

Lara Beiert

From: MaryJane Parker
Sent: Friday, 26 November 2021 2:51 PM
To: Nadja Weijs
Cc: Elana McNeill; Karen Chow; Melissa Mead
Subject: RE: [ACTIONS FROM MEETING] NZQA/MOE fortnightly meeting

Categories: Contractors Group meeting

Kia ora

Our response to the points raised by Elan and Karen:

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

We will pass the point regarding the 'justify' questions found in Numeracy being similar in Pāngarau to our assessment development team for consideration.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Karen your response re the Numeracy CAA writer is correct. [REDACTED]

No the number of attempts a student makes of an assessment is never recorded.

There is no 'pass mark'. Students need to show they have met the requirements of the standard across all of the evidence presented in the assessment activity. Some items assess evidence for one outcome while others for more than one outcome. A final judgement is made holistically across all of the evidence, which was the intent of the standard writers.

[REDACTED]

Please get back to me if there is anything that requires further clarification.

Ngā mihi

Mary Jane

From: Nadja Weijs <Nadja.Weijs@education.govt.nz>

Sent: Thursday, 25 November 2021 9:58 AM

To: Daniel Mapp <Daniel.Mapp@nzqa.govt.nz>; MaryJane Parker <MaryJane.Parker@nzqa.govt.nz>; Melissa Mead <Melissa.Mead@nzqa.govt.nz>; Phillipa Junger <Phillipa.Junger@nzqa.govt.nz>; Susan Henry <Susan.Henry@nzqa.govt.nz>; Kevin Hoar <Kevin.Hoar@nzqa.govt.nz>; Miriam Bookman <miriam.bookman@education.govt.nz>; Jo Haynes <jo.haynes@education.govt.nz>; Elana McNeill <elana.mcneill@education.govt.nz>; Janne Song <janne.song@education.govt.nz>; Crystalea Wilson Connell <crystalea.wilsonconnell@education.govt.nz>

Subject: RE: [ACTIONS FROM MEETING] NZQA/MOE fortnightly meeting

Nadja Weijs | Project Manager | TP Secondary Tertiary Pathways and Transitions
TP-Te Poutāhū

DDI [REDACTED]

Mon, Wed, Thu 9am-5pm; Tue till 2pm

From: Nadja Weijs <Nadja.Weijs@education.govt.nz>

Sent: Thursday, 25 November 2021 9:58 a.m.

To: Daniel Mapp <Daniel.Mapp@nzqa.govt.nz>; NZQA - Mary Jane Parker <maryjane.parker@nzqa.govt.nz>; Melissa.Mead <Melissa.Mead@nzqa.govt.nz>; Phillipa.Junger <Phillipa.Junger@nzqa.govt.nz>; Susan Henry <Susan.Henry@nzqa.govt.nz>; Kevin Hoar <Kevin.Hoar@nzqa.govt.nz>; Miriam Bookman <Miriam.Bookman@education.govt.nz>; Jo Haynes <Jo.Haynes@education.govt.nz>; Elana McNeill <Elana.McNeill@education.govt.nz>; Janne Song <Janne.Song@education.govt.nz>; Crystalea Wilson Connell <Crystalea.WilsonConnell@education.govt.nz>

Subject: [ACTIONS FROM MEETING] NZQA/MOE fortnightly meeting

Hi all

Below the actions from today's meeting. We didn't go through them at the end, so let me know if they need updating.

Cheers

[REDACTED]

- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- Have we considered having similar 'justify' questions in Pāngarau as what is found in Numeracy? For example, [REDACTED] The reasons would be twofold, (1) from a numeracy perspective, explaining how the process works with the situation is a good way to show numeracy competency, and (2) it could be a chance to use more te reo Māori in the assessments.
- [REDACTED]

• [REDACTED]

• **Plus notes from Karen Chow:** A few more questions/points of note arose in the kanohi ki te kanohi hui on Saturday (20 Nov):

• [REDACTED]

- Will the number of attempts required for a learner to gain the literacy or numeracy corequisite be noted on their Record of Learning/Record of Achievement?
- What constitutes as a passing grade? This was a question of great interest from teachers - I responded that learners must display understanding of all process ideas, and on balance show understanding of a range of content ideas. They seemed to be looking for a % pass mark, which doesn't align with the concept of standards-based assessment, but any further clarity on this would be appreciated.

• [REDACTED]

• [REDACTED]

Nadja Weijs | Project Manager | TP Secondary Tertiary Pathways and Transitions
TP-Te Poutāhū

DDI [REDACTED]

Mon, Wed, Thu 9am-5pm; Tue till 2pm

DISCLAIMER:

This email and any attachments may contain information that is confidential and subject to legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, dissemination, distribution or duplication of this email and attachments is prohibited. If you have received this email in error please notify the author immediately and erase all copies of the email and attachments. The Ministry of Education accepts no responsibility for changes made to this message or attachments after transmission from the Ministry.

Lara Beiert

From: Miriam Bookman <Miriam.Bookman@education.govt.nz>
Sent: Friday, 26 August 2022 9:04 AM
To: whare; MaryJane Parker
Cc: Melissa Mead; [REDACTED] Crystalea Wilson Connell; Nadja Weijs
Subject: RE: Email requests sent to NZQA Māori whānau

Categories: Contractors Group meeting

Thanks Whare

Melissa- would we be able to understand how these specific queries can/are being addressed?

Would also be great if you (NZQA) could meet with them as they have suggested.

Suggest that NZQA update on progress of this at the next fortnightly.

Thanks

Miriam

Miriam Bookman (she/her) | Senior Manager (Acting) Secondary Tertiary, Pathways and Transitions
Te Poutāhū (Curriculum Centre)

DDI [REDACTED] | Mobile [REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, 25 August 2022 9:17 pm
To: NZQA - Mary Jane Parker <maryjane.parker@nzqa.govt.nz>
Cc: melissa.mead <melissa.mead@nzqa.govt.nz>; Michael Clark <Michael.Clark@education.govt.nz>; [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] Crystalea Wilson Connell <Crystalea.WilsonConnell@education.govt.nz>; Nadja Weijs <Nadja.Weijs@education.govt.nz>; Miriam Bookman <Miriam.Bookman@education.govt.nz>
Subject: Email requests sent to NZQA Māori whānau

Kia ora rā kōrua, hope you are both well.

Please found attached an **English adaption of the email (Māori lang email below)** that [REDACTED] sent to NZQA earlier today on behalf of TKKM o Manurewa who are feeling very anxious about the upcoming CAA. Here are the questions they asked us to send to NZQA Māori team on their behalf:

1. [REDACTED] indicated that they are worried about some tech issues. When he did a NZQA device check, they discovered that the current Chrome books their ākonga utilise aren't suitable with the current pixel requirements needed to complete a digital assessment. This is a big concern.
2. They are suggesting 2 possible solutions. Firstly, they be given an opportunity to practise on a **live test version of the CAA**. Secondly, they have access (at the correct time) to a paper copy of the CAA in order for ākonga to better complete the exam. There is absolutely no way they can access new digital devices by mid-September.
3. According to kaimahi, their ākonga are worried about terms being used for pāngarau, and realise they may need to use the online pāngarau dictionary, but they know this will cause

issues with the CAA as it will slow down the browser. Partially due to this, ākonga would like a Reo Māori and reo Pākeha assessment, then they will better understand terms. This example has been set in NCEA TRM which is Māori, English, whilst NCEA Te Reo Pāngarau is Māori only

[Redacted]

Anei rā;

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

3. Mehemea e pai ana ā rātou chromebooks - kei te whakaaea tā rātou kuhu ki ngā 'sample assessments live' ērā i tuari ki ngā kura i tērā tau? Hei whakaharatau mataora nei.

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

Ngā mihi

DISCLAIMER:

This email and any attachments may contain information that is confidential and subject to legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, dissemination, distribution or duplication of this email and attachments is prohibited. If you have received this email in error please notify the author immediately and erase all copies of the email and attachments. The Ministry of Education accepts no responsibility for changes made to this message or attachments after transmission from the Ministry.

Lara Beiert

From: Miriam Bookman <Miriam.Bookman@education.govt.nz>
Sent: Friday, 21 October 2022 7:15 AM
To: Bill Dieckermann; Sue Chalmers
Subject: RE: Lit / Num Additional Questions - Sept Assessment Event

Kia ora kōrua

Yesterday evening I was commissioned with the below reactivities from Ellen. Can you please confirm you are comfortable with the responses? I need to get these to Ellen by 9am so will send through these if I do not hear back.

1. Do you expect September's assessment event results to be just as poor?

Because the June assessment results are the first set of results from a sizeable pilot cohort, it is difficult to say whether these numbers will remain stable. This is because many schools and kura were using the assessments for the first time and entering full cohorts, as opposed to when learners were deemed ready for the assessment. This means that we could see an improvement in the results as schools and kura become more familiar with the assessment and assessment ready practices. That said, the results also reflect similar patterns in other measures (for example NMSSA), meaning that they could reflect ongoing achievement rates.

We will continue to monitor the results of the September assessments as well as the results next year to build a picture of student achievement.

2. How is September's assessment event different to June / July's? i.e. Is it a different cohort of schools and kura and/ or learners? Is it the same assessment?

The September assessment had a mix of schools and kura, some of whom took part in the first assessment event, and some who did not. Some learners will have sat the assessment for a second time, and some will be sitting the assessment for the first time. An analysis of the cohort will be carried out and discussed in the evaluation.

The September Common Assessment Activity is a different set of questions to the June assessment event, however it assesses against the same set of outcomes that are reflected in the standards.

Miriam Bookman (she/her) | Senior Manager (Acting) Secondary Tertiary, Pathways and Transitions
Te Poutāhū (Curriculum Centre)

DDI [REDACTED] | Mobile [REDACTED]

From: Amanda Broatch <Amanda.Broatch@education.govt.nz>
Sent: Thursday, 20 October 2022 5:28 pm
To: Miriam Bookman <Miriam.Bookman@education.govt.nz>; Bill Dieckermann <Bill.Dieckermann@education.govt.nz>
Cc: Stephanie Melville <Stephanie.Melville@education.govt.nz>; Te Poutāhū ODS GCM <TePoutahu.ODS.GCM@education.govt.nz>
Subject: Lit / Num Additional Questions - Sept Assessment Event
Importance: High

Kia ora Miriam and Bill

Ellen has asked for a couple of more reactives please.

1. Do you expect September's assessment event results to be just as poor?
2. How is September's assessment event different to June / July's? i.e. Is it a different cohort of schools and kura and/ or learners? Is it the same assessment?

Can we have these answers for the morning please – by 9 am.

Thanks

Amanda

DISCLAIMER:

This email and any attachments may contain information that is confidential and subject to legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, dissemination, distribution or duplication of this email and attachments is prohibited. If you have received this email in error please notify the author immediately and erase all copies of the email and attachments. The Ministry of Education accepts no responsibility for changes made to this message or attachments after transmission from the Ministry.

Lara Beiert

From: MaryJane Parker
Sent: Thursday, 21 July 2022 3:52 PM
To: Miriam Bookman; Melissa Mead; Michael Clark
Subject: RE: NCEA newsletter input

Categories: Contractors Group meeting

Thanks Miriam. Good to hear good news! Similar to what we have been hearing from our School Relationship Manager.

Ngā mihi
Mary Jane

From: Miriam Bookman <Miriam.Bookman@education.govt.nz>
Sent: Thursday, 21 July 2022 3:47 PM
To: Melissa Mead <Melissa.Mead@nzqa.govt.nz>; Michael Clark <Michael.Clark@education.govt.nz>; MaryJane Parker <MaryJane.Parker@nzqa.govt.nz>
Subject: FW: NCEA newsletter input

FYI – I reached out to [REDACTED] for our Curriculum newsletter, but thought you might also want to see the positive feedback 😊

Miriam

Miriam Bookman (she/her) | Senior Manager (Acting) Secondary Tertiary, Pathways and Transitions
Te Poutāhū (Curriculum Centre)

DDI [REDACTED] | Mobile [REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, 21 July 2022 3:43 pm
To: Miriam Bookman <Miriam.Bookman@education.govt.nz>
Subject: RE: NCEA newsletter input

Hey Miriam

Here's a little bit from the team that ran the pilots here.

A couple of disclaimers:

- Our pilot for the first assessment window were small. Approx 30 students involved -For the first assessment window we only piloted the reading and writing, not the numeracy. In the September assessment window PHS will be doing all 3.
- We don't actually know how well the kids performed. I think results come through in mid-August.

Overall, the literacy (and numeracy, if you just wanted to include that as well) pilot was a positive experience for the students and teachers involved. The students, who are all digital natives, found the software platform very user friendly. As long as the students have their NZQA learner logins sorted prior to sitting the common assessment activities (CAA), the actual navigation through the CAA was straightforward for the students. The trickiest aspect is making sure all the students have their NZQA learner logins ready to go beforehand.

The administration of the CAA from an administrator or supervisor perspective is straightforward as long as some time has been spent navigating around assessment master, the software platform used to administer the CAA. If you have confident administrators and supervisors then minor issues can be sorted quickly and the students aren't adversely affected.

As a side note, depending on a school's infrastructure our team would recommend administering the CAA in large groups to try and cut down on the number of adults needing to learn about the software etc.

Nāku iti noa, nā



From: Miriam Bookman <Miriam.Bookman@education.govt.nz>
Sent: Tuesday, 19 July 2022 8:44 am
To: [Redacted]
Subject: RE: NCEA newsletter input

Kia ora [Redacted]

Thanks for this. Friday would be great!

Have a great week.

Miriam

Miriam Bookman (she/her) | Senior Manager (Acting) Secondary Tertiary, Pathways and Transitions
Te Poutāhū (Curriculum Centre)

DDI [Redacted] | Mobile [Redacted]

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Monday, 18 July 2022 5:36 pm
To: Miriam Bookman <Miriam.Bookman@education.govt.nz>
Subject: Re: NCEA newsletter input

You don't often get email from [Redacted] [Learn why this is important](#)

Hey
Yep. Could do. I am meeting with my SLT this Friday and will talk to [Redacted] DP that ran the pilots at our place. [Redacted] is in Fiji right now, so might leave him alone for a couple of days!

Regards
[Redacted]

On 18/07/2022, at 3:08 PM, Miriam Bookman <Miriam.Bookman@education.govt.nz> wrote:

Kia ora [REDACTED]

Hope that things are well for you and you are you are enjoying the school holiday.

Rob Mill has been in touch to say that he was pleased to hear some positive feedback from you on the literacy and numeracy pilot. I wondered if you wouldn't mind going on record in a Curriculum newsletter with some positive feedback about the pilot?

If so, I'd appreciate you sending a sentence or two through.

Ngā mihi

Miriam

Miriam Bookman (she/her) | Senior Manager (Acting) Secondary Tertiary, Pathways and Transitions
Te Poutāhū (Curriculum Centre)

DDI [REDACTED] | Mobile [REDACTED]
National Office Mātauranga House

education.govt.nz

He mea tārai e mātou te mātauranga kia rangatira ai, kia mana taurite ai ōna huanga
We shape an education system that delivers equitable and excellent outcomes



DISCLAIMER:

This email and any attachments may contain information that is confidential and subject to legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, dissemination, distribution or duplication of this email and attachments is prohibited. If you have received this email in error please notify the author immediately and erase all copies of the email and attachments. The Ministry of Education accepts no responsibility for changes made to this message or attachments after transmission from the Ministry.

DISCLAIMER:

This email and any attachments may contain information that is confidential and subject to legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, dissemination, distribution or duplication of this email and attachments is prohibited. If you have received this email in error please notify the author immediately and erase all copies of the email and attachments. The Ministry of Education accepts no responsibility for changes made to this message or attachments after transmission from the Ministry.

DISCLAIMER:

This email and any attachments may contain information that is confidential and subject to legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, dissemination, distribution or duplication of this email and attachments is prohibited. If you have received this email in error please notify the author immediately and erase all copies of the email and attachments. The Ministry of Education accepts no responsibility for changes made to this message or attachments after transmission from the Ministry.

From: [Kevin Hoar](#)
To: [Jonathan Teppett](#)
Subject: Fw: Pour vous
Date: Monday, 15 May 2023 4:15:35 PM

Kevin Hoar
National Assessment Facilitator
External Assessment
Assessment Division

NZQA

125 The Terrace
P O Box 160
Wellington

phone: [REDACTED]
mob: [REDACTED]
[kevin hoar@nzqa.govt.nz](mailto:kevin.hoar@nzqa.govt.nz)

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, 8 December 2022 20:40
To: Kevin Hoar <Kevin.Hoar@nzqa.govt.nz>
Subject: Re: Pour vous

Hi Kevin

[REDACTED]

I think this time the Literacy people have provided the detail I did in my extended report for Pilot CAA 1, 2022. I cannot access those reports to find out. Please get hold of them so I can make sense of what the MOE people are saying.

I forwarded a longer review report to you, Sue and MaryJane. What is happening with that report?
Has that been sent to the MOE?

[REDACTED]

Regards

[REDACTED]

On Thu, Dec 8, 2022 at 1:28 PM [REDACTED] wrote:
Hello Kevin

My responses to their responses:

Thanks again for your continued commitment to the Numeracy Standard. There is minimal point in maintaining the discussion about one item that has already been used. However, there are matters of principle that do need to address as we move forward. This response is to the comments in red.

1. We acknowledge that there is a set structure to the Markers Report, and that

teachers across a range of learning areas can use this to help understand the skills learners need to be foundationally numerate that the marking schedule does not necessarily provide. If it was possible to see the percentage of learners correctly responding to each item, that could help develop understanding around learner performance and areas of focus (such as the feedback provided with respect to the third outcome has given rise to teachers reflecting on how they can better support learners to explain their reasoning by interrogating the evidence they have been provided).

We do process the percentage correct for each item in our data mining process. That information is easy to provide. The percentage itself is not as useful as the origins of difficulties that students have with the item. That is why we provide detailed descriptions of what students are required to do. Percentage correct can be provided by item in future markers reports.

2. The feedback for Q3 that is held by this Ministry is the following, with the responses in blue from NZQA:



While greater clarity could have been provided from the Ministry in terms of Q3c, there was already concern that this was above the expected level.

We also now have evidence that learners found this question challenging. When this occurs, there are two aspects to consider:

1. Whether greater focus needs to be provided in teaching and learning programmes to support learners to understand the content and the contexts this content may occur in
2. Whether the assessment item is fit for purpose

The change recommended would have changed the outcome being assessed. We had considerable feedback from the 2021 pilot that teachers wanted to see probability included in the 2022 items.

The success rate for item 3c was about 53% which is close to the overall 57% success required to achieve the standard. The most common reason students did not achieve on Q3c was that they failed to specially address the percentages in their answer. In general most seemed to know of tree diagrams of outcomes and be able to interpret them. The item was fit for purpose so aspect 1 is required.

3. Given that there were concerns raised prior to the assessment being used (albeit, greater clarification was needed) and after the assessment event from a range of SMEs within the MoE along with poor performance from learners, it indicates that a review of levelling for this assessment item is needed.

In our response we clearly justified why the item was at an appropriate level. See the discussion below.

4. The standard is *aligned to NZC Mathematics and Statistics L4/5*, along with two other frameworks: LNAAT and PIAAC. The assessment should be defined by the standard - while the curriculum can provide us with greater clarification in aspects of content, it does not define the assessment, the standard defines the assessment.

This argument is very confusing. The standard clearly references probability and L4/5 of the NZC. We provided evidence from the Ministry's own documents about the appropriateness of the item. The current draft of the Curriculum has no obvious change to that positioning. The requirements of Step 5 of the LNAAT are actually more demanding than L4/5 of NZC. Alignment of NZC to LNAAT and PIACC is imprecise and reference to that alignment only indicates a calibration of levels, not an exact match.

5. Further, when we examine the use of probability trees (or tree diagrams), these are explicitly mentioned in the learning matrix for NCEA L1, which is above the expected level for foundational numeracy. Also noting that *acceptable answers allow students to comment on potential sampling variation*, the standard explicitly states that sampling falls outside the benchmark - while the response demonstrates higher level thinking which should be commended, it should not be an expected response from learners.

Again caution is needed. NCEA L1 is supposed to be pitched at L6 of the NZC though often it is not. Tree diagrams expected at NCEA L1 are probability trees involving fractions and decimals, not a systematic way to find all outcomes as is the case as far back as L3. Trees of probabilities and outcomes are different representations. Item 3c did not require students to multiply fractions, it was simply about outcomes. The marking schedule guides markers about how to grade responses that involve connecting sample and population. That kind of response is beyond what is expected but we need to allow for more sophisticated answers so students are not disadvantaged. Achieved on Q3c did not require students to reference sampling variation. That is a misinterpretation.

6. The alignment of the standard to LN

We recommend that the sentence referencing to tree diagrams explicitly is removed from the assessment report.

It might be prudent to mention in the report that the reference to percentages, rather than interpreting tree diagrams, was the main source of difficulty. Agreed.
Happy to change that.

Regards

[Redacted]

--

[Redacted]

Mob: [Redacted]

email: [Redacted]

[Redacted]

Mob: [REDACTED]

email: [REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Kevin Hoar](#); [MaryJane Parker](#)
Subject: Response to MOE
Date: Friday, 2 December 2022 8:21:16 AM

Hi Kevin and MaryJane

Below is what I would write in response to MOE feedback about the Markers Report. It is yours to do as you see fit.

Response:

Thank you for your response to the Markers Report and we appreciate your continued commitment to the Numeracy Standard. Here is our detailed reply to the points you raise.

1. The Markers Report is conventionally created in this format. Naturally it reflects the Marking Schedule but does go further in that it provides information about student performance in specific areas. A more detailed report is already available that includes other information. Moving forward it would be useful to know what information Ministry officials would like that they are not receiving. That request can be considered in relation to other issues, such as confidentiality of process and the political sensitivity of students' performance.

2. One item seems to have attracted attention, the probability question 3c. Our check of Ministry feedback on Question 3 found only this response to 3b.

Question 3	b. A distracting detail to some ākonga might be that we're not including the cost of the advanced driving course in the total, it would be good to include this cost to remove this distraction.
------------	--

Concern seems to be around the appropriateness of the question. Probability is in the Numeracy standard so our assumption is that the issue is about correct level. Below the level is addressed:

1. Unpacking Numeracy states:

This means that learners can:

- recognise and interpret everyday situations involving probability, chance, and simple risk
- use the language of probability to describe outcomes

The question (3c) meets these requirements. The probability of success on the driving test is an everyday situation that is extremely relevant to students in lower Secondary school. The second point should not be interpreted to mean that the language of probability, e.g. likely, certain, is the only way students are expected to represent their responses. That happens as early as Level One.

2. The level of the Numeracy standard is 'end of Level 4/beginning Level 5'. It is important that items are interpreted in this way. That is the setting for the standard. The achievement objectives for probability at Level 4 state:

- Investigate situations that involve elements of chance by comparing experimental distributions with expectations from models of the possible outcomes, acknowledging variation and independence.
- Use simple fractions and percentages to describe probabilities.

In test-based assessment the process of investigation is curtailed. Item 3c involves a model of outcomes (tree diagram) and acceptable answers allow students to comment on potential sampling variation. The percentages involved, e.g. $4/10 = 40\%$, are simple.

Elaboration of the meaning of the AOs for Level Four Statistics can be found at:

<https://nzmaths.co.nz/elaborations-level-four-statistics>

Expected performance statements match the requirement of item 3c. For example:
Level Four students are expected to use systematic methods such as listing, tree or network diagrams with equally likely outcomes, and tables to find all the possible outcomes of simple one or two stage situations such as tossing two coins, drawing counters from a bag, or rolling two dice.

3. At Level 5 students are expected to:

Compare and describe the variation between theoretical and experimental distributions in situations that involve elements of chance.

Calculate probabilities, using fractions, percentages, and ratios.

Item 3c does not require connection between theoretical models and experimental results so that item is not at Level 5. Elaborations for Level 5 can be found at <https://nzmaths.co.nz/elaborations-level-five-statistics>

The ideas at Level 5 are more complex than what is required in item 3c.

We hope this addresses the issues around Item 3c.

Regards

[Redacted signature block]

NZQA questions

Does NZQA believe the ministry acknowledges NZQA's leadership and expertise in developing the corequisite assessments?

Yes.

The ministry suggested in its brief a range of changes to the assessments such as fewer questions, the use of spellchecking software, etc. Which of these changes, if any, has the Qualification's Authority made?

The nature of a piloting process means that changes to assessments are to be expected.

For example, now we have had a full year of the trial, NZQA has been able to analyse our digital examination platform's data to better understand how long students took to complete the Literacy and Numeracy assessments. This will help us refine assessments so the majority of the 2023 student cohort will be able to complete them within 45-60 minutes, and there is no time limit – students should have as long as they need.

NZQA is also continuing to include Māori and Pacific voices throughout the assessment design and development process; and to build Universal Design for Learning principles into assessments. This is part of NZQA's focus on equity for Māori, Pacific and disabled ākonga, as well as the NCEA Change programme's goals of making NCEA more accessible and recognising the equal status of mātauranga Māori.

NZQA has involved Ministry subject matter experts in the early phases of the assessment design and development process, and has provided the Ministry with early drafts of the activities for feedback. NZQA has provided the Ministry with an overview of how subject matter experts in the Ministry can be involved in the phases of assessment design.

NZQA and the Ministry continue to refine the support available to schools/kura and tertiary providers participating in the pilots, to help them be confident in delivering assessments and preparing students for assessments, without narrowing learning or 'teaching to the test'.

NZQA and the Ministry are also partnering on a trial of support for schools who have not yet engaged in digital assessment, to help them develop a transition plan. While this transition occurs, NZQA will work with individual schools, kura and providers to implement an approach that best meets their needs and those of their students. ~~paper-based assessment will be an option for schools unable to participate in digital assessment of Literacy and Numeracy.~~

Is NZQA confident the assessments that will be trialled this year will be fair, accurate and fit for purpose?

Yes. All the external assessments NZQA develops undergo a rigorous process to ensure they are valid, fair, accurate and fit for purpose. The 2021 and 2022 corequisite assessments have been through a thorough review and evaluation process and areas identified for improvement have been acted on.

Commented [SC1]: I would prefer to say 60 minutes if we are referring to them collectively, and I have added further clarification. There is only one numeracy assessment and it will take longer to complete than the two literacy assessments. Te Reo Matatini is split into two assessments and Pāngarau is one, longer assessment. However, this is FYI and is too much detail for the response.

Commented [GM2]: NB: this is likely to lead to a request for more information or a copy of this overview.

Formatted: Strikethrough

However, there is always room for improvement, and NZQA values both the piloting process and the feedback we receive. This helps us continue to refine assessments and to support the goals of the NCEA Change programme.

MoE questions

Has the Qualification's Authority resolved the concerns raised by the ministry in its 31 October brief?

Yes.

Is the ministry confident the literacy and numeracy assessments that will be trialled this year will be fair, accurate and fit for purpose?

Yes. All the external assessments NZQA develops undergo a rigorous process to ensure they are valid, fair, accurate and fit for purpose.

However, there is always room for improvement, and NZQA values both the piloting process and the feedback they receive.

Does the ministry have confidence in NZQA's work developing and trialling the corequisite assessments?

Yes.

The nature of a piloting process means that regular refinements are to be expected, and NZQA and the Ministry continue to work closely together, valuing both the piloting process and the feedback received.

Lara Beiert

From: Miriam Bookman <Miriam.Bookman@education.govt.nz>
Sent: Wednesday, 29 June 2022 11:16 AM
To: MaryJane Parker; Melissa Mead; Susan Henry
Cc: Michael Clark; Nadja Weijs
Subject: Some positive feedback

Categories: Contractors Group meeting

This morning we received this feedback from [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] St Andrew's College. This is awesome praise from a key stakeholder 😊
We have completed the Literacy standards at St Andrew's this week. I was supervising so able to see the tests.

I thought the tests worked well, although suspect that my Year 10 class will learn that their shift key and the full stop is a requirement for the writing standard. I keep telling them! Now they might believe me! There was excellent guidance built into the writing questions, for those who read carefully.

My class enjoyed the reading assessment. There was great coverage of 'foundational literacy' over the 8 questions.

Miriam Bookman (she/her) | Senior Manager (Acting) Secondary Tertiary, Pathways and Transitions
Te Poutāhū (Curriculum Centre)

DDI [REDACTED] | Mobile [REDACTED]
National Office Mātauranga House

education.govt.nz

He mea tārai e mātou te mātauranga kia rangatira ai, kia mana taurite ai ōna huanga
We shape an education system that delivers equitable and excellent outcomes



DISCLAIMER:

This email and any attachments may contain information that is confidential and subject to legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, dissemination, distribution or duplication of this email and attachments is prohibited. If you have received this email in error please notify the author immediately and erase all copies of the email and attachments. The Ministry of Education accepts no responsibility for changes made to this message or attachments after transmission from the Ministry.