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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 History. 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 of 23 August 2021, the Ministry received 393 responses to the Ministry’s online survey about the subject content developed so far for History. 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.

### Summary of History

There were 39responses to History products. Responses about the products were generally mixed. Respondents generally wanted the assessment criteria to clearer and more specific, with many respondents asking for student exemplars included.

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?***

***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 27 total responses, of which three were positive. While one respondent asked for more focus on mātauranga Māori, three wanted more detailed information and support for kaiako when teaching mātauranga Maori and Pacific values. Other respondents wanted clearer, more specific language, finding the wording for the subject content too vague and complex. Finally, there was a call for student exemplars.

* ‘Further resources to support kaiako with understanding key concepts and how to clearly explain them to students. Incorporation of Matauranga Māori concepts is fantastic but many teachers will need a lot of support to implement successfully. Even some activities that you could run with students to help them develop these concepts’.
* ‘Key concepts need to be clarified as to where and how they will be used. Some assessment model/exemplar. More specifics in the all explanations!
* ‘No exemplars posted on the website. There does not appear to be any material to show how to apply the concepts & newly modified standards to topics outside of NZ’.

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?***

***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)?***

There were five responses. Three respondents thought that the Course outlines were too complex, one respondent criticising the lack of mātauranga Māori and arguing there was too much content for lower-level learners. Other respondents, however, praised the Course Outlines for their ambition and range of topics.

* ‘Course outlines were helpful for giving an idea of how the year could look - However, it does seem like a lot of context is being crammed into a space. This could be a massive challenge for lower level learners.’
* ‘Weaker students may miss the meaning in some of the concepts like: ‘Explore the ethical dimensions of historical interpretation. Workload potentially an issue with 1.1 and 1.2. Different contexts ‘should be provided each year’. Re-planning of courses will add to teacher workload, but isn't reducing workload one of the aims for NCEA changes? History 1.1 analyses primary but no longer secondary sources. Does this limit their overall growth/development in historical skills?’
* ‘The second offering has a great range of topics which we think is important for student engagement’.

1. **Individual Achievement Standards**
   1. **AS 1.1 and Assessment Activities**

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

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

***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***

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

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

***Do the internal 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?***

|  |
| --- |
| There were seven responses. One respondent thought that the excerpts of examples were too small and should match the suggested word count. Other respondents wanted exemplars and thought that the step-ups and wording for the standard were too vague.   * ‘Why only primary sources? Secondary should be included too. This standard on it's own is meaningless if students simply collect sources to hand in, which is what will happen as it is the easiest way to achieve the standard. Furthermore the criteria for A, M and E are extremely vague and will not lead to equity. For instance, examine and interpret mean very much the same thing when assessing sources.’ * ‘I like this revised research internal and how it focuses on the use of primary evidence and can lend itself to local research. I also like how at this stage there is no planning and evaluation (please do not add!). It gets straight to the point and encourages critical thinking. Exemplars at different levels would be beneficial as the one provided is very brief and no real explanation’. * ‘What is the rationale for only focusing on Primary sources? This seems to lead to a lack of room for looking at different types of evidence. Examine is used as a command word for Excellence in 1.1, but it is at Merit level for other standards. Should this not be consistent across all standards?’ |

* 1. **AS 1.2 and Assessment Activities**

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

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

***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***

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

***Do the Internal Assessment Activities 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?***

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

|  |
| --- |
| There were 16 responses. Some respondents thought that providing a different context every year is too restrictive and difficult, while other thought that the concepts discussed and the step-ups were too vague and complex. One respondent wanted annotated exemplars. |

* ‘I think re the use of a historical person as the context, that the stipulation of providing a different context every year is unhelpful and puts too much of a demand on teachers. Also, it denies students in a particular cohort the opportunity of learning about important people eg Dame Whina Cooper or Sir Apirana Ngata simply because other students have learnt about these people in other years. Too much work for teachers and too restrictive.’
* ‘The term discussing is too vague, do they mean explain why? What is meant by “interpret?” Unpacking standard is difficult - unclear what we actually need to do - suggested activities don’t actually help with this. We were all still really unsure about what to do and how this would work practically after reading everything on this. Quite complex concepts for Y11 - if teachers are struggling with this, how can we teach our students? Significance as ‘whakapapa or tuakiri’ are synonymous. Can we use other meanings for significance? In ‘unpacking the standard’ this is very long winded. Can you simplify this statement?’
* ‘Concepts of change, continuity etc. Is there a place for these?’
  1. **AS 1.3**

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

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

***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?***

There were 10 responses. The main issues raised were the lack of detail and opposition to the reduction of historical concepts. Other respondents praised the emphasis on Mātauranga Māori, with one respondent arguing it needed additional explanation.

* Resources to support teacher PLD on this and the teaching of this in the classroom would be helpful…encouraging the links between Aotearoa context and other contexts is exciting. More detail on how students are expected to engage in the 'unfamiliar context' would be good. Will a series of resources be provided? What will the format of the exam be? Will students be expected to be familiar with all 4-5 concepts or can they pick?’
* ‘How long will students be given for this assessment? Is it a one, two or three hour exam? I have concern that cause and effect is the only remaining existing historical concept which remains explicit in the standard- this has implications for continuity of learning and transition of students to higher education. There is insufficient information about how this will be assessed for me to make judgements or give feedback about whether this is appropriate for my learners’.
* ‘I have concern that cause and effect is the only remaining existing historical concept which remains explicit in the standard- this has implications for continuity of learning and transition of students to higher education. There is insufficient information about how this will be assessed for me to make judgements or give feedback about whether this is appropriate for my learners’.
  1. **AS 1.4**

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

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

***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?***

There were 10 responses in a wide range of topics. Two respondents felt that the assessment should be marked explicitly as external, while another two wanted exemplars. Other individual responses thought that the marking criteria and terminology were unclear, that assessment at the end of Term 2 was inflexible, and that the range of formats were impractical.

* ‘Having the students present their information as either a speech, poster board or essay is impractical in schools with large class numbers (e.g. 30). It needs to be more uniform in terms of how it is assessed - eg all essays’.
* ‘It is not clear exactly how this will be assessed. Will the CAA all be marked exclusively externally? There are significant concerns around workload issues from this department if NZQA if disguises an internal as an external like they did with the MCAT. Further supporting materials are needed including full exemplars’.
* ‘This standard should be clarified as an external completed at the end of the year in a examination format. Saying it is external but then getting teachers to run it as a Common Assessment Activity is rather silly. This will not support fair and equitable assessment as 3/4 of the new standards will essentially be done outside of external exam conditions. Additionally, teachers are responsible for assessment design, as well as marking, this increases workload, and does not allow for enough fairness across the country.’

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?***

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

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

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

There were 10 responses. The most common issue, raised by five respondents, was the complaint that the suite of products was too complex for Level 1.

* 'We made note of a few phrases that could use clarification including: the idea of a "deterministic relationship". If phrases like this are going to be used they need to be unpacked. Another example if the use of "linear" in reference to history. The use of the term "histories" instead of "history" is interesting too. Generally some teachers in our group felt these could be clarified to make it clear to any teacher reading without a technical knowledge what exactly is meant. Though I understand that breaking down all of these ideas would consume a lot of space. However ideas that seem to be central like those above need clarity’.
* ‘One teacher felt there was inconsistency between levels 2 and three in terms of the learning matrix where "critical" was required at level three for one or two skills but not for others. Some others saw this as a non issue as it relates to perspectives which is a skills students should be able to be critical with by level three history’.
* ‘We were curious about the embedding of Matauranga Maori so heavily in the front end of the subject materials but not in the assessment standards…I would be curious to understand the motives. We thought additional pathways could be added in the pathway section like Law, Government etc. I figure these can be added by schools to their materials rather than needing them in the NCEA materials’.