

2 October 2024

Tēnā koe [REDACTED]

Official Information Act Request

Thank you for your request of 7 September 2024, under the Official Information Act 1982, for the following information:

1. *There are two sets of writing exemplars now on your website for the Literacy standard 32405 (Write texts to communicate ideas and information) from 2022 and 2023. These have samples of student work and marker commentary. **Please specify which of these pieces of student work were awarded a passing grade for standard 32405, and which (if any) did not Achieve. This is not currently stated on the exemplars.***

2. *On your website, you have provided assessment schedules for the 2022 and 2023 Writing tests (32405). **Please specify the criteria for a student to pass this assessment.***

Please clarify for the 2023 exams in US 32405 (event 1 and 2):

Was the exam US 32405 marked holistically? Or was each section marked separately?

Do students need to get 'sufficient evidence' in all sections across the exam to Achieve?

Do students need to pass a certain number of the three sections?

To pass Question One or Question Two (where students completed pieces of writing), does a student need to gain 'sufficient' evidence in all four categories from the assessment schedule (content, language choices, structure, and accuracy) - or can they have 'weak evidence' in one or more categories? For example, if a student had 'weak evidence' for accuracy, but 'sufficient' for content, language choices and structure, would their piece be at a passing standard as far as the marking panel was concerned?

For the accuracy criteria of the writing rubric, was there a number (or rough estimate) of errors markers were looking for?

Which errors (if any) were weighted more heavily?

Which errors (if any) were weighted more lightly?

Were there any types of errors ignored entirely?

3. *You have provided assessment schedules for the 2022 and 2023 Reading tests (32403). **Can you please specify for the 2023 US 32403 exams in Terms 2 (assessment event 1) and 4 (assessment event 2), what number of correct answers a student needed in each of these tests to pass?***

If answers were weighted differently, which answers were weighted more heavily in each of the two exams in 2023?

If students needed to gain a certain number of correct answers for each of the three outcomes (read to make sense of written texts / read written texts with critical awareness / read written texts for different purposes) what was this number? If different for each exam in 2023 (event 1 and event 2), please specify.

4. *I request any **marking instructions, guidelines and emails sent to markers** about how to mark the 2023 CAA exams for Reading (32403) and Writing (32405). I would also like to see any **meeting minutes** taken during marking meetings.*

Your request has been considered under the Official Information Act 1982. Our responses set out below correspond with the numbering in your request.

1. The exemplars provided on NZQA's website for US 32405 are for each of the writing tasks (tasks 1 and 2) and the comments are aligned to the standard and the rubric. They are designed to assist with teaching and learning by explaining how markers make a judgement about each of the four criteria using the rubric / schedule. There is no Achieved / Not Achieved (A/N) per task as the result is determined by a student's evidence across all three tasks.
2. In 2023, tasks 1, 2 and 3 of US 32405 were marked separately. The A/N result is determined by evidence across all three tasks.

Individual markers do not decide on A or N for any student. This is done by NZQA following the four-phase cut score process, outlined below, once marking is complete:

- Phase one: Consideration of the assessment instrument
- Phase two: Consideration of marking candidates' responses
- Phase three: Consideration of candidate performance
- Phase four: Evaluation of the assessment to decide upon a cut score. For the Writing CAA, the Angoff Method is used.

See Appendix 1: *Process for setting Literacy and Numeracy cut score* for a copy of the process. Scores for tasks one and two are determined using the published schedule

<https://www2.nzqa.govt.nz/assets/NCEA/LitNum/Assessment-resources/32405/LitW-32405-Assessment-Event-2-Assessment-Schedule-2023.pdf>. No evidence = 0, minimal evidence = 1, weak evidence = 2, sufficient evidence = 3, strong evidence = 4.

In 2023, task 3 was marked out of 10 for assessment event 1 (1 mark per correct answer); in assessment event 2, it was marked out of 4 (0.5 of a mark per correct answer).

Event 1:

- Developed through Angoff Method without component separation
 - Minimum of 23/32 for task 1 plus task 2; AND
 - An overall total of 30/42.

Event 2:

- Developed through Angoff Method with component separation
- Minimum scores across tasks 1 and 2:
 - Content 5/8
 - Structure 5/8
 - Language 5/8; AND
 - Minimum scores across tasks 1, 2 and 3:
 - Accuracy 7.5/12
 - Overall 25/36.

For the accuracy criteria of the writing rubric, there was no number (or rough estimate) of errors for markers to identify.

The marking rubric is used for all four criteria across tasks 1 and 2. Task 3 is auto-marked multi choice.

3. Cut scores are selected points on the score scale of a test. The points are used to determine whether a particular test score is sufficient.

The reading cut scores are determined by using the same four phase process outlined in Q2. above. These use either the Angoff or the Bookmarking method.

There was no minimum cut score for any outcome.

The cut scores for US 32403 were:

- 2023 Assessment Event 1: 24/35
- 2023 Assessment Event 2: 25/35

Answers were not weighted.

4. Attached is a copy of the following information covered by your request:

- Appendix 1: Process for setting Literacy and Numeracy cut score

32403 is auto marked so there are no marker instructions.

For 32405, before starting to mark, markers are led through a 'how to mark' panel meeting. There are no minutes taken at marking meetings.

NZQA's instructions to markers are to use the rubric / assessment schedule (which is published and is on the student report) to mark each piece of writing. Extensive check-marking is carried out in the first few days of marking then regularly and randomly until marking is complete. Markers can request additional check-marking if they have concerns about a particular response.

The role of marker is confidential and NZQA requires markers to securely destroy all materials once marking is complete.

Selected exemplars (with marker comments aligned to the rubric) are published on NZQA's website so they are available to all teachers and learners across the country.

Our response to your request may be published on our website after five working days. Your name and contact details will be removed before publication.

If you require further assistance or believe we have misinterpreted your request, please contact Elizabeth Templeton in the Office of the Chief Executive, email elizabeth.templeton@nzqa.govt.nz or telephone (04) 463 3339.

You have the right to seek an investigation or review by the Ombudsman of this decision under section 28(3) of the Official Information Act 1982. Details of how to make a complaint can be found at www.ombudsman.parliament.nz. You can also telephone 0800 802 502 or write to the Ombudsman at PO Box 10152, Wellington, 6143.

Nāku nā



Alex Bidois
Pouwhakahaere Hāpai /Acting Chief Executive

Process for setting Literacy and Numeracy cut-score

Phase one: Consideration of the assessment instrument

Phase two: Consideration of marking candidate responses

Phase three: Consideration of candidate performance

Phase four: Evaluation of the assessment to decide upon a cut score

Phase One: Consideration of the assessment instrument

Development Team	<i>Highlight any issues from development that could have impacted upon scores</i>
Experience and background of development team	
Changes in development team	
Issues with development due to authoring tool	
Changes/continuities in the instrument from previous years	
Rationale for any changes	
Number of objective and subjective items	
Format of the assessment	
Identification of the construct through a matrix that relates the curriculum and achievement objectives (written form) at the relevant level to question/items. Including intended assessment outcome for each item	
Number of question items	
Scoring format per item	
Weighting attached to items	
Rationale for weights	
Estimate of the difficulty of assessment relative to difficulty in previous years	

Phase Two: Consideration of marking candidate responses (Writing 32405 and Numeracy 32406 only as reading auto marked)

Marking Team	<i>Highlight any issues from marking that could have impacted upon scores</i>
Composition of team	
Previous experience of team	
Changes to team from previous years	
Changes to marking process	
Impact of the number of entries and responses on marking	
Marking duration	
Marker reliability and validity process	
Frequency of marker quality control sampling	
Ratio of accurate to inaccurate sampled responses (for panel and per marker)	
Monitoring process and data available during marking	
SOP for each marker for each question item desirable but may not be possible	
Issues noted regarding the fit of the candidate responses to expected response	
Changes to schedule and weighting during marking	
Estimate of the difficulty of the assessment relative to previous years	

Phase three: Consideration of candidate performance

NAF in consultation with SME	
Issues from authoring, sitting, or marking application that could have impacted results	
Entries, voids, and absences for assessment	
Question/item data, percentage of candidate subs that responded, percentage at score	
Candidate year level and e-asTTle data	
Angoff analysis data	

State the claim NZQA makes for the assessment, and highlight any issues from instrument development, marking, or candidate performance that the National Assessment Facilitator considers could have impacted upon scores.

Provide a recommended cut-score:

Attach any appendices.

Phase four: Evaluation of the assessment to decide on cut-score

Cut-score Team	
Changes in cohort	
Changes in characteristics of the submission	
Effects of instrument on scores	
Relationship of assessment instrument to the construct and the claim	
Distributions and variances of results in the current year and previous years	
Impact of the assessment and possible cut-scores on candidate outcomes	

Final cut-score confirmed	
Final cut scored changed (justified)	