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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 Japanese. 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 34 responses to the Ministry’s online survey about the subject content developed so far for Japanese. 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. Each section was optional so not every respondent answered every section. The sections are:
	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.

1. **Summary of Japanese**

There were 34responses to Japanese products. Responses about the Course Outlines and Standards were generally critical.

The main themes from feedback about Course Outlines, Standards and Assessment Activities were:

* More guidance and clarity needed for all materials
* More activities and examples needed to help teachers develop a course that will enable students to engage with the Significant Learning and achieve the Standards
* Concern that the Standards and Assessment Activities are too complex and difficult for Curriculum Level 6
* Concern that the Standards’ proposed assessment format and timing will result in teacher and student workload issues
* Concern about credit weightings for some Standards, particularly in comparison with similar European Languages Standards
* Concern that mātauranga Māori is not well incorporated in the draft materials. This was coupled with requests for professional development to help teachers understand, and base teaching on, mātauranga Māori in an authentic way
* Concern that too many skills are being assessed in the Standards, particularly those that assess speaking and writing skills within one Standard.

Many responses commented on specific wording issues and suggested detailed changes to Course Outlines, Standards’ criteria and Assessment Activities. These individual responses are detailed within each section below.

1. **General impressions of the subject content**

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

 ***Chart B:*** *Are the draft Japanese materials ready pilot****?***

**Question: 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 21 responses to this question.

* Several responses said that **more guidance and clarity** is needed. These responses included a request for more definition of the term ‘non-native English speaker’, and more detail in the Assessment Activities. There were also requests for clarity on how each Standard was being assessed, particularly the standards that are assessing a range of skills, such as AS 1.2.
* Several responses said that the proposed **learning and assessment is too difficult** for Curriculum Level 6, particularly for ‘genuine second language learners’.

*“The contents [sic] to be taught is too high for Level 1. They need to compare cultures and understand unfamiliar topics, which what we teach in Level 2 in the current system. As we have to learn three different types of characters, it is too difficult to get to the level this new course outline is expecting.”*

* Several responses said that **more examples and resources** are needed, such as vocabulary lists, kanji, and grammar.

*“Japanese authentic materials (including Youtube videos, books, articles online etc) can't be used in class without significantly adjusting them due to a huge difference between polite vs colloquial languages and complex writing system of Japanese. Who will provide these resources that are suitable for Level 1 students to use?”*

* Some responses said that **professional development is needed** for teachers to understand how Japanese language content can be grounded in mātauranga Māori and can be taught in an authentic way.

Individual responses included:

* concern that the **credit weightings** aren’t balanced well in terms of the different language skills being assessed by the Standards
* concern that assessing AS 1.4 in Term 3 will create a **student workload issue**, considering Term 3 will likely be a very assessment-heavy time period.
1. **Course Outlines**

**Question: 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 C1*:** *Do the Course Outlines form a coherent year’s programme?*

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

***Chart C2:*** *Do the Course Outlines demonstrate how teaching and learning could*

*be grounded in mātauranga Māori?*

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

There were 12 responses to this question, with three main themes emerging from the comments:

* Concern that it will be **too difficult for teachers to ground mātauranga Māori into teaching and learning**. Most of the responses said that teachers need much more guidance, professional development, and resources to incorporate mātauranga Māori into their teaching programme. Some responses said that the suggested activities, such as creating a pepeha, are not suitable for a Japanese language learning course.

*“The course outline shows how significant learning and how teaching and learning could be grounded in mātauranga Māori. It needs to be remembered that many students know little about Te Ao Māori. How will teachers get the support they need to teach Te Ao Māori world in an appropriate way?”*

*“So although there is a definite need to be far more culturally responsive than in the past, and to integrate Matauranga Māori wherever we can, we need to be careful about how we approach this, and do this with care and consideration for our Māori students, their whānau and iwi.”*

* Some responses said the **examples provided are out of date** and would not provide students with the language and knowledge they would need in a real context.

*Intercultural learning in general seems obsolete or irrelevant to me. Phrases like ”おげんきですか。”　”おかげさまで” in Hauora does not sound natural for teenagers' conversation. Many Japanese family do not know, do not use かもん nowadays. I am no sure these topics are called live. When my students go to Japan and use these out of date phrases, they will face difficulty to merge with native Japanese people.*

* Concern that the **level of learning is** **too difficult for students** at Curriculum Level 6. A few responses added that the level of learning shown in the Course Outlines is also too much for teachers and would lead to **teacher workload issues**.

Individual responses said:

* + there is too much content in the Course Outlines
	+ the Asian languages Course Outlines should be more like the European languages ones.
1. **Individual Achievement Standards**
	1. **AS 1.1 and Assessment Activities**

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

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

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

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

**Question: 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**

**Question: 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?*

**Question: 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?*

**Question: 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?*

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

There were 20 responses to this question

* While a few responses said that they were “happy with” the Standard overall, several responses said that the Standard and its activities are **too difficult for Curriculum Level 6 students**.

*“If these are truly unscripted, unrehearsed interactions, the level of the current example tasks and the critera are too hard. The excellence criteria wording is too hard for Level 1. Many students find the interaction very challenging.*

*“This proposed standard will not encourage students to communicate with others and only discourage them to attempt the standard”*

*“The scope of the activities requires a larger linguistic scope than is currently expected at level one. For example, while akonga may be able to introduce someone or something special to them, the structures for talking about how to look after them and things to avoid etc are currently mostly L2 structures.”*

* Some responses said that there was a **resourcing** **imbalance between AS 1.1 and the other Standards,** which willmake it difficult for students to achieve them.

*“1.1 requires students to speak for approx 2 mins without the support of any language based resources. 1.2 requires students to speak for approx 1 minute and they can read the entire thing off of cue cards…Both standards have the same amount of credits attached to them. So there needs to be some adjustment made here - either 2 pieces for 2 mins total for both, or 1 piece at 1 min total for both.”*

*“[W]ith 1.1 no language based resources are permitted. Whereas in both 1.3 and 1.4 students are allowed access to the official vocab list, even those these are both externals.”*

* Some responses said that **more guidance and clarity is needed*,*** such as whether the students need to complete two tasks about the same topic or not, and if the Standard’s achievement criteria needs to be better defined to avoid misinterpretation.
* Other views (from one or two responses) were:
	+ That some content may be unsafe for students, or negatively affect their wellbeing: “*Taonga: This can be difficult when students don’t have personal connections to things and maybe don’t have many happy memories in their lives.”*
	+ The ‘Manaakitanga’ Assessment Activity was the best of the three, however it would be more suitable to name it ‘Kura’.
	+ Professional development is needed for teachers to help ground teaching and learning in mātauranga Māori.

*We have some concerns about the te-au [sic] Maori aspect of it. It feels forced and there are Maori concepts that do not correspond directly to Japanese concepts so talking and comparing them is something scary, when we are not always familiar with them…* *Will we get training or / teaching in some of these concepts of te-au Maori or are we expected to know them?*

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

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

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

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

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

**Question: 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**

**Question: 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?*

**Question: 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?*

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

***Chart D2.6:*** *Do the activities for AS1.2 support all learners?*

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

There were 23 responses to this question.

* Most responses expressed **concern about writing and speaking skills being assessed within one Standard.** The majority view was that this would cause confusion for both teachers and students, and create student workload issues. There was also concern that more work would be required for this Standard, compared with others, but with no additional credits awarded. Many responses noted that writing and speaking skills are also assessed in other proposed Standards, so having both assessed in AS 1.2 could lead to confusion about what evidence is submitted for each Standard.
* Several responses asked for **more guidance and clarity** on the assessment format and timing, and the Assessment Activities.

*“1-2 minutes is quite a difference. Can a student get Excellence from just one minute. Is it the thought that quality is more important than quality.”*

*“How will 1.2 this be assessed? considering the differences in how Speech / Writing Portfolios are assessed. Speech - Intonation / Delivery / Fluency / Memorised? Writing Portfolio - Accuracy / Development / Range of language features. How do we assess this when these separate assessments have been combined into one? - Do we use a different assessment criteria depending on the skill? If so will that be provided?”*

*“The information given in the Students Activities is not clear. It seems it explains more for the students who are planning to do an oral presentation and there is little equivalent information for the students who will complete this assessment in writing.”*

* Other views (from one or two responses) were:
	+ More examples of the language expectations at Achieved, Merit and Excellence need to be clearer in the Standards and Assessment Schedules.
	+ They were happy with the proposed Standard and its activities.
	+ This Standard should have a higher language requirement than the ‘interaction Standard’.
	+ Professional development is needed to help teachers and students ground learning and activities in mātauranga Māori.
	1. **AS 1.3**

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

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

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

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

**Question: 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?*

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

There were 25 responses to this question.

* Several responses expressed concern about the Standard’s proposed **assessment format and timing**. This included concerns that:
	+ The proposed assessment format will result in students’ critical thinking skills being assessed, not their language skills.
	+ Students will not put in time and effort to memorise vocabulary if they are permitted access to a vocabulary list during the assessment.
	+ Listening and reading should not be combined in a 1-hour exam.
* Several responses said that **more guidance and clarity** about the Standard and its activities is needed. More examples and resources are needed to help teachers understand the Standard’s requirements and to help them know how to develop junior students’ skills in readiness for the new Standards.

*“We need to know more about how the assessment will be conducted. Is the vocab list going from Japanese to English only? Or also English to Japanese? Will it include kanji? How will the kanji be listed? Are there grammar structures listed - if so, how? Will the vocabulary list be supplied in printed form for use during the actual assessment?”*

* Some responses said that the **credit weighting is not right** for this Standard, given that a European languages Standard assessing similar skills is worth 10 points.
* Other views (from one or two responses) were:
	+ The proposed Standard will create **difficulty for schools to coordinate professional development** for languages teachers in schools, if the Standards between Asian and European languages are not similar enough.
	+ There was disappointment across the sector at a perceived **lack of consultation** about the new Standards.
* The level of learning proposed in the new Learning is too difficult for Curriculum Level 6, particularly if the Standard combines reading and writing.

*“We are concerned with listening and reading comprehension skills being assessed in an integrated way. This might mirror the real world, but at Level 1 Japanese is not the real world. Expecting students to show understanding of both aural, visual, and written sources, and integrate what they’ve understood in their responses is too hard. These skills are not currently seen in languages until Scholarship.”*

* There are **equity issues** with the draft Standard, as expressed in the quote below:

*“I do not think the proposed assessment approach will be capable of supporting fair and equitable assessment. It does not take into account that learners have different skills. A learner who is a skilled listener, but has difficulty in decoding written text will never be able to get beyond a merit, and vice versa. Possibly they won't even be able to get a merit - as the description states that to achieved excellence the students need to demonstrate comprehension across all sources AND justify their responses. For Māori and Pasifika students who come from an oral culture this could be a significant blow to them feeling that they can succeed in a language course.”*

* 1. **AS 1.4**

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

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

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

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

**Question: 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?*

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

There were 25 responses to this question.

* Most responses were about the need for **more guidance and clarity** about the Standard’s assessment format and timing. This included queries about:
	+ What kind of stimulus material will be provided, and how many do students need to write about?
	+ Whether the 90 minutes is done all at once, or in parts.
	+ What happens if a student is sick or needs to resubmit the assessment?
	+ Whether resources are permitted for this Standard, as they are for AS 1.3.
	+ Whether different stimulus material can be used for parts 1 and 2 of the assessment.
	+ How flexible the topics can be, and how they will be linked to mātauranga Māori.

*“For 1.3 it states that students can use resources on demand in the digital exam. It would be good to clarify what resource on demand means. For the 1.4 CAA will there be any idea given about topics to be assessed? I've noticed throughout the mention of Family, school, work, leisure and holidays. Would this suggest that the CAA will be based on these topics and have links to Matauranga Maori? How will this be equitable for all students as local school design is different for everyone”*

* Several responses said that **more examples are needed** to help teachers understand the Standard’s requirements and design a course of learning.
* Some responses expressed concern about this Standard **causing** **inequity and impacting wellbeing**. One response said that this Standard will increase teacher workload and impact teachers’ wellbeing. Changing the Standard to be more like similar European languages Standards will help avoid these issues. Other responses said that holding this assessment in Term 3 will negatively impact students’ ability to achieve the Standard, and their wellbeing, as they will have a heavy workload at that time

*“I am worried that akonga will not have a clear idea of what to do, or what the examiners will be looking for. I can see akonga (especially weaker ones) being very stressed by this assessment, in comparison with the current writing portfolio which allows for learning during the assessment and for iterative drafts (this being more similar to how important documents are written in real life). This new writing assessment will replace it with one high-stakes, high-stress assessment opportunity, which will disadvantage weaker learners.”*

* While one response said that this Standard’s **focus on grammar** was a positive change, others said that the Standard should focus on assessing writing, not grammar.
* Other views (from one or two responses) were:
	+ The achievement criteria is **too difficult for Level 1 students**, if multi-clausal sentences are required for students to achieve Excellence.
	+ There was no acknowledgement in this Standard that extra time is needed for learning because it is a script-based language. This response said that **this Standard should include script-related questions**.
	+ this proposed Standard **will not allow for the deep learning and development opportunities** offered through the current portfolio format.
1. **Impressions of the Achievement Standards as a suite**

**Question: 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 E1:*** *Do the four Standards credential the most important knowledge and*

*skills as illustrated by the Learning Matrix?*

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

***Chart E2:*** *Do the four Standards support ākonga Māori to succeed as Māori?*

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

 ***Chart E3:*** *Are the four Standards appropriate to Level 6 of the Curriculum?*

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

There were 30 responses to this question. Many responses reiterated themes already summarised in earlier parts of this report, including:

* Requests for **more guidance and clarity** about the Standards’ requirements, and the types of language structures to be expected for each assessment.
* Requests for more exemplars of the proposed new Standards.
* Concern that the **credit distribution of the Standards is not well balanced**, in terms of how many credits can be awarded to the assessment of different language skills.
* Concern that the Standards are **more confusing and complex than the draft European languages.**
* Concern that some of the Japanese Standards assess too many language skills within the Standard.
* Concern about teacher and student workload issues due to a ‘pressure point’ of assessments in Term 3.

Several responses expanded on the need for resources and professional development to help them ground teaching and learning in mātauranga Māori. There were also comments that students would have difficulty engaging authentically with some of the suggested Māori concepts.

*“[W]e need a solid unit on Mātauranga Māori to give us an idea of what they are looking for and the final outcome needed. Teachers need training on what this is and how it looks in Japanese. A lot of teachers feel uneasy about this, especially having to combine Māori concepts when we barely get enough time to teach Japanese concepts too.”*

*“While I applaud the lovely way mātauranga Māori has been embedded into the new standards, the degree to which year 11 students can talk about these concepts in the target language has been overestimated and made too challenging. For example, all students should be able to introduce a Taonga. However, being able to talk about how to care for it (do's and don'ts) draws on a large number of communication functions outside the current scope of L1.”*

* Other views (from one or two responses) were:
	+ The Standards focus **too much on written language skills** and not enough on speaking skills.
	+ The suggested content for the new Japanese Standards will be **too difficult** for students who are newer to learning Japanese, and the topics suggested in the Assessment Activities are too difficult for Level 1 students.