term 3, how either can be achievable. |
| ANON-767U-41HG-D | Too many contents to be covered in year 11. I am just worried that we don't have enough time to finish all the contents. |
| ANON-767U-41UP-3 | It seems a bit hard for Level 1 |
| ANON-767U-4EPA-3 | ¬ Duration of the course is 32 weeks, which is too long , not realistic. There are many school base activities throughout, eg, Sports tournaments, school exams, field trips… Suggest course duration less than 28 weeks (same as European languages ) . Whānau- Family ♣ too specific, the suggested topics are more about school and leisure ♣ Suggest new name for this Unit “ Me and my people”, which will cover family, hobby etc. Whakanui Celebration ♣ Festival celebration is more for level 2 topic as the vocabulary and sentence structures will be above level 6 in NZ curriculum. ♣ Suggest a new name for this unit “Birthday celebration” Harenga ki Haina Trip to China- ♣ Trip to China is not everyday context ♣ Some topics such as a city/town in China, environment, hometown, festival celebration, compare them to their own places of living and learn how to communicate about places in China are more for level 2. ♣ Suggest new name for this unit “Holiday” Toku akomanga reo Hainamana My Madrin class ♣ -Too specific and narrow, suggested new name- school life. ♣ Suggested activities for this unit such as “language learning experience” are also more Level 2. Year 11 students will not have sufficient language skills exchange views on learning experience. ♣ Intercultural learning- Visiting a Maori language class -is not practical Hauora and Manaakitanga -wellbeing and support ♣ The language required for this unit is above level 6 in NZ curriculum ♣ Suggest new name for this unit “being sick” Suggest units for course outline could be: ♣ Whānau -Me and my people ♣ Whakanui -Birthday Celebration ♣ Harenga ki Haina - Holiday ♣ Toku akomanga reo Hainamana - School life ♣ Hauora and Manaakitanga- Being sick |
| ANON-767U-412D-M | 1. Some grammar points should be in Year 10 such as buying, shopping and describing clothing sizes, asking for prices, different sizes and bargaining. 2. Family members' nationality as well as date of birth should also be taught in Year 9 and 10. 3. Asking about preferences, likes and dislikes are something included in Year 9. 4. Asking about food to eat and drink is also Year 9/10 content. 5. In the proposed course outline, the future tense is introduced before past tense which is inappropriate as daily routine would have been introduced in Year 10 and characters that indicate the past "le and guo" should have been taught in the first term in Year 11 to help students build their ability and confidence when talking about past experiences (what they did yesterday, last night, last year, etc.). 6. Future tense such as "hui, xiang, yao, zhun bei, ji hua, da suan" should be introduced as early as term in term 2, after "describing the past experiences". As the students progress to learn the future tense when planning a trip to China or a holiday destination of students' choice, learners become more and more confident in term 3 when common assessment task takes place. Overall, I feel that this new Yea r11 course outline has been dumbed down and students will not be able to learn/experience success as much as the pervious course outline. Finally, the current NCEA level 1 requirement of describing matters of most immediate relevance, i.e. present, past and future experiences is critically relevant/useful to a modern language user who needs to know how to communicate those information after learning 2.5 years of the target language. |
| ANON-767U-4S1F-Q | content seems too much for Level 1; not achievable |
| ANON-767U-4S18-9 | The course outline appears very dense and prescriptive in terms of language use. Is this an indication of what is expected for external standards? Please note my concerns on the Japanese language for 1.2, 1.3 and 1.4 also for Mandarin. Interesting topic choices with lots of scope. |

**Is this Achievement Standard [1.1] ready for piloting?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Option | Total | Percent |
| The standard is ready for piloting | **2** | **0.21%** |
| The standard needs small amendments before piloting | **3** | **0.32%** |
| The standard needs significant amendments before piloting | **6** | **0.63%** |
| The standard is unsuitable for piloting | **1** | **0.11%** |
| Not Answered | **939** | **98.74%** |

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Option | Total | Percent |
| The criteria are clear | **2** | **0.21%** |
| The criteria need some clarification | **8** | **0.84%** |
| The criteria need significant clarification | **2** | **0.21%** |
| Not Answered | **939** | **98.74%** |

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Option | Total | Percent |
| Guidance is sufficient and clear | **3** | **0.32%** |
| Further detail is needed in the guidance | **7** | **0.74%** |
| Guidance is unclear | **2** | **0.21%** |
| Not Answered | **939** | **98.74%** |

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Option | Total | Percent |
| I could use or adapt all 3 activities | **3** | **0.32%** |
| I could use or adapt 1 or 2 activities | **8** | **0.84%** |
| I could not use or adapt any of these activities | **1** | **0.11%** |
| Not Answered | **939** | **98.74%** |

**Do the Internal Assessment Activities exemplify how mātauranga Māori can be recognised and valued in assessment? (Do they demonstrate appropriate Māori contexts for assessment? Do they provide guidance and support for teachers and students to engage with mātauranga Māori in assessment?)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Option | Total | Percent |
| All 3 activities do this | **4** | **0.42%** |
| 1 or 2 of the activities do this | **6** | **0.63%** |
| None of the activities do this | **1** | **0.11%** |
| Not Answered | **940** | **98.84%** |

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Option | Total | Percent |
| All 3 activities do this | **6** | **0.63%** |
| 1 or 2 of the activities do this | **5** | **0.53%** |
| None of the activities do this | **1** | **0.11%** |
| Not Answered | **939** | **98.74%** |

**Do you have any further feedback on [Achievement Standard 1.1] and its activities? For example, if you noted that the Achieved, Merit and Excellence criteria were unclear, which grade level in particular is problematic and why? If you have noticed problems in an Activity, which one was it?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ANON-767U-4EJU-H | Level 1 Chinese standards need to be simple and accessible. We need to consider the difficulty of the language itself, not to compare Chinese with other languages. |
| ANON-767U-4EPR-M | Okay, maybe competently should be for Excellence. Interaction makes students want to learn the language, it is still time consuming. |
| ANON-767U-4EGA-T | The assessment does not take the aspect of identifying the Chinese characters into account rather focus on interaction, communication and understanding of Mandarin. besides, the assessments are very subjective. This might encourage students to use Pinyin which is closest and convenient to English speakers but Pinyin is not just a convenient access to Chinese Language for foreigners or preschool Chinese natives. in the external level if some focus on how to assess their talent of identifying Chinese Characters will be very useful to encourage students to communicate in writing Chinese Characters. After all, characters serves the basic part of Chinese language and also writing characters is kind of art and a charming part for foreigners although the most difficult part. At least assessing the the abilities of identifying characters is another option to raise learning interest. In a word, the current assessments are very subjective wanting some objective method of assessing their learning achievement. if given pressure of identifying Chinese characters, they are given a tool of further learning Chinese language in the future. |
| ANON-767U-41XG-W | 1. No explanation/clarification for Achieved and Merit criteria so far. 2. Understand that Māori contexts are important, but they should not show in the task title. Students' language abilities and the standards are achievable are the main aspects that you need to consider. 3. Students have fewer options to do their internal assessments. They can drop one of the internal assessments before but they have to do the interaction (1.1) now. |
| ANON-767U-41H2-R | Some tasks are too hard, esp. 1.1a. Many tasks are better suited for presentation rather than interaction. The language required for some activities is far beyond Level 1. There’s no mention that students should use language up to NZC curriculum level 6 . It needs some more work. |
| ANON-767U-412E-N | Like European Language and Pasifika Languages, 1.1 for Chinese should allow students to interact in written form as well. Although real-time interaction in written form is harder in Asian languages than European and Pasifika Languages, but the students of Asian languages should have the same options as the students of other languages. |
| ANON-767U-4EPA-3 | ¬ A renewed emphasis on the demonstration of unrehearsed, 'on the spot' “in a real time” language use is too much to ask for level one. Currently we have 5 standards so many schools do not offer this standard. But with the new standard, students and teachers have no choice because we only have 4 standards with 20 credits. Suggest this interaction standard can be combined with a speech so that students can have a choice of a speech or interaction. Assessment activity A: ♣ A social media influencer and a celebrity are not everyday topics ♣ Need to be aware that many schools offer Chinese as a taste course in year 9 with one period a week so by year 11, the students may have only learned Chinese around 150 hours. Assessment activity B: ♣ The topic “Why learning Chinese” is more at level 2 need further clarification on the differences between competently (build on) and skilfully (enrich). |
| ANON-767U-4S1F-Q | This standard is too hard for Level 1. Students need much large vocabulary to achieve this. Workload will be much increased. |

**Is this Achievement Standard [1.2] ready for piloting?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Option | Total | Percent |
| The standard is ready for piloting | **0** | **0.00%** |
| The standard needs small amendments before piloting | **3** | **0.32%** |
| The standard needs significant amendments before piloting | **2** | **0.21%** |
| The standard is unsuitable for piloting | **2** | **0.21%** |
| Not Answered | **944** | **99.26%** |

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Option | Total | Percent |
| The criteria are clear | **0** | **0.00%** |
| The criteria need some clarification | **4** | **0.42%** |
| The criteria need significant clarification | **3** | **0.32%** |
| Not Answered | **944** | **99.26%** |

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Option | Total | Percent |
| Guidance is sufficient and clear | **1** | **0.11%** |
| Further detail is needed in the guidance | **3** | **0.32%** |
| Guidance is unclear | **3** | **0.32%** |
| Not Answered | **944** | **99.26%** |

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Option | Total | Percent |
| I could use or adapt all 3 activities | **1** | **0.11%** |
| I could use or adapt 1 or 2 activities | **6** | **0.63%** |
| I could not use or adapt any of these activities | **0** | **0.00%** |
| Not Answered | **944** | **99.26%** |

**Do the Internal Assessment Activities exemplify how mātauranga Māori can be recognised and valued in assessment? (Do they demonstrate appropriate Māori contexts for assessment? Do they provide guidance and support for teachers and students to engage with mātauranga Māori in assessment?)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Option | Total | Percent |
| All 3 activities do this | **3** | **0.32%** |
| 1 or 2 of the activities do this | **3** | **0.32%** |
| None of the activities do this | **1** | **0.11%** |
| Not Answered | **944** | **99.26%** |

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Option | Total | Percent |
| All 3 activities do this | **1** | **0.11%** |
| 1 or 2 of the activities do this | **4** | **0.42%** |
| None of the activities do this | **2** | **0.21%** |
| Not Answered | **944** | **99.26%** |

**Do you have any further feedback on [Achievement Standard 1.2] and its activities? For example, if you noted that the Achieved, Merit and Excellence criteria were unclear, which grade level in particular is problematic and why? If you have noticed problems in an Activity, which one was it?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ANON-767U-4E7K-M | Too many different combinations of ways to carry out this assessment, therefore it is too difficult to handle by teachers and students. Please make this standard simpler and more practicable. |
| ANON-767U-41XG-W | 1. No explanation/clarification for Achieved and Merit criteria so far. 2. You expect to see Level 1 students create a Chinese song? How are we going to mark their pronunciation when they sing a song? or pronunciation is not important? 3. You emphasises that critical thinking is important in the Big Ideas and Significant Learning aspect. How can the standard shows students' critical thinking when they describe a person, summary a story? 4. Too much information for students to include in their assessment and it is not achievable. 5. "2-3 weeks to prepare and produce your work for this assessment". It is more difficult for students to complete it as they do not have portfolios and cannot get the teacher's general feedback anymore. |
| ANON-767U-41H2-R | This standard and some activities are too hard and some require language much higher than NZC curriculum level 6. I have concerns that level 1 students have insufficient language to achieve this standard. The assessment criteria is not clear if this standard is assessing writing skills or a spoken presentation or bother oral and written skills. |
| ANON-767U-41HG-D | It should have different marking criteria for presenting orally and in written form. |
| ANON-767U-4EPA-3 | ¬ The assessment conditions are not very clear. If the students give a spoken presentation, they must write a speech first. If the written speech can be submitted for the standard with 5 credits, why would anyone want to give a spoken presentation. ¬ Evidence can be presented in a variety of formats, which will make the assessment become more complicated. For example, teachers may find it more difficult to make a judgement on the evidence between a song and a game. How can the learner’s performance be assessed in different forms with one assessment schedule? ¬ This standard needs to be clear either a spoken presentation or written presentation. Not a combination of both or in a variety of formats. ¬ Assessment activity A: ♣ A social media influencer and a celebrity are not everyday topics ♣ Community and environment are the topics at level 2 ¬ Assessment activity B: ♣ “The presentation will show that you can use Mandarin to communicate simple information about an everyday topic.” Why use “simple” in this assessment activity? ♣ “Storytelling” will easily mislead students to recite the story. Book review or movie review are the topics for level 2. |
| ANON-767U-4S1F-Q | 1. Too confusing that it can be written and spoken 2. Integrate Maori culture will demand much vocabulary 3. It is too hard for Level 1 assessment |

**Is this Achievement Standard [1.3] ready for piloting?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Option | Total | Percent |
| The standard is ready for piloting | **0** | **0.00%** |
| The standard needs small amendments before piloting | **1** | **0.11%** |
| The standard needs significant amendments before piloting | **4** | **0.42%** |
| The standard is unsuitable for piloting | **5** | **0.53%** |
| Not Answered | **941** | **98.95%** |

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Option | Total | Percent |
| The criteria are clear | **0** | **0.00%** |
| The criteria need some clarification | **3** | **0.32%** |
| The criteria need significant clarification | **6** | **0.63%** |
| Not Answered | **942** | **99.05%** |

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Option | Total | Percent |
| Guidance is sufficient and clear | **0** | **0.00%** |
| Guidance is insufficient | **1** | **0.11%** |
| Guidance is unclear | **8** | **0.84%** |
| Not Answered | **942** | **99.05%** |

**Do you have any further feedback on [Achievement Standard 1.3] and its activities? For example, if you noted that the Achieved, Merit and Excellence criteria were unclear, which grade level in particular is problematic and why? If you have noticed problems in an Activity, which one was it?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ANON-767U-4EB6-A | It's very different to combined the 2 standards for students to do. It is not fair for those who are only good at one achievement standard. NCEA should be helping all students to achieve at their best. |
| ANON-767U-4E7K-M | Listening and Reading are two out of four important skills of language learning, they should be assessed separately and should be granted 5 credits each. Furthermore, it's easier for students to concentrate on either reading or listening in one assessment rather than mix them up. With the question styles, there should be different types of questions from easy to difficult level, rather than 'one question to assess all'. Who are to be defined as Chinese as additional language? Please state it clearly. |
| ANON-767U-41XG-W | 1. Needs further explanation and/or samples for: "include a combination of the following: emails, social media content, maps or infographics, instructions, interviews, audio-visual resources. 2. Clarify: this standard is "for whom the Chinese language is an additional language." Students' listening and speaking skills are pretty much like the native speakers' level, but their reading and writing skills are the same as non-native speakers, then how are your going to clarify this group of students. 3. If combinate Reading and Listening together, then this standard is not achievable for students who have Dyslexia or auditory processing disorder or need other learning supports. They probably can achieve either Listening or Reading, at least one external standard. Now, standard 1.3 “Show understanding of Mandarin related to everyday contexts ” is not achievable for them. You emphasise that inclusiveness is important, however, so far, it does not show the inclusiveness for these groups of students and it goes against "inclusiveness". 4. Clarify "Candidates can use resources on demand and will be allowed to use a vocabulary list provided by the MoE." the resources are from the Level 1 vocabulary list or the extra vocabulary? |
| ANON-767U-41HG-D | This standard will put some students in a disadvantage if they are not good at both. |
| ANON-767U-412E-N | This is a significant change from the current assessment approach. I would really like to know what are the rationales for this change (Is it based on any research based evidence?). And I also want to see an exemplar of the exam paper. There are further clarification needed for this standard. |
| ANON-767U-41U8-B | This standard increases the stress for students as they will have to deal with materials in different modes (written, aural and visual). It may not be fair for most of our learners who are good in some but not all the skills (listening, reading, viewing). It may be easier for us to assess this standard if we are given more details of what the exam will look like. |
| ANON-767U-4EPA-3 | ¬ Listening and Reading are receptive skills that are very different and require different capabilities. To combine the two will adversely affect students who have trouble with one or the other. Listening and Reading are separate skills, it may penalise the students who are good at one skill but not the other. How will the exam marker be able to distinguish whether the learner responded wrongly due to listening or reading skills? The combined standard will not give a fair or true indication of learner’s strength and weakness on each skill. Assessment should be used to differentiate the different skills of a learner so that both teachers and students can identify the strength and weakness in learning. ¬ This assessment standard will affect learners with learning support needs. ¬ A sample of this assessment needs to be provided for teachers to understand how to make it work for all learners. |
| ANON-767U-41UB-N | The external standards, 1.3 (listening & reading) and 1.4 (writing) for Asian languages will make the languages less accessible to students, compared to those standards for European languages in which listening (1.3) is separate from reading (1.4). Listening and reading are different strands. Some students might be good at reading while others at listening. European languages standards are more accessible as the standards recognise students' learning styles and put students' needs at the heart. For Asian languages learners, listening and reading tied together will be very challenging for students to achieve or perform well. The additional writing external means that it will further affect students' access to the Asian languages. Students might feel the expectations of the Asian standards are higher. As ONE learning area, the discrepancy between European and Asian languages is too substantial to ignore. This is not alighned with the fundamental principles of RAS, inclusion and making NCEA more accessible. In the meantime, students' and teachers' workload will increase significantly. There's a need for a consistent assessment matrix across European and Asian languages. |
| ANON-767U-4SSH-U | The listening and reading are totally different skills and should be assessed differently, same as European languages. It is not fair for students as some students might be good at reading while others at listening. |
| ANON-767U-4S1F-Q | 1. It is not right to put reading and listening into one standard 2. It will disadvantage students who might be strong only in one skill 3. It is against result from research 4. Students may drop the standard by taking it as a hard assessment 5. It will dramatically damage the sustainability of Asian languages |

**Is this Achievement Standard [1.4] ready for piloting?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Option | Total | Percent |
| The standard is ready for piloting | **0** | **0.00%** |
| The standard needs small amendments before piloting | **1** | **0.11%** |
| The standard needs significant amendments before piloting | **3** | **0.32%** |
| The standard is unsuitable for piloting | **8** | **0.84%** |
| Not Answered | **939** | **98.74%** |

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Option | Total | Percent |
| The criteria are clear | **2** | **0.21%** |
| The criteria need some clarification | **1** | **0.11%** |
| The criteria need significant clarification | **8** | **0.84%** |
| Not Answered | **940** | **98.84%** |

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Option | Total | Percent |
| Guidance is sufficient and clear | **0** | **0.00%** |
| Guidance is insufficient | **2** | **0.21%** |
| Guidance is unclear | **9** | **0.95%** |
| Not Answered | **940** | **98.84%** |

**Do you have any further feedback on [Achievement Standard 1.4] and its activities? For example, if you noted that the Achieved, Merit and Excellence criteria were unclear, which grade level in particular is problematic and why? If you have noticed problems in an Activity, which one was it?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ANON-767U-4EBT-8 | This standard should be inline with the European languages and nice and simple! |
| ANON-767U-4E7K-M | Writing in characters does take a long time for students to complete a piece of work from draft to final. Besides, notes, in-class materials and dictionaries ae needed to assist their writing. Therefore, keep writing internally assessed can reflect students writing skills (the ability to use proper works and features) better than the proposed external writing standard . |
| ANON-767U-41XG-W | 1. The Achieved, Merit criteria cannot be seen 2. Students can choose to submit one 150 Chinese characters writing in 1.2, to what reason do students need to do the writing again in 1.4? It can be seen as repeat assessments. 3. Will the assessment will be examed together in the whole country at the end of Term 3? It actually gives teachers more jobs to do. Mock exams are at the end of Term 3, how can students and teachers prepare the two things together? It is over workload for both teachers and students. If it is not going to examine at the same time, then why writing cannot be internal? 4. Writing was an external task before, due to it is too hard for students to achieve, it changed to an internal task. One should learn from past mistakes so as to avoid falling into the same old trap again. 5. Clarify "Candidates can use resources on demand and will be allowed to use a vocabulary list provided by the MoE". The vocabulary list here is from the Level Vocabulary list or the extra vocabulary? |
| ANON-767U-41HG-D | It is not really clear how teachers are going to assess this standard. Do students have to do hand-writing piece or they can use devices to type their writing piece? What are the stimulus materials? Are they related to the topics in the course outline? Do students have options to choose what to write? |
| ANON-767U-41DU-Q | I think assessing writing as an external is too difficult. I believe most students will opt out of this standard as the concept of writing in an exam environment at level 1 Chinese is intimidating. |
| ANON-767U-4184-A | Why is writing (MUCH more difficult in the Asian languages than in the European languages) being assessed as an external? This is problematic and unfairly discriminates against the Asian languages. |
| ANON-767U-412E-N | Making this standard a common assessment activity is a significant change from the current assessment approach. To write in a limited timeframe could cause a lot of anxiety. Writing in characters is a different skill of learning Chinese, so making it a external standard could increase the difficulty. I would like to see an exemplar of the assessment. |
| ANON-767U-41U8-B | What does the common assessment activity (CAA) look like exactly? Conditions? Is typing acceptable? Isn't this standard overlapping with standard 1.2 as students can also provide a piece of writing for standard 1.2? |
| ANON-767U-4EPA-3 | ¬ Need to think about how all these assessment standards work together and be realistic about the amount of class time available to students and teachers. Chinese language needs to be truly recognised for the slower progression in characters learning and linguistic proficiency. This assessment standard should be kept as internal rather than external. Otherwise, this will discourage learners to choose Chinese. |
| ANON-767U-41UB-N | 1. The external standards, 1.3 (listening & reading) and 1.4 (writing) for Asian languages will make the languages less accessible to students, compared to those standards for European languages in which listening (1.3) is separate from reading (1.4). Listening and reading are different strands. Some students might be good at reading while others at listening. European languages standards are more accessible as the standards recognise students' learning styles and put students' needs at the heart. For Asian languages learners, listening and reading tied together will be very challenging for students to achieve or perform well. The additional writing external means that it will further affect students' access to the Asian languages. Students might feel the expectations of the Asian standards are higher. As ONE learning area, the discrepancy between European and Asian languages is too substantial to ignore. This is not alighned with the fundamental principles of RAS, inclusion and making NCEA more accessible. In the meantime, students' and teachers' workload will increase significantly. There's a need for a consistent assessment matrix across European and Asian languages. 2. I am concerned about students’ well being and workload with the changes. Language is different than other subjects, and students do better towards the end of the year when they have more language skills. Thus 1.1 interaction portfolio, 1.2 writing, speech, or combined with both writing and speech are generally due at the end of term 3. With 1.4 CAA writing also happening at the end of term 3, the pressure and workload on students is going to be huge. |
| ANON-767U-4SSH-U | 1.4 CAA writing will make the languages less accessible to students, compared to those standards for European languages. I am concerned about students’ well-being and workload with the changes. By the end of term 3, students not only need to finish 1.1 interaction and 1.2 communication, but also have to complete 1.4 CAA writing. thus the workload for both students and teachers will increase significantly. |
| ANON-767U-4S1F-Q | 1. It may repeat 1.2 when students choose written presentation 2. It increases workload both for teachers and students to do by the end of Term 3 which is already busy term with practice examinations and internal assessments 3. It was proofed to be a failure 10 years ago when students just walked away and did not attempt when writing was externally assessed 4. If keep 1.2, then remove this 1.4 standard! |

**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?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Option | Total | Percent |
| Yes | **3** | **0.32%** |
| Some gaps | **7** | **0.74%** |
| Large gaps | **3** | **0.32%** |
| They cover the wrong knowledge and/or skills | **3** | **0.32%** |
| Not Answered | **935** | **98.32%** |

**Do the Achievement Standards support ākonga Māori to succeed as Māori? (select all that apply) (Do the Standards value mātauranga Māori? Do they place the learner at the centre?)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Option | Total | Percent |
| 1.1 does this | **7** | **0.74%** |
| 1.2 does this | **6** | **0.63%** |
| 1.3 does this | **0** | **0.00%** |
| 1.4 does this | **0** | **0.00%** |
| All standards do this | **8** | **0.84%** |
| None of the standards do this | **4** | **0.42%** |
| Not Answered | **934** | **98.21%** |

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Option | Total | Percent |
| Yes | **4** | **0.42%** |
| They are too challenging | **12** | **1.26%** |
| They are not challenging enough | **0** | **0.00%** |
| They are a mix of too challenging and too easy | **1** | **0.11%** |
| Not Answered | **934** | **98.21%** |

**Do you have any further feedback on the Achievement Standards? If you noted that there is important knowledge and/or skills missing, please detail that here.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ANON-767U-4ESN-K | All good |
| ANON-767U-4EFD-V | Writing shouldn't be external assessment. |
| ANON-767U-4EM9-R | WE SHOULD USE CHINESE AS SUBJECT NAME INSTEAD OF MANDARIN. AS ALL UNIVERSITIES IN NZ AND ALL OVER THE WORLD ARE USE "CHINESE" AS SUBJECT NAME.. |
| ANON-767U-41VD-R | 1.3 and 1.4 are very challenging for a language learner. It is not clear about how 1.4 will implemented in the program. It is also an disadvantage to a leaner with learning difficulties such us writing difficulty or dysgraphia etc. At the current writing standards, students can type their pieces of writing with open book setting, this gives them to achieve this standard. For the new standard, 1.3 combines reading and listening under one standard. This is not only discourage students choose not learn Chinese or to learn an European language. As listening is most challenging standard for most learners. |
| ANON-767U-41X5-B | When considering important knowledge/skills, consistency across European and Asian languages is equally crucial. Languages is ONE learning area. However, the external standards, 1.3 and 1.4 for Asian languages put too much emphasis on students' productive skills (25%) while the 1.3 and 1.4 standards for European languages only test students' 'receptive skills'. By research and experiences, productive skills are harder to obtain than receptive skills. This discrepancy will mean Asian languages learners are not on an equal ground with the European languages learners. This is against our 'inclusion' policy. In the meantime, students' and teachers' workload will increase instead. This will affect students' accessibility to the Asian languages. |
| ANON-767U-4E7K-M | Keep Reading and Listening as two separate assessments as they are. |
| ANON-767U-41XG-W | I. Change the subject name from Mandarin BACK to Chinese. Reasons are as follows： 1. Mandarin is only for spoken language, it's nothing about reading, writing and cultural elements. If the subject name is changed to Mandarin, does it mean Chinese language teachers do not need to teach reading, writing and culture in the class? It obviously goes against MoE's opinion that culture is important. 2. The subject/paper name is Chinese rather than Mandarin in the universities in NZ and other countries, to what reason that the subject name is changed to Mandarin in NZ secondary school curriculum? 3. Change the subject name from Chinese to Mandarin is unnecessary. Waste time and money. II. Students abilities and the stands are achievable or not should be the first couple things that we need to consider. You emphasise inclusiveness and culture are important, then think about all students in our country. III. Make the Asian language learning matrix and assessment matrix are the same as European languages. Otherwise, it is not equal to every language learning student. European languages separate reading and listening standards, and they do not have another external writing standard. |
| ANON-767U-41HG-D | For some schools with year 9 language as an optional, the content is too broad to cover in less than 2 years. |
| ANON-767U-41EX-U | In 1.2 Internal Presentation, European languages group has the option to submit the interaction as written. It should be also provided as an option for Asian languages group. The prescribed vocabulary list is the key to unlock the knowledge and information for all standards. It needs to be updated and include teachers' input in making changes to it. Achievement standards marking schedule is also the key. We would like to know more details of the updated prescribed vocabulary list and the marking schedule. |
| ANON-767U-41U8-B | These 4 standards are quite confusing and bring more doubts than confidence in teaching. Standard 1.3 requires students to be good at listening, reading and viewing to achieve, which is too challenging. Standard 1.4 provides very little information on what the common assessment activity (CAA) is like. Both Standard 1.2 and Standard 1.4 potentially assess the writing skill. |
| ANON-767U-4EPA-3 | The assessment standards should be clearly focus on the four language skills: speaking, writing, listening, and reading. Therefore, the four assessment standards for Chinese could be: Internal Speaking: 1.1 Use Chinese Mandarin to communicate on everyday topics. (Students can have a choice of either a spoken presentation or interaction.)  Writing: 1.2 Use Chinese to produce responses related to everyday contexts External Listening 1.3 Show understanding of spoken Chinese Mandarin related to everyday contexts.  Reading 1.4 Show understanding of written Chinese related to everyday contexts. |
| ANON-767U-41UW-A | They are against the purpose of reducing vocabulay and difficulty so to reduce the workload for both teachers and students. even harder and confusing compared with European group |
| ANON-767U-4SVK-1 | 1.2 is overlapping with 1.4. Assessment condition of both could be a piece of writing in characters from students. 1.4 requires students to write in characters under examination conditions, which is too challenging for Chinese language learners. 1.3 requires students to make meaning while being presented both aural and visual sources, which is too hard for students to cope. In all, the new 4 standards are very messy and seem hard for teachers to manage |
| ANON-767U-412D-M | Learning matrix is too broad while the level of complexity presented in 1.3 and 1.4 achievement standards (AS) can potentially deter learners who already see Asian languages' script/characters as the number one obstacle to their success in learning the subject. The proposed AS inequity between European languages and Asian languages further divide learners of modern languages (all learners are to learn all 4 skills but when it comes to assessments, 1.3 that combines listening and reading in Asian Languages will only give learners 5 credits while their counterparts who are learning European Languages will be awarded with 10 credits for the 2 skills they are assessed for). As to 1.4 Writing AS, would the topics, themes and grammar be predictable as prescribed in the Learning Matrix? If not, students' well being are bound to decrease rather than increase.  Learning Matrix: "develop a foundational awareness of and use the key building blocks and patterns of the language"- should there be clear patterns of the language and building blocks provided by the Ministry or NZQA, in order to guide teachers' teaching and students' learning? This will definitely have a positive impact on the students' and the teachers' well being as patterns of the language can be anything is undefined. Additionally, "acquire simple linguistic strategies and basic knowledge of how to use resources to make meaning from unfamiliar language"- what is the definition of basic knowledge of how to use resources to make meaning from unfamiliar language? Furthermore, what simple linguistic strategies this point is referring to? Overall, the lack of examples for achievement standards 1.3 and 1.4 have not provided a positive outlook for the future of Asian language programmes in Aotearoa New Zealand, as the Achievement Standards will play a huge role in deterring NZ's already shrinking population of foreign language learners. I wonder if this is contradictory to the 5 big ideas which include "educating the next global citizens" and "encouraging our learners to learn other Language, culture, and identity while learning to know their own language, culture and identity". Finally, focusing our education only on transferrable skills such as engineering and business courses does not enrich us as a bi-cultural environment and nation. That means, our future citizens will not take learning languages, cultures and identities seriously. |
| ANON-767U-4S1F-Q | Overall too challenging and unrealistic for Level 1 to achieve It will increase workload both for teachers and students It will largely demotivate students to continue learning Asian languages They should be the same as European language standards which require reduced workload, otherwise it is not fair Asian language learners. They may kill Asian language subjects at the end! |

**I think it should remain as Mandarin I think it should change to Mandarin Chinese I think it should change to Mandarin (Chinese)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Option | Total | Percent |
| I think it should remain as Mandarin | **0** | **0.00%** |
| I think it should change to Mandarin Chinese | **3** | **0.32%** |
| I think it should change to Mandarin (Chinese) | **1** | **0.11%** |
| Not Answered | **947** | **99.58%** |