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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 Physical Education. 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 **50** responses to the Ministry’s online survey about the subject content developed so far for Physical Education. 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. Respondents had the option of submitting feedback as individuals or on behalf of groups, such as school departments. Except where pertinent, responses have not been identified as originating from an individual or a group.

## A. Summary of Physical Education

There were **50** responses to Physical Education products. Responses about the Achievement Standardswere generallypositive with **18 / 27** responses in favour of small or no amendments to Physical Education products before pilot.

Responses were especially positive for Standard 1.3, but there was a prominent number of requests for extra clarity about assessment specifications and teaching expectations across all products. Responses about Achievement Standard 1.4 were particularly critical, with qualitative responses expressing the sentiment that the Standard was too broad in content and that audience presentation might be a difficult assessment medium. Mātauranga Māori and critical perspectives were also contentious issues among respondents discussing Standards 1.3 and 1.4, with concerns about the use of the term ‘Hauora’ in 1.3, and tokenism in 1.4.

It should also be noted that of the **50** respondents answering questions about Physical Education, the number of responses to each question was much lower, especially for questions about internal Standards.

The most answered question was question 1 (*Do you think the draft materials for this subject are ready for testing with students in pilot schools/kura?*) which received **27** responses. Questions about the internal Standards received **6 – 8** responses each, while questions about the external Standards received 9 **– 16** responses each. Questions about the set of Standards as a whole received **18 – 21** responses each.

## B. 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 think the draft materials for this subject are ready for testing with students in pilot schools/kura?*

***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?***

20 respondents provided commentary.

* There was general support for the Big Ideas, Learning Matrix and intent of the products, but confusion about how some concepts within the Learning Matrix fit into the units of knowledge assessed in each Standard, especially for Standard 1.4
* There were several requests for information about Physical Education at levels 2 & 3 to provide a frame of reference for assessing the level 1 products, and to help kura to plan ahead and allocate resources.
* Many respondents were concerned about incorporating mātauranga Māori into teaching and wanted more information about Professional Learning and Development (PLD).
* There was a desire for additional examples of Assessment Activities and Assessment Schedules with both a greater variety of activities and more detailed examples within each activity. There were also numerous requests for exemplars for external Standards, which generally received a greater number of requests for clarity and further detail than the internal Standards.
* Multiple respondents requested clarity for collection of evidence and assessment specifications for externals, regarding timing and method, with a preference for the portfolio model to be used where possible.
* A common question among respondents was the request for guidance around the expectations on student and teacher workloads and assessment, given the perceived breadth of the content for this subject. Common questions sought clarity about how and when assessments would happen, and how the amount of material on which students are assessed is expected to be broken up and taught as individual units of learning.

## C. Course Outlines

### Chart C.1: *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.2: *Do the Course Outline(s) demonstrate how teaching and learning could be grounded in mātauranga Māori?*

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

4 Respondents provided commentary

* 2 of the respondents mentioned mātauranga Māori explicitly, with 1 requesting PLD and the other stating:
	+ *“For teachers with minimal understanding or respect of te reo Māori and te ao Māori,* [Course Outline] *number two seems inaccessible at times.”*
* 1 respondent was positive but suggested that we include 4 Course Outlines.
	+ “*I think 4 examples would be appropriate. The two examples that are there are excellent. I think they encapsulate the learning area well, and I can see the work of the SEG within them*.”

## D. Individual Achievement Standards

### AS 1.1 and Assessment Activities

### Chart D1.1: *Is this Achievement Standard ready for piloting?*

### Chart D1.2: *Are the Achieved, Merit and Excellence criteria clear enough to support consistent assessment judgments?*

### Chart D1.3: *Does the unpacking of the Standard and the Conditions of Assessment provide sufficient and clear guidance on the use of the standard?*

***Internal Assessment Activities***

### Chart D1.4: *Could the activities for AS1.1 be used or adapted in your local context?*

### Chart D1.5: *Do the Internal Assessment Activities exemplify how mātauranga Māori can be recognised and valued in assessment?*

### Chart D1.6: *Do the activities for AS1.1 support the engagement, access, understanding and participation of all learners?*

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

7 Respondents provided commentary.

* There was a prominent number of requests for clarification of the step-up terms for AS 1.1, particularly around how to provide one overall grade for 2 movement contexts. One respondent expressed that some “*terminology is left open to individual interpretation in terms of accrediting a grade; 'some control', 'most of the time', 'accuracy', 'interpretation', 'efficiency' etc”.*
* Several respondents questioned the need for 2 applied settings at Achieved and expressed that this may create an excessive workload for students and teachers alike. Respondents also wanted an explanation as to why just 1 applied setting was required at Merit and Excellence.
* Respondents were largely uncertain around the meaning of certain terms: ‘applied setting’ and ‘movement contexts’ and requested clarification, with one respondent additionally commenting that ‘applied setting’ is used at NCEA Levels 2 & 3 and may not be appropriate here.
* Multiple respondents felt strongly about potential issues with collection of evidence, in regards to:
	+ Possible equity issues (“*Setting could be outside of school. Does this mean, they may be able to do it in a context not offered to whole class? Track cyclist's saying come and watch me at the velodrome on Saturday?*”),
	+ the possibility of extra work for teachers to create rubrics, arising from students negotiating their applied settings. This may also render marking inconsistent.

“*If there were a bunch of rubrics like these for this new standard, it would really save a lot of stress and workload for all teachers across NZ. It would also mean what I am marking is the same criteria as another teacher using the same sport/movement. How do I know if the rubric that I make up is too easy or too hard and vise versa from the PE teacher at the other high school down the road?*”

* There was a concern of tokenism in Activity 1.1a.

“[…] *in 1.2A* **[1.1A]** *a teacher should HAVE TO explain the whakapapa of the game of Ki O Rahi and share the legend, it is so much more than a game! Why "ihi, wehi and wana"?*”

### AS 1.2 and Assessment Activities

### Chart D2.1: *Is this Achievement Standard ready for piloting?*

### Chart D2.2: *Are the Achieved, Merit and Excellence criteria clear enough to support consistent assessment judgments?*

### Chart D2.3*: Does the unpacking of the Standard and the Conditions of Assessment provide sufficient and clear guidance on the use of the standard?*

***Internal Assessment Activities***

### Chart D2.4: *Could the activities for AS1.2 be used or adapted in your local context?*

### Chart D2.5*: Do the Internal Assessment Activities exemplify how mātauranga Māori can be recognised and valued in assessment?*

### Chart D2.6: *Do the activities for AS1.2 support the engagement, access, understanding and participation of all learners?*

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

There were 6 respondents who provided commentary.

* Generally, the step-ups for Merit and Excellence were well-received, with specific mentions approving of the reflective aspects of the Standard.
* Several respondents felt that criteria for Achieved were too easy, with one commentor suggesting that a reflective criterion be added to Achieved.
* Multiple respondents were critical of activity 1.2a, for:
	+ using outdated thinking and being unengaging,

“*It uses archaic language and approaches to physical education, and perpetuates the fitness discourse. There are undertones of public health agendas, obesity agendas and the old age belief that PE is 'fitness'. This will be rejected by many physical educators for these reasons. There are simple ways to change this, including the language, the use of a circuit and the choice of activities. Focus could shift to strength, empowerment, power, personal challenge rather than 'push ups'.*”

* Incorrect use of te reo terms,

“*What is the element of kotahitanga - performing the fitness movements (press ups etc) together in the circuit? Also it states that the chosen movement context involves working in a group and then this activity is done in a pair, this doesn't really align as it would be quite easy* to achieve unity in a pair.”

* + and one commentor further noting that the use of the phrase ‘co-constructed’ was too difficult for NCEA Level 1 students.
* One commented that Activity 1.2c uses a “*Western viewpoint of success, depends on the teachers deep understanding of Kotahitanga as a guiding principle.*”
* Several respondents wanted extra clarity around specifications and collection of evidence, such as the number of movement strategies required for grading, and how something as subjective as ‘challenging’ (which appears in ‘Unpacking’) could be measured objectively.

### AS 1.3

### Chart D3.1: *Is this Achievement Standard ready for piloting?*

### Chart D3.2: *Are the Achieved, Merit and Excellence criteria clear enough to support consistent assessment judgments?*

### Chart D3.3: *Does the unpacking of the Standard and the Proposed Assessment Approach provide sufficient and clear guidance on the use of the standard?*

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

9 Respondents provided commentary.

* Generally, there was a lot of support for Standard 1.3, with specific appreciation of its content material, clarity in presentation, and step-up criteria, with a few exceptions. (“*Overall, I think 1.3 is excellent and I cannot wait for this standard to be implemented and supported*.”)
* There were many requests for exemplars and PLD for mātauranga Māori, with some citing that it was difficult to provide commentary on the external products without exemplars.
* 2 respondents found the Achieved criteria too easy.
* 1 respondent sought clarity on “*Excellence, maybe a bit more information on what an evaluation is*.”
* There was a desire for clarity around specifications and submission of evidence as described in the Explanatory Notes, there were patterns about:
	+ terms which are not explained in Explanatory Note 2 (“*what are cultural settings?*”, “*EN2,* *clarification around what unstructured physical activity is*”),
	+ whether or not both criteria of Explanatory Note 4 need to be met (“*is it active participation AND participating in an active role or... active participation OR participating in an active role?*”),
	+ and the logistics of submitting portfolio evidence in Explanatory Note 5 (“*Please clarify how the external portfolio will be sent through and assessment*.”).
* There were significant and divided views on the use of the term ‘Hauora’, and its interaction with models other than Te Whare Tapa Whā. All agreed that the term needed to be used in a consistent and robust manner, but respondents were fragmented in their reasons for criticism and suggestions for amelioration, with some recommending including more models for wellbeing and others suggesting that the language restricts students to using the 2 models outlined:
	+ *“Use of the word Hauora needs to be clarified (are we looking at concepts around "health" because we are looking at more than Whare tapu Wha model) Would we only use the word "hauora" within the whare tapu wha model?”*
* *“My concern is the understanding and use of the concept Hauora, is this consistent with 11 Health studies? It is vital that the PE understanding/use of the concept is the same as how Health studies is using it as we have multiple students who take both courses - which is a huge cause for concern if the terms are not used in the same manor.*”
	+ “*I am unsure why the standard would limit to only two models to show Hauora. What if a new model was created next year and surpassed Te Whare Tapa Whā? What about a contrast between western models of health and these two indigenous models of wellbeing? Realistically they are models of wellbeing and by confining yourself to two, you are prioritising those two models over un-mentioned or un-assessed models*.”
	+ “*Should only draw on Te Whare Tapa Whā and Fonofale if you choose – it shouldn’t be an option*” [in reference to Explanatory Note 3]

### AS 1.4

### Chart D4.1: *Is this Achievement Standard ready for piloting?*

### Chart D4.2: *Are the Achieved, Merit and Excellence criteria clear enough to support consistent assessment judgments?*

### Chart D4.3: *Does the unpacking of the Standard and the Proposed Assessment Approach provide sufficient and clear guidance on the use of the standard?*

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

15 respondents provided commentary.

* In addition to numerous requests for exemplars and further resources, there was a clear majority voice expressing that the Standard is too broad and tries to cover too much content. Respondents felt that the breadth of the Standard matter may either induce a large workload increase or time-starved learning for ākonga.
* Many respondents suggested that 3 influences on movement provided too many factors for consideration, and would require covering too much material, with some seeking clarity on the weighting of each of the influences or asking if they could be assessed individually. Some respondents were also unclear on whether the 3 influences must be discussed or *could* be discussed.
* Some commentors suggesting removing 1 of the influences. Most commonly, respondents expressed a desire to omit te ao Māori influences, with some arguing that it felt like it had been added on in a contrived and tokenistic manner and might fit better in another Standard. Others argued that they couldn’t see how te ao Māori influences would connect with socio-cultural and biophysical influences.
* “*The Te ao Māori INFLUENCES seem to be an afterthought and are adding to what is already a significantly 'content dense' achievement standard. This INFLUENCE does not seem to enhance the standard and seems better placed in the 1.3 standard. Wording needs to be way more concise and more information needs to be provided as to the complete expectations of this standard. It will be challenging to keep student work to under 800 words that's for sure.”*
* ”*The standard is far too broad and the guidance around what needs to be included as an influence (the wording says it MUST include considerations of); Te ao Maori / Biophysical / Sociocultural is very unhelpful. There needs to be clearer guidance as to what consideration means, what concepts are appropriate in Te ao Maori and how these are meant to marry together.*”
* There was a strong sense from respondents that an audience presentation was not the right method of assessment for this Standard. Of those against the audience presentation, general themes were:
	+ logistics of the evidence collection and submission,

“*What is meant by audience presentation - more guidance needed on this as quickly as possible. Teachers will be concerned by this.”*

“*Please clarify what the external presentation to an audience entails. Is this to be done online or recorded to a live audience and sent through?”*

* + concerns about student wellbeing and engagement,

*“Audience presentation - I would love to see more information around this and logistically how this is achieved. Students who have high anxiety levels need to be considered with this assessment approach.”*

*“Audience presentation? Majority of students dislike presentations, even if it is a recorded speech, could we be turning students off to our subject area if this is a requirement.”*

* + and the volume of content being assessed within the provisional specifications.

*“Wording needs to be way more concise and more information needs to be provided as to the complete expectations of this standard. It will be challenging to keep student work to under 800 words that's for sure.”*

“*Being an external - submitting via audience presentation (what exactly does this mean look like) 2-4 min presentation to cover and demonstrate knowledge across all influences might be difficult.”*

### Impressions of the Achievement Standards as a suite

### Chart D5.1: *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 D5.2: *Do the Achievement Standards support ākonga Māori to succeed as Māori? (select all that apply)*

### Chart D5.3: *Are the Achievement Standards appropriate to Level 6 of the curriculum? (Approximately Year 11)*

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

16 respondents provided commentary.

* Many respondents in this section addressed the perceived breadth of Standard 1.4 as an issue, with some suggesting changing the credit-weighting to compensate for the extra content and work involved.
* There were many requests for resources such as exemplars for externals or PLD, especially for mātauranga Māori. Mātauranga Māori was an aspect of the Standards about which multiple respondents expressed their lack of confidence in the ability for teachers to incorporate appropriately without significant support, particularly for Standard 1.4.

*“There will need to be significant support for teachers to grasp the idea of Mātauranga Māori as foundational to these standards. Teachers will also need decent support around the externals. There is already fear about what this will look like, and the apprehension is exacerbated by the limited explanation available on the webpage.”*

* There were multiple respondents supportive of the inclusivity of mātauranga Māori in the internal Standards, despite the comments expressing concern about how this is achieved in the externals.
* Some respondents found the criteria for Achieved too easy across the Standards.
* Some respondents expressed a general lack of clarity in the boundaries separating some areas of learning, and how Standard 1.4 would tie into the Learning Matrix and fit into one unit of learning.

“*There is a large disconnect between these concepts so if it is difficult for teachers to understand (albeit with no assessment activities etc) how can we expect students to connect them and then evaluate this. The idea of then scaffolding this learning into what Level 2 standards may look like also seems difficult.* “

* Some specific mentions from individuals addressed the need for clarification of ‘Hauora’ across the Learning Area, especially with its use in the Health and Home Economics subject.
* Multiple respondents expressed concerns about the mode of assessment for externals:

“*The idea of having dictated external assessment periods goes a long way to limiting the scope of building an individualised and student oriented programme. Less standards focusing on reasonably obvious big ideas seems to have significantly and negatively effected the flexibility of course development and design and will do more damage at Level 2 and 3 if the same pattern is continued.*”

*“I am also concerned that 1.3 the students are not required to demonstrate strategies simply demonstrate understanding then explain. Again my concern is that the learning through PE will be lost in some schools. The students may have never demonstrated these in action but can write beautifully about them. Our assessments should not be that which an classroom teacher could pick up and assess. Our subject is great because often it is demonstrate or apply strategies in action then explain ..”*

.

“*The 'portfolio' 'overlap' nature of the learning and assessment will be problematic for learners who are less engaged in their education, and have more financial/social/cultural barriers. These students generally need waaaaay more support and structure - black and white.*”