



3 – Commerce NCEA Level 1 Phase 1 Survey – Raw Feedback

122 answers to "Impressions - Commerce - What is your overall impression of the Learning Matrix?"

↓ Option	Total	Percent
On the right track	9	0.79%
Needs amendments	113	9.89%
Not Answered	1020	89.32%

122 answers to "Impressions - Commerce - What is your overall impression of the Teaching, Learning, and Assessment Guide?"

↑ Option	Total	Percent
On the right track	12	1.05%
Needs amendments	110	9.63%
Not Answered	1020	89.32%

122 answers to "Impressions - Commerce - What is your overall impression of the example Course Outlines?"

↓ Option	Total	Percent
On the right track	10	0.88%
Needs amendments	112	9.81%
Not Answered	1020	89.32%

155 answers to "Comments - Commerce"

Response ID	Answer
ANON-K9GG-12XH-N	Quite frankly i think this new subject is rubbish, why would a student want to do it? this "commerce" subject is not a good foundation for further study in the commerce area. I was opposed to merging the three commerce subjects before and i am even more opposed to it now . It is wishy washy and does not prepare

Response ID	Answer
ANON-K9GG-12QU-U	<p>students for employment in the financial sector. If your goal is to raise a generation of financial illiterates and people who are happy to be dependant on the government for everything , then well done. In the future when you wonder why we have a shortage of accounting/finance workers and lack of economic understanding you can trace it back to this change, future governments will love this as no one will have the economic understanding to question their policies or direction.</p> <p>Needs minor adjustment? why is this the only option, the whole concept of merging three subjects into one is flawed, you are wasting lots of teachers subject expertise and dumbing the whole thing down. I don't need a degree to teach this, it is not interesting or challenging for academically capable students</p> <p>I believe this subject is more social studies orientated rather than teaching students skills related to business. There seems to be very little "commerce" content and more content on social justice and social inequality. It is disappointing to see how little accounting is acknowledged despite the lack of financial literacy skills we see in society.</p>
ANON-K9GG-122F-D	<p>Its all really poor as you have the content completely wrong</p>
ANON-K9GG-12SA-9	<p>The information provided is adequate, however I have an issue with the content. Having taught Business Studies, Economics and Accounting, the content envisaged here is very "light weight"</p>
ANON-K9GG-12SW-Y	<p>Does not incorporate commerce subjects but social sciences</p>
ANON-K9GG-12SU-W	<p>What if I think it needs MAJOR amendments - why is this not an option? Too much touchy-feely and nowhere near enough useful content. If this is followed through to Level 3, you will end up with students who know very little actual accounting, not much actual economics and a bit about running a business. Students will not have enough knowledge to make informed decisions about commerce careers & will get a HUGE shock if they choose to do Commerce at university. While I accept that businesses function within a societal context, we have now too much societal context and not enough actual decision-making tools like Supply & Demand, Accounting processes and Accounting analysis. Needs a lot more work.</p>
ANON-K9GG-12SR-I	<p>The content is unclear, the actual theories and knowledge seems like it will be lost and the value of the commerce subjects is completely diluted. I could not be more disappointed.</p>
ANON-K9GG-12M8-I	<p>The criteria 'on the right track' and 'needs minor amendments' do not allow me to feedback my opinion. There is not enough detail for each standard to be clear about the criteria that is being used for each standard and therefore the concepts, skills and content that fit under each criteria and standard. Also without knowing what these standards lead to it is difficult to identify what might be essential learning (i.e. building towards future learning) and what is flexible. There seems to be so much within each standard that you could assess any number of things - this works well in an individual context and particularly for</p>

Response ID	Answer
ANON-K9GG-12ZN-W	<p>internals but is more problematic for externals. I would also like to know what support will be in place to upskill teachers who in the past have taught solely Economics, Accounting or Business Studies but know are required to have a knowledge of all three areas?</p> <p>MAJOR ADJUSTMENTS ARE NEEDED</p> <p>This is supposed to be a Commerce course, it looks like a hybrid Social Studies/Tikanga Course with a very vague acknowledgement that the context could be slightly economic by nature.</p> <p>Who in the Ministry has decided this course would be in any way, shape or form useful or even a pathway into the individual subjects at Levels 2 and 3?</p>
ANON-K9GG-12WH-M	<p>This is absolutely pathetic and such a shame! Where is the crux of Accounting? These topics that have been proposed is what most schools cover in Year 9 and 10. Level 2 and 3 will be significantly effected by these changes as we will have to go 'back to basics' with them as they will not have a good enough foundation to build on. As an Accounting teacher, I will not continue teaching if this curriculum is confirmed. There is a very distinct difference between students who chose to take Accounting and those that take Business Studies. Our subjects in level 2 and 3 will suffer as a result.</p>
ANON-K9GG-12WD-G	<p>NEEDS MAJOR AMENDMENTS!</p> <p>The subject is COMMERCE not social studies. i.e Accounting, Economics and Business Studies! Social studies still has its own course.</p> <p>Where are the fun elements to this course? How are we attracting students to commerce? Accounting and Economics are already dying subjects because students find the content 'boring', don't drag business studies down the same track!!!</p> <p>Where in these new standards are we teaching the content for business studies in L2 AND L3?? There should be at least one standard that allows us to teach the basic concepts of business that they can use in L2 and L3/YES, especially the Business activity types.</p>
ANON-K9GG-12WR-X	<p>It is disappointing that it appears the practical elements of Business Studies have not been included in the Commerce Standards. Creating a business and running one is often the high point for learners and the place where authentic and real learning takes place. It is also where they can apply the skills and knowledge that they have gained throughout the course.</p> <p>I am concerned on how this learning will impact on the teaching and learning of Level 2 and 3 standards in Accounting as learners will not have gained the background knowledge and skills that they have previously gained at Level 1 to help support their learning at Levels 2 and 3. We have found that learners who have not completed the background learning have struggled with the context and content at Level 2 and 3.</p>
ANON-K9GG-12VM-R	<p>The Commerce course outline is atrocious! It appears to combine Social Science with Economics and very little Business Studies. How is this content preparing students for Years 12 and 13 or are you going to make this the same awful content. You are killing the Year 11 Business Studies subject.</p>
ANON-K9GG-12V5-Z	<p>Re: Commerce 1.3 and 1.4</p> <p>Why "Pacific"? and if so what is the definition of "Pacific". I don't see a need for this word in the Standard title.</p>

Response ID	Answer
ANON-K9GG-12JQ-G	<p>Seems like a lot of focus on Social Science with a bit if eco and very limited accounting. There is no clarity on whether business concepts will be possible in this design? Bit disappointing if it's not facilitating Business as Yr12 and Yr13 redesign prospects then seem worrying. As a teacher who's developed the programme over the years at our school I've validated what we do with AUT and AU lectures with positive feedback. Now that it seems like I finally have the programme sorted there's these changes with possibly a non-existent option for Business. :(Just worried and concerned - generally I am quite open to changes and making improvements for the better learning of our students. This one however is worrying! Students voice taken every year reflect that majority of the students absolutely love the authentic experience of creating student-run businesses and the soft skills developed during these experiences are invaluable! Will there still be options to continue offering such experiences?</p>
ANON-K9GG-12JU-M	<p>Where do you start? The two options in the survey aren't even close to what is needed!!!! This has completely eroded these three Commerce subjects. How are students going to go on studying the separate subjects at level 2 and 3 after this. It is a watered down social studies course. We have been let down by the subject 'leaders' on the advisory panel. A rethink is on the cards or there will be no Commerce being taught in schools in the coming years!!!!!!!!!!!!!!</p> <p>Needs major amendments.</p>
ANON-K9GG-12BM-4	<p>The course appears to be a thinly veiled attempt at social engineering to get everyone who takes the course to think the 'correct' way. All of the emphasis on different putake etc in commerce is turning this into little more than another version of social studies. If I am going to be forced to teach this I am going to find a new job.</p>
ANON-K9GG-12BK-2	<p>The NCEA Level 1 Commerce course is more Social Sciences and Economics. There is no Accounting or even Business Studies in it. Not even a Marketing or Business Activity aspect which is the fun bit of the Commerce courses!</p>
ANON-K9GG-12BV-D	<p>What sort of survey is this? It is a bit ridiculous that there are not more possible responses. I don't agree with any of the changes. They are all horrible. The content is basically waffly crap. There is no lead into L2 Standards at all. The focus seems to have shifted away from Economics, Accounting and even Business to a certain extent. This screams Social Sciences and not Commerce. It seems like you are trying to kill Commerce - the lifeblood of the NZ Economy. Why???</p>
ANON-K9GG-12W8-4	<p>The content is a major issue. It does not do commerce justice. It is moving away from the basics of Econ, Accounting and Business and lean a lot towards general education for social studies.</p> <p>Through the Official Information Act, a copy of the public submissions showed the submissions were overwhelmingly against the merger. Why are feedback not listened to? Why only giving the option now to tick minor amendments???</p> <p>Did you ever look at the number of students taking the three commerce subjects. A clear indication of how valued it has been.</p>

Response ID	Answer
ANON-K9GG-12BB-S	<p>I am liking how the teaching and learning is being applied to authentic contexts and is helping students to make meaning of the world they live in. I am also liking how the learning requires pedagogy and assessment practices to be used which focus on students developing the key competencies.</p>
ANON-K9GG-12BN-5	<p>"Commerce is the use and exploration of accounting, economic, and business concepts and models to make sense of society, and solve problems." Really! Is that all we do, "solve problems?" All sounds very "neutral", without environmental, social, cultural, economic or political consequences. How does it affect where we live, who we live with, our relationships with other persons and families and kin and clans? How does it affect our dwellings, what we eat and drink, what we do during the day, from week to week and year to year, our schooling, careers, lifestyles? What's it got to do with climate change, sea level rise, sexism, racism, religion/spirituality, material culture, government, charities, community organisations, businesses, NZ history?</p>
ANON-K9GG-12TK-M	<p>The Commerce course replaces three courses with 18 AS replaced with 4AS . As such the content of the course is now weak and lacking in real academic learning. The New Zealand Curriculum places much emphasis on Entrepreneurship and Enterprise and yet the new course does not reflect this thinking - indeed much focus seems to be on financial literacy. Is it a case of dumbing down to ensure more can pass?? The teachign and learning guidelines lack clarity in terms of what exactly has to be taught - given some teacher may not have previously taught the other subjects now combined it would seem to be a serious omission not to have more detail. I found the explanations to be confusing to say the least and left me wondering what exactly was the course aiming to achieve.</p>
ANON-K9GG-12P3-R	<p>It is similar to a Development/Humanities course offered in university and tertiary institutions. It will need to be rich in context to sustain it.</p>
ANON-K9GG-12P1-P	<p>The more actual teaching ideas the better. I am still struggling to understand the external requirements re topics to teach to it</p>
ANON-K9GG-12PP-N	<p>The wishy washy design of the standards does not sit within Commerce. This course needs to be split back into Accounting, Economics and Business Studies rather than a diversion from Social Studies.</p>
ANON-K9GG-12PR-Q	<p>This will make it very difficult for students to progress into L2 subjects for Accounting, Business studies and Economics. They will find the content very challenging. Expecting specialist teachers to teach this combined "Commerce" subject will also have challenges as teachers will have to up skill and this will take time and will disadvantage students. It will negatively impact on student numbers as students choose what they are interested in and lumping it all together will put students off taking Commerce.</p>
ANON-K9GG-12P5-I	<p>Hugely disappointing content. It is uninspiring, theoretical and not at all what students want or desire from a course. It reads from the 1950's. Students will not develop 21c skills from this and it's far too prescriptive. The worse decision ever to roll 3 very different subjects into 1. It looks like a social studies course with some flavours of financial literacy and low level</p>

Response ID	Answer
<p>ANON-K9GG-12P6-U</p>	<p>economics. Looks boring and I have no desire to teach this. Equally I think students will be unchallenged and bored with the content. Really disheartening that this is what has been put together.</p> <p>At the end of the current proposed course, Akonga will have little understanding of national and international commerce. The proposed course is rich in social studies type content, but is very weak in the jargon and nuances of the economic world, the consumer, producer and macro economic environments. There appears to be a significant lack of commercial terminology and language that matches the discipline of Commerce as a subject and the concepts being taught seem to miss the essence of the subject 'commerce'. (indeed, the glossary is grossly incomplete and it seems that not much work / effort has been done in this regard, so too the learning matrix). I am genuinely concerned that this course would not be meaningful and engaging to many students in its current form and that it does not adequately educate students in the world of commerce.</p> <p>There is a chance that the 'better' schools would completely drop L1 and offer a more academically rigorous commerce course, creating an inequality between schools if a the existing proposed course remains. This would be very sad, as the changes to NCEA provide us with a tremendous opportunity to close the current gap between many schools.</p> <p>I propose 3 different "BIG IDEAS" and 4 different standards to give a better education in the academic field of Commerce:</p> <p>Big Idea 1: CONSUMERS: The concepts of scarcity, choice and opportunity cost challenge consumers to make wise personal financial decisions. Consumers make decisions based on their personal beliefs and values (wairuatanga, whakapapa) Consumers should be informed of their rights and choices and should know consumer law and sound budgeting and personal financial management skills to enable students to make wise decisions for their economic future. Budgeting skills and cash flow management skills are important in financial decision making. Consumers are the demand component of economic study.</p> <p>Big Idea 2: PRODUCERS: Innovation and Enterprise is motivated by profit. While profit is important, businesses of different structures exist with different Putake / purposes / goals. Producers choose business structures to support their Putake and to help them earn a profit and trade (hoko). The concepts of efficiency, productivity and supply all work towards helping a firm make profit. Profit is calculated through accounting rules and procedures. Producers are the supply component of economic study.</p> <p>Big Idea 3: GOVERNMENT: Economies all answer the questions what to produce, how to produce it and for whom to produce it. There are different types of economies in the world (planned, market, mixed) that answer these questions differently. New Zealand is a mixed economy. The government is interdependent on producers and consumers to make New Zealand a fair and equitable place to live while encouraging innovation and enterprise. The circular flow of the economy model shows interdependence both domestically and</p>

Response ID	Answer
<p>ANON-K9GG-124H-H</p>	<p>internationally. Sometimes goals clash such as economic growth (GDP) and environmental issues (Kaitiakitanga) and Net Social Welfare (equity / hauora). When government, producers and consumers come together we can create models to predict the impact of different decisions on the economy (demand and supply graphing / PPC)</p> <p>Having re-thought these Big Ideas I also suggest 4 different standards:</p> <p>5 CREDIT INTERNAL: Consumers - Consumer decision making, values (wairuatanga, whakapapa, whanaungatanga), personal financial literacy, demand and consumer law (consumer guarantees Act, Fair Trading Act)</p> <p>5 CREDIT INTERNAL: Producers and Accounting - Innovation, enterprise, goals of a firm (including putake / quadruple bottom line, rautaki), business structure (including social enterprise, charities, co-operatives and iwi business models along with traditional business structures, turanga), business accounting (cash flow, income statement, statement of financial position), concepts of supply (graphs) and efficiency and productivity (percentage calculations)</p> <p>4 CREDIT EXTERNAL: Macro Economics and the role of government - types of economies, interdependence, circular flow of the economy (model), equity vs equality (matatika), Growth vs environmental concerns (kaitiakitanga) and net social welfare (hauora). Maybe include the PPC model in it's basic form?</p> <p>6 CREDIT EXTERNAL: The market - bringing together demand and supply and government and learning to predict the impact of consumer, producer and government decision making on the micro economic environment (market demand and supply graphs) (or could make this the four credit external and swap with the role of government for the 6 credit??)</p> <p>1. The move to Commerce as a single subject has no mandate - I have yet to come across anyone teaching in this arena who advocates for this change and yet no serious justification has been provided for this change.</p> <p>2. The learning matrix is vague and will do nothing to motivate students to take this subject, remembering that Economics and Accounting are both in the top 10 subjects for participation. How about some direct, clear, engaging and motivating language and standards instead of what is there now. In particular 1.2 looks like exactly the sort of standard that few people choose to do now and which will be uninspiring for future students and teachers.</p> <p>3. The clear move to a social science approach to what have until now been primarily business focussed subjects appears to reject everything in the Business Studies and Accounting arena that we are currently doing. It is unclear what justification there can be for this given the relative popularity of the subjects as they are right now.</p> <p>4. This social science approach will do little to prepare students for the more robust requirements of Level 2. It seems unlikely that competent teachers would be able to build a complete course that will lead to Level 2 out of this. Instead they will have to build their own programme to properly prepare students that diverges from this learning which will undermine the intent of these standards as they will be seen as irrelevant.</p> <p>4. Much of this material is pretty basic and covered by many schools in Year 10</p>

Response ID	Answer
<p>ANON-K9GG-1245-X</p>	<p>under financial literacy and enterprise so is not providing a clear advancement from Year 10 to Level 2</p> <p>The content is vague and looks more like a Social Studies programme than our existing Commerce subjects. It is difficult to see how it would adequately prepare students for level two in any of the individual Commerce subjects. A lot of work will be required by teachers and those developing resources to prepare to teach this subject. I am aware of many teachers who are dismayed by what is being presented, a number of whom are considering leaving the teaching of the subject and potentially the profession.</p> <p>The proposed Commerce standards will not engage students in the field of Commerce and will provide students with little knowledge of the world of Commerce. It feels like the proposed standards are diluting Commerce down to Financial Social Studies which doesn't benefit students or staff in the subject.</p> <p>Standards need to align with a larger subject e.g. Economics/Accounting/Business Studies so students can make clear choices when selecting L2 and L3 subjects. It feels like the essence of Commerce has also been removed from the new standards. The content we're teaching now is important and should be retained, maybe reformatted and merged but not diluting it to the proposed level.</p> <p>My fear is that some schools will ditch the new L1 standards and teach their own brand of Commerce (which will be incredibly engaging for students) and then have kids select L2 and L3 courses in the future. I strongly feel that students who complete the bespoke, non-L1 course will be in a significantly greater position for L2 and L3 subjects. I also strongly feel that students who complete the proposed L1 courses will struggle and disengage with L2 and L3 courses as they stand.'</p>
<p>ANON-K9GG-12C3-B</p>	<p>These proposed standards need to be strongly reviewed. My suggestion: 4 standard, 2 external, 2 internal but link them to pre-existing content so teachers aren't having to reinvent the wheel.</p> <p>#1 - Financial Information (Accounting/ Business based) - EXTERNAL -Should cover Financial Statement preparation and some basic Accounting knowledge, then link with small businesses.</p> <p>#2 - Economics & Markets (Economics based) - EXTERNAL -Should cover elements of Supply/Demand and Market Equilibrium and possibly information around Circular Flow and Sectors. Can then link in how taxes, subsidy's, govt intervention etc affect the market. Leads well into L2 Economics. Would be a Micro and Macro mix.</p> <p>#3 - Marketing & Business. (Business based) - INTERNAL -Marketing mix, internal controls, could incorporate stuff from Eco 1.2</p> <p>#4 - Consumers & Financial Decisions (Eco, Bus, Acc, Financial Literacy based) - INTERNAL -Consumer law, financial information, consumer choice, demand.</p>

Response ID	Answer
ANON-K9GG-126V-1	<p>Please reconsider these standards, they are not (in the proposed form) engaging for students, they will cause staff great stress in reinventing resources and the desired outcomes will not be achieved. Commerce is not Social Studies, please don't try make it so.</p> <p>The content needs rigor behind it if it is to reflect subjects like Accounting and Economics. The big ideas reflect a very weak watered down Social Studies curriculum and does not really provide any major scaffolding links to teaching Accounting and Economics at Year 12.</p> <p>In my view the term Commerce does not evoke excitement and future thinking. I worry about those highly competent Accounting and Economics teachers who now might have to teach this subject. What a waste of their knowledge and expertise.</p> <p>I suggest you start from scratch. This is a backward step. I use to be proud of the intellectual content, and useful skills that were taught in Economics and Accounting at level 1, and how students could apply the learning to everyday life.</p> <p>Surely we can do better than this</p>
ANON-K9GG-12RT-U	<p>Needs complete review. Not appropriate content.</p> <p>Firstly, can I please point out that there is a gaping chasm in this feedback form - I only have 2 possible options for response: "on the right track" or "needs minor amendments". We are given no opportunity to voice our concerns if we believe the subject content "needs major amendments" or "needs a complete rewrite". This makes a mockery of the whole consultation/feedback/feedforward process.</p>
ANON-K9GG-12HA-X	<p>Secondly, I do not believe the Commerce content at Level 1 is even close to what students/schools need. It has removed subject specific knowledge and replaced it with a quasi Social Studies perspective. Accounting, Business Studies, and Economics are 3 separate, distinct, rigorous areas of academic knowledge that are hugely popular with students (as indicated by national statistics) - and they are being removed from the curriculum. The draft standards that replace them are not Commerce-specific and should not be labelled as such. Yes, Social Studies involves Commerce - but Commerce is not Social Studies. The mistake that has been made here is that the approach has been made too generalist, to the point where students will be seriously disadvantaged. It forces them to pick up Accounting, Business Studies, and/or Economics at Level 2 with no prior knowledge - and that is HARD. As a result, I see only 3 possible outcomes: 1 - students will choose not to take Commerce subjects at high school, will therefore take Commerce at tertiary level with zero prior knowledge and will be far more likely to fail; 2 - students will pick up Commerce at Level 2, thinking it will be more of what they learned in Level 1 - and will get quite a shock because it will be nothing like what they've ever encountered before; 3 - Commerce subjects will have to be dumbed down at Level 2 and Level 3 in order to give students a chance for success. This will again impact on their chances of success at tertiary level.</p>

Response ID	Answer
ANON-K9GG-12EY-K	<p>As a Commerce teacher I am horrified that a national move is being made to disestablish such a popular and industry-relevant body of knowledge. As a parent of teens I am hugely disappointed that my children's subject options are being narrowed and dumbed down in this way.</p> <p>Another example of a narrow focus - these kids are global students and as such should be taught with those principles in mind. Pretty disappointed that my kids will not receive an education that gives them an even playfield in our global economy. I would suspect you'll see an increase in people choosing IB and Cambridge for their children.</p>
ANON-K9GG-12EC-W	<p>This proposed course does not represent any of the three subjects it replaces and should not be called "Commerce". It fails to meet NZQA's own aims. It does not provide the foundation of language or concepts required to allow students to succeed at Level 2 and 3 Accounting or Economics. Nor does it make a clearer pathway to work in the business sector or as a small business owner. Rather it will make such a pathway more difficult to achieve.</p> <p>I have seen an alternative course put forward by an Economics teacher which would meet your stated aims. I urge you to consult further with Commerce teachers (perhaps through CETA) and parents. I am confident that working together a course can be designed to better meet the needs of students who want to pursue a career in commerce/business. I have not completed the two questions above because there is no option to state opposition and I fear "needs amendments" will be interpreted by you as only needing small changes.</p>
ANON-K9GG-12A3-9	<p>Since when does wellbeing be such a big part of Commerce. Teachers will be very uncomfortable teaching this when some areas like Health and Home Economics have been teaching it since the NZC was bought out. Leave most of this to the so called experts and concentrate on the business side of the subject. You are encroaching into other subject areas.</p>
ANON-K9GG-12AV-C	<p>The course outlines seem to be social science based and at Level 4-5 in that curriculum area. There are only general illusions to Economics regarding Opportunity Cost with no Accounting or Business Studies concept at NCEA Level 1 addressed. Accounting is NOT a dying profession - qualified accountants are well sought after. By removing the basics of Accounting - which are not covered in an Accounting degree we are removing the underlying understanding of accounting processes. This leads to ever increasing industries based on fixing problems caused by the lack of knowledge of those who have only learnt processing through a computer software. Business Studies is a new and relevant subject which has now been thrown out.</p> <p>Budgeting is not a high level business or accounting process. It is also covered in the Financial Capabilities curriculum very well = in a much more relevant way than suggested in the course outlines.</p> <p>Experienced Commerce teachers are now being dictated what to do and there is no longer a choice. I have run a Level 1 Commerce Course for 8 years. I have combined Accounting, Business Studies and Financial Capability standards to match student needs individually and as a group - this autonomy is being stripped away under this new NCEA. It is so disappointing that teachers are so under appreciated for their level of skills and expertise.</p>

Response ID	Answer
ANON-K9GG-12K6-P	<p>Very repetitive with other areas eg. Social studies. Seems very social studies, throwing the word economics in every now and then. Watering down of Commerce learning area. Large gap between this and what the level 2 expectations are – not a preparation for higher level learning Students who leave after level 1 won't receive required skills and acumen from this course to succeed. Doesn't feel like we are accommodating different types of learners. Concern that there is no business “carry out” – it is definitely an application of understanding rather than just text learning. Considered to be “dumbing down” of the specialist knowledge and understanding. Shame to lose the flexibility of tailoring a course to the needs of our learners.</p>
ANON-K9GG-12UN-R	<p>I am extremely disappointed that so little accounting has been included. In this case it will be good to retain accounting at a separate subject. What concerns me greatly is we have no idea what the courses might look like for NCEA Level 2 or 3 accounting. Usually when courses are being remodelled, you would start with the essential knowledge and skills for L3 and then work backwards. It seems that the feedback given in the first round last year has been completely ignored. I am beginning to think it is time to give up teaching altogether (only teach accounting), as I don't currently have the knowledge or skills to teach this new commerce subject without significant effort. The workload is already massive - this has dramatically increased it.</p>
ANON-K9GG-12D3-C	<p>I am shocked at these changes to Level 1 Economics, Accounting and Business Studies. Outlines need major amendments which is why I could not tick the above boxes. Little choice for students and there should be a reason for these changes as previous NCEA results have been very good both in numbers and the few number of students who did not sit external papers. All three subjects are very different and offer life skills that will apply to all students. Very concerned and disappointed. As if written by people who have no understanding of Accounting, Economics or Accounting.</p>
ANON-K9GG-12DS-C	<p>A very simplified and narrow view of the world of commerce. The breadth we are currently able of offer and areas of experiential learning will be significantly limited in this new strangled 'commerce'. Science is not being cut down but commerce which leads to and supports ALL future areas of employment is. STEM needs commerce to succeed so it seems very shortsighted to reduce it to 4 standards of basic and generic learning.</p>
ANON-K9GG-12NM-G	<p>I do not believe the Commerce content at Level 1 is even close to what students/schools need. It has removed subject specific knowledge and replaced it with a Social Studies perspective. Accounting, Business Studies, and Economics are 3 separate, distinct, rigorous areas of academic knowledge that are hugely popular with students (as indicated by national statistics) - and they are being removed from the curriculum without public feedback/response. The draft standards that replace them are not Commerce-specific and should not be labelled as such. Yes, Social Studies involves Commerce - but Commerce is not Social Studies. The approach has been made too generalist, to the point where students will be seriously disadvantaged. It forces them to pick up Accounting, Business Studies, and/or Economics at Level 2 with no prior knowledge - and that is not easy.</p>

Response ID	Answer
<p>ANON-K9GG-12NP-K</p>	<p>As a result, I see these possible outcomes: 1 - students will choose not to take Commerce subjects at high school, will therefore take Commerce at tertiary level with zero prior knowledge and will be far more likely to fail; 2 - students will pick up a Commerce subject at Level 2, with little prior knowledge even if they took Commerce at Level 1 - and will get quite a shock because it will be nothing like what they have encountered previously; 3 - Commerce subjects will have to be dumbed down at Level 2 and Level 3 in order to give students a chance for success. This will again impact on their chances of success at tertiary level.</p> <p>As a Commerce teacher I am horrified that a national move is being made to disestablish such a popular and industry-relevant body of knowledge. As a parent and grandparent I am hugely disappointed that my grandchildren's subject options are being narrowed and dumbed down in this subject area only.</p> <p>The Learning Matrix is really poorly done. the so-called Big Ideas are vague, poorly written and seem quite arbitrary. They are not Big Ideas in that the first and third are ideological statements of hope. The middle one is very low level. The Significant Learning needs to be much more specific. There are invented terms like 'sustainable thinking model' - what is that? Terms like 'explore' are far too vague. There needs to be clear guidance on what is to be taught eg. scarcity, opportunity cost, decision making model, market equilibrium, budgeting, sources of income, Balance Sheet, Income Statement, business goals.</p> <p>The Course Outlines give some idea of what may be taught but are far too light weight. As presented they would be taught in a term. There needs to be far more substance and rigour.</p> <p>The Course Outlines don't make it clear that this is a Commerce course. It could be Life Skills, Civics, Maori Studies, Social Studies, Financial Literacy because the Commerce aspect is so light.</p> <p>There appears to be very weak linkage between the Course Outlines and the assessment material. Most of what appears in the Course Outline cannot be seen in the Assessment material.</p> <p>Vocabulary - this needs expanding to include a full glossary of 50 to 60 key terms.</p>
<p>ANON-K9GG-12FJ-5</p>	<p>The content of the new course seems to have been considerably downgraded from the previous courses, which begs the question why would anyone want to take the course as it does not seem to develop skills and understanding to the level of the previous courses. This could seriously impair the ability of students to transit into L2 courses with the knowledge and understanding to be successful.</p>
<p>ANON-K9GG-12F6-H</p>	<p>We need time to see how this can be fully implemented due to the drastic change away from delivering separate Economics and Accounting and no Business Studies at L1</p>
<p>ANON-K9GG-125W-1</p>	<p>I find it rather insulting that a subject like Economics and Accounting (7th & 9th most popular L1 subjects respectively) are being combined into a generic Commerce subject when Arts subjects such as Dance, Drama & Music are</p>

Response ID	Answer
ANON-K9GG-1239-1	<p>being kept as separate subjects and Social Studies + History & Geography are being offered separately.</p> <p>Course outlines provided good examples and guidance but for the course content that I feel needs amending</p>
ANON-K9GG-18MT-V	<p>Absolutely appalled at the damage being done to learning in important areas of economics and accounting and deeply suspicious that the absence of detail is there to disguise the ruination of teaching and learning in this crucial area. VERY concerned that the authors of these standards are largely independent. The lack of consultation is also a major concern. While God (or in this case the Devil!) is in the detail, the little you have published looks incredibly damaging and cause for deep concern as both a teacher and parent.</p>
ANON-K9GG-18QQ-W	<p>Wow. I currently work in a decile 3 school with 30% Maori students and 40% of students of Non-European descent. We have a very strong Enterprise programme at our school which runs from years 9 to 13. Over 300 students (approx 45%) have opted to take this subject because it offers them the real-world skills of Enterprise and an opportunity to break out of the poverty cycle. Many of our students leave school with their highest qualification being NCEA Level 1 or Level 2. The removal of the Level 1 Business Standard - Plan Run and Review a Small Business will make it very hard to motivate our students to participate in meaningful Enterprise projects at Level 1. This could result in a serious drop off in the number of students taking Level 1, Level 2 and Level 3 Commerce. Thus the number of students leaving school without tasting Enterprise will be significantly lower. It is a shame that our hairdressers, electricians, plumbers, small and large business owners of the future will not have the chance to learn Enterprise skills before they leave school.</p>
ANON-K9GG-182Y-6	<p>If you are going to press ahead with this matrix which forces our high decile schools to stop offering accounting and economics and stops the low decile schools from equipping their students with the skills to break out of the poverty cycle are you going to offer a Unit Standard in place of the Level 1 Business standard - Plan, Run and Review a Small Business?</p> <p>I am extremely disappointed in the new Commerce Standards. Currently we can offer Business, Economics and Accounting. Business is the fastest growing of these three and is not accurately represented in the proposed new standards</p> <p>There was no consultation or justification for such a radical departure from the current curriculum. School Certificate to NCEA saw some small trimming of the the content, but most of the curriculum was the same. There is no text or Professional Development, yet the content is vague and emotive - hardly a rigorous academic course.</p>
	<p>The proposed standards are not "Commerce". They are junior social studies with very little relevance to the current Level 1 Commerce subjects</p> <p>I feel strongly about students at level 1 not being given the necessary tools to help them cope with the complexity of levels 2 and 3. It is also very difficult to see the 'big picture' when we are unaware what Level 2 and 3 would even look like.</p>

Response ID	Answer
<p>ANON-K9GG-182B-E</p>	<p>Is this really Commerce? What is Commerce. If you looked at what Universities offer in their commerce pathways, is this going to assist students in their first steps towards this pathway. I think not? Was consultation feedback ignored or not even read? To minimize one area (to one subject - Commerce) while allowing others like Geography to be a subject in it's own right shows special interest groups have been able to influence the decision makers unfairly, while not listening to others. This process is a sham!</p> <p>I have some concerns that the intent and content of the three disciplines (Economics, Business and Accounting) have been lost to the point that students will not be clear what these subjects are, their significance, and their relevance- to the point that making choices to study them beyond L1 is diminished. The name "Commerce" only exists at Level 1 after all.</p> <p>Without seeing the exact specifics of the L1 standards and what L2 and 3 will look like for all three subject areas, it is hard to be constructive. This is disappointing.</p> <p>The content/significant learning areas seem contrived and forced and very scatter-gun in their approach. They have lost the specificity of their parent subjects and look and feel more like Social Studies standards.</p> <p>The content/significant learning also cribs from Year 9 and 10 courses and our students will feel that they are just doing more of the same without the challenge of new content. The key competencies are doubling up on what we already do at Y9/10.</p>
<p>ANON-K9GG-18SS-1</p>	<p>If the intention is to be more broad-based and more real-world for Level 1 (a commendable idea) then it would make more sense to create content that works discretely inside each subject area. The inclusion of 3 disciplines in one standard has ended up being wishy-washy and does not give students a sense of "what is the essence of Economics (for example) at my current level" at all. In fact, it would not be clear to a student what Economics is full stop.</p> <p>Why has this approach been taken when other Social Sciences have been able to maintain their autonomy? This is interesting as under the heading "Social Studies/Sciences" in Year 9 and 10 Geography, History and Economics are combined. Why is Economics suddenly thrown into a generic "Commerce" pot? Why has Visual Arts, Music and Drama remained as individual subjects when many schools already integrate them? Technology subjects and Science subjects retain their autonomy. It appears that Commerce is harking back to the old days and the umbrella term used in universities currently. It is not helpful to the survival of our individual subjects.</p> <p>Is it because the NZ Curriculum does not specifically mention Accounting, Business and Economics (they are under the banner of Social Sciences) that we have been treated thus? In the front part of the NZC, The concepts taught in Economics and Business particularly embody the principles and vision for our learners (the first two bullet points under vision, Enterprising and entrepreneurial, Contributors to the well-being of New Zealand – social, cultural, economic, and environmental, The curriculum encourages students to look to the future by exploring such significant future-focused issues as sustainability,</p>

Response ID	Answer
<p>ANON-K9GG-18WF-R</p> <p>ANON-K9GG-18WE-Q</p>	<p>citizenship, enterprise, and globalisation.</p> <p>If the three subjects are to be combined then the "Significant Learning" should be specific in terms of those unique skills and knowledge in each subject area - not attempting to throw a blanket over the three and dumbing all of it down.</p> <p>It should be clear from the knowledge and skills taught in Level 1 how these spiral into Level 2 and 3 courses. This is able to be achieved in every other Level 1 course - why not Economics, Accounting and Business. To me, this is one of the greatest problems with the standards and potential course outlines provided. Developers have tried so hard to integrate that the guts and specificity has been lost for each subject. A teacher of Commerce will need to become a generalist in their teaching whereas Digital Technology or Music, or Drama, or Dance, or Geography teachers can maintain their subject specific expertise.</p> <p>Leave it to individual schools to develop their own interesting learning programmes- within each discrete subject, please. We actually already do combine standards from Business and Economics into one course and it works very well - the students get a feel for each area and are able to make subject choices confidently for Level 2. I am very worried for the future of my subject (Economics) if this change goes ahead.</p> <p>Once the decision was made to separate science, to allow geography, history and social studies as separate subjects, to allow several different foreign languages, to allow dance separate to drama separate to Māori performing arts, the rationale for commerce to be one subject because Level 1 was to be broad foundational no longer has any foundation.</p> <p>Broad foundation would occur if all combinations occur (not just one) - for example social studies, geography and history could have been social studies; science, chemistry/biology and physics/earth and space science could have been science; dance, drama and Māori performing arts could have been performing arts and there are other combinations that could have occurred yet only commerce has been forced into combining three existing subjects into one. The argument justifying the combination of three subjects into commerce is lost when other combinations do not exist in the Level 1 subject list.</p> <p>Very concerned at the dumping down of this curriculum area. As a teacher of both Business Studies and Economics the combining if them into one "bastardised" subject does a disservice to both and to our students. The separate subjects cater for two very different groups of students and the combined proposal will satisfy no-one. Why change something that isn't broken. When you look online at what international curriculum areas cover in level 1 economics it is pretty much the same world wide. Why would we not provide this opportunity to our students. When I look at the book that used to be used for Level 1 Economics and I look at what we now cover I wonder at the dinning down that has occurred but when I see what is proposed I see no challenge for academic students at all. If this change is introduced in 10 years time we will be asking the questions that are currently being asked about our students maths ability. Why are they so weak?</p>

Response ID	Answer
ANON-K9GG-18WN-Z	<p>I feel like the Commerce course has become an extension of a junior social studies programme and doesn't really fully embrace the business and enterprise subjects.</p>
ANON-K9GG-18VX-9	<p>Learning matrix repetitive around decision making hard to know what would be assessed mainly as case studies. Course outline very heavy emphasis on business studies / financial literacy compared to economics.</p>
ANON-K9GG-18VC-M	<p>For outline one and two they are both very heavy on Economics and Finance, not much consideration to the other two elements of commerce. Outline 3 is a better plan but still could add some economics to it.</p> <p>Using Whanau for each of the outlines and assessments is very judgmental on the families and placing pressure on them to provide personal information to the students which they may not like to do. Then if families don't want to provide the information puts pressure on the teachers to find information for the classes.</p> <p>Also international students make the education system in this country a lot of money and including many things about Whanau when they are in a homestay situation is not very fair on them and puts them at a disadvantage would be better if the assessment was based on case study provided.</p>
ANON-K9GG-18GC-5	<p>I am teaching Commerce currently and am concerned about the proposed new standards. My concern is both with the internals and the externals. For example; what models will they actually use in 1.1 and in 1.2 what the economic situation is. This seems very unclear and needs more direction and explaining for the students.</p> <p>With the externals in 1.3 and 1.4, I feel that there needs to be more explanations as to the requirements in each of the standards (new ones) and it is confusing and does not read clearly and it is very hard to understand for me and therefore difficult for the student to comprehend.</p>
ANON-K9GG-12NR-N	<p>I am very disappointed that the new course has taken away 3 important subjects when the rest of the Level 1 subjects remain as stand alone subjects. If the MOE wants to broaden the learning outcomes at Level 1 then it must be across the whole curriculum. The new standards have a 'Social Studies' feel to them. There is no opportunity for enterprising students to work practically and it dilutes all 3 subjects to an unrecognisable level. There is no way you could continue with the current Level 2 and 3 courses in Economics and Business (I can't speak for Accounting) as students will no longer have the foundations of the subject.</p> <p>I a world where Financial capability, Economic understanding and Business skills are so important why is it these subjects the MOE has chosen to take out of the curriculum. Without a holistic approach across the curriculum these important subjects will decline meaning there will be less students leaving school with this understanding.</p> <p>I was not against the change at first, but now Science continues with 3 stands and the Humanities have not been combined I struggle to see how we are achieving any objective to give students a broader subject knowledge at Level 1, so therefore all subjects should be able to remain as stand alone subjects. Also the changes promised to combine the 'best bits' of all 3 disciplines, this course does not achieve this objective.</p>

Response ID	Answer
ANON-K9GG-18BW-M	<p>Its is disappointing that three significant subjects have combined into one mish mash. It is difficult to see how this will meet the Minister's goal of "prepares learners for more advanced study on related subjects, and supports the Crown's commitments under the Treaty of Waitangi." How is Financial Literacy going to be developed in this situation. There is little or no room for this.</p> <p>The learning Matrix ignores subject-specific skills, models and knowledge required to provide an adequate foundation for learning at Levels 2 and 3 for Economics, Accounting and Business Studies.</p> <p>It is impossible to design and implement a teaching and learning commerce course at Level 1 (for the proposed new standards) to prepare students for learning at Levels 2 and 3 when we have no indication from the MOE what Levels 2 and 3 Economics, Accounting and Business Studies Matrices will look like. This is causing considerable stress for teachers.</p> <p>The step up to learning at Level 2 will be huge and in time students will become aware of this and may choose not to pursue Economics, Accounting and Business Studies subjects at higher levels as a consequence.</p>
ANON-K9GG-18BX-N	<p>The Teaching, Learning and Assessment guide is a woefully inadequate tool. It provides a skeleton only and requires curriculum leaders and subject teachers to undertake the mammoth task of preparing adequate unit plans, resources, assessment materials and activities to deliver invisible commerce content disguised within social studies.</p> <p>The sample Course Outlines clearly illustrate a dumbing down of subject-specific content and a loss of academic rigor in Economics, Accounting and Business Studies, replacing specific subject content in 3 discreet and very different subjects (appealing to different ako with diverse needs) with thinly veiled junior social studies content.</p> <p>My impressions of the subject content so far is that it completely ignores the vast number of earlier submissions against combining Level 1 Economics, Accounting and Business Studies into one Level 1 Commerce subject. Results of the initial consultation appear to have been ignored by the MOE. Of all submissions received, 93.8% were about commerce and financial literacy. Of those submissions, 78.1% were against a merger into 'Commerce' /removal of accounting. With the proposed changes, it is clear the overwhelming majority against the merger were not considered.</p>
ANON-K9GG-18T3-2	<p>Concerns summary:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is a lack of follow on to NCEA level 2 and 3; in specific areas i.e. doesn't naturally link into existing L2 and 3 subjects. This course is not a foundation course that supports the knowledge and skills required in current level 2 and 3 standards in accounting, economics and business studies. This may lead to a drop off in student numbers as they may not see the value in level 1 commerce. 2. There is a replacement of commerce skills and knowledge with social studies AOs that are already covered by social studies, history and geography standards.

Response ID	Answer
<p>ANON-K9GG-18P7-2</p>	<p>3. Currently schools use a mixture of standards across the three separate commerce subjects to meet the diverse needs of ākongā within their community. The new standards provide less flexibility of course design.</p> <p>4. Results of initial consultation appear to have been ignored by the MOE. Of all submissions received, 93.8% were about commerce and financial literacy. Of those submissions, 78.1% were against a merger into 'Commerce' /removal of accounting (this data is a response to an official information request by CETA). With the proposed changes, it is clear the overwhelming majority against the merger were not considered.</p> <p>The creation of this stand alone subject, rather than 3 individual subjects as is currently provided, will become a barrier to enabling ākongā to participate and contribute as valuable financially literate members of society in the future. Rather than creating a broad foundation course this proposal is creating a course that will leave all students well behind when they enter Economics, Business and Accounting in levels 2 and 3, unlike other "broad foundation courses" such as French, German, Dance, Religious Education..... Changes are needed.</p>
<p>ANON-K9GG-18PH-K</p>	<p>No real thought appears to have been put into how these L1 standards will flow into L2 and L3. This should have been one of the early considerations. Standards appear wishy washy....at this stage expressed extremely broadly.</p> <p>In addition to the submission by the Commerce and Economics Teachers Association, CETA, which I support I have the following comments.</p> <p>I remember sitting in the first meeting of the RAS Reference Group where Richard D'Arth talked about the reasoning behind the review, and in particular where he talked about the unintended consequences of the previous changes to NCEA. As an economist this resonated with me as unintended consequences are an integral part of our subject. I see the same pattern emerging with the changes to NCEA Level One where Economics, Accounting and Business Studies have been dropped and a new subject, Commerce, introduced. While the new subject is being proposed as an opportunity for teachers to deliver a broad understanding of these subjects there are unintended consequences inherent in the change.</p>
<p>ANON-K9GG-18PX-3</p>	<p>Teachers I have talked to are unsure of what they will be teaching, myself included, and are waiting for the assessment exemplars to come out so they know what they will be teaching and the level they should pitch their teaching at. This is the opposite of what the team driving the change is wanting, but a natural reaction, and unintended consequence, of the massive changes proposed. Once again, we will be back to the same problem of teaching to the assessment, which while undesirable is the natural reaction to the incentives evident in the change.</p> <p>The incentives are not to create an innovative program that engages students in their learning, it is for teachers to wait for the assessment exemplars as a guide to what they should be teaching so they don't end up delivering the wrong content, or at the wrong level. Existing teachers will also be required to teach in areas that they may not have as much knowledge or experience in as others. This further incentivises them to teach to the assessment. The Ministry needs to</p>

Response ID	Answer
ANON-K9GG-1841-Z	<p>seriously consider how teachers will react to these changes, rather than how they would like them to react.</p> <p>A compromise could be to keep Economics, Accounting and Business Studies as discrete subjects. This could also allow teachers to design a program of learning for their community by picking and choosing from the achievement standards of these subjects, eg two from Economics, one from Accounting and one from Business Studies. Many schools already offer programs like this. This enables a broad coverage of these subjects at Level One and leads to further learning at Level Two.</p> <p>Content is not clear, it's hard to understand what is actually going to be taught or what is possible to teach. The content is extremely general and is very different to the historical Accounting, Business and Economics. Explanations are unclear. As a professional I am very unclear of what we would actually deliver to students. Some of the time allocations for activities show that those that wrote it have a limited understanding of what is required in terms of times for activities, or they have not put in more specific information that would assist us in understanding it.</p>
ANON-K9GG-184Y-8	<p>I thought this was going to be a Commerce Course more in line then with the current NCEA Y11 achievement standards. I am concerned on how this course in its current state transfer through to Level 2 and Level 3 Commerce.</p> <p>Feedback on Commerce Learning Matrix</p> <p>This is done by sections</p> <p>What is Commerce About?</p> <p>Ok except, instead of Maori, Pacific and Other business models why not something less discriminatory.</p> <p>The concept of other is problematic if you are going to acknowledge Maori and Pacific, you need to acknowledge European and Asian business models as different and worthwhile.</p>
ANON-K9GG-184S-2	<p>Big Learning Areas</p> <p>(1) Society sees hauora through kaitiakitanga, taujokohoko, enterprise and innovation.</p> <p>Lose the word hauora (wellbeing) as it is a subjective statement</p> <p>Change the word tauhokohoko as the translation (barter / trade) is not appropriate for the more rounded concept of exchange.</p> <p>The topic uses the word enterprise and innovation but the following exploration does not mention these at all and focuses just on kaitiakitanga. Enterprise and innovation is more than just creating sustainability as it asks students to be creative and forward thinking.</p> <p>This big learning area has the ability to focus students on the concept of action.</p>

Response ID	Answer
	<p>For example, getting out and doing something; including enterprise and social enterprise. The consequence of the badly worded exploration means that the assessment standards do give students any business / innovation task.</p> <p>(2) Whakapapa, wairuatanga, culture and values shape diverse perspectives which inform financial and non-financial decisions.</p> <p>The idea that we focus on personal and business decision making is fine.</p> <p>Again, there are more than just Maori and Pacific perspectives in a multicultural society. I like the idea that we explore the economic world through different lens, but do not be so limiting.</p> <p>There is a potential for confusion that it looks at both personal and business decision making,</p> <p>This big learning area seems to be driving the two internal standards created. The consequence is that similar skills are being developed.</p> <p>(3) Participation in society through informed financial and non-financial decision-making and action can result in the sustainable uses of resources and deliver more equitable outcomes or whanu, communities and environments.</p> <p>This is a pointless waste of time as it merely repeats aspects of the first two (yes I am aware that it acknowledges this). It seems like the panel could not think of any new ideas and felt the need to come up with a third big learning idea by order.</p> <p>Why repeat decision-making? Why repeat sustainability?</p> <p>This needs to be re-written with a different focus. A better focus that actually complements the first two ideas but is still different is an examination of society. For example, looking at how markets work, and the consequences of the changes in the market on stakeholders in society.</p> <p>A failed big-learning area</p> <p>Solution: If we are going to join the commerce subjects into one, then it makes sense for the big ideas to use the main drivers from previous subjects.</p> <p>Big Idea 1: Action – Enterprise and innovation to create kaitiakitanga</p> <p>Big Idea 2: Financial and Non-Financial decision making – shaped by values etc</p> <p>Big Idea 3: Society – how markets work and the impact / consequences of changes on stakeholders.</p> <p>Key Competencies</p> <p>Good – well-based on the curriculum</p> <p>Standards</p>

Response ID	Answer
	<p>1.1 and 1.2 are essentially testing the same set of skills, decision-making. Yes, they are looking from different perspectives (personal and society) but it will be some of the most tedious internals imaginable.</p> <p>1.3 has the basis of a good standard, looking at the uptake of a business is a reasonable starting point. I think some mention for clarification of how internal and external factors / influences impact the business reaching their putake would be helpful.</p> <p>1.4 is also the basis of a good standard. I think some clarification in the standard on the level fo economic decision would be critical. I wouldn't want to see just personal economic decisions and think the standard would be stringer for concentrating on a national level.</p> <p>What is surprising about these standards is how some of the concepts discussed in the big learning ideas do not become explicit in the standards. Surely their must be some correlation. For example, what we do not see in the standards are the concepts of;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Kaitiakitanga - Enterprise and innovation - Equity <p>Solution</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. One of the internals can be decision-making based as this reflects the second big learning idea (a personal financial and non-financial decision making would be fine) 2. One of the internals must be enterprise based - either at an exchange level or an innovation level. This can meet some of the business financial and non-financial decision-making big learning ideas. 3. The putake external standard can continue to exist, just focus ot on how it meets dome of the internal and external influences 4. The model standard can also continue to exist, but focus it on national decision making and the impact on stakeholders. <p>This is a whole of department response. Southland Girls High School. We were opposed to the removal of the separate subjects of accounting and economics from level one of Ncea , but this was ignored. We are even more opposed to the change now we have seen the weak new standards and the lack of academic rigour. Also we see no pathway for students in the commerce subjects based on this content. Why would a student attempt to pick up accounting or economics in level two without a foundation in the subject at level 1, particularly accounting.</p> <p>Please release the findings of the consultation process that resulted in the removal of these subjects from level one.</p> <p>The four standards for Commerce, the connection to level 2 & 3 for Economics can be seen. But it is harder to see how it connects to the current Level 2 & 3 Business and Accounting courses overall.</p> <p>I originally was enthusiastic about having a general Commerce course at Level 1, as I assumed the content would include at least one economics standard, one accounting standard and one business studies standard. If students are to</p>
<p>ANON-K9GG-18C5-K</p>	
<p>ANON-K9GG-18CN-C</p>	
<p>ANON-K9GG-181X-4</p>	

Response ID	Answer
	<p>be properly prepared for these subjects at Level 2, then specific subject knowledge needs to be taught at level 1. Eg For Level 1 Science, there are standards specific to biology, physics and chemistry, so that students have the subject knowledge necessary to study Physics, Chemistry and Biology at Level 2. At our school we have taken this approach and currently have a Level 1 Commerce course which includes 2 Economics Standards, 1 Accounting Standard and 2 Business Studies standards. This course has proven to be very popular with students and seems to prepare them sufficiently for Level 2 subject specialisation in Commerce. However, what is currently proposed seems to be the creation of a whole new subject with a focus on general principles which don't seem to be very subject specific - it reads more like a Social Studies course rather than a traditional Commerce course. The only positive I see in this approach is the inclusion of the Maori concepts, which is great, but otherwise I think what is proposed is going to be very unpopular with most Commerce teachers AND the workload required to adapt current schemes of work is going to be massive. Our school is considering not offering Level One; a proposal I was originally opposed to, but now I am all in favour of it , so I can keep teaching a course which best suits the needs of our students (AND I can keep doing the cool real world stuff, like the current 6 credit 90842 Business Studies standard - where students can set up and run a small product based business.)</p>
ANON-K9GG-1897-B	<p>It needs to be completely revamped and to take into consideration the views of current day teachers, professional and tertiary institutions.</p>
ANON-K9GG-189H-V	<p>I truly cannot believe the way you seem to have completely abolished the level 1 economics and accounting theory that has so successfully and usefully been taught around the country for many years. it seems to have been replaced with a Maori social studies unit... which i am all for in a social studies unit. This seems to go against all the consultation recieved from ACTUAL commerce teachers... i can't believe you seem to be merely going on the advice of the "independants" you have on the panels. I have done nearly every job for nzqa over the years writing exams and marking etc and i know the ins and outs of our subject and it's popularity and usefulness and you are decimating it. I can't wait to get to the press with this as they will lap it up.</p>
ANON-K9GG-1899-D	<p>Financial knowledge and the skills required to deliver the financial aspects of a managing a business or the economic impacts are vague.</p>
ANON-K9GG-189D-R	<p>This is totally killing economics - this is not what the subject is about and will put us on an uneven grounding for the rest of the world. The key concepts and models that we teach in Y11 are gone, and will dumb down the subject at Y12 and 13. Economics is one onf the most popular subjects at L1 and they choose it for a reason - why would you do this to a well liked and useful subject.</p>
ANON-K9GG-18R1-X	<p>Having taught accounting for a number of years, students who attempt to pick up accounting at level 2 with out the foundations of level 1 really struggle and continue to struggle as they are on the back foot the whole time, to remove level 1 accounting makes no sense to me and will severely disadvantage any</p>

Response ID	Answer
ANON-K9GG-189G-U	<p>students who aspire to further education and a career in commerce, or intend on running their own business one day and would like some basic skills in managing their books</p> <p>I suggest anyone who tells you that students can just pick up accounting at university without a problem have not actually studied accounting at university</p> <p>There is too much 'explore' and 'looking at' instead of doing, which business studies has previously done and which rewards learning practical skills that students find most valuable for equipping them for real life and ENJOY. There is nothing here that specifically rewards the learning in taking a product to market for example, (Business Studies) or creating a budget and plan for purchasing a first car (Accounting).</p> <p>The social studies emphasis robs students of essential business studies and accounting learning.</p>
ANON-K9GG-18RF-K	<p>The economics standards at the moment provide academic and specific clarity around the subject content needed to advance to level 2 and 3. The new standards omit a lot of the subject and academic content and do not provide an appropriate subject content base for students to succeed at a higher academic level.</p>
ANON-K9GG-18RB-E	<p>I am disappointed with the suggested course outlines. I do not believe they represent Commerce, nor do they capture the disciplines of Economics or Business - this course is akin to a social studies course with a significant focus on Maori. Business and Economics continue to be individual disciplines at levels 2 and 3 and at university. I do not believe this suggested course will provide students at year 11 with an accurate overview of either subject to help them decide which they might be best suited to, nor do I believe it adequately equips them for levels 2 and 3. Given the feedback already provided by NZ Commerce Teachers, this suggested course outline is a disgrace. I would not want to teach this course. Please refer to 9(2)(a) proposed alternative to this which she has shared with the NZ Economics Teachers Community. It is a far superior suggestion to combine Economics with Business. Regards 9(2)(a)</p>
ANON-K9GG-18RC-G	<p>After reading the documentation it is clear to me that Economics and Business Studies are overly represented in the new standards. As a teacher of all 3 commerce subjects, I am very disappointed by the lack of Accounting content. Where is the processing and the preparation of financial statements content? These are both major components of Level 2 and 3 Accounting standards. When will this content be covered? It takes time for students to acquire such knowledge and with such diverse learners presented to use in the classroom, consolidation may take longer than one school year for some of our students. Level 1 Accounting is a hugely popular subject amongst students across NZ. In 2020 14989 students sat an Accounting external examination, so why is this subject not receiving equity in the new Commerce curriculum?</p> <p>What I do appreciate with the subject content is the beginnings of some Financial Literacy learning- borrowing, interest etc. For at least 10 years, teachers and parents have been hearing about the importance of Financial literacy - finally there is some evidence of this. I would like to see more emphasis on this due to it's increased importance.</p>

Response ID	Answer
<p>ANON-K9GG-18RD-H</p>	<p>i would like to raise the following issues</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The consultation process, the overwhelming majority of commerce teachers were opposed to the changes to ncea level 1 but this feedback was ignored. 2) Where is the public record of the above consultation and how do we get access to it. 3) The impact on teachers of commerce subjects who may be permanent staff but will have to teach in other areas if numbers of students doing senior commerce drops (which is likely given the lack of progression/pathway in the new standards) 4) The impact on student career pathways, students are far less likely to do a subject they have not had a good foundation in. The new standards do not provide a good academic foundation for any of Accounting, Economics or Business Studies 5) How on earth does this improve financial literacy, which is a stated objective of the government/ministry. <p>As a level three student of both accounting and economics, this is crap. it doesn't cover either subject and if that was the course outline offered to me in level one I would never have taken the subject because that is not appealing whatsoever as it takes away the integrity of the subjects. Accounting and Economics have turned out to be my favourite subject and that is but if these proposed changes were what was offered I would have never taken the subject because the changes do not reflect the basis of what accounting and economics is.</p>
<p>ANON-K9GG-18RW-4</p>	<p>Is the content clear? With some context it is clear Titles of the assessment might be confusing for the students / overseas trained teacher / beginner teacher External very vague</p> <p>Is it useful? A Lot of new language and terminology Course outline 1 is better than others . It addresses all cultures not just Maori.</p>
<p>ANON-K9GG-18RS-Z</p>	<p>Is knowledge covered? What is 'knowledge'? Theory?</p> <p>Are the explanations clear? Perhaps after unpacking the document, currently not as clear, not very specific</p> <p>Do the Course Outlines help you to understand how the Learning Matrix and Assessment Matrix could work together? Yes and No. The learning activities and the assessment requirements don't correlate Look forward to seeing what the assessments look like - will give more clarity Good learning activities, accounting seems diluted The fun in business studies is gone (no experiential learning taking place), more about perspectives.</p> <p>Comments and recommendations</p>

Response ID	Answer
ANON-K9GG-18RN-U	<p>Very NZ based not global/international relevance -hoping level 2 & 3 open up to world views</p> <p>As a student of economics and accounting - I think that the ongoing development of the subject content for Commerce does not keep in mind the best interest of students and their desires to learn about Commerce subjects in depth. I believe that the new subject outline sounds unappealing and will deter students from going down a Commerce pathway. If I was in year 10 choosing my subjects for level 1 NCEA, I would not be attracted to nor desire to take 'commerce' as a subject. I believe that Commerce has been targeted under these new proposals, and I believe that it's extremely important that Accounting, Economics and Business Studies are crucial subjects should stay as stand alone subjects - as they all offer extremely valuable skills, not only for those wanting to commit to a Commerce future, but also in a practicality sense.</p>
ANON-K9GG-18R5-2	<p>From what I've seen of the new standards if that was to be the proposed subject at school I wouldn't have taken it. It doesn't really seem to include any of the key ideas and lessons that we would have been taught. The new proposal takes away from the subjects key components and doesn't even cover the content that would be useful to continue with the subject. Combining the subjects and adding in things that are some what irrelevant to the commerce section just ruins the subject. Accounting and Economics are subjects that need to be taught separately in order to fully learn and understand the subjects and have a good foundation to build off of in the future years. This new commerce subject does not enable one to do this and in ruins the real content of the subjects.</p>
ANON-K9GG-18RG-M	<p>Matrix does not reflect the subject content. There is no clear specific T&L guide. Course outlines are not reflective of the subjects but show a dumbed down version of a contrived joint subject. It will lead to massive variation in what is taught.</p>
ANON-K9GG-18H8-U	<p>It is hopeless lumping accounting, economics and business studies under one subject area. They require very different skill sets . One suggested programme I have seen shows that we will have to be compromise student learning of accounting skills to "fit in" under this generic commerce subject. Accounting is communication using very different concepts, language and thinking than students use in other areas and it takes a full year of practise and study to be able to record, report and interpret accounting information. This cannot be watered down and subsumed into a course of work where two other very different subjects have to be covered as well.</p>
ANON-K9GG-18HA-4	<p>The learning matrix isn't clear or very informative. The assessment guides and example outlines are helpful, but very similar - some other broader examples of how we might differentiate for different students/contexts/etc would be helpful</p>
ANON-K9GG-18HK-E	<p>Trying to get three discipline rich, distinct subjects into a one year course has meant that the Significant Learning and course outlines examples are extremely large. In order for a Year 11 student to have the necessary skills in today's financial world, they need a more discipline rich education that what is here, which is really material that is covered in the broad foundation subject that is Commerce at Year 9 and 10. It is a shame, that unlike all the languages, sciences, arts, geography, history and social studies, these commerce subjects</p>

Response ID	Answer
ANON-K9GG-18HX-U	<p>that are related but distinctly different, were not able to be kept separate. A broad foundation is wanted at Level 1, however this has not been equitably applied across all subjects.</p> <p>Where is the box to say you are not happy with the matrix? This survey does not allow respondents to give their view. I can't believe that such a biased/rigged survey is allowed. 'Needs amendment' can be taken to mean I am largely happy with the changes - when I am not. Where is the 'on the wrong track' tick box???</p> <p>The changes to the Commerce courses have reduced the specific subject content that will lead to students being able to work in business and make a positive contribution to society. Instead we are expected to teach values/culture which should come from the whole community not teachers. Our role is to encourage students to consider and respect cultures not to be dictating these cultures.</p>
ANON-K9GG-18HE-8	<p>It has very little to do with the content of the courses that are being merged, it has no connection to the subjects at year 12 and 13. It appears to have been derived only from the Social Sciences curriculum, and does not have any input from the accounting or business studies curriculum.</p>
ANON-K9GG-18H4-Q	<p>The proposed content in the suggested course outlines is far too shallow, and at the wrong level. There is insufficient learning proposed to provide any worthwhile foundational knowledge for level 2 and level 3 subjects. Much of the proposed content is currently taught in the junior school (year 9 and 10 and earlier).</p>
ANON-K9GG-18H3-P	<p>Although I have filled out the responses above, only have two options, neither of which was particularly negative is a very biased survey. If one of my students produced a survey like this for Business Studies I would say that it wasn't useful. Anyway, my opinion in this is that the whole course proposal is a disgrace. From the discussions I have had with fellow Commerce teachers, if your aim in this review were to drive teachers from the profession you couldn't have done it better. The consultation process from 2020 clearly indicated that we had strong support for 3 subjects continuing at this level. There is no mandate for combining these subjects and no support I have heard from colleagues for these changes. If we have to combine the three subjects into one course can we please have a more relevant mix of Commerce topics. The course simply doesn't have the academic merit that other international qualifications have. It seems far more aligned with a New Zealand Social Studies course than an Economics/Accounting/Business Studies course. Consequently I don't think this is an attractive course for Year 11 students compared to what is available currently. I have read Year 11 Commerce course suggestions from my CETA colleagues that would would provide a far more engaging, robust and relevant Year 11 learning experience. How about we have some genuine consultative engagement with Commerce teachers rather than ignoring our feedback. It is not too late to do a U turn on this !</p>
ANON-K9GG-18HB-5	<p>These standards are not well thought out. I hope you listen to the feedback of the Commerce teachers who are at the coal face and actually understand what needs to be taught. There is a great risk of many Economic, Accounting and or Business teachers simply leaving the profession due to these changes. I</p>

Response ID	Answer
<p>ANON-K9GG-18HW-T</p> <p>ANON-K9GG-188Q-4</p>	<p>suggest you join the Economic and Accounting teachers Facebook pages to get a clear picture towards the feelings from teachers of what you are prosoning.</p> <p>At the end of the current proposed course, Akonga will have little understanding of national and international commerce. The proposed course is rich in social studies type content, but is very weak in the jargon and nuances of the economic world, the consumer, producer and macro economic environments. There appears to be a significant lack of commercial terminology and language that matches the discipline of Commerce as a subject and the concepts being taught seem to miss the essence of the subject 'commerce'. (indeed, the glossary is grossly incomplete and it seems that not much work / effort has been done in this regard, so too the learning matrix). I am genuinely concerned that this course would not be meaningful and engaging to many students in its current form and that it does not adequately educate students in the world of commerce.</p> <p>There is a chance that the 'better' schools would completely drop L1 and offer a more academically rigorous commerce course, creating an inequality between schools if a the existing proposed course remains. This would be very sad, as the changes to NCEA provide us with a tremendous opportunity to close the current gap between many schools.</p> <p>I totally oppose the changes and new subject content! The proposed content in the suggested course outlines is far too shallow, and at the wrong level. There is insufficient learning proposed to provide any worthwhile foundational knowledge for level 2 and level 3 subjects. Much of the proposed content is currently taught in the junior school (year 9 and 10 and earlier).</p> <p>Why is Commerce being singled out in this process??? Initial 2020 feedback was nearly 80% against, this is not democracy nor is it genuine consultation. There is clear evidence that feedback on this change has been blatantly ignored as shown by the request through the Official Information Act by NZCETA. The fact that we could originally only indicate "on the right track" or "minor amendments" again indicates there is little interest in engaging with our consultation on the standards. How can we support and be confident with these changes if there is no genuine consultation occurring? Separation of the sciences for example has been maintained following their feedback.</p> <p>The proposed course lacks academic credibility compared to international standards for this level of learning such as IGSCE and Cambridge, while the current standards are comparable.</p> <p>The changes would limit student agency, and limit the ability of teachers to design courses in a way consistent with good pedagogy compared to the original standards.</p> <p>Without information around potential means of assessment for these standards, it is hard for teachers to consider the 'whole package' and offer any support.</p> <p>There appears to be too much content to cover in a 1 year level 1 course. The broad intro to concepts will require a lot of support for teachers to know the depth expected at level 1 and to confidently and competently assess at the level 1 standard especially for teachers expected to deliver outside what may be their specialist subject.</p> <p>The models to be used need a lot of clarification.</p>

Response ID	Answer
<p>ANON-K9GG-18E9-S</p>	<p>As a foundation course I question whether students will be prepared for specialised subjects at level 2 and whether their are equitable outcomes for commerce students compared to students in other subjects including getting excellence at level 2, 3 & scholarship. Is there to be a time allocation for teachers of commerce to receive training?</p> <p>Does not include accounting, business studies to give proper taste of subjects and minor economics. It seems to contain mostly social science so not a commerce course.</p> <p>Extremely disappointing that Economics, Accounting and Business Studies have been dropped as this is a very poor substitute. This is not a course I want my kids to do. Having read through the big ideas and suggested course outlines I think it is lacking in academic merit - it appears to be targeted at a lower level than year 11 - and is devoid of real useful economic and accounting content compared to the courses that my daughter did and loved. It contains a lot of content that was covered in her junior classes. This is not a course that prepares students for higher level study in economics, accounting and business studies. I don't understand why these subjects have been pushed together when other subjects like social studies and geography and history haven't? They are popular subjects at daughters school and were her favourite and the current courses give real skills to the students. She said the great thing about Year 11 was finally being able to do the courses they wanted and putting these together would have meant that she would have been forced to pick another subject she didn't want to do which would have made a bit of a miserable year. They are also subjects that relate to real life so well and provide great critical thinking opportunities. Accounting has been particularly good for her financial literacy so that further compounds the disappointment I have as to why this course has been removed - don't the Government want to encourage financial literacy skills? Why change something so successful? I tried looking at the assessment and there is nothing there content wise so I can't tell what students will be assessed on so very hard to comment on something that doesn't exist. I only hope that all 3 subjects will definitely be available at level 2 - huge disaster for our students if they are not.</p>
<p>ANON-K9GG-18EP-G</p>	<p>The panel have got this subject totally wrong. They have not understood the key concepts. The panel does not reflect a cross section of commerce teachers so it has not been able to do a proper job to deliver relevant material. This needs a total rework that better reflects the need to give our students a global commerce education. No other subject has been made irrelevant to the international world like this has. It does not prepare students to become global citizens. International students, kiwi student have appreciated our commerce subject - the numbers taking the subjects prove this. The panel has totally thrown away the good stuff. There are no winners with this new subject. Students cannot become well functioning, economically literate citizens from this course. There is no part of this course that is OK. It has taken a total left field approach. It is an insult to call the subject Commerce.</p>
<p>ANON-K9GG-18EG-7</p>	<p>The panel have got this subject totally wrong. They have not understood the key concepts. The panel does not reflect a cross section of commerce teachers so it has not been able to do a proper job to deliver relevant material. This needs a total rework that better reflects the need to give our students a global commerce education. No other subject has been made irrelevant to the international world like this has. It does not prepare students to become global citizens. International students, kiwi student have appreciated our commerce subject - the numbers taking the subjects prove this. The panel has totally thrown away the good stuff. There are no winners with this new subject. Students cannot become well functioning, economically literate citizens from this course. There is no part of this course that is OK. It has taken a total left field approach. It is an insult to call the subject Commerce.</p>
<p>ANON-K9GG-18A8-M</p>	<p>The proposed changes are too similar to Level 5 Social Sciences strands of the NZC.</p>

Response ID	Answer
<p> ANON-K9GG-18A1-D </p>	<p> Making it repetitive with what students have done in Year 9 and 10 Social Studies or Commerce subjects. Its diminishing the academic content/specialist knowledge required by students for each area within commerce. Not enough Economic, Business and Accounting specific content or skills. I believe it will not set students up for L2, although this is hard to ascertain with no plan of what L2 and 3 will look like yet. I believe there is massive inequity when you look at changes being brought into other learning areas - History and Geography essentially remain the same and as their own disciplines which retain their own autonomy as do the Arts, Technology & Languages subjects. Science is not losing the essence of its 3 contributing subjects. At mu school our current blended L1 Economics and Business course is the most popular option in Year 11 at our school, it is growing year on year. 40% of our students CHOOSE it. With 77% of our Year9s and 65% of our 10s CHOOSING it. Key ideas/themes need to be represented from the subjects they are coming from. Big ideas from such as consumers, producers, government and market would allow for better integration of concepts from each subject rather than the very L5 social studies strand Big Ideas that have been proposed. These “big ideas” must lend themselves to the development of entrepreneurial skills such as collaboration, communication, research, critical thinking, citizenship, creativity, and innovation. They must allow for the delivery of programmes of learning that look at the future focus issues of sustainability, citizenship, enterprise and globalisation (what has happened to the principles of the NZC) while focusing on real world issues/context relevant to students which lend themselves to authentic experiential learning and assessments. This is what Commerce currently delivers to akonga all very important skills that will ensure the wellbeing of the people of NZ - socially, culturally, environmentally and economically. I do not believe these new standards can do this. In my school our students have responded very positively to these types of programmes and assessments. Our L1 blended Economics and Business course is our schools biggest option in Year 11(40%). Our year 9 and 10 courses that feed into this Year 11 course are also our biggest option classes with 77% and 65% of students, respectively, choosing these classes. </p> <p> I would hope that this time around the submissions are valued as time poor teachers have taken the time to give genuine feedback and yet were overwhelmingly ignored in the last round of submissions with regards to the provisional subject list. Over 90% of submissions related to 'Commerce' and of those 78% were against the merger and yet this is not reflected in the current stage of development. Again, please consider your intentions and don't offer us the opportunity for discussion if you have no intention of valuing the time and effort we are putting in. </p> <p> While I appreciate the efforts of the teachers involved with the subject expert group, they have failed at the impossible task of merging three quite different subjects. There is minimal opportunity for deep learning. Although the intention of this review is to reduce teacher workload, the concepts and assessments do not allow teachers to get students the credits they will want and prepare them to take one or more of Economics, Business Studies and Accounting at Level 2. If these Level 2 subjects are then dumbed down, this subject area becomes a pointless pathway, not adequately preparing ALL students for a tertiary pathway in Commerce. While many of our more able students could pick up these subjects at university without prior knowledge, our at risk groups will not be served well. </p>

Response ID	Answer
ANON-K9GG-189C-Q	<p>Consider also that many teachers are subject specialists in only 1 of the three subjects and yet you are asking them to upskill and two other subject in the same timeframe as other teachers not facing a merger.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * If we are trying to prepare students to participate in a world of global finance and commerce, the proposed new L1 Commerce course falls way short of proving the necessary foundations. * The only conclusion I can draw is that it spells the end of L2 and L3 Economics, as these courses cannot be taught without the foundation learning provided in L1. * The current NCEA economics course is already less rigorous than either the Cambridge or IB syllabus. * These changes will make it impossible for a mainstream NZ student to compete. * It's not a case of tinkering with the proposals - they need to be scrapped all together to keep Economics as a stand alone specialist subject .
ANON-K9GG-18AQ-D	<p>Not really any commerce, in a traditional sense, in there. Many students find economics, and/or accounting provide enough skills and information to allow them to contribute/understand enough news and work. There are really only ideas in the current format</p>
ANON-K9GG-18AU-H	<p>excellent - fully support, its a positive change in the correct direction, i fully support the content - really relevant to the present students.</p>
ANON-K9GG-18A6-J	<p>The content is very narrow - I believe there should be at least 6 standards and we choose 4. Most of the standards are Economics and only one loosely Accounting. We need to incorporate the best of the standards in these two subjects in order to make a useful course. 1.1 is about whānau, WHY when most of the students following a business course will be working for a business. I have not spoken to a Economics or Accounting teacher who is happy with this course so who has put it together? This will kill Commerce in schools.</p>
ANON-K9GG-18K3-S	<p>I am concerned about the very general nature of the proposed content, it lacks certainty and robustness for both teachers and students to ensure standards are met. While the course outlines provide some nice ideas, I do not believe they address the key ideas from any of the three subjects attempting to be addressed in this new "Commerce" subject. I do not believe the current program provides a basis for further study of any of the subjects at a more senior level.</p>
ANON-K9GG-18AS-E	<p>I am an Economics Teacher of both NCEA and Cambridge, with the new changes to NCEA and Commerce we have for sure now lost the purity of the Subject. The new 'Commerce' course at Level 1 has been designed as a Social Science with Social Science Maori terms used as opposed to Commerce terms. I understand in terms of meeting the 'directive' under the Social Sciences umbrella this probably fits - however, what I am struggling with is that it is labelled 'Commerce'? The original decision to take Commerce out of the Curriculum continues to baffle me, given we are such a large subject area with more students taking this subject than MANY of the other subjects that have remained in the Curriculum. The new Course outlines are incredibly weak and</p>

Response ID	Answer
ANON-K9GG-18HR-N	<p>very wishy-washy, illustrating very little rigour or depth. I certainly don't think these meet the aims of providing 'equity' or 'efficiency' for students, particularly heading into Level 2 and 3 (whatever they are going to look like?), two terms that we study in great detail in Economics, ironically.</p> <p>The learning matrix , teaching learning and Assessment guide is not fit for purpose. It has a very vague focus that does not link well with any of the senior subjects to be taught in Years 12 and 13. The course outline looks like its been rushed through with little attention to achievement objectives that is outlined in the curriculum document. The development of the subject matrix shows lack of content understanding and delivery of to students , The course outline does not sit well with any of the subjects it has amalgamated into this commerce course, i.e Accounting, Business Studies and Economics.</p> <p>The feedback survey needed another column " not fit for purpose" The survey itself is clearly indicating that this is a process to tick boxing exercise. The survey result will show only one outcome the assessment matrix need "amendments". This whole consultation process is a farce, to justify and end that already been decided.</p> <p>I am disappointed to see how Economics, Accounting and Business Studies have been "diluted". Standard 1.1 is very similar to the Yr 9 Financial Capability course we currently run. The Commerce subject looks very like Social Studies. Commerce is a very old fashioned term and when I asked my students what they thought it meant the most common response was "Money". A lot of promotion would have to be done to sell it with its present title.</p> <p>I am also concerned as these standards assume the subject teacher has expert knowledge of Accounting, Business Studies and Economics, not to mention Financial Capability. I have one of the these so would need a lot of upskilling.</p>
ANON-K9GG-18HD-7	<p>I am disappointed to see how Economics, Accounting and Business Studies have been "diluted". Standard 1.1 is very similar to the Yr 9 Financial Capability course we currently run. The Commerce subject looks very like Social Studies. Commerce is a very old fashioned term and when I asked my students what they thought it meant the most common response was "Money". A lot of promotion would have to be done to sell it with its present title.</p> <p>I am also concerned as these standards assume the subject teacher has expert knowledge of Accounting, Business Studies and Economics, not to mention Financial Capability. I have one of the these so would need a lot of upskilling.</p>
ANON-K9GG-18YF-I	<p>Please give us information on how this would look at Level 2 and 3.</p> <p>I question the content and also proposed assessment. It is pitched to low at curriculum levels 4 & 5. The content especially with regards to financial literacy and decision making at the whanau level is what I teach in year 9 and 10 Financial Literacy. The other proposed content looks to similar to what is taught in year 9 & 10 Social Studies. I am quite confident this course will not engage learners at year 11 and also not prepare them for further study in Business, Economics and Accounting.</p> <p>The proposed content and assessment does not give students a proper idea of what Accounting, Economics and Business Studies are. There is little in the way of skills here.</p>
ANON-K9GG-18U8-8	<p>Combining all 3 subjects into one is firstly unfair considering the majority of submissions was against it & also student choice in terms of numbers of students enrolling in these subjects currently. Secondly it is also hard to reconcile all 3 subjects into 1. 2 of them are often combined by schools (e.g. Business and Accounting or Business & Economics) in response to their school community's voice. In doing this the individual subject skills and focus is still kept. In attempt to combined all 3 clear ideas about what each subject involves and the specific skills in each are lost.</p>

Response ID	Answer
	<p>Further too much effort has been made to align this "new subject" of commerce to the social science curriculum objectives. By doing so the subject has become an extension of year 9 and 10 Social Studies and not in fact Commerce.</p> <p>I am against the merge but was open to potentially what could be done. This leaves me concerns and devastated for students who will no longer get to experience the excellent and useful life skills Accounting, Economics and Business Studies provide. This is especially true for students who may not be interested in further education but instead could have taken level 1 and gained useful skills that support their passion for subjects such as the Arts or Sciences or even helped in a career in the trades.</p> <p>I genuinely hope you will listen to the feedback and take note of voice of teachers, students and other stakeholders who are not against change, indeed we welcome it. We are just here to teach Commerce, not Social Sciences.</p> <p>FYI though this feedback does not ask I have a BA in History with a Dip Grad Business, majoring in Economics.</p> <p>I started by career teaching History and Social Studies, Religious Education and Economics. I am now an Economics Specialist teaching at all levels to Scholarship and additionally also teach Business Studies and Accounting as well as Financial Literacy.</p> <p>Prior to teaching I worked for a number of years in the private sector working for a number of multinational businesses as well working in 3 different countries. I am grateful that I was able to follow my passion for Economics at high school and hope our rangatahi is not robbed of this opportunity too.</p> <p>So I therefore feel I do offer a balanced opinion that should be listened to.</p> <p>We as teachers of Accounting, Business Studies and Economics are deeply, deeply concerned about the proposed subject of "Commerce" and the proposed Learning Matrix, Teaching, Learning and Assessment Guide and Course Outlines.</p> <p>Our concerns are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The overall majority of feedback received from the public by MOE last year was strongly opposing the merger of these three subjects into one at Level 1. This is of real concern when there are 28 of the 32 subjects in the proposed Level 1 all being discipline specific/standalone subjects and not broad as stated under the wide-scale review of the National Certificates of Educational Achievement (NCEA) by Hipkins. 2. There is insufficient information provided to us about how the "broad, foundational Learning" will prepare students for Level 2 and 3 in any of Accounting, Economics or Business Studies. Students are NOT going to have sufficient foundational knowledge from this proposed Level 1 course to prepare for more advance study into Level 2 or 3. In particular, skills learnt in Accounting at Level 1 are fundamental financial literacy skills and our students are most concerned they will be woefully under prepared in this subject when they study Accounting in Level 2 and 3.

[ANON-K9GG-18Y5-9](#)

Response ID	Answer
<p>ANON-K9GG-18UQ-1</p>	<p>3. All 3 subjects support in different ways students to develop a rich understanding of managing money, income, and risk, set realistic financial goals, and make sound economic and financial decisions. Diluting these 3 subjects into 1 is a step backwards in time in the financial education field. Our students need to have a robust understanding and knowledge of their finances, our economy, supply and demand, financial statements, budgeting and operating a business. This course is not giving our students a robust understanding and knowledge.</p> <p>4. Merging these 3 subjects as they are purported to be small in number in NZ is false information. Numbers in these 3 subjects are much BIGGER than the 15 standalone subjects that can continue eg Dance, Drama, Music, 9 languages, Religious Education, Social Studies and Maori Performing Arts. Why were not some of these subjects combined into one eg "Languages. Surely if the demand from our educational communities is for these 3 subjects and not for the others mentioned, then they must remain as standalone subjects.</p> <p>5. The proposed course outlines/Learning Matrix/Teaching, Learning and Assessment Guide all illustrate a lack depth in the course. The course is so watered down and very much like the Yr 9 and Yr 10 Financial Education/Literacy courses that many schools across NZ already teach to Junior secondary students. The whole proposal does not maintain academic standards at all for Level 1.</p> <p>6. The proposed course outlines is very business focused and only has token coverage of some basic skills in Economics or Accounting. This course WILL NOT prepare students for advance learning at Level 2 and 3 - does that mean the next levels will be watered down as well and lack academic rigour. We propose that Accounting, Economics and Business Studies ALL provide broad, foundational learning and prepare learners for more advanced studies in critical areas of the curriculum.</p> <p>7. We are absolutely appalled that very little Accounting will be covered in this subject - eg a cash budget is totally unacceptable as covering this subject. Is this to be considered then as another standalone subject?</p> <p>8. If anything, Accounting, Economics and Business Studies are growing subjects in our school as the students see the value of having financial capability.</p> <p>Finally, we do not think that an equitable and valid decision has been made and the stakeholders feedback has not been considered in making the decision to combine 3 subjects into 1.</p> <p>As a teacher of Accounting, Business Studies and Economics for many years, I am deeply, deeply concerned about the proposed subject of "Commerce" and the proposed Learning Matrix, Teaching, Learning and Assessment Guide and Course Outlines.</p> <p>My concerns are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The overall majority of feedback received from the public by MOE last year

Response ID	Answer
	<p>was strongly opposing the merger of these three subjects into one at Level 1. This is of real concern when there are 28 of the 32 subjects in the proposed Level 1 all being discipline specific/standalone subjects and not broad as stated under the wide-scale review of the National Certificates of Educational Achievement (NCEA) by Hipkins.</p> <p>2. There is insufficient information provided to us about how the "broad, foundational Learning" will prepare students for Level 2 and 3 in any of Accounting, Economics or Business Studies. Students are NOT going to have sufficient foundational knowledge from this proposed Level 1 course to prepare for more advance study into Level 2 or 3. In particular, skills learnt in Accounting at Level 1 are fundamental financial literacy skills and our students are most concerned they will be woefully under prepared in this subject when they study Accounting in Level 2 and 3.</p> <p>3. All 3 subjects support in different ways students to develop a rich understanding of managing money, income, and risk, set realistic financial goals, and make sound economic and financial decisions. Diluting these 3 subjects into 1 is a step backwards in time in the financial education field. Our students need to have a robust understanding and knowledge of their finances, our economy, supply and demand, financial statements, budgeting and operating a business. This course is not giving our students a robust understanding and knowledge.</p> <p>4. Merging these 3 subjects as they are purported to be small in number in NZ is false information. Numbers in these 3 subjects are much BIGGER than the 15 standalone subjects that can continue eg Dance, Drama, Music, 9 languages, Religious Education, Social Studies and Maori Performing Arts. Why were not some of these subjects combined into one eg "Languages. Surely if the demand from our educational communities is for these 3 subjects and not for the others mentioned, then they must remain as standalone subjects.</p> <p>5. The proposed course outlines/Learning Matrix/Teaching, Learning and Assessment Guide all illustrate a lack depth in the course. The course is so watered down and very much like the Yr 9 and Yr 10 Financial Education/Literacy courses that many schools across NZ already teach to Junior secondary students. The whole proposal does not maintain academic standards at all for Level 1.</p> <p>6. The proposed course outlines is very business focused and only has token coverage of some basic skills in Economics or Accounting. This course WILL NOT prepare students for advance learning at Level 2 and 3 - does that mean the next levels will be watered down as well and lack academic rigour. We propose that Accounting, Economics and Business Studies ALL provide broad, foundational learning and prepare learners for more advanced studies in critical areas of the curriculum.</p> <p>7. I am absolutely appalled that very little Accounting will be covered in this subject - eg a cash budget is totally unacceptable as covering this subject. Is this to be considered then as another standalone subject?</p> <p>8. If anything, Accounting, Economics and Business Studies are growing</p>

Response ID	Answer
ANON-K9GG-18UC-K	<p>subjects in our school as the students see the value of having financial capability.</p> <p>Finally, I do not think that an equitable and valid decision has been made and the stakeholders feedback has not been considered in making the decision to combine 3 subjects into 1.</p> <p>To replace Accounting with Commerce is a bit hard to believe. All the description I read was touchy feeling stuff and nothing about Accounting. Accounting is a separate subject with a lot to learn and cover. It is factual and numbers and a reporting tool. Do you require Accounting to be part of the Maori studies curriculum? No. And for the same reasons cultural studies are not part of the Accounting curriculum. To fit in all this other stuff you would need to dumb down the teaching of accounting. This proposed new subject is insane. Accounting is about numbers and will suit students who prefer facts. Now if a student wants to do accounting they have to contend with culture and environment and living harmoniously and cultural heritage - no no no! That is what social studies is for, that is what languages and history are for. Awful idea to mix up rational numbers with social sciences.</p>
ANON-K9GG-18UN-X	<p>The big ideas and ideas on course outlines look like what I all provide at year 10.</p> <p>As the NZ curriculum achievement objectives do not adequately cater for the variety of subjects that fall under the commerce umbrella it is difficult for an overall Commerce subject to be created and then for that subject to adequately cater for the learning required for level 2 and 3 in these specialist subjects.</p>
ANON-K9GG-18U5-5	<p>I don't understand why you are trying to combine two subjects that are perfectly fine as they are. The new course has no accounting therefor if you aren't combining them you are just getting ride of a subject.</p> <p>I have not ticked either option, because there is no choice, it is an invalid survey. I am not in favour of the proposed course outline of Level 1 Commerce. It is not a Commerce course and I will not be teaching it. That means refusing to trial it and then if feedback from current commerce teachers is not taken onboard I will either teach Mathematics, actual Social Studies or become a relief teacher for the remaining 10 years of my career- I feel that strongly.</p>
ANON-K9GG-18U2-2	<p>I am disappointed that the last round of feedback has clearly not been taken into consideration and that Level 1 Accounting, Level 1 Economics and Level 1 Business Studies have not been 'merged' but in fact replaced entirely with a Year 10 Social Studies course. Much of what is in the outline is material that is currently being taught at our school in Year 9 financial literacy and our Junior Social Studies and Te Reo courses. I am in no way opposing the incorporation of Maori values into the commerce curriculum. In fact our Department has made this a current goal for example in Level 1 Economics when we the producer sector we integrate the concepts of kotahitanga and kaitiakitanga.</p> <p>I am in favour of retaining the separate three courses and my reasons for this are-</p> <p>These are useful, relevant subjects that are very popular with students (numbers are in the 000's compared to many other stand alone subjects)</p> <p>Students are NOT specialists at any point in their secondary education, so to</p>

Response ID	Answer
<p>ANON-K9GG-18DJ-9</p> <p>ANON-K9GG-18D2-H</p>	<p>disallow students to explore subjects such as Accounting does in no way make them a specialist or prevent them from studying a completely different subject the following year. I studied Accounting until Year 13- I had a great teacher, I enjoyed it, I never studied it again at University- but it's useful for doing my tax returns and has given me a useful perspective when teaching senior Economics.</p> <p>Why are these three subjects being merged when dance/drama or geography/history aren't??</p> <p>Do we really want NZ students not be allowed to study current economic theory? Many of our top academic students study a combination of Economics and Science. They will not be encouraged to consider Economics at senior level if they are offered this Social Studies course at Year 11.</p> <p>If there must only be one Commerce course at Year 11, then get Accounting, Business studies and Economics teachers to write it. In the short space of a weekend [REDACTED] from Albany junior High School presented something more palatable 9(2)(a) [REDACTED]</p> <p>than what months has taken from a panel with no representatives from large urban Colleges. Get local branches of CETA to come up with a draft plan. We are willing and keen.</p> <p>Give students the taste of what Accounting in modern day means, a taste of what Economics is and how it is central to questioning the world in which they live and a taste of Business studies to spark their enthusiasm for entrepreneurship.</p> <p>All the proposed course will do is discourage students from Commerce and lead to an exodus of teachers- I will be one of them. Kia Kaha Commerce.</p> <p>9(2)(a) [REDACTED]</p> <p>St. Patrick's College Silverstream</p> <p>My concern is that the new plan lacks the ability for students to apply the knowledge they gain from the content covered, in an authentic way.</p> <p>The current Business Studies curriculum provides scope for students to create their own businesses and apply the knowledge they learn. They can then have an experience of commerce in a safe, low-risk environment.</p> <p>My current students see the benefit of learning Economics and Accounting as they apply the theoretical knowledge they learn to their hands-on experience of running their own businesses. This is possible through the way the Young Enterprise Trust has embedded the NCEA curriculum into their program so students are getting the experience while achieving NCEA qualifications. It would be a shame for students to lose this opportunity through the new NCEA change package and I hope you will consider retaining this experiential learning.</p> <p>Needs to include more Accounting eg budgeting and Accounting theory.</p>

Response ID	Answer
ANON-K9GG-18NU-X	<p>These are broad concepts and will only provide students with an overall perspective. They will lack any real commerce skills. My personal view is that "Course Outline1" totally underestimates the time it takes for Level 1 Akonga to grasp the SKILLS associated with the subjects that have been combined. This is short sighted and will need to be reversed in the future when the country grapples with a lack of entrepreneurial and business in candidates. It will flow through to levels 2 and 3 and then on to tertiary institutions. One cannot make such a change without it impacting on other areas and suggest that there will be no unintended consequences. This is short sighted and regressive at a time when we should be building capacity in the business arena.</p>
ANON-K9GG-18NS-V	<p>Commerce means Accounting / Economics and Business. What is in the revised content that relates to business sector and is comparable with this level of education in any other country. Accounting is the core of all these and their is nothing on Accounting in the revised standards! Subject knowledge is not covered. Content had been dumped down. Instead we should be helping students to uplift their learning. The revised standards do no help to form a firm foundation for further studies or even prepare them for the job market.</p>
	<p>I am very concerned with this change process. I am aware that, as well as myself, a large number of my subject colleagues are also concerned about the "proposed" changes. We have 3 separate subject specialist areas, each with its very own specialised skills that are being squeezed into a single course. I don't see how the base skills that we currently teach in our separate subject areas can be sufficiently covered in 4 standards that assess all 3 subjects AND give students the level of understanding required for Level 2 and beyond - especially in Accounting.</p>
ANON-K9GG-18KD-A	<p>There is simply not enough information in the draft standards for us to gauge exactly what will be assessed, and the content that has been suggested in the course outlines indicates a significant 'dumbing down' of L1 - much of the suggested courses is content that we are currently teaching at Y10. There is no clarity in these draft standards to indicate what specific skills are going to need to be demonstrated in order for students to achieve in these standards (i.e. 1.4 Use models to demonstrate..... what models? Economics, Business, Accounting? How many models will be needed? How we would interpret that under current standard would be 2 or more. 2 is far fewer than what are currently being taught and assessed in the L1 course of Economics alone, let alone Business and Accounting).</p>
	<p>I am particularly concerned about our ability to continue to offer the project-based, hands-on, business carry-out activities under the new standards. Those standards are very well received by students, and the Market Days and opportunity to run their own businesses are strong drivers for students selecting our Commerce courses. I cannot see how much of what we do in those units of work would contribute to the draft standards being proposed.</p>
	<p>It appears that the Commerce skills of Commerce are being overlooked in favour of Social Studies. I alongside many of my colleagues, oppose the changes that are being "proposed".</p>

Response ID	Answer
<p>ANON-K9GG-18N5-X</p>	<p>As a senior teacher of Commerce is am unable to respond to the only two options given in this consultation. The whole thing needs to be re-considered for the following two reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The overwhelming feedback from the sector and public as per the OIA request from NZCETA opposing the merger of our 3 distinct and legitimate disciplines into 1 subject called "Commerce" . This is not consistent when other subjects have been able to stand in their own right and teach foundational knowledge and skills. Furthermore the numbers of students in 2020 entering NCEA in each of Accounting, Economics and Business remains strong. 2. These new proposed standards have severely diluted the excellent foundational teaching and learning of Commerce skills that currently exists for our Akonga within the current subjects in their own right. <p>I oppose these standards and changes entirely for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Commerce appears to have been singled out in this process, as is evident by the fact many other specialist subjects have not been combined to a broader foundational course. Separation of the sciences for example has been maintained following their feedback. Why was commerce combined despite feedback showing opposition? 78% of submissions received in 2020 consultation were against the merger as well as 10% undecided, implying a meager 12% supporting this. - There is clear evidence that feedback on this change has been blatantly ignored as shown by the request through the Official Information Act by NZCETA. The fact that we could originally only indicate "on the right track" or "minor amendments" again indicates there is little interest in engaging with our consultation on the standards. How can we support and be confident with these changes if there is no genuine consultation occurring?
<p>ANON-K9GG-18FB-3</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proposed content in the suggested course outlines is far too shallow, and at the wrong level. There is insufficient learning proposed to provide any worthwhile foundational knowledge for level 2 and level 3 subjects. Much of the proposed content is currently taught in the junior school (year 9 and 10 and earlier). - The proposed course lacks academic credibility compared to international standards for this level of learning such as IGSCCE and Cambridge, while the current standards are comparable. - The changes would limit student agency, and limit the ability of teachers to design courses in a way consistent with good pedagogy compared to the original standards. - Without information around potential means of assessment for these standards, it is hard for teachers to consider the 'whole package' and offer any support. <p>THESE PROPOSED CHANGES NEED TO BE TAKEN BACK TO COMMERCE TEACHERS IN ORDER FOR US TO DEVELOP PROGRAMMES WHICH REFLECT THE FINANCIAL LITERACY LACKING IN NZ SOCIETY TODAY.</p>

Response ID	Answer
ANON-K9GG-18F9-T	<p>There needs to be some foundation skills included for success in NCEA Level 2 for Accounting, Economics and Business Students. The proposed commerce course is too general and vague and looks more like a programme suitable for junior students at High School or College and not senior students</p> <p>The proposed changes for the commerce-based subjects are not fit for purpose. I am not opposed to reducing the three Level 1 subjects into one "Commerce" subject but the new course must meet the needs of the learner. These needs are twofold.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. They need to prepare the student for study at Level 2. 2. They need to give the student a sound understanding of the basics of commerce. <p>The proposed changes do not do either of these. The new course looks more like a Year 10 level course and will lead to students struggling at the higher levels of study as they will not have the necessary skills or knowledge. A much better course would be.</p> <p>AS 1. Accounting. (5 Credits) This needs to include the preparation of Income Statements and Balance Sheets with balance date adjustments. It should also include Analysis and Interpretation. Recording financial information in the way that nearly all businesses all over the world do and then being able to analyse how well that business is doing is critical for understanding business. This understanding is important for every would-be entrepreneur. This could be assessed externally as a portfolio.</p>
ANON-K9GG-18FP-H	<p>AS 2. The Market (5 Credits). This would be supply, demand, and the interaction of the two as the market. This could be assessed externally as an end-of-year exam.</p> <p>AS 3. Producers (6 Credits). This would look at resource use, production, productivity and include a little marketing (as part of producer decisions). This could be assessed internally.</p> <p>AS 4. Interdependence (4 Credits). This would look at the circular flow model. Students would understand how interconnected the economy (and societies) are. It would also look at growth, business cycles, and measures of GDP. This could be assessed internally using a local business as a case study.</p> <p>As stated the current proposals will not adequately prepare students for the Level 2 studies in each discipline. Worse, however, is that if our students only do the commerce subject for one year at Year 11 they are going to have little understanding of how the economy (and business) works.</p> <p>I would be happy to talk to this proposal should the need arise.</p> <p>9(2)(a)</p>
ANON-K9GG-185B-J	<p>As an Accounting Teacher for a number of years, I am so sad to see that Accounting no longer exists in the new matrix apart from a mention of financial information and Income statement. It really saddens to see that an important</p>

Response ID	Answer
ANON-K9GG-183A-F	<p>subject has been completely taken off the curriculum in this. I would really appreciate a revisit to the new matrix.</p> <p>I am a student of L3 Accounting and Economics. I am glad I have learnt the foundations of Eco and Acc in Year 11 and the different skills in each have helped me to be a more confident learner. The new standards are more like social studies and I feel are too simplistic for a Year 11 students that really enjoy learning the foundations and skills of Accounting.</p>
ANON-K9GG-1856-6	<p>Matrix needs to include a business section. The students really enjoy these business activities. They learn so much about business, by doing their own business. I don't understand how this has gone. If we are serious about moving Aotearoa forward globally we need to have students who can participate in business. Not just learning theory. I think the written units are good, well suited to maths. I think that there needs to be some specifics given to global market places. I have some concerns about the quality of resourcing that can be provided. There needs to be some more resourcing as all other materials seem to have been tossed away, eg business and accounting. We will need to get some very good resourcing and skills.</p>
ANON-K9GG-183B-G	<p>What you are doing to Commerce as a subject is devastating. There should be 3 separate subjects (Accounting, Economics, Business Studies) as they are as much separate entities as Geography, History and Social Studies or Dance, Drama and Music. The Commerce teachers of NZ do not trust the MoE with their claims on consultation. 78% of respondents to the last consultation said that there should be separate subjects at year 11 and nothing has been done to accommodate this. The Ministry's own criteria for year 11 subjects have been ignored by the amalgamation and the consultation has been a sham. What has been released as details of a new Commerce subject are extremely disappointing. The entire course is severely lacking in content and has an overall impression of dumbing down of level 1. The course is more reflective of a junior social studies course than it is of a Commerce course. What there is as content is vague – based on what has been published, a student could complete a Commerce course which is meant to be a combo of Economics and Business Studies without learning about economic fundamentals such as supply and demand and market equilibrium. Surely 'more accessible' doesn't mean a course so dumbed down that an average junior student could pass it without much effort. There is no pride in having a qualification that comes in a cereal box.</p> <p>Having taught different Commerce subjects over years 9 to 13 at a school where we have developed courses that are popular with students, where we have high student engagement and high levels of student success, what has been published here is not a course that students will enjoy without serious modification. I have a wide range of students taking these subjects with differing needs and goals. What is contained within the content will poorly serve most of these students. For example, I have students who are looking at Trades careers and want foundational Accounting and Business skills with the idea of owning their own Trades business. These standards offer almost nothing for these students. This does not align with the goal of making vocational pathways accessible.</p> <p>There is a lack of foundational knowledge for study at level 2 and 3 within this Commerce course. It does not prepare students with either life skills or</p>

Response ID	Answer
	<p>academic depth. This is not a course that sets students up for future academic or life success.</p> <p>Most of the numeracy available over Economics, Accounting and Business Studies has been stripped away which is surprising when we have an educational system that is failing in the numeracy area. The stand alone subjects offer multiple opportunities for students to use numeracy skills in meaningful situations.</p> <p>There appears to be an overall dumbing down on what is being offered. This will impact on how our educational system is viewed internationally. The overall direction of level 1 NCEA will inflict damage on our education system that eventually someone in power will realise and it will take us years to recover. Meanwhile private schools will increasingly turn to Cambridge and IB which will become more attractive to more parents and as a result the educational gap will widen.</p> <p>I have yet to talk to a secondary teacher who is comfortable with these changes and the direction this is going. I have talked to teachers who plan to leave teaching as a result of the changes. I don't know of any teachers who would recommend secondary teaching to senior students and graduates. The teacher shortage will worsen.</p>
ANON-K9GG-183H-P	<p>Missing all the good bits of commerce and switched to a Social Studies lens. There are enough options for Social Studies - let commerce be recognisable as a business education course.</p>
ANON-K9GG-1837-5	<p>The Wellington Girls' College Commerce Department is very concerned that nationwide opposition to the merger of our three subjects by a vast majority of respondents in the last round of consultation was not taken into account when developing the new standards. In our school the teaching of Economics and Accounting in their own right as two separate disciplines provides our Akonga with foundations at level 1. We believe these existing subjects could have been refreshed to fit the model of foundation at Level 1. We note that other subjects are still stand alone as separate disciplines. Attaching "models" to the proposed standards do little to elevate these standards to deliver a cohesive programme.</p>
ANON-K9GG-1835-3	<p>Yes the proposed changes are on the right track. Our school roll is 390 and we have 42 taking Accounting as a separate subject which includes 15 at Level 1. We have larger numbers taking Economics at a senior level (54) and a strong Junior program in Business Studies.</p> <p>We use our junior courses to promote and feed in to the split between Accounting and Economics.</p> <p>Once I removed my own emotions of 'losing' an accounting class at Level 1, the transition became clearer. Our school has this 'composite' commerce course at years 9 & 10 to encourage the students to choose Accounting and Economics for Year 11. Students are able to take both and have enjoyed this approach for a number of years. Our students are ready to make this decision coming in to Year 11 and I can't see the need to delay this a year. There is plenty of material within the Accounting and Economics subject areas to have these subject areas continue separately.</p> <p>My other 'pet' area is that of Financial Capability. I find it both surprising and disappointing that these L1, L2 & L3 unit standards are not getting more air time. The confidence in the basic skills these unit standards offer are vital in preparing our students for life.</p>

Response ID	Answer
ANON-K9GG-1NMJ-8	<p>Perhaps a combined course between Accounting and Financial Capability would be hugely beneficial as the knowledge taught in this area would underpin any future job or work in any industry. I am keen to talk more to this if required - 9(2)(a)</p> <p>I am concerned that this does not cover key skills that will support students in their learning or future learning as students move into level 2 and 3 economics in particular. I do believe there needs to be adjustments to the current curriculum but don't no feel this is a movement in the right direction.</p>
ANON-K9GG-1NM2-G	<p>The things that we note are: Previously unique learning opportunities that existed for learners in quite divergent subjects have been combined into uninteresting and and confused internal assessment standards. The hands-on enjoyment that students have got from Business 1.4 and 1.6 is gone. Learners gain significantly from doing business rather than interviewing business people. The language of Business Studies, Economics and Accounting have all been included, but the core foundation skills have not been.</p>
ANON-K9GG-1NMR-G	<p>Very disappointed and concerned about the draft course for Commerce Level 1. It does not prepare students for the specialist subjects at NCEA Level 2 and 3. Even if students only choose to study Commerce at level 1, this does not give them many coherent skills or knowledge that could be deemed useful in later life. The proposed content is very thin, it bears very little resemblance to what is currently being taught successfully in schools at this level. The proposed standards are very 'Social Studies' like and currently reflect what we do at a junior level. If we were to teach offer content like this to our students, it would not be engaging and they would simply choose another subject that has more academic rigour, interest and meaning to their future.</p>
ANON-K9GG-1NXA-A	<p>The content lacks the curriculum knowledge, concepts, and broader understanding needed to develop foundational knowledge in Economics and Accounting for akonga.</p>
ANON-K9GG-1NXE-E	<p>Its an absolute travesty that Level 1 Accounting has been disregarded. There are a huge number of students who take this subject, love it and aquire a range of skills that go on to be so beneficial to them. It is so inclear where this is heading, there isn't enough knowledge and skills being taught in the new proposal.</p>
ANON-K9GG-1NMB-Z	<p>I like the kaupapa behind the changes but it is not been well executed. There is a clear lack of visibility for accounting which is concerning. As an Accounting, Economics and Business teacher and for a government, who has explicitly said financial literacy is key, this is another nail in the coffin to trying to change this trend.</p> <p>The Teaching and Learning and Assessment Guide needs to be explicit about accounting skills are needed like budgeting, cashflow management, the importance of source documents, the difference between business structures, calculating tax and GST. The biggest skill needed is the ability to make financial decisions using financial statements along with the use of basic ratio analysis. At present all teachers would agree that there is no accounting but rather</p>

Response ID	Answer
<p>ANON-K9GG-1N7A-9</p> <p>ANON-K9GG-1N7B-A</p>	<p>financial literacy (this is not accounting).</p> <p>More connection to existing Accounting standards is needed in order for accounting to be made more accessible. A priority is needed to ensure that Accounting has a greater weight alongside Economics. Our data shows that numbers in option subjects tend to be lower than in "Core Subjects". If you follow this logic then less access to Accounting and Economics means fewer students being able to see the relevance of those skills and knowledge in their future selves. This means that fewer students will carry on with Accounting and Economics which are deemed as important skills for the 21st century. (ability to make financial and economic decisions).</p> <p>Another option is to put Accounting and Economics under Maths (Applied Maths).</p> <p>The content is muddled and inconsistent to make it dynamic and functional without it becoming a social studies class with business. Social Studies exists as a standalone subject and is already covered (where is the equity and equality and why has History, Geography and Social Studies remained separate).</p> <p>When talking to parents they want their students to engage with commerce and more explicit and fundamental level than more social studies. They want their students to obtain skills and knowledge that can use to be successful for the remainder of their lives - writing and reflection will not allow this to happen and nor will it be helped if the fundamentals are missing such as core accounting skills and knowledge.</p> <p>There is not enough in the year 11 course to prepare students for year 12 as it currently stands. It is more like social studies than commerce.</p> <p>I am very concerned, and appreciate my colleagues in Economics teaching will have stated very compelling cases to you in opposition to a process that has not felt like true consultation, but I will provide a couple of short anecdotes to show my disagreement with combining the disciplines of Accounting, Business Studies and Economics together, and that they should be kept as individual subjects, to illuminate the issue as I see it.</p> <p>1. I took a group of Year 12 Economics students to Treasury in recent time. Treasury gave them a task of 'being the Finance minister' and writing a budget and justify the weighting of spending. The students proceeded to give compelling arguments and justification as to their thinking with spending and policy of many (sustainable) areas on gender equality, race equity, environmental justice etc..</p> <p>The presenters at treasury were completely blown away with their level of sociology and subject specific Economic modelling. The went on to say they would employ many of them that day if they could (said to me personally to the side, not to the students) as the students had justified with Economic specific modelling and language, concepts that they had been battling with in treasury over that week. They wished "they'd recorded their presentation".</p> <p>You see, Economics is an important discipline to be left by itself. It is very much a social Science, but the nuanced skill at abstraction and Economic policy</p>

Response ID	Answer
<p>ANON-K9GG-1N7S-U</p>	<p>writing/justification is a skill that firstly is important, but gives students autonomy and agency, along with mastery. The new standards are so watered down, they will achieve the sociology, but not the nuanced skill and in depth, authentic learning that economics specific education provides. A teacher recruited to teach the proposed course in the future, may not have the nuanced knowledge to teach this in depth learning.</p> <p>Secondly, a muslim student, thanked me after the year 13 course as she had a tecaher who allowed her autonomy to study Football as her project on micro economics. She ended up giving compelling interviews on RNZ national ablut her experience in football and issues refs would give over Hijab wearing. Her Economic knowledge gave her weight in the ability to justify with Economic wellbeing policy writing to be a leader in the field. You must keep the subject Separate!</p> <p>The subject content for Level 1 Commerce is weak and does not meet the needs to the students now or in the future! Accounting Economics and Business Studies are, currently, three independent subjects with distinct content and learning outcomes. This subject has removed the integrity of all of these subjects, and does very little to prepare students for financial awareness for life, let alone prepare them to study these subjects at Level 2 or 3. The information provided does not include some of the most critical skill and knowledge these subject provide students, and is much more a junior social studies course than a commerce one. The Commerce proposed standard and supporting information needs to be completely rewritten - individual subjects or at least two subjects: Economics and Business go well together and Accounting and Financial Capabilities the others. The overwhelming response from respondents to the initial proposal to keep the three commerce subjects was ignored and this is disturbing and raises the question of prior agenda's and the facade of consultation as opposed to genuinely hearing the peoples voice.</p> <p>The proposed standards undermines the professionals who have been committed to fostering financial knowledge to their students over many years. It will mean in some schools the subjectd area will be removed as it is not seen as important and students don't want another subject with an incredibly strong social science lens. Yes there is a place and this view complements the current Commerce subjects, but the porposed standards leave students with minimal financial or economic awareness in a world where whanau, business leaders and politicians are all saying our students need to leave school with more financial understanding.</p> <p>The proposed standards are disengaging, without a genuinely commerce focus, and it is extremely disappointing that the SEG did not have broader representation from within the sector. But their hands were tied by the MoE decision to blend together despite the submissions against this proposal.</p> <p>Neither of the two options reflects my response to the above questions. I strongly oppose of the development of the new "Commerce" subject as it is currently proposed. It needs a total rewrite (not just amendments).</p>
<p>ANON-K9GG-185M-W</p>	<p>The proposed content in the suggested course outlines is far too shallow. Much of this content is currently taught in the junior school (year 9 and 10 or earlier). There is insufficient learning proposed to provide any worthwhile foundational knowledge for Level 2 and Level 3 of any of Accounting, Economics or Business Studies as individual subjects. Additionally, having no idea what Level</p>

Response ID	Answer
<p>ANON-K9GG-1NQV-R</p> <p>ANON-K9GG-1NQ9-U</p>	<p>2 and Level 3 are going to look like makes it impossible to say if the proposed content will be suitable, unless these are also going to be "dumbed down" as well, which takes me to my next point.</p> <p>The proposed course lacks academic credibility compared to international standards for this level of learning such as IGSCCE and Cambridge (while the current standards are comparable). Why would we not ensure we provide the best financial capability to our students and provide them the best tools set possible to analyse and grow our economy in this ever changing and challenging world they are growing up in? Going down the proposed path will leave our future generations of potential game changers, world leaders and entrepreneurs alike, well behind their international counterparts.</p> <p>To provide enough depth Accounting, Economics and Business Studies cannot be combined into one subject at Level 1. I do NOT support the ongoing development of the subject content for Commerce as it is presented in its current proposed version.</p> <p>In almost every case, a secondary student will either work for someone else (in a company, for the Government, or an non profit) or work for themselves. The opportunity to develop an understanding of the world of work is fundamental to our society, both local and international.</p> <p>The compression of such disparate subjects as accounting, economics and Business Studies into one subject area termed commerce is wrong. The students themselves approach the subjects as currently presented with a wide range of views to possible future outcomes, including future tertiary study or direct employment post secondary school. In some cases students at secondary school, Level 1 commerce may be their only exposure to basic commerce practises, models and experiences which have been sidelined into a version of social studies. The building block of Level 1 commerce needs to include the opportunity and flexibility to satisfy those student who wish to specialise at level 1 who may have or may not have any intention to progress to tertiary study. In accounting, Business Studies and economics development at level 1 provides some learners with important steps (and confidence) to build Level 2 and 3 success upon, particularly those learners at risk.</p> <p>I am also concerned that the ground braking movement into developing a specialist learning area such as agribusiness appears to be at risk. NZ needs the development of our learners in commercial understanding and practice at level 1, and the opportunity to specialise at that level if they want. The subject area should be grown, not reduced.</p> <p>I would like not to tick any options. I do not believe it needs amendments, I think it needs a rewrite. I have so many concerns it is hard to know where to begin. I teach a L1 Commerce course currently and thought you would have provided something similar but really you have given us economics and social studies all at a junior level. The content is not clear at all, the topics are very brief and no depth to them. It is topics we have already done not only in junior commerce but in Social Studies and RE. There is NOTHING that will interest our students and it seems like you are trying to kill our subject area completely. Students will have no idea what they are doing, whether it is Economics, Business Studies or Accounting so to choose subjects for L2 from this course would be impossible. There is pretty much nothing we are doing this year which can be carried</p>

Response ID	Answer
<p>ANON-K9GG-1NQW-S</p> <p>ANON-K9GG-1NQB-4</p>	<p>forward into the course outlines given and our course is currently one that students love and do well in. We do processing, statements, market and marketing mix. Where is this content? Why get rid of things that were working? I fully support updating the assessments and some of the content especially around processing but really why try and change commerce to social studies? It is a course which could provide students with real skills but instead they will learn about values and scarcity for the 1000th time. Please give us something we can work with to grow our numbers and not this, it will put us out of a job and destroy our subject area. These currently outlines are so vague that students will get different content from one school to the next. This may be fine unless you happen to have a teacher who is new to teaching commerce or is not experienced in one of the three areas and therefore does not know what possible content there is to teach. It is way to vague and I feel really sorry for any teacher having to recreate these outlines when they are the only teacher in the department. Students from one school will have a totally different perspective of what commerce is compared to a student from another school. This is not how it should be.</p> <p>The concepts should not be restricted into a social studies context merely because this is currently on the national curriculum. Business is a substantially separate framework. It relates to social studies, but equally to Maths, English and other areas. Commerce is an umbrella title that deals specifically with the workplace. It has a vastly separate purpose to social studies. As a former senior manager in government and a chartered accountant, I do not see the reason for dumbing down what is one of the more successful and targeted areas of the education system that provides skills for future commercial leaders. Also, the three different subjects are highly popular, as the statistics prove. It shows me that significant numbers of students - particularly those who will not receive tertiary education will be disadvantaged.</p> <p>1) I think your proposed changes require HUGE amendment. Mainly to restore meaningful and fundamental subject content. 2) Having looked at the current list of big ideas in Economics from TKI, they are: a) Scarcity results in choices with opportunity costs; b) Values influence economic choices, c) Markets provide incentives and ration scarce resources; d) Perfectly competitive markets are efficient; e) Market failure may require government intervention; f) The benefits of market activities may not be equitable; g) Government intervention may involve an equity–efficiency trade-off; h) Interdependence results in flow-on effects; i) Marginal analysis will maximise results; j) Economic indicators aid economic analysis; k) Inflation can distort economic indicators; l) Economic models aid economic analysis; m) Micro and macroeconomics. Are you now proposing that these big ideas are no longer big ideas? Or are only some of them valid big ideas? 3) If the point of this is to provide a broad base from which to specialise later, why single out Economics, Accounting & Business Studies - three quite different subjects with quite different concepts - for this treatment? Why do we amalgamate these three - but not Dance, Drama & Music which are all Performing Arts? Why leave History and Geography and over 20 other subjects as stand-alone subjects? The actions you're taking are not consistent, or across the board, let alone logical. 4) Most of the content you propose for Level 1 Commerce is generally done at the Year 9 and 10 level in all the schools in which I have taught - both in Social</p>

Response ID	Answer
	<p>Studies (perspectives, etc) and in the Financial Literacy portions of junior Economics or junior Business Studies. The changes you propose appear to be at level 4 and 5 of the curriculum, rather than level 6.</p> <p>5) It is difficult to see where your 'broad base' comes from if you've removed most, if not all, of the content of the three subjects - where is the Accounting, apart from Financial Literacy? Where is the Economics? Where is the Business Studies? Students taking this proposed course will have ABSOLUTELY NO IDEA of what will be involved at Levels 2 and 3 NCEA in these subjects? Or are you planning to remove all the content from those levels as well?</p> <p>6) Apart from some aspects of Financial Literacy, most of this looks like Social Studies with a token slant towards the business environment. Why not offer a Level 1 Social Studies course instead of removing Economics, Business Studies and Accounting? Actually, you already do - and it has less numbers than each of Economics, Business Studies and Accounting.</p> <p>7) If this is about student numbers, there are many subjects with smaller nationwide numbers than Economics, Accounting or Business Studies, including many languages, performing arts subjects (music, dance & drama) and religious studies. Yet all these subjects remain stand-alone subjects.</p> <p>8) if this is about improving outcomes for Maori and Pasifika students, are you actually implying that the only way they will succeed is by removing all the subject-specific, potentially difficult content from Economics, Accounting and Business Studies - but keeping it in other subjects? How patronising is that? How racist is that? This is a disappointing approach as I have successfully taught and assessed many students of Maori and Pasifika descent. Many of them have also succeeded in passing their external exams.</p> <p>9) If this is intended to improve educational outcomes, is this really the best approach the Ministry can come up with? Poor educational outcomes occur inside and outside students studying Economics, Accounting and Business Studies. Getting rid of these subjects at Level 1 (or Level 2 or 3) will not change the level of educational outcomes. They will still exist as these poor outcomes is not a result of subject choice, but rather the result of inadequate investment in reading recovery, mathematical assistance and support in the classroom. Perhaps addressing these is more likely to lead to better educational outcomes than removing three subjects from the senior curriculum?</p> <p>10) The inclusion of bicultural and multicultural concepts is great - although many teachers will have already done this. Are you also planning to address equity issues for girls? I notice that your example year plans focus on businesses run by Maori and Pasifika, but if you're going to prescribe this, perhaps you should also prescribe that a portion of these businesses that are studied should be run by women also, as their perspectives may differ from businesses run by men of whatever ethnicity.</p> <p>11) The Ministry claims that students should have a series of vital knowledge and skills before entering the workforce, including financial literacy, so that learners can successfully transition into careers and further post-secondary education. This would favour knowledge and understanding about finances, how the economy functions, how government interventions affect the market, prices, supply & demand, financial statements, budgeting and running a business. I fail to see how removing these ideas of study helps this understanding. Changing Accounting, Business Studies and Economics - three vital subjects from Level 1 into Level 1 Commerce is a short-sighted leap backwards in the financial education of our future entrepreneurs & our future runners of businesses and all contributors to the New Zealand economy.</p>

Response ID	Answer
ANON-K9GG-1N2X-U	<p>12) In this consultation document, you ask us to consider if the content is clear. Having removed most of the subject-specific content and knowledge, it is impossible to answer this. Are other subjects also to have their subject-specific content and knowledge removed as well - or is the Ministry just singling out Economics, Accounting and Business Studies?</p> <p>You can do better. Not Achieved.</p> <p>While this change looks like a fait accompli - despite any consultation - it is heart-breaking to me to see three subjects I have taught for many years have the guts ripped out of them. They are not interchangeable, not the same and generally have high success rates. Please reconsider.</p> <p>I feel like the commerce subjects have been completely disregarding in the development of this subject content. There is little to no conceptual content outlined for all 3 of the commerce subject in the proposed standards. The content is being dumbed down to make it more achievable rather than redesigning an exciting subject based around project learning which incorporates the concepts of all 3 subjects. The fact that all 3 subjects are being merged in the first place seems to be completely illogical when each of the 3 subjects on their own are significantly bigger than a number of subjects that still remain as stand alone subjects.</p>
ANON-K9GG-1N26-S	<p>This should be the 3 separate subjects of Accounting, Economics and Business Studies as was clearly supported in the last round of consultation. This Commerce course is an extremely poor replacement. Content is shallow at the best and does little to prepare students for the future whether it be school study in Economics, Accounting and Business Studies, University study or as a future business owner. Fundamental knowledge appears to be optional. This curriculum does not hold the NCEA qualification up to the international standard it should be at and our students will bear the consequences of this in the future. Also not a curriculum that will retain teachers or attract new teachers. Our local CETA met to discuss these changes and there was universal despair at these changes - no one at the local branch supports this. Also a lot of disgust at the MoE's approach to consultation as they are not interested in engaging in anything meaningful.</p> <p>Major concerns about forthcoming resources from MoE if this is the standard of curriculum being set. General feel is that MoE will consider their Course Outlines enough and that will be it.</p> <p>Overall an absolute travesty for our students to be offered this as a replacement for the current popular Accounting, Economics and Business Studies courses.</p>
ANON-K9GG-1NSM-H	<p>The learning matrix needs to cover more accounting, business and economics rather than social studies. Accounting, Business and Economics have very specific skills and are separate disciplines. Students need these skills no matter what career they enter and they need the financial knowledge in their own personal life. There is little commercial terminology and language that matches Commerce. The course seems rich in social studies and I think very few students would take this subject in its current proposed form.</p>
ANON-K9GG-1NM8-P	<p>The content is not cohesive and does not do justice to the academic rigour of any of the three subjects that have been absorbed into this pot pourri misnamed 'commerce'. Much of it looks like topics I have taught in a year 9 & 10 social</p>

Response ID	Answer
<p>ANON-K9GG-1NSE-9</p>	<p>studies programme which is where it belongs. I am seriously concerned that this will not prepare students for dealing with the complex models in level 2 or 3 economics, or any of accounting concepts and analysis and is likely to see students fall far short of understanding business concepts and language. We need to be encouraging entrepreneurship and developing economic understanding that will help our future businesses compete on a large and extremely complex world stage. This will put them off before they start. I am not sure how many students would actually opt for this as a subject.</p> <p>I have many concerns about the proposed subject of "Commerce" and the proposed Learning Matrix, Teaching, Learning and Assessment Guide and Course Outlines. They are as follows:</p> <p>The feedback from the MOE in 2020 was strongly opposed to the merger of these three subjects into one at NCEA Level 1. There are 28 of the 32 subjects in the proposed Level 1 all being discipline specific/standalone subjects and not broad as stated under the wide-scale review of the National Certificates of Educational Achievement (NCEA) by Hipkins.</p> <p>I am concerned that this proposed course is insufficient preparation for those students taking Level 2 and 3 Accounting, Economics and Business Studies. In particular, skills learnt in Accounting at Level 1 are fundamental financial literacy skills and our students are most concerned they will be woefully under prepared in this subject when they study Accounting in Level 2 and 3.</p> <p>Students need to have a robust understanding and knowledge of their finances, our economy, supply and demand, financial statements, budgeting and operating a business. The proposed course lacks the rigour required to achieve this</p> <p>It is false to say that a small number of students take these subjects. Numbers in these 3 subjects are much greater than the 15 standalone subjects that are continuing eg Dance, Drama, Music, 9 languages, Religious Education, Social Studies and Maori Performing Arts. Why were not some of these subjects combined into one eg "Languages. Surely if the demand from our educational communities is for these 3 subjects and not for the others mentioned, then they must remain as standalone subjects.</p> <p>Within the proposed course outlines/Learning Matrix/Teaching, Learning and Assessment Guide the course is very similar to that taught in schools at Yr 9 and Yr 10 Financial Education/Literacy courses. Therefore the proposal does not maintain academic standards for Level 1.</p> <p>The proposed course outlines is very business focused and only has token coverage of some basic skills in Economics or Accounting.</p> <p>Accounting, Economics and Business Studies are increasingly popular subjects in schools and are important life skills ensuring students have financial capability in society.</p> <p>Finally, I believe what has been proposed is not an equitable and valid decision as the stakeholders feedback has not been considered.</p>

Response ID	Answer
ANON-K9GG-1NS2-P	The combining of Economics, Business Studies and Accounting into Commerce has reduced important content, knowledge and jargon. Students will be unprepared for NCEA Level 2 and 3 across all commerce subjects. Furthermore, the new Commerce standards will create a large gap of knowledge between NZ students and what is expected internationally. We are doing our students a disservice by reducing key subject specific content and knowledge.

122 answers to "Mana orite impressions - Commerce - Does the Learning Matrix show mātauranga Māori is appropriately woven throughout?"

↓ Option	Total	Percent
On the right track	56	4.90%
Needs amendments	66	5.78%
Not Answered	1020	89.32%

121 answers to "Mana orite impressions - Commerce - Does the Teaching, Learning, and Assessment Guide explain how the subject supports ākonga Māori to succeed as Māori?"

Option	Total	Percent
On the right track	40	3.50%
Needs amendments	81	7.09%
Not Answered	1021	89.40%

121 answers to "Mana orite impressions - Commerce - Do the Course Outlines demonstrate how teaching and learning could be grounded in mātauranga Māori?"

↓ Option	Total	Percent
On the right track	39	3.42%
Needs amendments	82	7.18%
Not Answered	1021	89.40%

107 answers to "Mana orite comments - Commerce"

Response ID	Answer
ANON-K9GG-12XH-N	i hate the new standards
ANON-K9GG-12SA-9	Unable to comment as my understanding of Te Reo and Tikanga, while adequate, is not sufficient to understand the intricacies and subtles of Te Ao Māori.
ANON-K9GG-12SU-W	What if I think this needs MAJOR amendments - why is this not an option? I didn't realise that the accounting processes we use, we teach and which have been functioning very well since the 1400s are too universal or not universal enough. An asset is still an asset, despite its ownership. While it would be great to have more accountants and economists and businesspeople from diverse ethnic backgrounds, we can't do this by taking the skills and knowledge required OUT. Your ethnicity, like your gender, does not mean you can do something if you aren't taught the skills - which are not a function of ethnicity or of gender. A rethink is required.
ANON-K9GG-12M8-T	The criteria 'on the right track' and 'needs minor amendments' do not allow me to feedback my opinion. Lots of Maori terminology but not much actual activities/experiences.
ANON-K9GG-12ZN-W	It seems that Commerce, as a new, made-up subject, is the place to dump anything and everything Māori. This is just plane stupidity and reeks of tokenism.
ANON-K9GG-12WD-G	Heavily Maori based... this should be up to individual schools as it is now. Set concepts each year, increase the number of concepts we should cover but don't make it the main focus!
ANON-K9GG-12VM-R	Again, is awful.
ANON-K9GG-12JQ-G	To be honest, my attention got diverted observing exclusion of Business in the new design. Considering there's already lots of push for supporting akonga Maori to succeed as Maori and is strongly incorporated in our school, I am certain we will continue to make this an intergral part of our teaching and learning environment. :)
ANON-K9GG-12BV-D	Again...this survey is crap. 2 questions only and the focus is on only a small part of the change. I don't agree with anything said here. Of course it is up to the individual teacher to provide grounding a support of Maori within a context. The Standards themselves are not helpful and will just emphasize the amount of extra learning that needs to take place at L2 to provide the basic and fundamental knowledge needed (that is currently supplied at L1). Survey suck. Changes to Standards suck. The process of public engagement and feedback sucks. Why don't you ask some commerce businesses what they want to see in the subject - I can guarantee it won't be anything within these new Standards.
ANON-K9GG-12BB-S	It is not clear what the teaching, learning and assessment guide is or where to find it. Is it the initial page which explains what commerce is about? Is it the existing guide - this needed to be clearer. Apart from that, Matauranga Maori seems to be appropriately applied.

Response ID	Answer
ANON-K9GG-12BN-5	See above comments, particularly as regards NZ history, kinship, material culture and life not being reducible to "solving problems".
ANON-K9GG-12TK-M	The use of Maori terminology is fine only if all teachers are fully conversant with the terms and their deeper meaning - as such a much better glossary and explanation of terms is required to ensure good delivery in a classroom context.
ANON-K9GG-12P3-R	The model assumes that schools have subject classes have strong links to Maori and community. It will work in small towns or Pasifika countries, but I do not feel it will work with large urban city centers. In light of the Tomorrow's School model, a lot of ako are not attending their local community school and may be learning about contexts in their 'school' which are different to their own in their local area.
ANON-K9GG-12P1-P	I know this is a push to do with engaging Maori students but the grounding in such introspective context doesn't support an understanding of the wider community - world. Also I can not draw a link between how these changes will support Akonga Maori to succeed in a full understanding of all commerce subjects
ANON-K9GG-12PP-N	very difficult to envisage how maori teaching will be incorporated
ANON-K9GG-12PR-Q	Its actually quite hard to understand exactly what some of the new standards mean if you are not speaking Maori. It will take a lot if time to decipher exactly what it all means.
ANON-K9GG-12P5-T	Far too steeped in Maori content. It is important to recognise and learn but this is too the extreme.
ANON-K9GG-12P6-U	I have suggested alternative Maori terminology in my comments above that more naturally align with the discipline of commerce. The Maori concepts used in the MOE proposed curriculum are good, but they tend to focus on social issues rather than commerce and therefore I have tried to correct this balance. There is an opportunity in commerce to focus on putake and the business concept of quadruple bottom line firms (this is done to a small extent in L2 Business currently). This could be moved to a L1 commerce study on 'business structure' and a look at social enterprises and co-operatives that Maori use as business structures, along side more traditional business structures of limited liability, partnerships, sole traders, charities and listed companies etc. An historical look at Maori shipping companies (mid 1800's) could be interesting to see Maori innovation and adaptation to the changing world we found ourselves in. (e.g. book, Chiefs of Industry) and / or a look at lwi businesses today. There is an opportunity for a good resource book / work book to be published on lwi businesses. I have made other links to Maori concepts in my suggested big ideas and standards above.
ANON-K9GG-124H-H	This change is obviously a major shift. The significant degree of this shift will require substantial support for Commerce teachers who typically do not teach in the social sciences realm. What resources and PD (not on-line like the endless digital technology resources) will be provided to ensure that teachers can approach this with confidence. Without support I fear that this element will be ignored.

Response ID	Answer
ANON-K9GG-1245-X	<p>There is a very strong Maori cultural perspective described. A lot of students and teachers would struggle to identify with the contexts described.</p>
ANON-K9GG-126V-1	<p>This needs a major overhaul. This does not reflect well on the writers of this course. I suggest you connect with organisations like CETA (Commerce and Economics Association) and teachers in the State Secondary Schools who care deeply about the quality learning that is provided through subjects like Economics and Accounting.</p> <p>If we are going to have "Big Ideas" that overarch the entire course, please make them clear in two languages; ie an English version and a Maori version (direct translations) so that teachers are not forced to learn a second language in order to understand said Big Ideas. (We are a bicultural country with 2 national languages, but there are very few people who are fluent in both of said languages.) Specifically, I should be able to understand each idea on first read, without having to rely on Google translate to reach a point of understanding.</p>
ANON-K9GG-12HA-X	<p>The course outlines look full - but when the actual suggested content is studied beyond surface level, it is thin. Far too thin for the timeframes suggested. Not only is it thin - it is dumbing down the content and in many areas is now a replication of what schools already cover in year 10. Yes, they provide an example of how matauranga Maori can be embedded in the course - but I don't believe it will be rich enough to sustain a year's study. Furthermore, I believe the way the course is structured, the way the content is outlined, and the way Commerce looks as a whole in this new landscape will NOT be appealing to the majority of students who are looking to take Commerce as a specialist senior subject.</p>
	<p>The teaching, learning, and assessment guide incorporates many ideas that are embedded in matauranga Maori so, in this respect, I guess the subject as defined here helps Maori students identify and succeed as Maori - IF delivered as directed here (and that's a big IF, because honestly, there is insufficient "Commerce" in this introductory Commerce course to actually be useful to students wishing to pursue Commerce - hence teachers will, I'm sure, find ways to deliver content that is more relevant to tertiary/workplace Commerce).</p>
	<p>I am very concerned that there is a tendency in all this to OVERidentify with Maori at the expense of other cultures. I teach in a school with students representing 70+ different cultures - this course, as outlined here, will in my opinion not be inclusive of our diverse population.</p>
ANON-K9GG-12EC-W	<p>The course outlines only have tenuous relationships to Commerce subjects . While I have no real objection to this course and it does appear to be grounded in mātauranga Māori, it should not be called Commerce and should not be considered a valid replacement for Accounting, Economics and Business Studies at Level1.</p>
ANON-K9GG-12A3-9	<p>Not sure the thinking is on the right track</p>
ANON-K9GG-12AV-C	<p>Developing teaching in learning in mātauranga Māori i the course outlines looks to have introduced a whanau based assessment paradigm rather than addressing the significant mātauranga Māori business concepts that are</p>

Response ID	Answer
	integrated into the current Business Studies curriculum. The use of Pūtake seems a stab at mātauranga Māori rather than real integration.
ANON-K9GG-12K6-P	Too vague to say at this stage, but with out the appropriate skills to apply the course won't be grounded in anything unfortunately.
ANON-K9GG-12D3-C	Little to no information about this. Needs major changes or back to what we had previously
ANON-K9GG-12DS-C	Relevance and authenticity are important or it becomes shallow and tokenistic.
ANON-K9GG-12NM-G	If we are going to have "Big Ideas" that overarch the entire course, please make them clear in two languages; ie an English version and a Maori version (direct translations) so that teachers are not forced to learn a second language in order to understand said Big Ideas. (We are a bicultural country with two national languages, but there are very few people who are fluent in both of said languages.)
ANON-K9GG-12NP-K	This seems to be a very clumsy attempt to work matauranga Maori into a subject. The Big Ideas have attempted to take some Maori concepts and 'shoe horn' them into a Commerce course where there really is no natural fit. The Course Outlines show this to be the case because they have to almost ignore the Big Ideas to get any proper content and activities listed. This is a very unnatural 'marriage' between Commerce and matauranga Maori.
ANON-K9GG-12FJ-5	There is an excessive level of use of Te Reo terms in the course outlines which is at best confusing and I wonder just what the purpose is in developing an understanding of commerce and business in general - there seems to be a great emphasis on health and wellbeing whereas in reality these are only influences on business decisions and not the most important as profit must be the main motivator. There is also an assumption that all teacher will have a full appreciation of Te Reo.
ANON-K9GG-12F6-H	Clearly demonstrated
ANON-K9GG-125W-1	The only information that is currently available is very vague and rather generic - it does not outline how the 3 subjects of Business Studies, Economics and Accounting will be catered for in this generic Commerce subject ... very disappointing. How are we possibly meant to give useful feedback on something that is so vague?
ANON-K9GG-18QQ-W	What is the point of having Maori words woven through a course of learning when your matrix will put off the particular students you want to appeal to. Lots of Maori students want real-world, group-based learning of skills that will be useful. Lip service and words will not overcome the problems we face in New Zealand.
ANON-K9GG-18SS-1	The Matauranga Maori components of the standards are a good move and will work well with however the final standards look in Economics, Business and perhaps Accounting although I am not familiar with this curriculum. We already use a number of these concepts in our teaching and also use case studies of Maori businesses and entrepreneurs. This move is long overdue.

Response ID	Answer
ANON-K9GG-18WF-R	<p>My concerns are not with this at all, but rather with the actual combining of three discrete subjects under the Commerce banner.</p> <p>Those concepts of matauranga Maori will be able to be woven into Economics and Business without any issues at all.</p> <p>Needs to reflect a collaborative approach to learning and assessment - Māori as I understand, place more importance on the collective and much less importance on the individual. So collective learning situations like group work should be promoted and the ability to be assessed as a collective should be available to learners.</p> <p>They have long term views back through tūpuna and forward through mokopuna.</p>
ANON-K9GG-18WE-Q	<p>Only as so far as my previous comments. Love the te so Maori inclusion but the dinning down of this subject area does a disservice to Maori. "look at how a whanau comes to a financial decision" as compared to " explain consumer behaviour using the concepts of demand" is insulting.</p>
ANON-K9GG-18VX-9	<p>Tikanga Maori woven throughout the resources. Perhaps over-emphasised at the expense of some fundamental economic models. Yes to investigating businesses/ enterprises but not that they have to be Maori or Pasifika enterprises. Investigate those within the community that are suitable - We visit a Mediterranean Food retailer/ Arataki Honey long established in our region . A manufacturing plant for furniture.</p>
ANON-K9GG-18VC-M	<p>Using the various terms in the teaching of L1 will help with understanding but if they are not apart of the finished assessment than students are not going to put much emphases into understanding and learning them.</p>
ANON-K9GG-18BX-N	<p>The subject changes made to reflect Mana Ōrite mō te Mātauranga Māori are excessive. I am in favour of educating students about the importance of the Maori economy and incorporating Mana Ōrite mō te Mātauranga Māori where it is authentically relevant to the ako in our school community. I am not in favour of this one size fits all approach where every school in NZ is required to deliver Mana Ōrite mō te Mātauranga Māori in the same way and to the same extent. It should be used to inform and enhance current teaching and learning programmes NOT replace subject-specific content, skills, models and knowledge entirely.</p>
ANON-K9GG-18PH-K	<p>The approach the MOE is taking to reflect Mana Ōrite mō te Mātauranga Māori is likely to result in push back from some school communities, students and teachers. This is a contributing factor to many schools throughout NZ no longer offering NCEA Level 1 as an assessment pathway. My current school is included in this movement away from NCEA Level 1, replacing it with a Senior School Foundation Diploma.</p>
ANON-K9GG-184S-2	<p>I'm an older teacher who is currently in the process of learning Maori. Content needs to be written to support teachers in my position. Both English and Maori text -</p> <p>As above, some of the words are inappropriately designated and way too subjective for the Commerce subject.</p>

Response ID	Answer
	<p>Lose the word hauora (wellbeing) as it is a subjective statement</p> <p>Change the word tauhokohoko as the translation (barter / trade) is not appropriate for the more rounded concept of exchange.</p>
ANON-K9GG-18C5-K	see comments for first question
ANON-K9GG-18CN-C	Course outlines have not been provided, all that is detailed is a purpose. Therefore having more detail on this would be needed before a judgment can be made.
ANON-K9GG-189H-V	see above
ANON-K9GG-1899-D	Covered appropriately in the business context.
ANON-K9GG-189D-R	No.
ANON-K9GG-18R1-X	removing a foundation course will disadvantage all students
ANON-K9GG-189G-U	I would like to know which iwi have been consulted on this.
ANON-K9GG-18RB-F	As discussed above, the focus on Te Reo Maori is over the top in this course outline. Important to acknowledge the difference between Maori and Non Maori business culture, but this has over shadowed the fundamental disciplines being taught.
ANON-K9GG-18RC-G	There is very little support for teachers around these concepts. Teaching resources need to be developed by the ministry with exemplars. Currently there is very little emphasis on Maori culture with the standards, though they are stated in some standards.
	Hi could you ask the advisor with relation to the following points
ANON-K9GG-18RD-H	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The consultation process, the overwhelming majority of commerce teachers were opposed to the changes to ncea level 1 but this feedback was ignored. 2) Where is the public record of the above consultation and how do we get access to it. 3) The impact on teachers of commerce subjects who may be permanent staff but will have to teach in other areas if numbers of students doing senior commerce drops (which is likely given the lack of progression/pathway in the new standards) 4) The impact on student career pathways, students are far less likely to do a subject they have not had a good foundation in. The new standards do not provide a a good academic foundation. 5) How on earth does this improve financial literacy, which is a stated objective of the government/ministry.

Response ID	Answer
ANON-K9GG-18RW-4	<p>N/A</p> <p>Are Māori terms used appropriately? Yes, a lot of people across the country will struggle to use them properly.</p> <p>Are the concepts grounded in te ao Māori? Definitely, impressed with how they have related it back to it.</p>
ANON-K9GG-18RS-Z	<p>Can you see Māori contexts and approaches to teaching and learning explained? No not explained- alluded to . Not laid it out clearly for the teacher.</p> <p>Do the Course Outlines show how a course could be taught across a year in the subject? Yes, three different course options to work with and adapt if necessary.</p>
ANON-K9GG-18RN-U	<p>I believe that the inclusion of te reo Maori is definitely moving in the right direction.</p>
ANON-K9GG-18RG-M	<p>Much more guidance is required from authentic recognised sources. How do we categorically know that mātauranga Māori is correctly interpreted and woven throughout.</p>
ANON-K9GG-18HA-4	<p>Does feel a bit like substitution of terms from English to Māori for the sake of it.</p>
ANON-K9GG-18HK-E	<p>The use of 'whanau' needs careful consideration as not at all students have access to a business in a whanau sense.</p> <p>Again the survey does not allow disagreement with the statements.</p>
ANON-K9GG-18HX-U	<p>I am happy to teach Commerce and allow the context to reflect a wide range of cultures. I teach at a multicultural school and we reflect students' wide range of cultures including Maori. I don't want to be forcing students to take on cultural views that may well not reflect their families/whanau.</p>
ANON-K9GG-18HE-8	<p>There is significant use of Maori, at the cost any semblance of relevance to the commerce world.</p> <p>While it is great to see Maori culture and language included, it seems to dominate the course at the expense of globally taught business studies concepts and topics. (see my comments above, which are repeated here in the hope that someone reads them) - The course doesn't have the academic merit that other international qualifications have. It seems far more aligned with a New Zealand Social Studies course than an Economics/Accounting/Business Studies course. Consequently I don't think this is an attractive course for Year 11 students compared to what is available currently. I have read Year 11 Commerce course suggestions from my CETA colleagues that would provide a far more engaging, robust and relevant Year 11 learning experience. How about we have some genuine consultative engagement with Commerce teachers rather than ignoring our feedback. It is not too late to do a U turn on this !</p>
ANON-K9GG-18H3-P	

Response ID	Answer
ANON-K9GG-18HB-5	You are proposing to move from the current assessment which does lack focus in this area to the complete opposite where you are basically expecting teachers to deliver Commerce content (albeit weakly - see comments above) to deliver a course heavily based with Te Reo/Maori principles. There needs to be a more workable middle ground, especially if you are expecting teachers to transition to this from traditional teaching of the standards. Once again many colleagues I have talked to are frustrated and questioning whether they want to go through this major transition. We clearly need to incorporate Maori principles into our curriculum but there still needs to be a focus on the key Economic, Accounting and Business concepts which appear to have secondary importance.
ANON-K9GG-18HW-T	I support whakapapa, wairuatanga, culture, and values being woven through financial and non-financial decisions. I don't support and totally oppose the new subject content (above)
ANON-K9GG-188Q-4	These concepts do not seem to give equal weighting to the 3 subjects covered by commerce. Was it intended to represent the 3 subjects? Are students able to progress into the 3 subjects fairly at level 2
ANON-K9GG-18E9-S	Good basis exists but needs to be refined to develop a more real life relationship
ANON-K9GG-18EP-G	Whilst it is good to include a multi-cultural perspective on Accounting, Economics and Business Studies, these perspectives seem to dominate the big ideas and course outlines at the expense of actual useful commerce knowledge. It also appears to completely miss a global view as at the end of the day we participate in accounting, economics and business ideas at a global level more and more. Don't you want to have future youth who are able to hold their own on a global stage?
ANON-K9GG-18EG-7	It is a very contrived approach to learning. The context is wrong to deliver Commerce. The concepts should be appropriate to Commerce and teachers can deliver in a Maori context if they wish. First and foremost students should be educated to be global - economic ideas. Please start again - NEW PANEL - commerce concepts.
ANON-K9GG-18A8-M	If you can listen to the teachers of these subjects and get their concerns over the proposed standards inline what students, teachers (primary, secondary and tertiary) and our economy need then I think Commerce can and will reflect these changes extremely well as many aspects of Maori views, knowledge, culture, customs and business is well established in this area.
ANON-K9GG-18A1-D	Many schools such as mine will cope fine with the increased language and concepts within the assessments as they already part of the school culture. However there are a number of teachers who will need further support in this area. This compounds the workload further for those teachers a specialist in only one area who are already upskilling to teach the other two. It is also a concern that these concepts appear to be 'added' at the expense of other content when in fact many schools are successfully embedding them in their current programmes in the three individual subjects.
ANON-K9GG-18AU-H	excellent content - fully support. best for what students need to survive in current times and future

Response ID	Answer
ANON-K9GG-18A6-J	I understand why this is being done but when we deal with Economics and Accounting it is the concepts of these subjects that are important and Maori names etc can be put into the exercises. This has gone far too far.
ANON-K9GG-18K3-S	I like the fact that there is more explicit recognition of mātauranga Māori in the essence of the subject, however this needs to be supported as teachers grow in confidence in ensuring they do justice to these ideas.
ANON-K9GG-18AS-F	The Maori terms and concepts used are more relevant to Social Sciences generically, than being specific to Commerce.
ANON-K9GG-18HR-N	There are many Maori terms and concepts that are new which require PD , how these concepts can be woven in to main stream academic subjects. Are the Maori concepts and economic concepts have the same meaning ?
ANON-K9GG-18HD-7	This course is very heavily Mātauranga Māori focussed. It is good to see its incorporation but I believe it is possibly done to the point where there are terms and concepts used which many teachers would not be familiar with. I envision Professional Learning would be needed. Are other subjects equally focussed?
ANON-K9GG-18U8-8	I think there is good intentions but it is hardly mana building to give students a course that is pitched at level too low for them. There are many ways to enrich our current courses to allow for greater context and inclusion of Te Ao Maori. I not satisfied that what is shown does this.
ANON-K9GG-18Y5-9	The course outlines have shown how a very diluted financial literacy course could be taught. The course outlines do not reflect a rich understanding of managing money, income, and risk, set realistic financial goals, and make sound economic and financial decisions for our students.
ANON-K9GG-18UQ-1	Accounting, Economics and Business Level 1 already support Māori contexts and approaches to teaching and learning explained. Have the proposed course outlines continued to do this??
ANON-K9GG-18UQ-1	The course outlines have shown how a very diluted financial literacy course could be taught. The course outlines do not reflect a rich understanding of managing money, income, and risk, set realistic financial goals, and make sound economic and financial decisions for our students.
ANON-K9GG-18UC-K	Accounting, Economics and Business Level 1 already support Maori contexts and approaches to teaching and learning explained. Have the proposed course outlines continued to do this??
ANON-K9GG-18UC-K	I really get annoyed when I read a document and there is no glossary - if the document is written in English it is for an English speaking audience. I am really happy to see the use of Maori in language, BUT for goodness sake have a translation of all the words available - either at the top, bottom, in brackets or as a pop-up when the cursor moves over the word. Being "inclusive" also means making the reader feel welcome and part of that is providing a translation. I don't want to go to google every time I meet a new word - I like to know the meaning to get a true understanding so if you are going to use Maori words, be proactive and have the translation right there.
ANON-K9GG-18UC-K	Including Maori principles in Accounting makes as much sense and including Accounting in teaching Maori language and culture. Accounting reports on financial facts and data. Accounting principles income/expense, profit and loss,

Response ID	Answer
	facts and figures should not be influenced by what is and isn't Maori. (I can see that business and economics may be affected). Accounting needs to remain a separate subject. Why on earth would Accounting be grounded in matauranga Maori?
ANON-K9GG-18U2-2	See above
ANON-K9GG-18DJ-9	There is definitely more scope. I do not feel I have the necessary knowledge to comment on whether or not this will support Maori to succeed as Maori. But I do like the Te Ao Maori concepts will be embedded into the curriculum rather than optional.
ANON-K9GG-18D2-H	Needs to include more Accounting eg budgeting and Accounting theory.
ANON-K9GG-18NU-X	I do feel that there needs to be a stronger Maori thread in the curriculum in the senior years but as separate commercial subjects. I do not have sufficient knowledge of Maori culture to really make an informed comment above.
ANON-K9GG-18NS-V	Contents do no reflect the common Accounting, Economics and Business terms. Needs to be revised thoroughly. The revised standards have dumped down the contents rather than helping the students to lift their learning.
ANON-K9GG-18F9-T	As New Zealand is a small country on 5 million we need to prepare out students for the global business world. While it is important to acknowledge the Maori world view of commerce we must focus on teaching our students Accounting, Econmoics and Business skills that will provide them the capability to thrive on the global busiesss arena.
ANON-K9GG-18FP-H	The outline of a Commerce course as suggested above does exclude the introduction of any mātauranga Māori.
ANON-K9GG-1856-6	Seems to be some good ideas, just really would like to see some good resources. Help schools to establish links to their iwi. Iwi need to respond how they control their resources. I feel happy as we have Ngai Tahu as the main iwi in our rohe. However, not all tribes have preformed as well. I do like the idea about getting a variety of views about decisions and these are not just financial. I don't think Hauora is a key aspect of Business. We could move that to be more about carrying our a business and seeing how students felt. How could they work through different bottom lines to get Hauora.
ANON-K9GG-183B-G	While it is good to have an increasingly multi-cultural focus, it appears that this has been done at the expense of academic content. There would be better ways of designing the course to incorporate matauranga Maori that are interesting and exciting and actually incorporate useful Accounting, Economics and Business Studies concepts. Some of the learning activities suggested are cringingly tokenistic (eg 'who is my whanau' – how can you get students to see and understand the relevance of Maori world view in terms of business when the course outlines suggest tasks like this that one would find in Year 8 Social Studies course.) and this does not help give credibility to the course or to Maori business. A better approach would be looking at some interesting case studies of Maori business and get the students see things in action. There needs to be a far greater balance between matauranga Maori, tikanga Maori and academic knowledge of internationally recognised models and practices of Economics

Response ID	Answer
	<p>and Accounting. However it also needs to be remembered that business in NZ operates more and more in an international arena beyond the Pacific. It is vital for the future economic success of NZ that students are able to operate in that world too. This course is extremely narrow in scope and leans to focus mainly on Maori business concepts and does not adequately address the far reaching international nature of business and ignores that Accounting is the international language of business. This approach will not benefit our students in the future if we expect them to hold their own in an international arena.</p> <p>I like the use of appropriate whakatauki and language. To me it is an embracing process and not for show or a token effort. Keep up with this ans this alsu enhances the richness of what is being worked on and presented here. Thank you</p> <p>I strongly believe that more integration of Maturanga Maori is important in learning about the economic causes and then the impacts of policies on different groups. For example economics I feel this should be more applied to the real world. As economics is a live subject that we can see all around us. For instance we can examine current impacts and historical impacts leading to inequality, health, educational outcomes, without making Maori and Pacifica feel like they are unable to achieve at same level but highlight that some have to overcome more obstacles and this comes from what occurred in the past. Small changes in policies could be made to reduce negative impacts. Students can look at if we have a sugar tax this will have benefits in long term on Heath but government could make sure the tax revenue goes into heathy eating programs, school lunches, subsidies.</p> <p>I feel that currently the integration of Maori in economics especially external examinations is tokenism with only using Maori names in assessment rather than current impacts, and things such as different ways of approaching business (goals and resource use). Which leads students not to take the Maori content seriously.</p>
<p>ANON-K9GG-1835-3</p> <p>ANON-K9GG-1NMJ-8</p>	<p>I have personally set goals at trying to incorporate more real world maori examples and impacts into my teaching. Which I think could be a more useful approach for the curriculum changes. For example impact of different ethnicities on policies like smoking and is it fair given that in last few years there has not been a statistical significant difference in reduction of smoking, and only a small percentage of tax revenue goes to preventing smoking and Maori and Pacifica are more burdened by the 10% price rise. This is true foe so many policies such as petrol tax, sugar tax, unemployment benefits, Covid 19, kiwi saver, pension and inequality in NZ just to name a few. If we teach more in a current real world example way looking at stakeholders, and short term and long term impacts. We are then teaching students to evaluate polices positives, negatives and short term and long term impacts. This then means students have the skills that are transferable to the real world careers that they may have as an economist. This is what our economic graduates do in treasury and their recommendations to the government, how RBNZ takes into consideration Unemployment, housing while setting monetary policy. Students then have the tools to be able to understand fiscal policies and evaluate the governments budget. They become more informed voters and critical thinkers. Students are then able to see Maori and Pacifica are more burdened policies such by tax, but long term could benefit if the policies are affective but maybe need a more</p>

Response ID	Answer
	holistic approach in using multiple policies tax, plus education and subsidies to make sure we improve our standard of living for our people.
ANON-K9GG-1NM2-G	Any teacher that is providing learning opportunities relevant to the NZ context is probably doing most/all of this already, within the current standards.
ANON-K9GG-1NMR-G	I feel that I lack the specialist knowledge to answer questions such as this. I am looking forward to including more Mātauranga Māori in my teaching but given my thoughts on the draft content this would need revising as well. We need to ensure that the key content is not masked by the overlay and inclusion of Mātauranga Māori but enhanced by it.
ANON-K9GG-1NXA-A	Again, without the basic Economics and Accounting curriculum content, concepts, and knowledge even at a foundational level included this qualification it looks seriously lacking. Perhaps starting the RAS at Level 3, working out what knowledge and dispositions we wanted our akonga to have in these subject-specific areas and working backwards through the levels may have been the more informed way to proceed.
ANON-K9GG-1NXE-E	It seems very unclear how this will be interwoven and taught throughout the year. Are Māori terms used appropriately? If you look at NZQA document about Mātauranga they clearly state Mātauranga cannot be defined due to differences with Māori community. They also indicated that using Māori words and then providing a western definition does not constitute Mātauranga Māori. Therefore, no - terms are not a reflection of Mātauranga Māori. Each Iwi is different to the other, each hapu is different. If the government is pushing placed based local curriculum then support is needed to allow schools to engage with Iwi together decide what to teach. Our community is screaming for more economics and accounting not less.
ANON-K9GG-1NMB-Z	Our HOF Māori said that he wished that Accounting and Economics be more accessible to Māori so that they can leverage the knowledge and skills to help them reach their aspirations within a globalised society. He said that Mātauranga Māori is about the past, present and future. It is filling the kete Aronui (Human Knowledge) so that our taira can use it to reach the aspirations for themselves, hapu and Iwi. Simply, throwing terms and concepts in without context is taken at best. For our taira to engage in Accounting they must use their current Mātauranga alongside the past Mātauranga to generate new Mātauranga. Accounting, Economics and Business Studies embraces this but is defined in western terms as Innovation and Entrepreneurship. Are the concepts grounded in te ao Māori? Not really, see above. The key concepts of Mātauranga Māori within Te Ao Māori are:

Response ID	Answer
	<p>Whakapapa - IO / Te Kore and Ranginui and Papatuanuku. These ideas and stories can be used to help our students understand how subjects like Accounting can be linked back to their whakapapa. That every business has an origin story that aligns with the creation story with Te Ao Maaori. That captures that story in financial numbers to help reconcile how well the assets are adding value to the customers and in return generate a benefit for the business. Behind this is the idea of Whakawhanaugatanga, Manakitanga and Ukaipo. Accounting these days looks at the tripple bottom line (People, Planet and Profit).</p> <p>Here are the core aspects of Matauranga Maaori:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whanaungatanga Wairua Turangawaiwai Rangateratanga Ukaipo Manakitanga Mauro Ora Pukengatanga Kaitiakitanga Kotahitanga <p>The other words and phrases sit within these key concepts of Matauranga Maaori.</p> <p>Can you see Māori contexts and approaches to teaching and learning explained?</p> <p>Nope. To simplified. Needs to engage with local businesses with Maaori community. Research shows that a connection is needed with role models where students can see their culture thriving within the context of learning. This is not going to happen under the current approach.</p> <p>In addition to this Maaori have always been Economists and Accountants through trade. Where are the opportunities to bring this in? Where are the stories that Maaori have always been economist, accountants and business people that operate from a collective (meso and macro economics) rather than western individual (micro economics).</p> <p>Do the Course Outlines show how a course could be taught across a year in the subject?</p> <p>Why is this question here? Nothing to do with Matauranga Maaori.</p> <p>However, in response to this not really - it is confusing and muddled. It gives an impression of what is possible but there is so much in it that it would be difficult to apply it without it being token, robust and not rushed. It would also bring into question the reliability and validity of the assessments. designed by NZQA.</p> <p>Finally, it would have been good to have the ability to talk about the assessments in addition to the matrix.</p>

Response ID	Answer
ANON-K9GG-1N7A-9	You really need to try again. These proposals are so watered down in terms of commerce content it is going to put people off.
ANON-K9GG-1N7B-A	n
ANON-K9GG-1N7S-U	It is not difficult to intergrate to ao Maori in commerce subjects and can be done so meaningfully. There are so many different viewpoints on Commerce that students can investigate and be aware of. Focussing solely on Maori and Pasifika contexts will be doing our akonga a dis-service.
ANON-K9GG-185M-W	.
ANON-K9GG-1NQV-R	<p>The focus on concepts grounded in te ao Māori has gone too far. The review has failed to recognise that Commerce is an international concept and has focussed on social studies type issues rather than the development of commerce concepts that would equally be relevant in NZ to all NZ citizens regardless of ethnicity, including Maori. In addition, with two thirds of school leavers entering employment (200,900 2019 MOE statistics) versus approximately 100,000 into tertiary education of some form, the development of relevant subject content is necessary. Inclusiveness of Maori concepts can be woven into the subject of commerce, as can the role of the Maori concepts in Aotearoa but the current proposals will not be developing the required learning for learners success in the real world/economy.</p> <p>Again I disagree in all areas. I fully support including Māori in the content where we can but it seems like it has taken a front seat at the cost of the majority. I teach in a school where I am lucky to have one Māori student a year. I understand this is not the case in other schools but I still need to make learning relevant to everyone in my classroom and having such a significant focus seems like we have gone from one extreme to another. Maybe it is because the Māori language used was not defined nor the content explained at all that I feel this way. I spent a lot of time googling to try and understand the terms being used as they are not ones I had come across before so this did not help.</p>
ANON-K9GG-1NQ9-U	
ANON-K9GG-1NQW-S	The whole concept is fundamentally flawed by trying to impose a Maori context. It does not fit, despite artificial attempts to make it appear so. There is a need for Maori context, but chiefly for Maori. The business world does not relate to these concepts beyond Maori involvement. It is an artificial PC attempt at appeasement that inevitably becomes patronising and therefore insulting.
ANON-K9GG-1N26-S	This has occurred at the expense of academic content and actual Commerce knowledge. One result will be a lot of students and parents equating the introduction of increased matauranga Maori with the dumbing down of the curriculum and forming conclusions from that which will be counter-productive for your goals. There are far better ways to celebrate Maori business than what is illustrated in this curriculum.
ANON-K9GG-1NSM-H	The focus on incorporating Maori needs to be woven more into Accounting, Business and Economics.

Response ID	Answer
ANON-K9GG-1NM8-P	It is good to see greater incorporation of Te Reo into these documents. However, I am not qualified to make judgements on how well this has been done.
ANON-K9GG-1NSE-9	The matrix is quite vague as to how you can deliver the course. Significant work needs to be done to make teachers comfortable with this content.
ANON-K9GG-1NS2-P	The new proposed course outlines show how the teaching and learning is grounded in mātauranga Māori - this is going on the right track.