## German Phase 2 Survey – Raw Feedback

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Option | Total | Percent |
| The materials are ready for piloting | **0** | **0.00%** |
| The materials need small amendments before piloting | **3** | **0.32%** |
| The materials need significant amendments before piloting | **0** | **0.00%** |
| The materials are unsuitable for piloting | **0** | **0.00%** |
| Not Answered | **948** | **99.68%** |

**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?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ANON-767U-4S18-9 | Sample tasks for 1.3 and 1.4. Please refer to separate comments for each standard. |

**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 | **3** | **0.32%** |
| The Course Outline(s) are unclear or do not contain enough information | **0** | **0.00%** |
| 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 | **948** | **99.68%** |

**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 | **1** | **0.11%** |
| The course outline(s) demonstrate this to some extent | **1** | **0.11%** |
| The course outline(s) do not demonstrate this | **1** | **0.11%** |
| Not Answered | **948** | **99.68%** |

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ANON-767U-4EYK-P | examples seem far fetched (waka huia) and/ or don't have a real link to matauranga Maori. It seems that different assessment topics are being recycled (my house, daily routine/etc) and given a Maori title, but how do MY HOUSE/ MY TOWN relate to Manaakitanga and Whakawhanaungatanga? Much more unpacking needed. Glad I got a chance to see what Japanese teachers are doing, as they did a much better job unpacking Maori concept and relating them to student activitites, eg Taonga, etc |
| ANON-767U-41SS-4 | Good |
| ANON-767U-4S18-9 | It seems very ambitious to be covering this many topics in one school year. I understand these are meant as example but very few teachers would cover so many topics. There may be topic overlap with Level 2 (e.g. healthy foods/ health). |

**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 | **2** | **0.21%** |
| The standard needs significant amendments before piloting | **0** | **0.00%** |
| The standard is unsuitable for piloting | **1** | **0.11%** |
| Not Answered | **946** | **99.47%** |

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Option | Total | Percent |
| The criteria are clear | **4** | **0.42%** |
| The criteria need some clarification | **0** | **0.00%** |
| The criteria need significant clarification | **1** | **0.11%** |
| Not Answered | **946** | **99.47%** |

**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 | **2** | **0.21%** |
| Further detail is needed in the guidance | **2** | **0.21%** |
| Guidance is unclear | **1** | **0.11%** |
| Not Answered | **946** | **99.47%** |

**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 | **2** | **0.21%** |
| I could not use or adapt any of these activities | **0** | **0.00%** |
| Not Answered | **946** | **99.47%** |

**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 | **1** | **0.11%** |
| None of the activities do this | **1** | **0.11%** |
| Not Answered | **946** | **99.47%** |

**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 | **2** | **0.21%** |
| 1 or 2 of the activities do this | **2** | **0.21%** |
| None of the activities do this | **1** | **0.11%** |
| Not Answered | **946** | **99.47%** |

**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-4EYK-P | link between activities and matauranga Maori need to e more explicit- more unpacking needed. Just calling the family topics whanau isn't enough. Specific examples, such as ...needed.Talk about different schools in New Zealand/Aotearoa including Kura Kaupapa Māori and Kōhanga Reo. • Talk about Māori, Pākeha and German traditional cultures taught in schools. |
| ANON-767U-41SS-4 | I think a student needs to show proficiency in all four Language Skills. • If they choose to do written interaction (1.1) and a written presentation (1.2) they could completely opt out of speaking being tested. That is not good, esp .as listening and speaking is what students would do most in a real life situation. • If students wanted to continue with German at a higher level or at university or go and live in a German speaking country, lacking one skill (and proof of the proficiency in that skill) would be a great disadvantage. • (The same applies if they opt out of submitting any written assessments...)  Assessing 1.1: • Organizing and assessing real time written interactions would be incredibly hard for Te Kura students and teachers. We have students from all over the country, often being the only student at an NCEA level of German in their own school. So we would need to organise two students from different schools (who have different timetables) to meet online and then supervise them during their written exchange. That is almost impossible and would be hugely time consuming in administration. I guess we would just not be able to offer this to our students, there for they might be disadvantaged. |
| ANON-767U-416F-T | need clarification for interaction - writing. sms language is very different. how do i record a written interaction? |
| ANON-767U-417B-Q | The Standard is good. Activities 1.1a:1 (photo album) and 1a.3 look usable and appropriate - good warning! but remove birth, family, pets from 3. 1a.2 language (dative) might be too late in the year for use in Term 3. 1.1bActivity 1 - it seems too limited for extensive interaction. Too many students might have missed the last day of Year 10 (eg. have to leave to help their family, involved with junior prizegiving practice, etc. 1.1b.2&3 are excellent but again could be too similar. |
| ANON-767U-4S18-9 | How much feedback or feed-forward is allowed? Can students resubmit any part of this standard? |

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Option | Total | Percent |
| The standard is ready for piloting | **1** | **0.11%** |
| The standard needs small amendments before piloting | **2** | **0.21%** |
| The standard needs significant amendments before piloting | **1** | **0.11%** |
| The standard is unsuitable for piloting | **0** | **0.00%** |
| Not Answered | **947** | **99.58%** |

**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 | **2** | **0.21%** |
| The criteria need significant clarification | **0** | **0.00%** |
| Not Answered | **947** | **99.58%** |

**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 | **0** | **0.00%** |
| Further detail is needed in the guidance | **4** | **0.42%** |
| Guidance is unclear | **0** | **0.00%** |
| Not Answered | **947** | **99.58%** |

**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 | **3** | **0.32%** |
| I could use or adapt 1 or 2 activities | **1** | **0.11%** |
| I could not use or adapt any of these activities | **0** | **0.00%** |
| Not Answered | **947** | **99.58%** |

**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 | **2** | **0.21%** |
| 1 or 2 of the activities do this | **2** | **0.21%** |
| None of the activities do this | **0** | **0.00%** |
| Not Answered | **947** | **99.58%** |

**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 | **3** | **0.32%** |
| 1 or 2 of the activities do this | **1** | **0.11%** |
| None of the activities do this | **0** | **0.00%** |
| Not Answered | **947** | **99.58%** |

**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-4EYK-P | questions: are teachers still supposed/allowed to give general feedback (it states not to "point out errors, edit, or correct" student work before handing it in? are native speakers allowed to sit this standard? (AS for student with German as an additional language) - are students allowed to run a spell and grammar check? (students should not use digital resources). In the past I asked students to prepare a video presenting where they live, and they created Loom videos with a voice over and annotated slides, as well as certain slides with the student face visible describing specific aspects of the house - this is a great example of combining speaking and writing. Again- I'd like to see a clearer link to mataurangi Maori |
| ANON-767U-41SS-4 | Same as for 1.1 basically • If students can opt out of either speaking or writing assessment all together (eg. choose only spoken/written 1.1 and 1.2), they they don't show proficiency in all four language skills. What could be done is giving the students the option in which of the two standards they want to do the speaking and the writing, but making it mandatory that they do writing and speaking . Maybe choose 1.1 speaking and 1.2 writing or vice versa. If we were going with them doing both in both standards (eg 1.1 folio of a written and a spoken piece), then assessment marking criteria and schedule need clarification (eg. still same number of words (300)and minutes (3-4) needed or just a percentage for each (150 words, 2 min?) This would be quite messy I think... Also, would schools be able to stipulate that 1.1 would have to be speaking (if not feasible to offer written interactions) and 1.2 would have to be writing? If so, then maybe no countrywide same conditions? |
| ANON-767U-417B-Q | Main concern is that students could achieve Level 1 German without proof they can write adequate German, eg do spoken only in 1.2 (yes they have had to write their presentation first, but their written language is not being assessed). Activities: 1.2a 1&3 must be careful not to repeat the same content as in 1.1 (photo album etc). 1.2a 2 could be too limited in vocab. 1.2b 1,2,3 are good but again 2&3 are very similar to interaction. 1.2c great idea, but again need to avoid repeating content from Interaction. |
| ANON-767U-4S18-9 | Could this end up being similar to the old Writing standard if students choose the written form except for the lack of feedback by teachers? They could still end up drafting their writing and use Google translate despite it not being permitted in the conditions. How much feedback/ feed-forward are teachers allowed? It states that no feedback is allowed but on the NZQA assessment opportunities it says teachers can provide feedback. Are re-submissions allowed and if so in what circumstances? Great combination of skills and interesting tasks. |

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Option | Total | Percent |
| The standard is ready for piloting | **1** | **0.11%** |
| The standard needs small amendments before piloting | **1** | **0.11%** |
| The standard needs significant amendments before piloting | **2** | **0.21%** |
| The standard is unsuitable for piloting | **0** | **0.00%** |
| Not Answered | **947** | **99.58%** |

**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 | **1** | **0.11%** |
| Not Answered | **947** | **99.58%** |

**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 | **1** | **0.11%** |
| Guidance is insufficient | **3** | **0.32%** |
| Guidance is unclear | **0** | **0.00%** |
| Not Answered | **947** | **99.58%** |

**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-4EYK-P | How long is the exam? Are the questions asked in English, German, or Te Reo? Will the short answers require students to identify the answer and simply write it down in German (Was ist Tims Lieblingsfarbe? BLAU)? |
| ANON-767U-4EZP-V | I strongly suggest that this standard is revisited in light of comments that were previously sent regarding testing reading and writing within the same standard. I have no issues that is it a reading comprehension or when it will be potentially tested, but to ask for answers to be written in German requires greater skill within already 1 skill area and this will greatly disadvantage the students. |
| ANON-767U-417B-Q | Yes |
| ANON-767U-4S18-9 | This standard seems the least finished standard. It is not clear what the common assessment activity may look like. Is this similar to the old Reading standard? Will students sit the task together as a group and assessed individually? Is it exam-like or will this happen over a period of time and how much will classroom teachers be involved in the assessing of this standard? Who will set the tasks? There is a lack of assessment task examples so it's not clear what achieving at AME will look like. The timing of the assessment is also too early for languages - it should be assessed in term 4. Alternatively, teaching time in term 4 should be extended to make up for the loss of teaching time in favour of this standard in term 3. |

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Option | Total | Percent |
| The standard is ready for piloting | **1** | **0.11%** |
| The standard needs small amendments before piloting | **3** | **0.32%** |
| The standard needs significant amendments before piloting | **1** | **0.11%** |
| The standard is unsuitable for piloting | **0** | **0.00%** |
| Not Answered | **946** | **99.47%** |

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Option | Total | Percent |
| The criteria are clear | **3** | **0.32%** |
| The criteria need some clarification | **2** | **0.21%** |
| The criteria need significant clarification | **0** | **0.00%** |
| Not Answered | **946** | **99.47%** |

**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 | **2** | **0.21%** |
| Guidance is insufficient | **3** | **0.32%** |
| Guidance is unclear | **0** | **0.00%** |
| Not Answered | **946** | **99.47%** |

**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-4EYK-P | How long is this task? When will it be assessed? What language do the questions come in? Do short question types simply require students to find the correct answer in the text and copy the sentence/ passage or rephrase? Are students allowed to access resources (open book/ dictionary/ vocab lists) etc? |
| ANON-767U-4EZP-V | As per 1.3 I have a very big concern with German required in answering for a listening skill. This will be testing 2 skills, both listening and writing. This will greatly disadvantage the students. This is an urgent matter that does need addressing. |
| ANON-767U-411B-H | I'm confused as to why students need to answer in German for some of these questions when this is not the case in French. Plus it then assesses multiple skills when should only be assessing 1. |
| ANON-767U-417B-Q | Yes ready to go. |
| ANON-767U-4S18-9 | There are no examples of assessment tasks given. Are these similar to the old Listening standard? I assume it needs to be different as the texts are going to be audio-visual. How often are texts being presented to the students? What is the time frame for the actual exam? What is the language of answering questions and the questions themselves? If the exam includes both audio and visual material, this means students with visual and/or hearing impairment may not be able to take this standard as one channel will not be accessible to them. How could this be amended? |

**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 | **1** | **0.11%** |
| Some gaps | **2** | **0.21%** |
| Large gaps | **0** | **0.00%** |
| They cover the wrong knowledge and/or skills | **0** | **0.00%** |
| Not Answered | **948** | **99.68%** |

**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 |
| All standards do this | **2** | **0.21%** |
| 1.1 does this | **0** | **0.00%** |
| 1.2 does this | **0** | **0.00%** |
| 1.3 does this | **0** | **0.00%** |
| 1.4 does this | **0** | **0.00%** |
| None of the standards do this | **1** | **0.11%** |
| Not Answered | **948** | **99.68%** |

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Option | Total | Percent |
| Yes | **3** | **0.32%** |
| They are too challenging | **0** | **0.00%** |
| They are not challenging enough | **0** | **0.00%** |
| They are a mix of too challenging and too easy | **0** | **0.00%** |
| Not Answered | **948** | **99.68%** |

**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-4EYK-P | To support ākonga Māori to succeed as Māori, more unpacking needs to be done. Simply giving tasks a Maori title isn't enough. |
| ANON-767U-417B-Q | It would be possible for a student to gain Level 1 without having to show they can write appropriate German, ie. if they do the presentation spoken. Yes they do have to write it first but there is no requirement to demonstrate that they can write appropriate German. |
| ANON-767U-4S18-9 | Care should be taken in the course outline of Food and Gesundheit to make sure it doesn't overlap with Level 2. You added Role-play for ordering fast-food but role-play is not allowed in 1.1 - could this confuse teachers? Compared to the Asian language assessments, matauranga Maori could have been more integrated into the European languages. |