



NZQA Assessment Support Material

Unit standard	27852				
Title	Evaluate systems of government and their formation				
Level	3	Credits	4	Version	2

Note

The following guidelines are supplied to enable assessors to carry out valid and consistent assessment using this internal assessment resource.

Assessors must manage authenticity for any assessment from a public source, because students may have access to the assessment schedule or student exemplar material. Use of this assessment resource without modification may mean that students' work is not authentic. The assessor will need to change figures, measurements or data sources or set a different context or topic.

While this ASM lends itself to written assessments, there are other activities and approaches that could be taken.

See Generic Resources and Guidelines at <https://www.nzqa.govt.nz/providers-partners/assessment-and-moderation/assessment-of-standards/generic-resources/>

Assessor guidelines

Context/setting

In this activity, students will produce a presentation that evaluates systems of government and their formation in relation to their key elements.

The systems of government for this task are NZ's unitary, unicameral system and Australia's federal, bicameral system and students are required to evaluate at least three key elements for each of these systems, with evidence, and describe their strengths and weaknesses.

A W A R D O F G R A D E S



- For award with **Achieved**, students must be able to evaluate New Zealand's system of government and its formation and one other country's in terms of at least three key elements with evidence, and describe their strength(s) and weakness(es).

AWARD OF GRADE S - CONTINUATION



- For award with **Merit**, the evaluation of the key elements of the systems of government and their formation is developed by discussing the strength(s) and weakness(es) of each of New Zealand's system and a system from another country.
- For award with **Excellence**, the evaluation of the key elements of systems of government and their formation is fully developed by considering actual and/or possible consequences, which may be for any one of, but not limited to - future law making, societal development, civic engagement, economic development, environmental development.

CONDITIONS OF ASSESSMENT

Assessors will set the conditions of assessment as appropriate.

Assessment activity

This assessment activity is a presentation and can be in the form of: a report as a political journalist; a PowerPoint presentation for a seminar; a wiki; or a blog, political style; or equivalent.

This assessment activity has three tasks.

Task One

The student evaluates, with evidence, NZ's system of government and its formation with Australia's federal system, in relation to at least three of: voting methods, parliamentary systems, constitutional arrangements and legislative process.

Task Two

The student describes and discusses at least one strength and one weakness for each of New Zealand's system and Australia's federal system.

Task Three

The student considers actual and/or possible consequences, which may be for any one of, but not limited to - future law making, societal development, civic engagement, economic development, environmental development.

Resource requirements

Assessors may find the following resources useful:

[https://www.parliament.nz/en/
www.elections.org.nz](https://www.parliament.nz/en/www.elections.org.nz)

<https://www.australia.gov.au/about-government>



There are a series of publications focused in New Zealand's general elections and electoral system, for example:

Jon Johansson and Stephen Levine (eds.) (2012), *Kicking the Tyres: The New Zealand General Election and Electoral Referendum of 2011* (Wellington: Victoria University Press).

Nigel S. Roberts and Stephen Levine (eds.) (2010), *Key to Victory: The New Zealand General Election of 2008* (Wellington: Victoria University Press).

Nigel S. Roberts and Stephen Levine (eds.) (2007), *The Baubles of Office: The New Zealand General Election of 2005* (Wellington: Victoria University Press).

Stephen Levine (1999) *Electoral and Constitutional Change in New Zealand: An MMP Source Book*, (Palmerston North: Dunmore).

Nigel S. Roberts, et al. (1996), *New Zealand Under MMP: A New Politics?* (Auckland: Auckland University Press).

Additional information

Teaching and learning guidelines that inform legal studies as it is taught in New Zealand can be found at <http://seniorsecondary.tki.org.nz/Social-sciences/Legal-studies>.

Assessment Schedule

Unit standard		27852			
Title	Evaluate systems of government and their formation				
Level	3	Credits	4	Version	2

Judgements for achievement	Judgements for achievement with merit	Judgements for achievement with excellence
<p>Systems of government and their formation are evaluated with evidence in relation to at least 3 of their key elements.</p> <p>Strength(s) and weakness(es) of the systems of government and their formation are described.</p> <p><i>Systems of government</i> may include but are not limited to – constitutional monarchy, theocracy, federal, dictatorship, absolute monarchy, Islamic republic.</p> <p><i>For this activity students evaluate New Zealand's system of government and its formation with Australia's federal system.</i></p>	<p>The evaluation of the key elements of the systems of government and their formation is developed by discussing the strength(s) and weakness(es) of each of New Zealand's system and a system from another country.</p>	<p>The evaluation of the key elements of systems of government and their formation is fully developed by considering actual and/or possible consequences, which may be for any one of, but not limited to – future law making, societal development, civic engagement, economic development, environmental development.</p>

Task	Evidence for achievement	Evidence for achievement with merit	Evidence for achievement with excellence
<p>One</p> <p>Outcome 1</p> <p>PC 1.1</p>	<p>A part answer could read:</p> <p><i>Unitary system</i> <i>The central government is supreme and may delegate some powers to local authorities.</i></p> <p><i>Federal system</i> <i>It has the powers assigned to it by the states who still have their own sovereignty on many matters.</i></p> <p><i>Parliamentary system of government:</i> <i>This is a model of government in which the executive is drawn from and is accountable to, a parliament.</i></p> <p><i>The NZ Parliament consists of the Queen of NZ and the House of Representatives. It is unicameral – there is no upper house, just one chamber of representatives – and it is directly elected by universal suffrage. The NZ Parliament is sovereign – no other institution can over-ride its decisions.</i> <i>The Australian Parliament is bicameral and consists of the Queen and two houses, the House of Representatives and the Senate.</i></p> <p><i>Separation of powers:</i> <i>Both in NZ and Australia there is clear separation of the legislature, the executive and the judiciary.</i></p>	<p>A part answer could read:</p> <p><i>New Zealand’s unicameral Parliament</i> <i>Strengths include: the principal advantage is more efficient lawmaking, as the legislative process is much simpler. It reduces costs, as even if the number of legislators is the same, there are fewer institutions to maintain and support.</i></p> <p><i>Unitary system more suited to a smaller country like NZ.</i> <i>Australia’s bicameral Parliament</i> <i>Strengths include: linked to a federal structure it is it is designed to ensure that smaller states are not overshadowed by larger states, which have more representation in the lower house.</i></p> <p><i>Both houses can introduce bills, but money bills can be started only in the lower house. All legislation has to pass through both houses and so all states are involved.</i></p> <p>Note – this sample answer only discusses strengths of both systems. Discussion of weaknesses would be required for merit.</p>	<p>A part answer could read:</p> <p><i>Whatever the costs involved, New Zealand’s laws need to be sensible and well considered, going through the full law making process, including select committees, unless there is genuine urgency.</i></p> <p><i>Majority group can dominate. Select committee process can involve some policy horse-trading, for example the milk price bill in 2012.</i></p> <p><i>In NZ, even with MMP and the need for coalition, the executive of the governing group in New Zealand may easily reach beyond their election mandates, e.g. charter schools in 2012.</i></p> <p><i>In NZ, laws are easier to pass but sometimes too easy, as in urgency. The dominance of the majority in NZ has changed with MMP, with more negotiation between parties in or outside the governing coalition.</i></p> <p><i>MMP has tended to bring a wider representation of women and ethnic groups into the House, compared to the days of FPP. The party lists have helped in this regard.</i></p> <p>Note – this sample answer only considers implications for New Zealand’s system. For excellence, implications for both systems are required.</p>

	<p><i>In both Parliaments a government must be able to maintain confidence and supply to be able to remain the dominant majority in the House.</i></p> <p>Note – this sample answer only evaluates the systems in terms of separation of powers. Further elements would be required for achieved.</p> <p><i>New Zealand's unicameral Parliament Strengths include: the principal advantage is more efficient lawmaking, as the legislative process is much simpler. It is therefore able to meet the community's need for legislative changes more quickly.</i></p> <p>Note – this sample answer only identifies one strength for new Zealand's system. For achieved a strength and weakness for each system is required.</p>		
--	---	--	--

Final grades will be decided using professional judgement based on a holistic examination of the evidence provided against the criteria in the unit standard.