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Public Engagement Survey Report: Drama
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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 Drama. 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 41 responses to the Ministry’s online survey about the subject content developed so far for Drama. 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 Drama**

There were **41** responses to **Drama** products. Responses about **draft materials** were mixed. The majority of respondents believe that the materials require some amendments before piloting (12 out of 25 believe that they need small amendments, while 9 out 25 believe that they need significant amendments). Only one respondent believed that materials were not suitable for piloting.

Questions about **Course Outlines** received the lowest engagementwith 12 responses to the quantitative questions and 10 responses to the qualitative question. 5 out of 12 respondents found that Course Outlines were useful examples, while 3 found them unclear and other 3 found them too similar to show multiple ways a course could be constructed. Only one respondent found the Course Outlines not useful.

Responses to **Achievement Standards** were also mixed. AS1.3 received the most comments (21), followed by AS1.1 and AS1.4 (19 comments each) and AS1.2 (18 comments). Overall, most respondents found that the Standards as a group credential the most important knowledge and/or skills either entirely (11 out of 24) or with some gaps (9 out of 24). Half of the respondents believe that the Standards are a mix of too challenging and too easy (12 out of 24), while 7 found the Standards were appropriate and 5 found them too challenging for the level. The majority of respondents also found that all Standards support ākonga Māori to succeed as Māori, with 1.2 receiving the most acknowledgement in this area.

Written responses throughout the survey contained several strongly defined themes. These include:

* Requests for guidance or clarity regarding wording/mātauranga Māori/assessment format or timing
* Anxiety about the potential increase in teacher workload
* The need for further professional development
* Concerns about the suitability of these materials for year 11
* Concerns about potential equity or accessibly issues
* Concerns about the balance of practical and theoretical elements of drama within the subject.

These themes, along with more specific ones pertaining to each one of the products, will be discussed in more details in the following sections.

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:*** *Are the draft Drama materials ready for pilot?*

***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 25 responses to this question.

* Responses varied in tone and covered a range of themes. There were several positive responses; commenters found the resources included to support the standard useful, were happy to see the essential skills and learning of drama as a focus of the subject, and praised the addition of te Ao Māori concepts.
* There were some concerns over the **balance between practical application of Drama and the theory behind it** within the subject materials. Several respondents feared that greater focus on theoretical aspects of Drama is detrimental to the subject as it takes away from the practical component that students enjoy. This concern is exemplified by this statement:

*“It appears to me that the whole ethos of Drama as a subject is being changed by these draft materials. Some change is helpful (e.g. incorporating Te Ao Maori) but many of the changes appear to be reducing the practical, performance based core of the subject. These are the aspects that appeal to a wide range of students, and I believe that reducing them will lead to a reduction of students taking the subject.”*

The perceived reduction of performance was perceived as a way to **lower expectations from students**, which was negatively received. Some respondents cautioned that it might hinder the subject’s legitimacy and lead to lower motivation to participate from students.

* **Inclusion of mātauranga Māori** received generally positive feedback. Most of the respondents praised the inclusion of te Ao Māori concepts into the materials but pointed out the need for further **professional development** to implement this change.
* Several respondents called for **professional development** that would help the sector handle the perceived raise in teacher workload.
* Several respondents throughout the survey expressed their concerns **about the content not being suitable for year 11.** In this part of the survey, commenters were worried about the amount of work required from students for each assessment is too large for NCEA Level 1 and emphasised the need to ensure that texts are appropriate, especially for students from sheltered backgrounds. This theme is more prominent in the feedback to AS 1.1.
* There were several **requests for guidance or clarity** in this section of the survey. Commenters requested more guidance around paperwork as a requirement for the Achievement Standard, concepts included in Big Ideas, and clarification around AS1.1 and AS1.3 being teacher- or student-directed.
* Concerns around **assessment format or timing** is a reoccurring theme throughout the survey. When commenting on draft materials in general, the sector expressed concerns about the internal/external split between four standards, the mechanism of the external assessment, and the timing of submissions for externals. This theme was more prominent in the comments to Achievement Standards and will be discussed in more details below.
* Respondents expressed some general concerns about **teacher workload**, given that teachers would be required to gather evidence for both internals and externals. This theme was more prominent in the discussion of AS1.3 and AS1.4.
* **Concerns around equity and accessibility** is also a reoccurring theme throughout the survey. In this part of the survey, respondents cautioned about less able students struggling to collect their own digital evidence and schools with lower resources and capacity not being able to provide students with the same opportunities.
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:*** *Do the Course Outlines form a coherent year’s programme?*

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

***Chart C.2:*** *Do the Course Outlines demonstrate how teaching and learning could*

*be grounded in mātauranga Māori?*

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

There were 10 responses to this question.

* Course Outlines received mixed to negative reviews. Some commenters found the products useful and commended the effort that was put into creating them. One respondent stated:

*“I like the detail in the course outlines, and that there are three different course outlines that structure the course differently, giving the pilot schools a chance to trial which course outline would work for them.”*

* Some respondents found the outlines “concept driven” and impractical for teachers who want to organise trips to live performances. There was also a call for the outlines to give more direction and to find a way to be applicable in a wider range of classrooms.
* **The texts mentioned in Course Outlines are not suitable for year 11.** A couple of respondents pointed out that suggested texts, such as Under Milkwood, might be too “heavy” for the age group and deal with complex and sensitive issues that are not suitable for year 11.
* Several respondents requested **more guidance** regarding teaching and assessments. Some commenters wanted clarity about the implied timeline to submit 1.3 in Term 3 Week 5. There were also some concerns about activities not having a big enough practical component.
* A couple of respondents noted that the content covered in Course Outlines would require significant **professional development**. Some respondents expressed concern over **teacher workload**, especially in large classes and in Term 3.
* Several respondents were concerned about **assessment format or timing.** In particular, commenters were alarmed that COs have all assessments completed by Term 3, Week 5.
* **Several respondents expressed concern about New Zealand content.** One stated that *“[m]any of the NZ scripts would need unpacking in terms of their cultural content”*, while another mentioned that *“it will be important to find the right context to explore views, themes and ideas that identify with the cultural diversity NZ has as a country and the world as a whole.”*
1. **Individual Achievement Standards**
	1. **AS 1.1 and Assessment Activities**

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

***Chart D1.1:*** *Is AS1.1 ready for piloting?*

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

***Chart D1.2:*** *Are the AS1.1 criteria clear?*

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

***Chart D1.3:*** *Do the Conditions of Assessment and the unpacking of AS 1.1 provide sufficient and clear guidance?*

***Internal Assessment Activities***

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

***Chart D1.4:*** *Could the activities for AS1.1 be adapted to your local context?*

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

***Chart D1.5****: Do the activities for AS1.1 exemplify how mātauranga Māori can be recognised and valued in assessment?*

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

***Chart D1.6:*** *Do the activities for AS1.1 support all learners?*

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

There were 19 responses to this question.

* Out of the four standards, AS1.1 received the most positive feedback. Some respondents indicated they were happy with Assessment Activities, while several others indicated they liked the verbs used in the criteria (explore, engage and express). There were several comments regarding the verb “explore” - the respondents particularly enjoyed the fact that it provided options. On the other hand, several respondents found it alarming that the standard is less focused on the performance and were concerned about the imbalance of practical and theoretical work, as exemplified by this comment:

*“Drama is often selected by learners as it is a practical subject - I think we should be cautious of weighting the more theoretical side of it - the written/ spoken reflection too much as we may see a drop in a numbers and we are already fighting for this. So, I see here that the reflection part has been given as much time as the performance part”*

* This standard also had the most **requests for clarity** out of all four Achievement Standards. Some respondents wanted clarity about what constitutes Theatre Aotearoa and its function. There was also some confusion about conducting assessment “through manaakitanga”; some commenters requested clarity around the concept of manaakitanga itself, while others wanted to know how it would be assessed.
* One of the strongest themes in the feedback to AS1.1 was the concern and request for clarity around the **format and timing of the assessment**. The respondents were particularly concerned that the scenes were only allocated 2-3 minutes as they believe it wouldn’t be enough time for students to demonstrate their knowledge. There was also some confusion regarding the time limit when it is applied to group work – the respondents wanted to know if this time would be applied to the whole group or to every individual within the group.
* There was a considerable number of responses that mentioned the learning presented **may** **not be suitable for year 11** students. Several respondents pointed out that several scripts referred to in the materials are too high level or too complicated for students of this age (“Dawn Raids” and “Shudder” were specifically mentioned). Others viewed this standard as too complicated in general; this was mostly in response to the wide scope of learning and the inclusion of manaakitanga.
* Several responses indicated anxiety around **professional development** **needed** to be able to teach this Standard, especially regarding Theatre Aotearoa and teacher’s understanding of mātauranga Māori. There was some concern that this standard would put te reo Māori teachers under a lot of pressure to educate, increasing their workload.
	1. **AS 1.2 and Assessment Activities**

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

***Chart D2.1:*** *Is AS1.2 ready for piloting?*

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

***Chart D2.2:*** *Are the AS1.2 criteria clear?*

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

***Chart D2.3:*** *Do the Conditions of Assessment and the unpacking of AS 1.2 provide sufficient and clear guidance?*

***Internal Assessment Activities***

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

***Chart D2.4:*** *Could the activities for AS1.2 be adapted to your local context?*

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

***Chart D2.5:*** *Do the activities for AS1.2 exemplify how mātauranga Māori can be recognised and valued in assessment?*

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

***Chart D2.6:*** *Do the activities for AS1.1 support all learners?*

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

There were 18 responses to this question.

* This question received a mix of positive and negative responses. Respondents were pleased to see the emphasis on group dynamics, the written oral limitations, and the fact that the assessment focuses on process, performance, and reflections. On the other hand, some responders indicated that activities would need amendment to appeal to their learners, and several expressed anxiety about the shift away from practice. As one respondent put it,

*“As Drama teachers we are continually fighting to keep our numbers going as increased subjects are offered, pathways pushed and parental pressure to choose the more 'main stream' subjects - we must be careful that Drama does not become another English portfolio but keeps its active, practical focus.”*

* Most commenters were **requesting further guidance** **or clarity** regarding the materials themselves or the way they were worded. There were several requests for clarity on whether students are marked as a group or as individuals and how to manage the different levels of contribution within the group fairly. Some respondents requested more guidance in order to understand the shift from whanaungatanga to kotahitanga in the step-ups. There was also some confusion about whether the process or the end product is being assessed.
* Several respondents commented on **the achievement criteria** and the way they are worded; a few comments pointed out that there needs to be more coherence between step-ups since Achieved and Merit are perceived to be about process and Excellence focuses on performance.
* Similarly to AS.1.1, the respondents expressed considerable concern about the **2-3 minute timeframe**, especially given that it is a devised work of 8-10 weeks of exploration.
* Some respondents were concerned that this Standard might lead **to increased** **teacher workload**, especially given the conditions of assessment and the expectation that teacher will collect evidence of students’ participation in the devising process. Several respondents felt that the logistics of gathering information in large classes need to be taken under consideration.
* Several commenters pointed out the need for **professional development** for teachers to be able to respectfully deliver aspects of the Standard that deal with mātauranga Māori concepts, such as whanaungatanga and kotahitanga.
	1. **AS 1.3**

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

***Chart D3.1:*** *Is AS1.3 ready for piloting?*

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

***Chart D3.2:*** *Are the AS1.3 criteria clear?*

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

***Chart D3.3:*** *Do the Conditions of Assessment and the unpacking of AS 1.3 provide sufficient and clear guidance?*

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

* Most of the written feedback to this Assessment Standard is negative; however, some respondents supported the idea of having this standard as an external because they believe it would reduce teachers’ bias in marking. There was also some feedback that progressions seem clear.
* Many respondents were concerned that teachers were required to film students’ performances. This was connected to both **teacher workload** and **equity and accessibility** considerations.

	+ **Teacher workload**: A few respondents were worried that providing this type of video evidence is time-consuming and would add significant load on teachers. A few respondents also pointed out combined workload for AS1.3 and AS1.4 might be unmanageable for some teachers, especially those with large classes.
	+ **Equity and accessibility**: Several respondents pointed out that students’ performance, especially their facial expressions, on stage might not be captured well enough on camera, which could disadvantage some students unfairly. The recording would also depend on the school’s camera and lighting equipment and the way it is set up. Several commenters were concerned that students whose schools do not have access to good cameras and microphones will be disadvantaged. There were also some concerns about the quality of teachers’ directing affecting students’ grades.
* As with other Standards, there were a few **requests for guidance and clarity**. Respondents wanted to know whether group or individual work would be marked, how much time and work is expected from students, whether work is teacher- or student-directed, and if there will be any written evidence required.
* Some respondents noted that this Standard seemed to be **disconnected from te ao Māori**, especially comparing to AS1.1 and AS1.2.
	1. **AS 1.4**

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

***Chart D4.1:*** *Is AS1.4 ready for piloting?*

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

***Chart D4.2:*** *Are the AS1.4 criteria clear?*

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

***Chart D4.3:*** *Do the Conditions of Assessment and the unpacking of AS 1.4 provide sufficient and clear guidance?*

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

* This question received mixed feedback. There was some positive feedback; some respondents indicated that they were happy that the Standard allows students to respond to a performance and liked the reciprocal nature of the relationship between the performance and its audience.
* There were some concerns about **the variety of how the Standard can be taught** across schools, as it has the potential to make marking quite difficult or even subjective.
* Several respondents were **concerned about step-ups**. There were some requests for clarity around the Excellence criteria. Having one bullet point under a criterion in EN also received mixed feedback; some respondents felt that it would make marking easier, while others thought that fewer bullet points would make Merit and Excellence harder to understand.
* A considerable number of respondents **requested guidance or clarity**. Main topics included what is expected from a student’s portfolio and how many and what type of performances could be included.
* Concerns about potential **equity or accessibility issues** was also a prominent theme. Several respondents pointed out that many schools have limited access to quality theatre (for example rural schools), which might disadvantage students attending them. Some concerns were voiced about less digitally-savvy students struggling with portfolios and how future COVID-19 complications (or similar) would prevent students from engaging with this Standard meaningfully.
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:*** *Do the four Drama Standards credential the most important knowledge and*

*skills as illustrated by the Learning Matrix?*

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

***Chart E.2:*** *Do the four Drama Standards support ākonga Māori to succeed as Māori?*

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

***Chart E.2:*** *Are the four Drama Standards appropriate to Level 6 of the Curriculum?*

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

There were 20 responses to this question.

* Most of the responses mirrored the themes discussed in the feedback for individual Standards. There were some positive responses on the group of four standards; respondents liked the Big Ideas, were happy with the integration of te ao Māori, and found the four-Standard structure simple and a good way to “divide up existing achievement standards”.
* There was also some **anxiety about the perceived shift away from practice** towards a more theoretical approach. The Standards were perceived as too theoretical and “concept driven” with a lot of focus on the process rather than the execution by several respondents. This is exemplified by this comment:

*“Concerns for Literacy – where is this in here? – explicit mention but also how this will be viewed – we fought hard to have Drama recorded as a subject that is literacy rich – and students take it because they see the value in process and performance – but there is little performance in here...”*

* There was a strong call for more **clarity and guidance** regarding all four standards and the supporting materials. There were some general comments about AS1.3 and AS1.4 lacking clarity. Respondents also wanted to know how the four Standards are going to be marked and which assessments and learning are done individually and which ones are done in groups.
* Respondents indicated they were **unsure about the chosen assessment formats and length**. There was some indication that the sector would prefer to have AS1.3 as an internal with some respondents suggesting to make either AS1.1 or AS1.2 external instead. Several commenters also mentioned that performance times are too short, which was discussed in more details in previous sections.
* There was some **concern about step-ups and marking**. As one respondent wrote,

*“Another issue for teachers will be the double bullet points for each internally assessed criterion, each of which changes incrementally (sometimes in 2 or 3 steps) for M and E- thus students have more hoops to jump through. While we may well be told to mark holistically, this does not fit with the notion of a standard that must be met. If holistic judgement is required then criteria can only be indicators of how to achieve at M or E.”*

* Responses also indicated a moderate level of anxiety regarding **potential equity issues**. These were similar to the feedback for specific standards and included, as outlined by one respondent, *“equity for students for access to resources, to live theatre, to cameras and editing, to theatres, to confident teachers”.*
* Responders were unhappy about the perceived **increase in teacher workload**, as teachers are expected to gather evidence for two portfolios and two external standards. Teachers worried that adding portfolios to their work would make it unmanageable, especially for those who have classes of 30 or more students.