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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 Geography. 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 **33** responses to the Ministry’s online survey about the subject content developed so far for Geography. 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 Geography

There were **33** responses to Geography products. Responses about Achievement Standardswere generally positive with **84%** of respondents to ‘General Impressions’ expressing that require few or no amendments before piloting.

The most commonly suggested amendment was ensuring consistent wording between step-ups and unpacking or Explanatory Notes. Responses about the external Standards were especially critical of the difficulty of assessments relative to the curriculum level, especially at Excellence level.

It should also be noted that of the **33** respondents answering questions about Geography, the number of responses to each question was typically much lower. 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 **24** responses. Questions about the Standards received **10 - 13** responses each. Questions about the Course Outlines received **9** responses each.

## B. General impressions of the subject content

### 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?***

23 respondents provided commentary.

* Numerous respondents began their comments with support for the products:
  + *“Great information and very exciting overall.”*
* Multiple respondents commented on inconsistent wording between step-up criteria and ENs or unpacking, such as:
  + *“1.3 - Standard says “an environment” but the unpacking says “a variety of environments."*
  + *“1.2 states that data is both primary and secondary evidence; whereas the unpacking section states primary or secondary - small tweak needed to align both.”*
* Several respondents expressed resentment about the lack of Fieldwork in the Standard.
* Many respondents were concerned with the difficulty of the Standards, especially with certain words commonly-associated with higher curriculum levels:
  + *“Natural processes at level 1 in the draft versus (extreme) natural event as it stands now - the unpacking acknowledges the complexity in how natural processes work and this has been more suited to higher level physical geography. Remaining as a natural event seems more appropriate, or it makes the higher levels difficult to differentiate the learning topic/context.”*
  + *“Are we now expecting Level 1 students to Analyse?”*
* 2 respondents expressed a concern about potential overlap with other subjects in the Social Sciences area. One was concerned with potential overlap with the new Aotearoa New Zealand History curriculum regarding land disputes, and the other was concerned with potential overlap with current level 3 Social Studies topics such as mining and migration.
* Numerous respondents expressed concern about receiving resources and allocating time for mātauranga Māori PLD.

## 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)?***

5 respondents provided commentary.

* Multiple respondents had trouble understanding some of the Big Ideas, most notably, ‘Tikanga shapes the relationship between ngā tāngata and te taiao’, and the use of the term ‘Kaitiakitanga’:
  + *‘Big idea is not clear. Need a clarification and an example of what this means. "Know how kaitiakitanga can shape the relationship between nga tangata and the taiao".’*
* Nearly all respondents requested additional exemplars, and PLD especially for incorporating mātauranga Māori into the teaching.
* 1 respondent found “*the 'tools, methods and skills' from the Geography Kete”* to be missing from Course Outlines, and mātauranga Māori to be added in a tokenistic way:
  + “*The references to mātauranga Māori and te Ao Māori seem very tokenistic when written into a topic on rivers as some content to cover before you teach the Geography.*”
* Earlier comments regarding difficulty were echoed in this section:
  + “*There seems to be plenty of content that traditionally in NZ is seen in level 2 and 3 courses. Natural processes that shape environments are tough to teach when students have had no specialist geography teaching before year 11 and these materials give me no faith they will get better progression to catch up with where they could be before they get to further education.”*

## 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?***

11 respondents provided commentary.

* Several respondents were positive about the content of the material:
  + *“Looks straightforward. Pa sites around Wellington activity looks great and would work really well for us.”*
* Multiple respondents described inconsistent wording between the criteria for Merit and Excellence and the unpacking, Explanatory Notes, or glossary:
  + “*For excellence, the bullet points in explanatory note 1 don't meet the definition of analyse as provided in the glossary.*"
  + *“For Merit criteria, command term is 'explain' yet this is elaborated on in the explanatory notes as meaning 'discussing how the spatial distribution of phenomena has changed or may change in the future, and how this is relevant for people'.”*
* Several respondents desired extra information about the assessment medium and enforcement of specifications of assessment:
  + *“We like the defined word limit, however believe it would be difficult to do all requirements for E in 800 words or less – exemplars will help us get our heads around this. Also is there a penalty if students go over word limits?”*
  + *“- Any medium of assessment - more clarification needed.*

*- length of written assessment 750-800 - good in theory but how will this be policed? - more clarification needed”*

* There were multiple requests for clearer definitions for specific terms:
  + *“Definition of phenomena is VERY broad.”*
  + *“Unclear what the difference is between 'give evidence' and give 'contextualised evidence'. Contextualised is not defined within the glossary and if students were giving evidence for an environment, surely this means it must be contextual. Does this mean giving general reasons but no case study information - it would be helpful if this could be clarified.”*
  + *“Need to clarify what is meant by own or others' experience.”*
  + *“In activities given, what level of reasoning for the change over time would be expected - terms like ‘consider’ are ambiguous and unhelpful in what is required.”*

### 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?***

10 respondents provided commentary.

* Multiple respondents were supportive of the Standard:
  + *“Overall, we love this standard and it is significantly better than the current 1.5. The removal of planning and data collection, and the structuring of criteria, makes this assessment much more manageable and accessible. Well done on coming up with these changes.*”
* A significant proportion of respondents expressed concern about the Excellence criteria, due to the introduction of a new skill criteria not displayed at Achieved/Merit, and word-limit restrictions:
  + *“The jump from merit to excellence criteria doesn't line up with higher order thinking but instead asks learners to do a different task. This is especially of the excellence criteria in explanatory note 1, which is only asking for reflection and evaluation and not analysis of the data.”*
  + *“Excellence criteria is quite high level - is it necessary to ask students about BOTH strengths and limitations of data AND alternative data. Also, given the word limit, this does not seem feasible to do in a meaningful way and at an Excellence level.”*
  + *“Questions around how an excellence can be achieved in the assessment schedule in 750 words.”*
  + *We still have questions around how an excellence can be achieved in the assessment schedule in 750 words. We need exemplars and we want to know if students will be penalized if writing outside the word limit. If there is no penalty for writing too much, then the word limit is pointless.*
  + *“it seems like you don't need to do an evaluation of the collection or processing of the data for A or M - just Excellence.”*
* 3 respondents expressed concern at the lack of Fieldwork in the Standard:
  + *“The standard is clear but the lack of requirement for fieldwork takes away a core geography skill.”*
  + *“Would like to see own/group data collection included in this as fieldwork is important. This could be coupled with master data set from teacher.”*
* Some respondents explicitly expressed concerns about teachers receiving sufficient PLD and resourcing to incorporate mātauranga Māori:
  + “*We still feel very anxious about applying Matauranga Maori effectively and we have not seen enough in the documentation here. Information or materials need to be provided to show the extent of comparing mātauranga Maori and current Science. As I have said in other parts of this survey, teaching resources and PD are more than essential if teachers are to do an effective job with Matauranga Maori.”*
  + *“Information or materials need to be provided to show the extent of comparing mātauranga Maori and current Science.”*

### 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?*

11 respondents provided commentary.

* Numerous respondents concentrated on language clarity and consistency across step-up criteria and the Explanatory Notes or unpacking, in their feedback. Respondents expressed:
  + uncertainty around the quantity of environments or processes that the student is required to examine,
    - *“The guidance suggests that information will be gathered throughout the year and relate to various environments, however the standard specifies one environment.”*
    - *‘Standard says “an environment” but the unpacking says “a variety of environments”’*
    - *“The achievement standard specifies “an environment” whereas the unpacking says “variety of environments” – this is really unclear and we are not sure what our students will have to do. We would prefer students to write about (and even compare) a variety of environments* […]*”*
    - *“The examples of natural processes given in 1.3 EN#2 are ‘umbrella’ processes and there are many sub-processes within them - it should be made clear whether Level 1 ākonga are expected to learn about several umbrella processes or whether they are expected to build a deep understanding of the connections between sub-processes within one of them eg tectonic; Currently the Merit criteria (“relationship between the natural processes”) imply more than one umbrella process ??”*
  + and concerns about verbs,
    - *“In the achievement standard rubric at top of web page - Merit criteria is 'Discuss how natural processes shape an environment' but in the explanatory notes it is 'Explain how natural processes shape an environment' Is this a typo?”*
    - *“Once again, the analyse information in the explanatory note doesn't meet the definition of analyse given in the glossary.”*
    - *“There seems to be a mistake in the description of the different levels - merit is stated as "Discuss how natural processes shape an environment" then in the explanatory note discuss is changed to 'explain”*
* Some respondents were particularly concerned with Excellence criteria introducing a new concept:
  + *The Excellence criteria is the first time that “people” are mentioned, unless we stress that “environment” could be cultural”*
  + *“How people respond has only been introduced at the excellence level.”*
  + *“Would like to know why people and their response is only needed for an excellence answer.”*
  + *“The excellence criteria brings in people's responses, which seems irrelevant to the rest of the criteria. It is also introducing a different task for only excellence. If this is an important aspect of the standard, I would recommend that students be asked to describe how people respond, with higher order thinking steps offered.”*
* Multiple respondents requested further clarification, or expressed dislike of pūrākau:
  + *“Explanations of pūrākau to understand processes needs clarification and resourcing.”*
  + *“We are not happy that Purakau is applied as something that can explain formation of environments. Geography is a science and we should never seek to explain natural environments using any culture’s creation myths. If we go down this track we will be undermining the importance of Matauranga Maori. It would be more appropriate to use Purakau to explain human interaction with an environment.”*
  + *“Purakau - Need more PD and clarification around this. Do not want this to take away from the undisputed science around the natural process we are teaching. Also as we are expected to have a range of environments and some of these to be global - are we expected to know, teach and be culturally aware of 'stories' from other parts of the world? Clarification needed here.”*
* Several respondents expressed concern with certain words which may be used at a higher curriculum level:
  + *“Showing the relationship between natural processes has previously been a L3 skill but this is a Merit criteria now for L1? This feels like a big jump.”*
  + *“Natural processes at level 1 versus (extreme) natural event - the unpacking acknowledges the complexity in how natural processes work and this has been more suited to Level 3 physical geography.”*

### 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?***

12 respondents provided commentary.

* Multiple respondents were supportive of the aims of the Standard, but there was a general concern about clarity of the task and difficulty.
* The most prominent concern was that the use of ‘critical evaluation’ in the unpacking is too difficult, as this has historically been asked of students in NCEA Level 3 Standards:
  + *“in the unpacking it suggests students .....need to critically evaluate..... is not asking too much for a Level 1 student - previously, this was in Level 3 standrds*.”
  + *“Critically evaluate - this is a very high level thinking/writing skill for Level 1 students.”*
  + *“Critical evaluation is difficult for Level 1 students – what are the expectations here?”*
* Several respondents requested clearer definitions, or consistency of language across step-ups, unpacking, and ENs of the Standard:
  + *“The merit wording in explanatory note 1 (explain) doesn't match the merit critiera (apply). The choice of the verbs demonstrate, apply (or explain) and examine is poor. Demonstrate and apply in the glossary are very close, and I would suggest that apply (to make use of) is a lower level skill than demonstrate (to show by example or through evidence)”*
  + *“I am confused about the seemingly interchangeable use of the terms 'decision' and 'response' in the explanatory notes for the different achievement levels. The word 'decision' is also referred to largely in the unpacking of the standard, instead of the term 'response'. In my opinion, I would like to see the word 'response' removed in the marking criteria and it replaced with decision throughout.”*
  + *‘Alignment needed for achievement with Merit, between Standard: “Apply decision-making…” and EN #1: “Explain decision-making…”’*
  + *“Consistency of language throughout the documentation needs to be improved e.g. using terms like ‘selecting’ and ‘justifying’ for E whilst also using ‘critically evaluate’ elsewhere.”*
* A large proportion of respondents questioned the certain specifications of the assessment, especially the timing and resourcing:
  + *“Don't like the suggestion of the term 2 external Common Assessment Activity that much - but mainly because of everything we would have to fit into term 1 to get round to this material in time. More pressure on fieldwork as this has to happen in term 1 or early term 2 for weather reasons.”*
  + *“Will it be resource based? Will we know in advance the case study? Is there an example of an assessment task? Does the school decide the timing of the common assessment activity or is it done nationally at the same time? Digital or hand writing?”*
  + *“The decision based resource is "provided a few weeks prior"- this requires no interpretation or decision making skills as teachers will discuss and come up with solutions with their classes. This should be done prior based around random situations in the teaching and learning and the exam topic should be unknown in order to actually assess skill.”*
  + *“We need context around what teaching resources will be provided to the students and what the external will look like. Will we be given a topic and resource booklet or do we come up with our own context and the students will be asked broad questions?”*
  + *“Who is marking this External Standard/CAA? Critically evaluate - this is a very high level thinking/writing skill for Level 1 students. Will exemplars and practice CAA be provided for schools in preparation of this assessment?”*
  + *“There is a need for exemplars of resource materials and how the CAA can be prepared for and administered. Again, need assurances that a CAA will be marked externally and not become a burden on teachers. Consistency of language throughout the documentation needs to be improved e.g. using terms like ‘selecting’ and ‘justifying’ for E whilst also using ‘critically evaluate’ elsewhere. Could this be done as an Exam at the end of the year?”*
* A small number of respondents sought clarity on what the students were being asked to do, or questioned how it fit into the subject matter:
  + *“Looks like it is a combo of skills and geog issue? “Respond to a stimulus”: what does this mean?”*
  + *“... Allows students to immerse themselves meaningfully in situations.... How can we measure this?”*
  + *“Decision making is not real geography. The simplification of the subject through the changes here would not be necessary if we decided we didn't need to do this decision making aspect. This is really close to some of the social studies materials and I think it can go and enable us to do a better job of research and analysis.”*

### v. 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?***

19 respondents provided commentary:

* There was a general sense of support for the products, but a desire to be more precise in some areas.
* A prominent number of respondents were concerned with difficulty across the products, with Achieved criteria being too easy in some instances, and Excellence being too hard relative to the Level in certain areas:
  + *“Analyse will require a significant jump up from where the standards currently sit. The National Moderation process will require students to do work that is beyond NZC Level 6 for an 'analysis' and therefore that needs to be factored into the standard design. In theory, it is nice to aim for analysis, but this is beyond NZC 6.*”
  + “[…] *some of the standards are asking for higher level skills (e.g. relationship between natural processes for a Merit in 1.3 - this was previously not asked for until Level 3).”*
  + *“The describe and identify qualifiers needed for achieved feel too easy for a level 1 standard but by contrast the analyse for excellence is too difficult. Perhaps focussing around explaining/fully explaining would be a better suit for level 1.”*
  + *“We do have concerns about some of the content and the level of skills at Level 7 and 8 eg. 'investigate how the power of language and discourse manipulates and marginalises people' - this seems to be more media studies than geography and 'perspectives are nuanced' is a more university-level skill set.”*
  + *“1.1: - Differentiation between the wording of describe, explain and analyse for the different achievement levels. Is this too easy to get achieved and too difficult to get excellence?”*
* Many respondents requested greater clarity or consistency in wording, typically between step-ups and unpacking:
  + *“In particular for 1.2, EN #2 states that data is both primary and secondary evidence; whereas the unpacking section states primary or secondary - small tweak needed to align both. In particular for 1.3, the standard says “an environment” but the unpacking says “a variety of environments”.* […] *In particular for 1.4, alignment is needed for achievement with Merit, between the Standard: “Apply decision-making…” and EN #1: “Explain decision-making…”.*”
  + *“The wording of the tasks and questions didn't guide the akonga towards excellence. We feel that the wording could be improved to give akonga better guidance towards what they should include in their work in order to reach the excellence level. “*
  + *“Overall the standards seem good, however, there is some ambiguity around some of the wording.*”
  + “*Many Maori terms are provided within the overall Geography learning matrix but not all of these have been defined in the online glossary provided (e.g. nga tangata). For overseas teachers this is important for clarity. A few discrepancies in terms on the current achievement standards which look like they could be a typo* […]”
* Multiple respondents expressed concern about resourcing and timing of assessments, with some describing a potential impact on feasibility of the tasks for students and workloads of teachers:
  + *“1.3: what does environment mean for this? Will portfolio checkpoints be set by teachers or nationally? 1.4: What if students are absent at the time when the resources are given out?*”
  + “*Would suggest that 1.3 and 1.4 could switch places in terms of timing when assessed. As 1.4 could encompass a year of learning and knowledge it would make more sense to test this at the end of the year.”*
  + *“1.4: - Will this cause a bottle neck at the end of term 2 (are all subjects assessing in a similar fashion at the same time?), Are students mentally prepared to sit an exam at this time of their Y11 course?”*
  + *“My biggest concern is the what the year looks like with these assessments. Moat geo teachers want to take students out on fieldwork when the weather is predictable and the structure of the year described by these standards makes this look very difficult to do.”*
* A handful of respondents provided feedback on provisional word-limit restrictions, especially for Standard 1.4:
  + *“I did have some concerns around the word limits provided, while I believe it is important to have students writing concisely,* […] *Limiting students ability to write comprehensively could lead to poorer Geographic writing overall.”*
  + *“will the 750-800 word criteria be enough to allow students to meet the criteria at Merit and Excellence?”*
  + *“Issues with word limits: 750-800 words must surely refer to the body of the response and exclude any annotations and captions and even then, it is deemed too constrictive. Wording should be more general and ask students for a concise verbal/written response.”*
* A number of respondents expressed concern at the subject matter of the products. Some took issue with how Big Ideas were explained or presented in the products. Others focussed on content they would like to see in the Standards, or where overlap within the Social Sciences learning area may occur:
  + *“The Big Idea: Tikang shapes the relationship between nga tangata and the taiao. Students will ... know how kaitiakitanga can shape the relationship between nga tangata and the taiao. Unsure what this means and how this can be shown/taught inside the topics and standards.”*
  + *“It is disappointing that while there is a clear response to the request for more physical geography, cultural/human geography is reduced to decision making.* […] *AO1 of curriculum level 6 is well covered. AO2 is less well covered. The big idea that tikanga shapes the relationship between ngā tāngata and te taiao is not evident at all in this package. The big idea about perspectives and power influencing relationships is not evident in this package, except for one confusing statement about considering viewpoints or perspectives.”*
  + *“We like the fact that key geographic concepts have been removed. We do have concerns about some of the content and the level of skills at Level 7 and 8 eg. 'investigate how the power of language and discourse manipulates and marginalises people' - this seems to be more media studies than geography and 'perspectives are nuanced' is a more university-level skill set.”*
  + *“Wording on power/discourse manipulating and marginalising... (indicator in Level 8) - why can this not include how discourse can resolve issues and unite people to balance out the negativity as it currently stands - what is the agenda here?”*
* PLD and resourcing for mātauranga Māori was another notable theme in comments:
  + “*Resourcing - especially Māori content; there is a push to connect with local iwi and to integrate more mātauranga Māori into studies eg the pūrākau associated with a local awa - the consequent (predicted) inundation of requests for assistance from local marae / iwi etc will pose quite a few issues for them & us*”
  + “*Our region does not have a strong iwi presence and local kumatua so we will need external help around local tikanga and maturanga knowledge.*”
  + “*We have an opportunity to involve Matauranga Maori effectively in our subjects, however at this stage the guidance is incredibly vague. If we are to do this well, without it becoming a token gesture, we need massive support from government – plenty of effective resources and PD.”*