## Commerce Phase 2 Survey – Raw Feedback

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

| Option | Total | Percent |
| --- | --- | --- |
| The materials are ready for piloting | [4](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dquestion.2021-07-30.3457785532&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2F18802f172f%2Fsubpage.2021-07-29.6026821579%2Fquestion.2021-07-30.3457785532%2Fquestion-2021-07-30-3457785532-radiosubquestion%3Alist=question-2021-07-30-3457785532-radiosubquestion%2FThe+materials+are+ready+for+piloting) | 0.42% |
| The materials need small amendments before piloting | [5](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dquestion.2021-07-30.3457785532&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2Facdfdd8bec%2Fsubpage.2021-07-29.6026821579%2Fquestion.2021-07-30.3457785532%2Fquestion-2021-07-30-3457785532-radiosubquestion%3Alist=question-2021-07-30-3457785532-radiosubquestion%2FThe+materials+need+small+amendments+before+piloting) | 0.53% |
| The materials need significant amendments before piloting | [26](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dquestion.2021-07-30.3457785532&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2F652a71e78c%2Fsubpage.2021-07-29.6026821579%2Fquestion.2021-07-30.3457785532%2Fquestion-2021-07-30-3457785532-radiosubquestion%3Alist=question-2021-07-30-3457785532-radiosubquestion%2FThe+materials+need+significant+amendments+before+piloting) | 2.73% |
| The materials are unsuitable for piloting | [49](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dquestion.2021-07-30.3457785532&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2F96d33c53c6%2Fsubpage.2021-07-29.6026821579%2Fquestion.2021-07-30.3457785532%2Fquestion-2021-07-30-3457785532-radiosubquestion%3Alist=question-2021-07-30-3457785532-radiosubquestion%2FThe+materials+are+unsuitable+for+piloting) | 5.15% |
| Not Answered | [867](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dquestion.2021-07-30.3457785532&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2Fc4817e040d%2Fsubpage.2021-07-29.6026821579%2Fquestion.2021-07-30.3457785532%2Fquestion-2021-07-30-3457785532-radiosubquestion%3Alist=question-2021-07-30-3457785532-radiosubquestion%2F__not_answered__) | 91.17% |

**Do you have any further feedback on the draft materials? If there was one thing you think would help make these materials easier to test in the pilot, what would it be?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| [ANON-767U-4ES6-U](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-4ES6-U) | The overall big problem with the whole way this course is being constructed is that you do not know where you are going. You do not know what the students need to know at level 1 because you do not know what they need for level 2 or level3. The course as presently constructed does not prepare students for level 2 and 3 in accounting, economics and business studies. Are the requirements for level 2 and 3 changing????. You should start with what you require at level 3, so that level 2 can prepare students for that, and then level one can be used to prepare students for level 2.  this is the blind leading the blind at present, this level one course does not prepare the students for the current level 2 and level 3, and since we as teachers do not know what level 2 and 3 will look like, how can we support this level one course???  you should have listened to the feedback and not changed the subjects in the first place. |
| [ANON-767U-4ES5-T](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-4ES5-T) | The subject seems to have a strong focus on Financial Literacy/Accounting with very little development in terms of business or economics concepts. As such it is difficult to see how the students will develop enough knowledge and understanding to be able to make informed choices when deciding what to study in Year 12 & 13. Unless the subject mater for Year 12 is going to be significantly dumbed down to allow students to cope with the content and complexity. The focus on Pacific knowledge is concerning as a bi-cultural country why is there a need to consider Pacifica knowledge surely it might be better to look at Indian culture/knowledge as they form a larger part of the community?? |
| [ANON-767U-4EAK-X](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-4EAK-X) | The content included is not adequate to be called a commerce course, and contains so little actual commerce content. It also provides no pathway to level 2 or 3 in economics, business or accounting |
| [ANON-767U-4EX2-V](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-4EX2-V) | Has a single teacher who actually knows commerce subjects looked at these standards and ideas. There is no chance to form actual student knowledge and students will be left ill equipped in the commerce area if they learn like this. Our school has 2 economics and 2 accounting classes who cover completely different content and some boys take both as they prefer the learning in this area. You are reducing students ability to make informed decisions about their future study as they will go to level 2 a step up already with no foundational knowledge. Further this plan talks about getting businesses to come in and field trips this make work for decile 10 where they know 10 businesses per class but what about other schoolsx |
| [ANON-767U-4EXR-V](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-4EXR-V) | There are three main factors that make the draft standards completely unusable and unsuitable for developing student learning, changing the following three things would massively improve the materials:  1. Retaining the subjects 'economics, accounting, and business studies' as individual subjects for schools where this what suits their local community the most, seeing as schools can already combine these to a commerce course themselves if it suits them.  2. Removing the mid year external - this is absolutely appalling pedagogy as it doubles the stress and time spent preparing for externals and completely undermines the few good features of the new standards by removing flexibility of course design (as students must be ready for an external half way through the year). It also proves a massive barrier to student agency, and the ability to differentiate the pacing of the course for different students, as well as posing as a barrier to create meaningful, local, community based project learning for the two internal standards, as this would be interrupted by the mid year external.  Please if you change nothing else - at least remove the mid year external assessment.  3. Actually engaging with teacher feedback and consultation on these standards. Maybe find our views and what should be internal and external??? Actually listen to our views on content? I find it absolutely appalling and offensive that the subject expert group described this as a "respectful" process, when 81% of teachers voiced their opposition to what was being done and yet we were ignored. This change is being "done to us" not for or with us, and many teachers I speak to from a range of curriculum areas are actively considering leaving the profession due to this. I personally am hoping that our school completely ditches the NCEA system entirely otherwise will also consider leaving. Genuine consultation, not 'tick box and then ignore them' consultation would help us pilot the materials with actual enthusiasm and therefore more effectively, rather than feeling like we are being attacked by the MoE and want by all means to avoid doing what you are asking. |
| [ANON-767U-4E6Q-S](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-4E6Q-S) | There is a significant lack of specific content to support a full year course. |
| [ANON-767U-4EQQ-M](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-4EQQ-M) | It is clear the group have done a lot of work, however sadly they are not a fair representation of the 3 commerce subjects we have currently. Accounting and Economics have been greatly hard done by. It is a very business studies focus, and from a social viewpoint more than a financial/economic one. We need three individual subjects. |
| [ANON-767U-4EQF-9](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-4EQF-9) | The general concensus amongst Commerce teachers is that we need to retain the existing pathway for Economics , Accounting (and to a lesser extent ,Business Studies). All of these subject have had success in the past, engaging students who go on to achieve good results. We feel we have not been listened to when it comes to the materials that have been developed, which do enable us to teach some of these concepts, but are very loose, reptitive and vague. I like the idea that there is scope for schools to modify what they teach but: 1. there needs to be more guidance around specific content. Its not really good enough to have " example of models include..." because there are a lot more. 2. this is going to be hard to assess and mark externally, as there will be a vast variety, content and interpretation of the standard requirements.  I can't see this being much of a step up from what most schools are already doing at Yr9 and 10, and hence it will be disengaging. The excellent L1 pathway has been taken away for Economics and Accounting, leading to less success at L2 and L3. |
| [ANON-767U-4EQV-S](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-4EQV-S) | I believe that they are totally unfit for purpose. That these standards should NOT be replacing Accounting and Economics. That these 2 subjects need to be reinstated. |
| [ANON-767U-4EJV-J](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-4EJV-J) | Don't make such drastic changes. There is way too much content being changed - overwhelming for students and teachers. Level 1 Commerce is basically a revised Business Studies course with a very small token inclusion of Economics and Accounting. There is almost no crossover with what is currently being taught at Level 1 in these subjects. You need to make all of the teaching resources available asap. How are we going to deliver this course?!! |
| [ANON-767U-4EJ1-D](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-4EJ1-D) | There is very little Accounting or Economics in any of the proposed standards. It will not set students up for L2/3 as they currently stand, it will also not prepare them for anything that will be covered at tertiary level. For example there is no supply or demand which are the very basic building blocks for Economics at any level.  The course is a business studies course with some financial literacy, which is already offered in the current NCEA L1 Business Studies course.  It is not possible to cover all the content proposed at level 6 of the curriculum. Some of the concepts are at level 3/4 and others are at a level 7/8/9  Instructions for the standards are very broad and the assesment conditions are very specific. The amount of content/work required will not be possible to complete in the time suggested and the constraints of the presentation/submissions e.g. 800 words. |
| [ANON-767U-4ECQ-6](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-4ECQ-6) | The material does not link together well enough to support full student learning and will drive students away from the Commerce subject. |
| [ANON-767U-4ECM-2](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-4ECM-2) | They are a mess - how can you convert three totally different subjects into 1 subject. They don't make sense. The is no cohesion. Bits pulled out of each subject. And some bits pulled from Level 3. |
| [ANON-767U-4EDG-W](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-4EDG-W) | I like the idea of combining Accounting, Economics and Business Studies into one subject as it gives students who have an interest in commerce the chance to try all three without the need to take up two or three of their option choices. We often get students who choose only one of the above subjects because they don't want to use up all of their option choices, but if they choose the wrong one, i.e. they choose Accounting in Year 11 and discover they don't like it, it can turn them off Economics and Business Studies in subsequent years. I think this new Commerce subject could mitigate this problem. It also gives them a little bit of background in all three which can be of a real benefit, especially if they want to do well in Business Studies in Year 12 and 13.  However, I am concerned that I don't see enough core skills in the current draft materials, especially for Accounting. I would like to see exactly what Accounting content they will be able to learn under these draft materials. For instance, will they learn the accounting equation. journals, ledgers, as well as statements? It would also be good to see more detailed examples of what content they will be learning for Economics and Business Studies. I would like to see the content further developed so that core skills of each area are identified, and then see examples of how this content could be taught under each of the standards. |
| [ANON-767U-4E6V-X](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-4E6V-X) | The significant learning area identified in the learning matrix shows that this is a 'mashed up' learning area which lacks depth, poor scaffolding across the learning area. It is a poor attempt at combining three philosophically, conceptually and functionally contrasting subjects into a pseudo subject, which is a broad learning area. The only way this can be piloted is to offer more credits (60 credits) with an option of covering the content of the learning areas under a specific subject umbrellas. This would offer both students and schools agency, with regards to what learning areas they wish to offer or undertake, while ensuring continuity of ongoing learning in the future. |
| [ANON-767U-4E8P-T](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-4E8P-T) | The language used in the Achievement Standards are biased towards financial decisions (Financial as a term used in all of them) rather than allowing the opportunity to explore both Economic and Non-Economic. It seems to narrow the focus rathr than broadening a student's understanding. |
| [ANON-767U-4EDH-X](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-4EDH-X) | This material has too many concepts smooshed together that do not actually fit. There are several ideas thrown into the material that are from across all three economics, business studies and minimal from accounting. What is in the standard assessment activities does not match the explanatory notes and the assessment standard tasks have no consistency across them. The standards fail to acknowledge the foundations of all commerce subjects that are needed for level 2 and 3. |
| [ANON-767U-4E8S-W](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-4E8S-W) | The overall concept of a 1 subject fits all 3 has created a watered down level of understanding, and will end up with outcomes for the students which is less than the specialist course we currently have. While 1 or perhaps 2 of the standards seem to have application to what I would have called economics, bot the standards that are assessed externally are a big concern. I have no concept of what that external might possibly look like e.g. will students need to be prepared to be assessed relating to all 4 models; marketing mix, price mechanism, break even analysis and mark up pricing. is this demand or supply, or part of a business plan? will 1.3 assess using the circular flow model to show sector interdependence or will they be expected to identify external and internal stake holders. Overall I see very little opportunity to explore accounting with any real depth. |
| [ANON-767U-4ECS-8](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-4ECS-8) | The external draft standards do not have enough information to make meaningful discussion possible let alone trialling. Across the four draft standards they do not prepare students for Levels 2 or 3 . They also do not make sense alongside each other or have internal cohesion. They are a mess of pieces from across the three subjects and three current year levels that leave teachers and students lost with no sense of direction. |
| [ANON-767U-4EM6-N](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-4EM6-N) | More elaboration of the external standards and sample assessment material. |
| [ANON-767U-4EM1-G](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-4EM1-G) | The assessments right now are a mixture of all commerce subjects and is missing on most of the important concepts. It is better that Accounting, Economics and Business Studies is assessed as an individual subject due to the different level of content in each. If not the assessments to show clear reflection of each subject area. |
| [ANON-767U-4EMW-P](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-4EMW-P) | Currently it is taught as commerce which is difficult for the students to understand the differences in the subjects taught. So it would be better option to separate the subjects altogether or if we are containing the same materials then it should reflect each subject for the assessment that the students would be undertaking |
| [ANON-767U-4E2C-7](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-4E2C-7) | There are very limited materials at this point in time for some of the new standards in Commerce. |
| [ANON-767U-4E29-W](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-4E29-W) | While the 3 previous commerce subjects are "covered" to some degree, the depth of knowledge has been lost, and so some of the key concepts are not covered. They definitely have more potential than what was originally released, but still quite worrying. They are well below what we teach currently and what is prescribed in the NZ Curriculum for Level 6. In its current state I do not believe they will form a good foundation for Curriculum level 7. |
| [ANON-767U-4E2X-V](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-4E2X-V) | It will NOT give students the foundation to continue into L2 Acc,Eco, Bus. It appears to be a watered down version of mainly Bus Studies with some Eco or Acc or Financial Literacy and of course some Maori to tick off the new initiative, thrown in. There is no way that we can offer these if we want the best for our students going into L2. |
| [ANON-767U-4E2U-S](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-4E2U-S) | The material did not give a balance between accounting, business and economics. It was unclear as to the depth of learning expected and how this can be adequately covered in a one year course. It was unsuitable to use at my school as there is no link to the school year 10 courses (which are developed from our school community) and no continuity into level 2 which puts the subject on the backfoot for student choices. Teachers will need upskilling (PD) so students can reach their potential in their chosen field. |
| [ANON-767U-4E2P-M](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-4E2P-M) | This course is not suitable for our students or teachers, not enough guidance, far too general and takes away the separate skill sets, Economics, Accounting and Business offers, does not at all progress on from our Year 10 courses and in no way prepares students for more specialised subject choices in future years. This whole concept appears to be dreamed up without consulting actual teachers who currently teach these subjects, who are specialists in their field(s), and actually know what works and not works for students sitting in front of them. This type of course will create students who will have very minimal basic skills in the three subject areas depending on the skill set of the teacher of each class and will then create a massive jump when specialising in Level 2. This will lead to a massive drop of students selecting these 3 important subject areas going forward. Addressing a severe lack of everyday Financial skills/literacy by the majority of students leaving high school in NZ would be a far better use of L1 students time and lead to more useful and beneficial outcomes than this complete mishmash of ideas. |
| [ANON-767U-4EP3-N](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-4EP3-N) | The materials need to be less general and more specific e.g. which commerce model should be used? There is no example of a CAT or an external exam. As the standards can be taught from a different focus how do I know the questions in either assessment will cover what I have taught. |
| [ANON-767U-4EPY-U](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-4EPY-U) | More specific guidance on content, timeframes etc |
| [ANON-767U-4EBY-D](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-4EBY-D) | The draft materials are not at curriculum level 6. It is difficult to see alignment between the matrix and the assessments. |
| [ANON-767U-4EBD-R](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-4EBD-R) | I am struggling to see how it is possible to pilot these materials for Level 1 Commerce when the requirements of Level 2 and 3 Accounting, Business Studies and Economics are not known. There is nothing to suggest that these will best prepare the students for the rigour of future study in the subjects they should be preparing them for, except putting them significantly behind where current students would be once completing a Level 1 subject in these three disciplines. Unless, the plan is to reduce the difficulty of the Level 2 and 3 standards to help boost results across the board - why raise the quality of teaching of learning, when we can lower the bar? I also have yet to see any significant support, desire or need for a combined commerce subject from any major stakeholder? Have parents asked for this? Students asked for this? Teachers asked for this? Employers asked for this? The only significant call has been for Financial Literacy to be made accessible for more students - so why not create a subject at level 2 and 3 to make this valuable item a realistic pathway for students. |
| [ANON-767U-4EBX-C](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-4EBX-C) | It is not rigorous enough and omits the material required to prepare students for separate subjects at level 2 |
| [ANON-767U-4ETJ-G](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-4ETJ-G) | Can and 1.2 be assessed together? Eg Can the same SWOT be used for both units  1.3 Explanatory Note 2 - Do they need to study all 5 points for the exam or can they choose at least 3? Will they need their own case study or will they be provided with a case study?  1.4 CAA - test style....what does this mean? Is there flexibility in when in the year this could be run eg for schools who run semester programmes eg in Term 2? |
| [ANON-767U-41V8-C](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-41V8-C) | Too broad--- by trying to justify the terrible decision to combine Econ/ Acctg and Business Studies these standards are too broad and contain too many possibilities. |
| [ANON-767U-4ETA-7](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-4ETA-7) | There is so much in each of the standards, I think we need a lot more guidance on what is expected before they can be taught. There is one standard that has a few more materials to help but I would like to see exemplars, and more about the key teaching points, or maybe even some AO before teaching it. |
| [ANON-767U-41VZ-E](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-41VZ-E) | I am deeply disappointed by the draft materials for the proposed new 'Commerce' at Level 1. I am particularly opposed to the virtual elimination of Accounting and seriously wonder if the panel experts even understand what function Accounting provides in today's world. A misunderstanding seems to pervade the community and perhaps our experts, that technology is replacing Accounting. What technology has done is pave the way for accountants to operate at a higher level, by telling the story behind the figures and giving business advice. All organisations need people who understand the financials. Personal financial literacy is being promoted from the Ministry level in schools, yet financial literacy is also fundamental to business and all organisations with a financial component to their operations. Globally, there is a growing shortage of qualified accountants. The USA acknowledges this and a bi-partisan bill is currently in Congress to add Accounting to the STEM subjects. We do our education system and the broader economy a great disservice by removing the opportunity to start developing this capability at Year 11 and potentially removing Accounting altogether. All specialist subjects can be started at tertiary level, but those who have laid a foundation at high school are much better placed to succeed. Those who leave school after Year 11 (Level 1) will still benefit from their understanding of the fundamentals of Accounting, be that as employees, contributors to community organisations or owners of small businesses. 'Commerce' is only at Level 6 of the curriculum yet all other subjects, even the new ones, cover levels 6-8. This poses real difficulty for year 10 business classes seeing a pathway via year 11 and is inherently unfair. The course outlines comprise essentially Business Studies content and do not provide a leg up for middle-of-the-road students wishing to study Accounting from Year 12. |
| [ANON-767U-41VU-9](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-41VU-9) | Commerce is supposed to represent Accounting, Economics and Business Studies. There is virtually no development of Accounting skills in the matrix or draft materials as a whole. I fail to see how this will progress students with the knowledge and skill set to be able to branch out into the three distinct Commerce disciplines at level 2. The learning opportunities of students have been restricted rather than enhanced by the changes. |
| [ANON-767U-41AE-4](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-41AE-4) | Have them at the correct curriculum level as currently they are at a level well below what is needed at level 6 and does not lead onto level 7 curriculum courses. They are focused too much on business studies and low level economics in parts. No consistency between them so what is taught in one school could be completely different in another. Students will not have a clear idea of what commerce is at the end of the course nor will they understand what accounting or economics are, only business studies. |
| [ANON-767U-41SD-N](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-41SD-N) | A clear indication of what L2 and L3 is going to look like in the Commerce area so that the course of study undertaken at L1 has relevance to and develops skills and knowledge that are prerequisites to those courses. How can we prepare students if we do not know what we are preparing them for. especially given the pic n mix outlines given.  At present the outlines given are very business focused so does not represent Economics and Accounting adequately enough. I fear the students will have less success in Commerce if they are taught from a single perspective whether it be Business, Economics or Accounting.  Furthermore large parts of the content has been covered in our Year 9 and 10 courses so it is not a step up to Level 6 the NZ Curriculum. I feel that by following the outlines presented I will you be repeating content I'd already taught at L4 and 5.  The flexibility of courses is idealistic and would be fine if it were not for the fact that each school covering different content means that skills will not be transferable amongst schools and students graduating from L1 will have a different skills set according to the school they attended. This may impact on students accessing further education opportunities within NZ and perhaps abroad.  I feel that the current system distinguishes career pathways and helps students learn and develop skills and knowledge in those specific fields whether it be as an Accountant, Economist or as a Business person. The propose scheme does not do this and hence loses credibility.  I feel as a teacher students select L1 subjects on their merits given the experiences and information that they have acquired in the past. Students need a clear understanding of what Economics is , what accounting is and what Business Studies is so that they are equipped to make decisions in regards to their future focus. The proposal does not clearly differentiate these 3 areas and consequently this may be a loss to Commerce subjects at L2 and L3. |
| [ANON-767U-41NS-Y](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-41NS-Y) | I do not think that the Matrix proposed equally represents Accounting - my particular subject area and therefore believe it needs major adjustment to the four standards suggested. |
| [ANON-767U-41NB-E](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-41NB-E) | There is not enough detail or information. We really need sample assessment activities for externals. There is not enough clarification on the depth and breadth of content. Also the inclusion of a CAA with no prior warning that this was going to happen, will severely impact on timing and flexibility of individual school programs. We still have grave concerns over this subject as a pathway and foundation for any study in level 2 subjects, Accounting, Economics, Agri-Business and Business Studies . why have the credit weightings changed? There is no direction/vision in terms of where this course is going. you would normally start with where you want to end up (level 3) and work back down to level one so that students have a foundation. The commerce subject does not feel like it goes anywhere and has just been created on a whim. Are subject endorsements still a thing? Why would a course need all the credits when students only need 10 credits per subject to pass level 1 (60 credits) |
| [ANON-767U-415W-A](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-415W-A) | Maybe you could provide some exemplars of student work |
| [ANON-767U-41N9-5](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-41N9-5) | More specific details and examples of models expected to be used particularly in 1.3 and 1.4 |
| [ANON-767U-4159-C](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-4159-C) | Some exemplars for teachers to use to guide their programs |
| [ANON-767U-41N1-W](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-41N1-W) | The external assessments are not available to look at. Availability of full and proper resources for teachers and students to use. Teachers will have to look for relevant resources from different sources to cater for the teaching, learning and assessments. If the above is made available, it would be easier to use in the pilot programme. |
| [ANON-767U-4167-B](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-4167-B) | This does not reflect well of the subjects of Accounting, Economics and Business Studies. It continues to be more of a Social Science course without the rigor that underpinned the 3 subjects. I continue to wonder why and am still yet to understand why these 3 subjects need to be merge yet subjects like Dance and Drama remain in their entirety. What is the rationale? The course as it is now does not easily allow for scaffolding of the learning in Level 2 Accounting Economics and Business Studies. Many international students study Accounting and Economics at level 1. International agents, parents would find it difficult to fathom/understand . Its makeshift nature would be beyond their comprehension. I am incredibly disappointed that this has been allowed to progress in its current state. Has the SEG group consulted with the subject association NZCETA as Minister Hipkins said it would. |
| [ANON-767U-41FH-C](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-41FH-C) | As a past student of the accounting and economics at high school and now a student of economics and commerce at a tertiary level, I am adamant in my opinion that the amalgamation of economics, accounting and business curricula into a single 'Commerce' subject would only serve to dilute students' competency in all three fields and leave them less prepared for future undertakings in those subjects. While breadth of knowledge is of course something we would all wish to achieve, this proposal is not the right way of doing so and will be counter-productive to the overarching goals of the NZQA and the teachers who teach these subjects. Effectively cutting the time spent on each of these subjects by a third will leave students underdeveloped in all three and only serve to hinder them in future endeavours. I could not imagine how unreasonably difficult my secondary and tertiary studies would have been had I been given a third of the time to acquaint myself with the distinct topics covered in economics, accounting and business studies. I do hope that the NZQA reconsiders and retracts this move for the sake of future students. |
| [ANON-767U-41F9-W](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-41F9-W) | The materials are more applicable to Yr 10 courses in Business Studies and financial education. This means that students are ill prepared for the rigors of Level 2 Economics, Accounting and Business Studies. The Yr 11 course - NCEA Level 1 - needs to be maintained as three separate subjects - the proposed standards are extremely vague and don't cover some of the prerequisites for Level 2 courses. |
| [ANON-767U-41HW-W](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-41HW-W) | These materials are NOT at Level 6 of NZ Curriculum.  There needs to be more clarity around the language used between the grade boundaries. For example the flow on effects vs consequences and implications in 1.3. In addition, it is difficult to comment as we are unable to see an exemplar assessment for the externals, nor can we see what is expected at NZC Levels 7 and 8, unlike other subjects.  There is significant confusion around the terminology used when they have different meanings across the 3 distinct subjects. |
| [ANON-767U-41EJ-D](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-41EJ-D) | The material is still struggling to combine three disciplines into one Commerce subject. It is not clear whether the material acknowledges that their are differences between models used in each subject. As a school you could not just take these standards and prepare your students for level 2. Unless level 2 is watered down significantly the gap between level one Commerce and any of the level 2 commerce subjects is going to be too much for a proportion of our students. |
| [ANON-767U-413N-Y](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-413N-Y) | The problem is caused by amalgamating three distinct subject areas into one - it is very hard to develop an understanding of the "subject". |
| [ANON-767U-413H-S](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-413H-S) | Models need to be more specific eg. 1.2 "economic models" in Note 2 is very vague! For externals we need a definitive list of models that can be in the assessment. Examples of the assessments would be very useful. |
| [ANON-767U-413K-V](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-413K-V) | I think that as it stands, the proposed changes to NCEA wipe out much of the Economics and Accounting parts of Commerce for year 10s. Year 10 is meant to set up students to succeed in the next 2 years of school, and with the proposed changes leave students who intend to take Economics or Accounting out to dry. I think there should be 40 credits available for these courses at least, to allow teachers to a combined 2 out of the 3 subjects. |
| [ANON-767U-413A-J](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-413A-J) | Unable to see any progression to level 2 and 3 so cannot comment on how suitable these materials are. There seems to be a mish-mash of content from three distinct curriculum areas leaving essential content from each out. Why does the matrix only have L1 standards and not levels 2 and 3 like other subjects? |
| [ANON-767U-41YF-W](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-41YF-W) | The materials will need a lot more materials including resources, exemplars, mark schemes in detail before piloting. |
| [ANON-767U-41CU-P](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-41CU-P) | Stick with the 3 subjects that we currently have at Level 1 and rather try to develop a separate subject that addresses the needs of the Schools that appear to have low levels of financial literacy. THIS subject as it stands DOES NOT prepare students for the future business world OR progressing to Level 2 in Accounting, Business Studies or Economics. |
| [ANON-767U-41FY-W](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-41FY-W) | The draft materials are insufficiently challenging for Y11 students. This is mostly due to the weak standards that attempt to combine three distinct subject areas, gaining poor coverage of any of them and thus disadvantaging students with the rigour associated with each of Accounting, Business Studies and Economics. Level 1 Commerce serves akonga poorly by not adequately preparing them for studies in Accounting, Business Studies and Economics |
| [ANON-767U-41GA-6](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-41GA-6) | The proposals are vague and lacking in subject specific content. They appear to have content from Level 4 and 5 of the curriculum rather than the appropriate level. Since it is a one year course it does not provide a coherent pathway to anything and does not adequately prepare students for Level 2 Accounting, Economics or Business Studies. It is difficult to comment on these standards without having seen the Level 2 and 3 standards. The limited information available for the external standards also makes it difficult to make useful comments. I believe these standards will lead to much greater inenquity at Level 2 as some schools will choose not to offer this subject at Level 1 and will continue teaching Accounting and Economics. This will give their students an advantage over schools who may be required to offer Commerce at Level 1. |
| [ANON-767U-41WM-2](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-41WM-2) | The draft materials are unsuitable for piloting as they do not meet the correct curriculum level for Level 1 NCEA. these standards are not at Level 6 of the NZ curriculum. They are currently lying between a Level 3 - 5. The content in these standards are what is currently being taught in Year 9 and 10 courses. This is not preparing our students for the next level. Also, where are the progressions? How come commerce does not have any curriculum progressions past Level 6 where other subjects do? The materials are a mishmash of three different subjects as well as Social Science and Matauranga Maori all together and not very successfully and without giving any substance into any of the learning areas. This will not engage learners, if anything it will deter our students as they want to be able to see what the outcome of a subject is and at this stage there is currently no clear outcome. 1.4 one of the externals is currently so vague that no teacher can even invisage what could possibly be asked of the students. It is clearly apparent that the writers of the standards have just put whatever they could think of in that standard without consideration of the outcome, coherency of course or outcome for the student, let alone the teacher. The three subjects of Accounting, Business Studies and Economics are not equally represented in the new Commerce Learning Matrix. There is really no Accounting at all. This is a concern as it has been stated by many that the standards are generalised to allow teachers to teach to their area of expertise and those with no or limited knowledge of Accounting as a subject will defer away from teaching the one standard that Accounting is briefly mentioned. Going forward this is a concern as we have no idea what the level two standards are going to look like for any of the three subjects, as well as Agribusiness, are we going to be able to prepare the students adequately for Level two in any, or all, three subjects especially Accounting as the only Accounting actually assessed is what is currently being taught in either Year 10 or the first 2-3 weeks of L1. |
| [ANON-767U-41DB-4](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-41DB-4) | 1. These standards demonstrate that there was very little consultation with teachers of Accounting, Economics and Business studies – eg NCETA was not consulted or had the opportunity to be involved in the process – and it shows! 2. The overall impression is a hodgepodge of the three very different subjects – with very different requirements in terms of subject approach all mashed together in a NON-authentic manner as though put together by people who had no real understanding of how these subjects progress or the very different approaches these subjects take. 3. The standards seem to ignore academic progress and, in fact, the curriculum requirements at Level 6. There is also no logical progression to future academic skills required for the three VERY DIFFERENT subject needs. Much of what is required are things that are taught to our Y10s! And then without the L2 and L3 standards it is really difficult to determine if there is a general “dumbing down” or if students have to make a huge leap to L2 (and it will be huge because the skills taught at this level are negligible). 4. The three subject areas are VERY DIFFERENT. This combination approach is like assuming that sewing and dance are the same because they are both practical. The skills and approaches are different. The language is different. The progression of skills is different and high level. If eg the program is taught through an Economic lens then they will not have the necessary accounting skills (because, once again, the subjects are very DIFFERENT. Once again…DIFFERENT. It is as though someone in the ministry with very little understanding of the commercial area came up with a brain-wave of combining the subjects because they are all commerce. It boggles the mind.) 5. Although “Commerce” is intended to be a pathway to Accounting/Economics/ at L2 – the 3 subject areas are not equally represented eg Economics and Enterprise studies come through much stronger in the course outlines than Accounting does. 6. It is laughable that the ministry of education sees Accounting as declining so badly when the student numbers way exceed many of the other subjects still on the list. I also submit that one reason the numbers are declining is because Accounting teachers can earn much more in the private sector so it is a staffing issue rather than a numbers issue. NZ is a trading nation – with a number of small businesses making up the business community. Accounting is required for all that – one would expect that the Ministry would encourage Accounting not discourage it – if they truly wanted pathways open for students! Tradies use Accounting just as much as big business – we surely want a nation of entrepreneurs. And knowing how to do a BUDGET is NOT what accounting is about. These standards do nothing to encourage/promote such knowledge. 7. And speaking of pathways: A school that drops NCEA level 1 and teaches pre Accounting/Eco is at a huge advantage compared to a school actually offering Commerce at L1. These subjects are DIFFERENT. I pity the pilot schools. There is no way I would be able to offer my students the rich learning experiences that I do now. There is additionally the very real risk that students will be put off the learning areas Accounting/Economics – due to the poke-your-eyeballs-out-boring standards. 8. There is insufficient information given on the requirements of the standards and with no exemplars expected until after the pilots we are all operating in the dark with the limited information available. 9. There are enormous gaps – eg no technology required (as might be in an Accounting program). And very little practical application of concepts – again all the fun stuff taken out. Also there are gaps between the big ideas and the assessment eg government debt and tax are not included because government is not included as an organisation. 10. The assessments have very little academic rigour. A 2 minute presentation for 6 credits at L1? A 6 credit assessment with less academic rigour than the current 3 credit one in Accounting (decision making). We are underestimating our students. 11. It is unclear how the same 5 or 6 credits are equally spread across workload eg 1.4 and 1.1 require very different amounts of work/skills/content – makes no sense that they are equal credits. 12. I cannot see how the standards support the NCEA Change program: equity, coherence, pathways and credibility a. Equity: it is inequitable that students who do not do Commerce L1 have an advantage over students that do. Furthermore it is inequitable that the skills that are generally learnt at L1 have now been dumbed down so students doing Commerce aren’t readying themselves for the future. b. Coherence: the standards are incoherent both within themselves (as in it is very very unclear what is actually meant to be achieved) and across other subjects (the standards appear to be a mishmash of Economics/Accounting and Enterprise studies with no real thought given to any of them – so from an external perspective and as an academic whole there is no comprehensive learning taking place here) c. Pathways: unclear as to where this is going…the skills are generally low level, there is no logical progression to L2, students who do not go to university need eg accounting to succeed and this is no longer available. And for any student that drops Commerce at L1 – it is unclear that they have learnt much at all. What a dismal waste of an opportunity. d. Credibility: It is unlikely that any person outside of school who sees these standards will consider them credible learning. Employers will laugh – especially if they have any understanding of what Economics or Accounting actually is. It is unlikely that this learning will be accepted as equivalent overseas. e. Wellbeing: I am concerned that with a rushed move to combine all three subjects that there is a real missed opportunity to explore mātauranga Māori across all commercial subject areas – we have really dropped the ball here. It is as though there has been a tick box exercise instead of truly integrating mātauranga Māori into our subjects. I want our Māori to succeed IN BUSINESS AS Māori and not lose or ignore the business aspects and academic aspects. My students deserve that. 13. I am EXTREMELY concerned that by the time I would expect to actually plan my program for 2023 that the ministry would have actually uploaded the necessary resources eg exemplars as pilots are unlikely to be complete by this point. It does not fill me with confidence that so far the first 2 days have been waffle and that the resources for the third day were late. How does this support teacher well being or workload? 14. Overall the standards are confusing, lack academic rigour, are incoherently presented, unimaginative and tick box “mātauranga Māori”. 15. KEEP THE SUBJECTS SEPARATE and do work on the standards as they are for a better way for ALL NZers eg “mātauranga Māori” can be explored through all different subjects and really be integrated into the worldviews of the students instead of this dumbing down that has just happened |
| [ANON-767U-419C-T](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-419C-T) | More detail about the depth required Its impossible to make sensible suggestions when we don;t know what the next two levels will look like????? Why does the Commerce Matrix only have one level but we are expected to give feedback? |
| [ANON-767U-417C-R](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-417C-R) | The proposed Commerce subject is TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE. The THREE very DIFFERENT subjects of Accounting, Economics and Business Studies are not equally covered in the Commerce Learning Matrix; there seems to be a very strong swing towards Business Studies only, with a token amount of Economics and almost nothing of Accounting. This proposed course has a minimal level of financial literacy and capability clearly set out in the NZ Curriculum as a core skill for all students. This material has failed to address this.  The Standards and the Course outlines are not set at Level 6 of the NZ Curriculum and is very much set at a much lower level, in fact is much more set at the Junior level of high school. Our Yr 9 and 10 students are already covering the content proposed in the current programme. Commerce at Level 1 therefore will not be stimulating and certainly will not prepare our students for the future.  What does this mean for future years in Level 2 and Level 3 Accounting, Economics and /or Business Studies? Are these subjects to also disappear in time or is there going to be any progression of these subjects? It is certainly not clear at all about Level 2 and Level 3 courses in Accounting, Economics and/or Business Studies. Also I have learned that the MOE has intentions of stopping Accounting being supported in schools at some time in the future. Why has this not been discussed with Accounting teachers?  This Level 1 Commerce course will not allow for "rich learning" and a "further range of future possible pathways" (as quoted by C. Hipkins, April 2021. As the course will be perceived by students and parents as too "light and fluffy" and lacking depth of learning, many will then consider not continuing with Commerce in the future.  I am struggling to make a fair comment on these proposed Level 1 standards when I cannot see in detail the Level 2 and Level 3 courses. Students will not be prepared from Level 1 to manage and achieve in Level 2 and 3.  From what I have read, there is limited information available for any teacher to make a worthwhile comment. What will an External Assessment look like - no detail or guidance has been given.  Why are other subjects such as Geography, History, Social Studies not combined as one subject? There is huge inequity if subjects such as this and the Sciences (which are now offered in 4 subjects after consultation and protest) are allowed to remain as standalone courses, yet this exact opportunity is not offered to our akonga in Accounting, Economics and Business Studies. You are not listening to the Accounting, Economics and Business Studies teachers around NZ or our subject Association NZCETA who are all on the ground, at the "chalk face" of our schools and students. Why have you not listened to CAANZ - Chartered Accountants Australia and NZ? We are all extremely concerned that the future of our students is being put at risk and will lack financial literacy skills which is going to severely impact on our economy if these young people do not understand such things as debt, savings, reading cash flow and financial statements. This course is going to lose very valuable skills for our young people. As a teacher, I do not teach them to be Accountants or Economists only - I teach them financial literacy and capability through these subjects of Accounting and Economics.  These draft materials and standards have not addressed how our present and future akonga will have a solid foundation at Level 7 in each of the VERY DISTINCT, different and VALUABLE knowledge, concepts and skills learned in Accounting, Economics and /or Business Studies.  There has not been given enough time for feedback on this material - 3 weeks at the start of a busy exam term puts a lot of pressure of teachers to give a fair response. My fear now for our students is that schools will not offer Level 1 as these standards are so poor and at such a low level. This has taken the choice away for schools that currently offer a combined course of some Accounting, some Economics or some Business Studies which gives students a wide range of skills, unlike this proposed course. |
| [ANON-767U-41MZ-5](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-41MZ-5) | I would like to offer some comments about the new proposed Commerce subject. I believe it covers relevant topics for NCEA learners to begin exploring, although I am not sure if the concepts will be appropriate for Level 1 learners with no business background. There appears to be a good focus on stakeholders and decision-making with the inclusion of Maori perspectives and sustainability. These are important concepts to include. However, the use of the terms "economic world", "financial viability" and "financial interdependence" is concerning and suggests the emphasis will be on businesses that operate as "for-profit" entities. It is important that learners understand impact and purpose and that the reason for operating a business needs to be purpose-driven. For most businesses this requires a transformation from their traditional approach. Will the learners be exposed to businesses with a range of operating structures including those that are purpose-driven, those that are charitable organisations, and those that are social enterprises? Another concern is that the subject is stated as "the use and exploration of accounting, economic, and business concepts and models to make sense of society, and solve problems." However, "accounting" is only mentioned once more in the overview, as an example, under "Using language, symbols, and texts". Accounting is more than the accounting cycle and it is good to see a focus on decision making in this Commerce subject, however, the elements of "accounting" that appear to be included relating to stakeholders and decision-making, and elements of "business studies" related to budgeting and profit calculations, do not appear to address "Accounting" as a subject area for further NCEA study. I am concerned that learners will not have a good foundation in NCEA Accounting for levels 2 and 3 as they currently exist. This will make NCEA Accounting levels 2 and 3 even more challenging for learners and teachers alike, having a negative flow-on effect on student numbers in NCEA Accounting, Accounting at tertiary level, and ultimately the Accounting profession. I am also concerned that a number of Accounting teachers will be ill-equipped to deliver Commerce due to its focus on the three areas of economics, business studies, and accounting, and the inclusion of elements of Accounting that have not necessarily been previously covered in any detail in NCEA Accounting by teachers. A final comment relates to the subject title of "Commerce". The Investopedia definition included in Course outline 3 is "the exchange of goods, services, or something of value, between businesses or entities". This suggests Commerce relates the "market", whereas the Commerce subject specifies aspects relevant to the "organisation". "Business" or "Business Decision-making" or "Business Sustainability" might be better subject titles. Thank you for the opportunity to share my views. |
| [ANON-767U-41MW-2](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-41MW-2) | The credits across the standards are unbalanced. I am not sure why the Financial interdependence is worth more credits that the price mechanism standard?. Furthermore Financial interdependence was an originally an external, but is now better assessed as an internal, as it allows for more authentic assessment. Also what are the sectors in the circular flow? The explanatory notes for the externals could be further unpacked. The 1.2 internal mentions models- it is not clear what "Economics models" refers to in this context. Income statements and balance sheets are important accounting statements and being able to prepare them will provide a foundation for students going onto Accounting. |
| [ANON-767U-41U3-6](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-41U3-6) | I feel that the draft materials (as currently presented) lack detail. Teaching from these and planning units of from what's been given to us so far is very difficult. There is no information about what's expected in terms of assessment - let alone what A, M or E look like. There's no information AT ALL about what externals will look like. There is NO INFORMATION about what Y12 or 13 will look like. If the ministry wishes us to teach these in just over a year, then a whole lot more is required. What is there is very disjointed with bits of standards all over the place and thus no coherent pattern of learning for students who like to know where what we're doing in class fits in overall. Secondly, it's so disjointed that vital bits of learning are missing - with the unit on pricing, are we looking at government intervention that affects price or not? So do we include Sales taxes like GST? We have bits of circular flow, but without all the sectors. Also, just how many decisions do you need - the decision making that is there is not at level 6 of the curriculum but rather level 4 and 5. It's stuff most of us teach at Year 9 and 10, not year 11. Thirdly, when did government (at local or central level) STOP being an organisation. Do Government decisions no longer count as valid decisions? |
| [ANON-767U-41B3-K](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-41B3-K) | These materials still give no idea what Commerce actually is? Commerce was the combination of three current subjects, Accounting, Business and Economics. The material presented is a poor attempt at trying to combine subjects that should not be combined. As the petition submitted to parliament states, the subjects should never have been combined in the first place. Other subjects have not, so why Accounting, Economics and Business. It shows a real misunderstanding from the Ministry and the Minister of Education about what these subjects are and that the are suitable for combination. |
| [ANON-767U-41B2-J](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-41B2-J) | The materials do not represent the broader foundation for the 3 subjects. |
| [ANON-767U-41B5-N](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-41B5-N) | It is hard to know how level 1 Commerce feeds into level 2 and level 3 Accounting, Economics and Business, when we do not know what they will look like in 2023/4. |
| [ANON-767U-41BB-2](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-41BB-2) | They need to be suitable for the Accounting, Business Studies and Economics learning objectives and achievement objectives at Curriculum Level 6. |
| [ANON-767U-41B7-Q](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-41B7-Q) | More information is needed especially for External Assessments. I see you have changed 1.3 & 1.4 around in terms of a CAT v an end of year exam. What happened to a "Portfolio". 1.3 could lend itself to a research approached where students investigate a specific event in their local area. Don't see that happening in a test. Still not convinced the objectives, content & curriculum level match up. Level 6? Still seems more like year 9 & 10 Social Studies. Can not see it will prepare students for levels 2-3 Eco, Accounting & Business. We still also don't know what these will look like so is hard to comment but based on current content & assessment at Year 12-13 there could be several students who would struggle based on this "Commerce" program at Year 11. Does appear feedback was listened to from the first round but feel if we must go ahead with level 1 Commerce we must have more standards that allow for schools to make a course that meets their communities needs. I.e. if they want to study Accounting then let them. If they want to do Economics or Business then the same thing. Schools have already been creative and responding to their local communities wants by combing Eco, Business and or Accounting (Rarely all 3) but still assessing each separately. We should be given the flexibility to continue to do that. What you have produced is interesting but not sufficient. More standards are needed to recognise Business, Accounting and Economics are separate and distinct subjects. |
| [ANON-767U-41BU-N](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-41BU-N) | I have concerns that the materials provided are not at NZC Level 6 and therefore do not provide appropriate learning and assessment opportunities for our learners. I am disappointed that the 3 subjects have been mashed together and the result is an incohesive package of materials which lack direction/clarity/engagement. |
| [ANON-767U-41BG-7](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-41BG-7) | The narrow choices available in this watered down Commerce Course and Standards are going to create even more inequity across the sector as these standards will not provide the same learning opportunities for students doing NCEA Level 1 as for those students in schools which choose not to do NCEA Level 1. Schools offering their own Level 1 program will be able to provide more rich learning and prepare students better for Level 2 and 3.  In Commerce there are 3 distinct subjects and by grouping them together in a hybrid course does not provide a sound foundation for study at Level 7 of the NZ Curriculum. A significant proportion of the content in these watered down standards reflect learning at levels 3,4 and 5 of the NZ Curriculum.  We have such diverse learners with their own strengths and needs and to lump them together in a hybrid course is cruel. We have rich learning courses in year 10 which cover the material you propose for Level 1 where students find their "interest" and then to deny them the opportunity to delve deeper into Accounting , Economics and Business Studies at level 1 is beyond belief. If you are dead set against offering the 3 Commerce Disciplines separately at Level 1 at least give us more standards to choose from to put together worthwhile programs to extend our learners because the standards proposed is not going to grab their interest nor prepare them for future possible pathways. We will keep on losing our students to alternative systems such as CIE an IB the more we water down the NCEA Level 1. This will increase inequity even further.  In particular ACCOUNTING is everywhere in life. It is a language we teach our students to READ, WRITE and SPEAK. We need the Level 1 year to lay the foundation so that in Level 2 and 3 we can focus on the decision making. (You cannot interpret a POEM or ESSAY if you do not have the vocabulary to write nor read the poem or essay). You need the Level 1 foundation year in Accounting to drill in the vocabulary and relentlessly process so students can "read" and "write" Accounting before we get to the interpreting and decision making aspects which Accounting courses at Level 2 and 3 should focus on. Would anybody in their right mind take level 1 of a language away and then expect students to read and interpret the language in Level 2? Of the 3 Commerce disciplines Economics and Business Studies can be picked up in Level 2 way more easier (if not studied in level 1) than Accounting and yet you have done the opposite in your proposed new level 1 Commerce course..... Again it does not make sense. You do not have the learners best interest at heart. Boys in particular like the predictability and structured nature of accounting and thrive in the subject and now you want to close that option in Level 1. Some go on to professional occupations (leave after level 3) and some go on to do their trade qualifications (leave after level 1) but the one common life skill they need and use is the skills they developed for Accounting in Level 1. If you give us Level 1 Commerce with 4 Accounting standards, 4 Economics Standards and 4 Business standards to choose from to put together a course schools can at least offer worthwhile programs. If Covid 19 has taught us anything is that CASH is the lifeline of any entity and that entities can survive without profit but never without cash, and in which subject do you learn that there is a big difference between cash and profit...... |
| [ANON-767U-4EAE-R](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-4EAE-R) | Having three individual and distinct level 1 subjects under the Commerce Umbrella; Accounting, Business. studies and Economics. This allows for school and student agency and 12 standards to construct a general course, if that is what the school/students desire, or offer three different subjects to help nurture future NZ entrepreneurs, where there is huge demand. If there can be four different performing arts (with almost no demand for performing artists in the NZ economy) and 9 different language options (again mostly pointless when the language of the global economy is English). Additionally there are four individual science subjects (therefore 16 standards to construct one course from); most schools have really only ever offered one general science course at Level 1 anyway. |
| [ANON-767U-4163-7](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-4163-7) | After reviewing the phase 2 materials I feel there have been significant improvements since phase 1. However the course now looks so broad you feel that you could end up covering a lot material. You could also teach it in a way that ignores 2/3 disciplines and focusses on the one the teacher is most comfortable with. If the plan is to reduce workload and make NCEA more standardised I feel these standards could lead to students receiving very different experiences depending on where they were at school.  Based on the standards I am unable to comprehend what the externals can look like. When students could be learning a whole range of different models/concepts but not the same from school to school. |
| [ANON-767U-414X-A](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-414X-A) | For a subject that is combining three subjects into one, there is just not enough of a 'taster' of each of Accounting, Business Studies and Economics in the draft materials. I still feel strongly that the three subject areas should be retained and will still protest to the point of switching jobs. However after looking at the draft materials it would be more logical to offer an Economics strand of Commerce and an Accounting/Business studies strand. If we do not allow a student to know their place in the Economic system in Level 1, we are doing them a dis service. The current 1.6 Internal is perfect for this - why did this just get thrown out? All the Commerce teachers in our meeting recently have decided NOT to pilot these standards until further feedback is taken onboard and we are genuinely listened to. We are not against change but want to be able to have students excited about being able to understand how an economy works and engage with it. The standards at present do not allow that. |
| [ANON-767U-4SVQ-7](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-4SVQ-7) | Probably exemplars of evidence for different standards/achievement levels |
| [ANON-767U-41UD-Q](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-41UD-Q) | Whilst these materials as a whole are an improvement on what was originally released earlier in the year it is still confusing as to how they are meant to prepare students for level 2 courses in Economics, Accounting and Business Studies so that students can achieve well at an appropriate level 2 standard. There needs to be more than one course in Commerce at level 1 going into the pilot. There should at least be an Economics course and a separate combined Accounting/Business Studies course. The Government is doing our students a dis-service by not allowing students to get fully educated in these areas at level 1. |
| [ANON-767U-41X1-7](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-41X1-7) | The standards for 'Commerce' have so little Accounting knowledge, skills or terminology included that students will have little preparation for Level 2 or 3 Accounting or their adult life in the real world. Most of what I see is 'financial literacy', which while beneficial does not prepare students for further study in Accounting and has not go far enough to prepare our akonga for the future.  The explanatory notes need explaining - throwing in a whole lot of Maori terms for teachers to decipher the meaning of in each context is not helpful and requires teachers to do a lot of extra work.  Why was the Commerce and Economics Teachers Association (NZCETA) not consulted in the planning and preparation of these changes/standards? I feel that there was been little to no consultation with teachers or parents as to what is important for our akonga, now and in the future. |
| [ANON-767U-4SVP-6](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-4SVP-6) | A large amount of time required to develop teaching and learning plans to scaffold students into the AS. Full time teachers dont have the time capacity to develop teaching and learning activities to the extent needed to teach the new AS |
| [ANON-767U-4SSB-N](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4173172074&user_id=ANON-767U-4SSB-N) | what has been given lacks detail, has no links to level 2 or 3, has no sample assessments so appropriate levels for A, M and E cannot be ascertained, lacks coherence/ seems a bit of a mishmash and not at curriculum level 6. I cannot, in all honesty, let these loose on students and claim that there is a coherent pathway for learning. |

**Do the sample Course Outline(s) exemplify how the Significant Learning can form a coherent years’ programme with opportunities to assess the 4 Standards? (Do they show how a course could be taught across a year in the subject? Remember these can be adapted to your own context.) Please note, there may be fewer than 3 Course Outlines for some subjects.**

| Option | Total | Percent |
| --- | --- | --- |
| The Course Outline(s) are useful examples | [4](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dquestion.2021-07-30.9414840163&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2Fed23fc1061%2Fsubpage.2021-07-29.9441321471%2Fquestion.2021-07-30.9414840163%2Fquestion-2021-07-30-9414840163-radiosubquestion%3Alist=question-2021-07-30-9414840163-radiosubquestion%2FThe+Course+Outline%28s%29+are+useful+examples) | 0.42% |
| The Course Outline(s) are unclear or do not contain enough information | [12](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dquestion.2021-07-30.9414840163&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2Fc4dc6d3057%2Fsubpage.2021-07-29.9441321471%2Fquestion.2021-07-30.9414840163%2Fquestion-2021-07-30-9414840163-radiosubquestion%3Alist=question-2021-07-30-9414840163-radiosubquestion%2FThe+Course+Outline%28s%29+are+unclear+or+do+not+contain+enough+information) | 1.26% |
| The Course Outline(s) are too similar to show multiple ways a course could be constructed | [5](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dquestion.2021-07-30.9414840163&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2F0d0868b74c%2Fsubpage.2021-07-29.9441321471%2Fquestion.2021-07-30.9414840163%2Fquestion-2021-07-30-9414840163-radiosubquestion%3Alist=question-2021-07-30-9414840163-radiosubquestion%2FThe+Course+Outline%28s%29+are+too+similar+to+show+multiple+ways+a+course+could+be+constructed) | 0.53% |
| The Course Outline(s) are not useful | [17](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dquestion.2021-07-30.9414840163&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2Fa883f24019%2Fsubpage.2021-07-29.9441321471%2Fquestion.2021-07-30.9414840163%2Fquestion-2021-07-30-9414840163-radiosubquestion%3Alist=question-2021-07-30-9414840163-radiosubquestion%2FThe+Course+Outline%28s%29+are+not+useful) | 1.79% |
| Not Answered | [913](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dquestion.2021-07-30.9414840163&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2F34f63dc4f9%2Fsubpage.2021-07-29.9441321471%2Fquestion.2021-07-30.9414840163%2Fquestion-2021-07-30-9414840163-radiosubquestion%3Alist=question-2021-07-30-9414840163-radiosubquestion%2F__not_answered__) | 96.00% |

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

| Option | Total | Percent |
| --- | --- | --- |
| The course outline(s) demonstrate this clearly | [7](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dquestion.2021-07-30.2006326010&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2F9f020b156a%2Fsubpage.2021-07-29.9441321471%2Fquestion.2021-07-30.2006326010%2Fquestion-2021-07-30-2006326010-radiosubquestion%3Alist=question-2021-07-30-2006326010-radiosubquestion%2FThe+course+outline%28s%29+demonstrate+this+clearly) | 0.74% |
| The course outline(s) demonstrate this to some extent | [16](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dquestion.2021-07-30.2006326010&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2F7bcac8298c%2Fsubpage.2021-07-29.9441321471%2Fquestion.2021-07-30.2006326010%2Fquestion-2021-07-30-2006326010-radiosubquestion%3Alist=question-2021-07-30-2006326010-radiosubquestion%2FThe+course+outline%28s%29+demonstrate+this+to+some+extent) | 1.68% |
| The course outline(s) do not demonstrate this | [15](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dquestion.2021-07-30.2006326010&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2F648e60183b%2Fsubpage.2021-07-29.9441321471%2Fquestion.2021-07-30.2006326010%2Fquestion-2021-07-30-2006326010-radiosubquestion%3Alist=question-2021-07-30-2006326010-radiosubquestion%2FThe+course+outline%28s%29+do+not+demonstrate+this) | 1.58% |
| Not Answered | [913](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dquestion.2021-07-30.2006326010&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2Fa0179bd03a%2Fsubpage.2021-07-29.9441321471%2Fquestion.2021-07-30.2006326010%2Fquestion-2021-07-30-2006326010-radiosubquestion%3Alist=question-2021-07-30-2006326010-radiosubquestion%2F__not_answered__) | 96.00% |

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| [ANON-767U-4EAK-X](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.2615381780&user_id=ANON-767U-4EAK-X) | The course outlines do not provide adequate direction on what knowledge is actually being taught and assessed, nor what valuable learnings we expect students to take from it. It is, honestly, just fluff, and does not seem to be enough to form a rigorous course |
| [ANON-767U-4E6Q-S](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.2615381780&user_id=ANON-767U-4E6Q-S) | The course outlines lack sufficient content detail and are unrealistic in the time allocation for various topics. The course outlines need further development. |
| [ANON-767U-4EQQ-M](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.2615381780&user_id=ANON-767U-4EQQ-M) | They shouldn't exist - we need three separate subjects. |
| [ANON-767U-4EJV-J](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.2615381780&user_id=ANON-767U-4EJV-J) | Way too much content in the course outline and the time frames are completely unrealistic. We need more guidance on what matauranga Maori is. We need resources. |
| [ANON-767U-4EJ1-D](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.2615381780&user_id=ANON-767U-4EJ1-D) | Way too much content to be taught in the time restraints given. Does not always line with the achievement criteria for each standard |
| [ANON-767U-4ECQ-6](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.2615381780&user_id=ANON-767U-4ECQ-6) | No balance between student learning from the different subjects. No clear way forward as the outlines include bits from all year levels and some not suited for Level 1. Some include more or one subject than that of another and for students who love a certain subject will drive them away. |
| [ANON-767U-4ECM-2](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.2615381780&user_id=ANON-767U-4ECM-2) | These are a mess. No clear way to teach it. Cobbled together bits and pieces. No flow on effect. Far too much slant towards Maori concepts and not balanced with other ethnic groups. Far to broad base. Unsure what you are getting at? |
| [ANON-767U-4E8P-T](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.2615381780&user_id=ANON-767U-4E8P-T) | The course outlines do not support the big Ideas. The Big Ideas can be linked to Accounting, Economics and Business Studies however the the way the course is structured it strongly supports Accounting and Business with very few opportunities to explore Economic market forces which are the base of commerce. |
| [ANON-767U-4ECS-8](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.2615381780&user_id=ANON-767U-4ECS-8) | The course outlines simply further show the lack of cohesion within each standard - they have pulled little bits from the three subjects and put them into a single standard with no overarching framework to allow teachers or students how to understand them as a whole or how teachers can teach what is in them cohesively. |
| [ANON-767U-4EP3-N](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.2615381780&user_id=ANON-767U-4EP3-N) | "Understand Māori terms" and then the terms are stated. This does not help at all. There needs to be more specific information on how teaching and learning can be grounded in mātauranga Māori. A lot of the content in the standards that have "an economic focus" appear to be timewasting. There are 32 weeks to allocate and that time has been filled. We could not do all of the standards as what we regard as essential information is missing. The learning matrix for levels 2 and 3 is not available and this is a real shortcoming with this process. |
| [ANON-767U-4EPY-U](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.2615381780&user_id=ANON-767U-4EPY-U) | The course outlines do not recognise significant bodies of knowledge and skills that are currently taught and vital for preparing students for ongoing study. They do not seem to link ideas with any coherence. |
| [ANON-767U-4EBY-D](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.2615381780&user_id=ANON-767U-4EBY-D) | As a non-accounting teacher, it is difficult to see how I can incorporate Accounting into my own course outlines given no basis is really given. The links to mātauranga Māori are mere tokenism - perhaps due to the lack of depth of 'commerce' content or perhaps because there is too much to choose from within the three subjects that it is easier not to choose any at all. As expected with different subjects are combined, there is inconsistency of vocabulary, eg economic profit vs accounting profit. |
| [ANON-767U-4EBD-R](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.2615381780&user_id=ANON-767U-4EBD-R) | The CO do not fully prepare students for an adequate body of knowledge and skills necessary to succeed on the current Level 2 and 3 programmes in the three subject areas. This could be achieved with three separate subjects at level 1.  They also seem to lack clarity around what content could be taught, which would pose some serious equity issue questions in both the Internal and External standards. It would lead to huge discrepancies between what is assessed and lead to similar grades being awarded to work that is wildly different in standard. External Standards with such a broad course outline favour the learners of anyone who has written the papers in question, as they would have the inside knowledge necessary to better prepare their students for these questions. The current 'secret squirrel - we will not tell anyone what we decide in external assessment markers meetings' is prevalent across al three subject areas as it is and leads to massive inequities between what is being taught in schools and nothing suggests that process would be any more transparent in the future. In fact, probably amplified and much worse. |
| [ANON-767U-4ETA-7](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.2615381780&user_id=ANON-767U-4ETA-7) | The course outlines do not give us enough information. I would like to have some sessions with course experts showing us more about the content required for each standard. Some of them are a bit vague and could be interpreted in several different ways. I would also like more direction on how to incorporate matauranga Maori into the course. |
| [ANON-767U-41AE-4](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.2615381780&user_id=ANON-767U-41AE-4) | They are totally inconsistent - have timing that is impossible to cover content listed. Have very little detail on what is actually covered - stating using models with no idea what models or how, no flow between ideas and how they relate to the assessment. Basically very unhelpful. No practical links to mātauranga Māori and how it could be integrated. If they are expecting teachers to build courses from these then it is totally impractical - far more detail and clear links and ideas need to be expressed. It is fine for people to have different focusses but general content should be the same so what one student experiences in a commerce course at one school should not be 100% different content from another school. These outlines do not show this at all. As a very experienced teacher in all three domains, I would have no idea what I was expected to teach in this course from any of the outlines which is a major concern. |
| [ANON-767U-41NS-Y](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.2615381780&user_id=ANON-767U-41NS-Y) | These are insufficient for valid interpretation of standards. Need to see sample assessments. |
| [ANON-767U-41RA-H](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.2615381780&user_id=ANON-767U-41RA-H) | do the teachers choose which course outline to choose? |
| [ANON-767U-41HW-W](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.2615381780&user_id=ANON-767U-41HW-W) | It is very evident that the course outlines are not coherent as they are presented as 3 separate subjects.  We have concern that the course outlines replicate common learning experiences for many schools at Year 9 and 10 which emphasises that these course outlines are not at Level 6 NZC, then there are elements which are well above Level 6 NZC.  The course outlines do not seem to align with the standards that are being assessed, nor the Learning Matrix. For example, understand strategic decisions in the course outline is not the the same as understanding the decision making process.  You have not done justice to mātauranga Māori, there are many lost opportunities for authentic learning experience and connection to local curriculum. |
| [ANON-767U-41FY-W](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.2615381780&user_id=ANON-767U-41FY-W) | The course outlines are weak. The whakapapa of Commerce is much richer than stronger than the selective potiki that the courses offer. Accounting is the language of commerce. Toku mamae that Accounting is left in the cold, both financial and managerial. Toku mamae that Business lacks foundation in contract and consumer law is absent. Toku mamae that Economics, both microeconomics and macroeconomics, are lightly dusted. This is no Level 1 course. Level 1 Commerce is merely an introductory Y9 course |
| [ANON-767U-41GA-6](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.2615381780&user_id=ANON-767U-41GA-6) | Much of the work included in the course outlines is very similar to what is currently being taught at Year 9 and 10. It is heavy on theory and social science content but lacks emphasis on applying knowledge/ models to problems. |
| [ANON-767U-41WM-2](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.2615381780&user_id=ANON-767U-41WM-2) | The course outlines have no real structure and alot of it is given to the teacher to teach to their strengths. The students will not get overall success in theis subject with the current course outlines.They may have success within different standards of the course but overall the end result should be an in-depth understanding of all three of the subjects which is not possible. If a teacher has a bias due to their specialty toward one subject such as Economics of course they will teach their students more confidently in that area. However with the standards as they are the teacher can teach a full Economics course without including any Business Studies or Accounting concepts introduced at all therefore defeating the purpose of a combined course. If a learner is able to have success in one lens it is restricting their success in other lens’ therefore restricting the students options in the future. |
| [ANON-767U-41DB-4](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.2615381780&user_id=ANON-767U-41DB-4) | I teach Accounting, Economics and Business studies. The course outlines offer many ideas and concepts that WE ALREADY TEACH AT Y10. I really think this is a dumbing down of our subjects. I am not convinced this learning is appropriate for L6 of the curriculum. Although Commerce is supposed to lead to Eco/Acc/Bus at level 2 It doesn't seem at all like Accounting is equally represented in the course outlines (there is some in there, but it mainly looks as though someone who doesn't teach L2 and L3 and thinks Accounting is all about budgets and basic outlines has popped it in there as a sop for Accounting teachers, instead of being the rigorous commercial subject that it is). It is unclear whether individual schools are able to offer this subject with eg an Economic lens or an Enterprise lens - if that is the case then I would love to know what on earth the Interdependence standard is actually referring to and how one might teach it with an Accounting lens. There is the additional problem that it is extremely difficult to evaluate a course outline when the achievement standards are themselves so unclear - and even more difficult to evaluate whether this course outline is acceptable if we don't know what the level 2 and 3 standards look like - I can assure the ministry that if you offer commerce as it stands here and then expect the students to make the huge jump to L2 and 3 standards in Economics and Accounting as they are now that we are going to run into trouble with the students. This is really looking like Y11 is a place holder year - surely we expect more from our students than this? |
| [ANON-767U-419C-T](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.2615381780&user_id=ANON-767U-419C-T) | When combining 3 subjects into 1 more detail is required . eg 1.4 price mechanism. Can use marketing mix model and/or price mechanism but to what depth?? Marketing Mix used to be worth 3 cr, Price mechanism (demand, supply and market) used to be worth12 cr. So more explanation required about what is now left out. Two of the course outlines had some value, one was absolutely no use |
| [ANON-767U-417C-R](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.2615381780&user_id=ANON-767U-417C-R) | There seems to be a range of knowledge from Level 3, 4, 5 and then mixed in with Level 8. I am struggling to see exactly how to put this course together and I am a very experienced teacher. |
| [ANON-767U-412Q-1](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.2615381780&user_id=ANON-767U-412Q-1) | Good general accounting baced content for understanding the financial processes. Specifics need to be included; (Budget proposals, balance sheets, profit and loss and inventory calculations) in business operations, financial forcasting and decision making. More specific content on how business operations in NZ relate to differences in global business ops and the interactions with global ecconomies and issues. More accessibility and inclusivity to ESOL students, and flexibility in Assessment standards for culturally diverse business practices other than Moari. Flexibility within Assessment Standards without the expectation of more complex business concepts as an introductory basis toward the requirements of Level 2 |
| [ANON-767U-41BY-S](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.2615381780&user_id=ANON-767U-41BY-S) | The issue may be that the grounding in Mātaurana Māori becomes just a fleeting reference for some learners. The scope to go deeper in MM is there, and covers a wide range. My concern would be how this is shown in assessments also. |
| [ANON-767U-41B2-J](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.2615381780&user_id=ANON-767U-41B2-J) | The assessment do not neceassrily come out of course outline. The merging o three subjects is not going to be helpful as a wide foundatinal base. There unclear connection between course outline and assessments |
| [ANON-767U-41BB-2](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.2615381780&user_id=ANON-767U-41BB-2) | There are three course outlines. One is Economics, One is Business Studies and One is Generic. This is outlining the fact that there isn't a new subject Commerce, that there are three distinct skills that make up Commerce - Accounting, Business Studies and Economics and that these can't be combined. This is the problem with this course. |
| [ANON-767U-41BU-N](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.2615381780&user_id=ANON-767U-41BU-N) | I am disappointed that the course outlines appear waffly and lack any clear direction. These have not provided me with any clarity as to how I could run a Commerce course successfully. There was great opportunity for mataurangi maori contexts to be explored in depth, however this is not evident in these outlines. |
| [ANON-767U-4EAE-R](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.2615381780&user_id=ANON-767U-4EAE-R) | They are a bit of a confusing mix Until we know more about when the CAA will take place and what format it will take, it is impossible to devise any meaningful outline. |
| [ANON-767U-4163-7](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.2615381780&user_id=ANON-767U-4163-7) | Course outline 1 - The 2 week introduction has way too much content to be an introduction. Maori/pacific business concepts (language) should be integrated as part of main stream business. Organisational Decision making again covers a lot in 7 weeks, especially if students are going through ideation and writing their own business plan (especially if they are going to produce and sell)  Outline 2 was my preferred CO, much clearer and timings looked more realistic.  Outline 3 vague, but used more learning from student experience. |
| [ANON-767U-414X-A](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.2615381780&user_id=ANON-767U-414X-A) | The course outlines do not allow students an introduction to understanding economic concepts. The list of models mentions 'mark up' which is a calculation not a model. Economic models include circular flow, supply and demand. As mentioned earlier this is an opportunity to have an Accounting/Business strand( 1.1 1.4) and an Economics (1.3 and the existing 1.6) strand. Somehow Accounting has been associated with those students who are doing to study it at University to become Accountants whereas we see students who are wanting to become Tradies to want to learn about cash flow and accounting principles to run their own businesses in the future. My main concern with matauranga Maori is how woefully underprepared and under resourced we are. In our Commerce group we had one member who has been learning Te Reo for three years and he felt that he wouldn't know how to incorporate the matauranga Maori. We feel that we should have started with that, to gain teachers knowledge and confidence. Are local maraes being supported to help support us?? |
| [ANON-767U-4SVP-6](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.2615381780&user_id=ANON-767U-4SVP-6) | A full set of teaching and learning activities and lesson plans is required to teach a course for the first time. Full time teachers do not have the time to build a subject from scratch. |

**Is this Achievement Standard [1.1] ready for piloting?**

| Option | Total | Percent |
| --- | --- | --- |
| The standard is ready for piloting | [1](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627617260.22-84564&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2F4b117e99e9%2Fsubpage.2021-07-29.1761043563%2Fpasted-question-1627617260.22-84564%2Fpasted-question-1627617260.22-84564-1627617261.16-80350%3Alist=pasted-question-1627617260.22-84564-1627617261.16-80350%2FThe+standard+is+ready+for+piloting) | 0.11% |
| The standard needs small amendments before piloting | [1](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627617260.22-84564&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2Ff293eb209e%2Fsubpage.2021-07-29.1761043563%2Fpasted-question-1627617260.22-84564%2Fpasted-question-1627617260.22-84564-1627617261.16-80350%3Alist=pasted-question-1627617260.22-84564-1627617261.16-80350%2FThe+standard+needs+small+amendments+before+piloting) | 0.11% |
| The standard needs significant amendments before piloting | [9](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627617260.22-84564&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2Ffe085267d9%2Fsubpage.2021-07-29.1761043563%2Fpasted-question-1627617260.22-84564%2Fpasted-question-1627617260.22-84564-1627617261.16-80350%3Alist=pasted-question-1627617260.22-84564-1627617261.16-80350%2FThe+standard+needs+significant+amendments+before+piloting) | 0.95% |
| The standard is unsuitable for piloting | [22](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627617260.22-84564&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2F6a12c294d5%2Fsubpage.2021-07-29.1761043563%2Fpasted-question-1627617260.22-84564%2Fpasted-question-1627617260.22-84564-1627617261.16-80350%3Alist=pasted-question-1627617260.22-84564-1627617261.16-80350%2FThe+standard+is+unsuitable+for+piloting) | 2.31% |
| Not Answered | [918](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627617260.22-84564&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2Fabc415c033%2Fsubpage.2021-07-29.1761043563%2Fpasted-question-1627617260.22-84564%2Fpasted-question-1627617260.22-84564-1627617261.16-80350%3Alist=pasted-question-1627617260.22-84564-1627617261.16-80350%2F__not_answered__) | 96.53% |

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

| Option | Total | Percent |
| --- | --- | --- |
| The criteria are clear | [2](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627617284.46-87364&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2F6919a53dd3%2Fsubpage.2021-07-29.1761043563%2Fpasted-question-1627617284.46-87364%2Fpasted-question-1627617284.46-87364-1627617284.69-93089%3Alist=pasted-question-1627617284.46-87364-1627617284.69-93089%2FThe+criteria+are+clear) | 0.21% |
| The criteria need some clarification | [7](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627617284.46-87364&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2F0869ae0eea%2Fsubpage.2021-07-29.1761043563%2Fpasted-question-1627617284.46-87364%2Fpasted-question-1627617284.46-87364-1627617284.69-93089%3Alist=pasted-question-1627617284.46-87364-1627617284.69-93089%2FThe+criteria+need+some+clarification) | 0.74% |
| The criteria need significant clarification | [25](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627617284.46-87364&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2Fd376504a9a%2Fsubpage.2021-07-29.1761043563%2Fpasted-question-1627617284.46-87364%2Fpasted-question-1627617284.46-87364-1627617284.69-93089%3Alist=pasted-question-1627617284.46-87364-1627617284.69-93089%2FThe+criteria+need+significant+clarification) | 2.63% |
| Not Answered | [917](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627617284.46-87364&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2F28768b4698%2Fsubpage.2021-07-29.1761043563%2Fpasted-question-1627617284.46-87364%2Fpasted-question-1627617284.46-87364-1627617284.69-93089%3Alist=pasted-question-1627617284.46-87364-1627617284.69-93089%2F__not_answered__) | 96.42% |

**Does the unpacking of the Standard and the Conditions of Assessment provide sufficient and clear guidance on the use of the standard?**

| Option | Total | Percent |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Guidance is sufficient and clear | [1](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627617300.08-40556&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2Fa05bfb6969%2Fsubpage.2021-07-29.1761043563%2Fpasted-question-1627617300.08-40556%2Fpasted-question-1627617300.08-40556-1627617300.32-43894%3Alist=pasted-question-1627617300.08-40556-1627617300.32-43894%2FGuidance+is+sufficient+and+clear) | 0.11% |
| Further detail is needed in the guidance | [13](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627617300.08-40556&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2F32759f224e%2Fsubpage.2021-07-29.1761043563%2Fpasted-question-1627617300.08-40556%2Fpasted-question-1627617300.08-40556-1627617300.32-43894%3Alist=pasted-question-1627617300.08-40556-1627617300.32-43894%2FFurther+detail+is+needed+in+the+guidance) | 1.37% |
| Guidance is unclear | [20](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627617300.08-40556&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2F1d37c71ad3%2Fsubpage.2021-07-29.1761043563%2Fpasted-question-1627617300.08-40556%2Fpasted-question-1627617300.08-40556-1627617300.32-43894%3Alist=pasted-question-1627617300.08-40556-1627617300.32-43894%2FGuidance+is+unclear) | 2.10% |
| Not Answered | [917](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627617300.08-40556&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2F686169ba34%2Fsubpage.2021-07-29.1761043563%2Fpasted-question-1627617300.08-40556%2Fpasted-question-1627617300.08-40556-1627617300.32-43894%3Alist=pasted-question-1627617300.08-40556-1627617300.32-43894%2F__not_answered__) | 96.42% |

**Could the Internal Assessment Activities for AS1.1 be used or adapted in your local context?**

| Option | Total | Percent |
| --- | --- | --- |
| I could not use or adapt any of these activities | [20](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627617331.74-17234&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2F4a35939b49%2Fsubpage.2021-07-29.1761043563%2Fpasted-question-1627617331.74-17234%2Fpasted-question-1627617331.74-17234-1627617332.05-70764%3Alist=pasted-question-1627617331.74-17234-1627617332.05-70764%2FI+could+not+use+or+adapt+any+of+these+activities) | 2.10% |
| I could use or adapt 1 or 2 activities | [12](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627617331.74-17234&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2F468ac8c0ad%2Fsubpage.2021-07-29.1761043563%2Fpasted-question-1627617331.74-17234%2Fpasted-question-1627617331.74-17234-1627617332.05-70764%3Alist=pasted-question-1627617331.74-17234-1627617332.05-70764%2FI+could+use+or+adapt+1+or+2+activities) | 1.26% |
| I could use or adapt all 3 activities | [1](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627617331.74-17234&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2F8cbb60e7d8%2Fsubpage.2021-07-29.1761043563%2Fpasted-question-1627617331.74-17234%2Fpasted-question-1627617331.74-17234-1627617332.05-70764%3Alist=pasted-question-1627617331.74-17234-1627617332.05-70764%2FI+could+use+or+adapt+all+3+activities) | 0.11% |
| Not Answered | [918](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627617331.74-17234&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2Fe2504b193e%2Fsubpage.2021-07-29.1761043563%2Fpasted-question-1627617331.74-17234%2Fpasted-question-1627617331.74-17234-1627617332.05-70764%3Alist=pasted-question-1627617331.74-17234-1627617332.05-70764%2F__not_answered__) | 96.53% |

**Do the Internal Assessment Activities exemplify how mātauranga Māori can be recognised and valued in assessment? (Do they demonstrate appropriate Māori contexts for assessment? Do they provide guidance and support for teachers and students to engage with mātauranga Māori in assessment?)**

| Option | Total | Percent |
| --- | --- | --- |
| All 3 activities do this | [3](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627617347.34-14940&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2Fab2ba4ca49%2Fsubpage.2021-07-29.1761043563%2Fpasted-question-1627617347.34-14940%2Fpasted-question-1627617347.34-14940-1627617347.79-36710%3Alist=pasted-question-1627617347.34-14940-1627617347.79-36710%2FAll+3+activities+do+this) | 0.32% |
| 1 or 2 of the activities do this | [14](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627617347.34-14940&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2F6c2c40bb93%2Fsubpage.2021-07-29.1761043563%2Fpasted-question-1627617347.34-14940%2Fpasted-question-1627617347.34-14940-1627617347.79-36710%3Alist=pasted-question-1627617347.34-14940-1627617347.79-36710%2F1+or+2+of+the+activities+do+this) | 1.47% |
| None of the activities do this | [13](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627617347.34-14940&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2Fd39f2aa8ba%2Fsubpage.2021-07-29.1761043563%2Fpasted-question-1627617347.34-14940%2Fpasted-question-1627617347.34-14940-1627617347.79-36710%3Alist=pasted-question-1627617347.34-14940-1627617347.79-36710%2FNone+of+the+activities+do+this) | 1.37% |
| Not Answered | [921](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627617347.34-14940&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2Fd39007e5ef%2Fsubpage.2021-07-29.1761043563%2Fpasted-question-1627617347.34-14940%2Fpasted-question-1627617347.34-14940-1627617347.79-36710%3Alist=pasted-question-1627617347.34-14940-1627617347.79-36710%2F__not_answered__) | 96.85% |

**Do the Internal Assessment Activities for AS1.1 support the engagement, access, understanding and participation of all learners?**

| Option | Total | Percent |
| --- | --- | --- |
| All 3 activities do this | [1](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627617364.49-25136&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2F2c6230be70%2Fsubpage.2021-07-29.1761043563%2Fpasted-question-1627617364.49-25136%2Fpasted-question-1627617364.49-25136-1627617364.73-34135%3Alist=pasted-question-1627617364.49-25136-1627617364.73-34135%2FAll+3+activities+do+this) | 0.11% |
| 1 or 2 of the activities do this | [8](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627617364.49-25136&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2F8037f2d768%2Fsubpage.2021-07-29.1761043563%2Fpasted-question-1627617364.49-25136%2Fpasted-question-1627617364.49-25136-1627617364.73-34135%3Alist=pasted-question-1627617364.49-25136-1627617364.73-34135%2F1+or+2+of+the+activities+do+this) | 0.84% |
| None of the activities do this | [24](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627617364.49-25136&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2F3fac2d5d4b%2Fsubpage.2021-07-29.1761043563%2Fpasted-question-1627617364.49-25136%2Fpasted-question-1627617364.49-25136-1627617364.73-34135%3Alist=pasted-question-1627617364.49-25136-1627617364.73-34135%2FNone+of+the+activities+do+this) | 2.52% |
| Not Answered | [918](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627617364.49-25136&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2Fc7d6b68592%2Fsubpage.2021-07-29.1761043563%2Fpasted-question-1627617364.49-25136%2Fpasted-question-1627617364.49-25136-1627617364.73-34135%3Alist=pasted-question-1627617364.49-25136-1627617364.73-34135%2F__not_answered__) | 96.53% |

**Do you have any further feedback on [achievement standard 1.1] and its activities? For example, if you noted that the Achieved, Merit and Excellence criteria were unclear, which grade level in particular is problematic and why? If you have noticed problems in an Activity, which one was it?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| [ANON-767U-4EAK-X](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627617378.32-55947&user_id=ANON-767U-4EAK-X) | The actual content being assessed is too unclear, with very weak links to commerce fullstop. It does not look like it has been developed by commerce expert, but instead people who only have surface level and sparse commerce knowledge. This means that the activity will never be clear enough as the content links are too weak. |
| [ANON-767U-4E6Q-S](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627617378.32-55947&user_id=ANON-767U-4E6Q-S) | There is a distinct lack of accounting in the standards. |
| [ANON-767U-4EEV-D](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627617378.32-55947&user_id=ANON-767U-4EEV-D) | The activities are all group works which are hard for our students due to the attendance issues. Alternative forms of activities/assessments that did not involve reliance on other students and access to ICT after school time (low socio-eco community) would allow students to have opportunities to complete the tasks. |
| [ANON-767U-4EJV-J](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627617378.32-55947&user_id=ANON-767U-4EJV-J) | 800 words? Doesn't seem very academically rigorous. How is this standard more useful than the current ACC 1.6 standard. Seems to be more aimed at Level 3 or Level 4 of the curriculum. |
| [ANON-767U-4EJ1-D](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627617378.32-55947&user_id=ANON-767U-4EJ1-D) | This standard is not an improvement on current decision-making standards in Accounting or Economics. It does not lead on to many, if any, standards in L2, L3 or tertiary level.  Standard is at level 3/4 of the curriculum - why is it 5 credits/how is that justified given the standard? How will students be able to show they have justified/evaluated the decision making process and financial decision in 800 words/2-4 minute presentation.  No marking criteria |
| [ANON-767U-4ECQ-6](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627617378.32-55947&user_id=ANON-767U-4ECQ-6) | No clear guidance, it is a mess and will leave everyone confused and not interested in the subject and that will lead to unemployment as there will be teachers with no students in their classes as the interest in the alone standing subjects have been taken away. |
| [ANON-767U-4ECM-2](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627617378.32-55947&user_id=ANON-767U-4ECM-2) | The presentation of your assessment task is very poor - how can we assess a student in a group activitiy that has prepared a few powerpoint slides or done a 2 minute video. How will a NZ european or Indian student feel about having to study mātauranga Māori business and concepts? No balance. |
| [ANON-767U-4E6V-X](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627617378.32-55947&user_id=ANON-767U-4E6V-X) | The aim of the changes made to level 1 was to remain "broad but also allows for greater specialisation at NCEA 2 and 3. This assessment activity is neither broad nor does it prepare students for greater specialisation. Its conceptually inadequate and does not give students the necessary conceptual foundation to specialise in Business Studies, Accounting or Economics. This would be more appropriate for students to undertake in years 10 at level 5 of the curriculum strand. It is going to "dumb" down the subject. |
| [ANON-767U-4EDH-X](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627617378.32-55947&user_id=ANON-767U-4EDH-X) | This is based around a financial decision but most tools listed do not actually relate to making a financial decision. While looking at the tasks, they are not consistent across what is actually expected of learners to do. Even though this is titled demonstrate understanding of an organisations financial decision there is very little/any fundamental accounting skills actually needed. Instead it links to making a decision based on values. This is a terrible mashup of two existing standards (accounting - make a financial decision for an individual or group and economics - demonstrate understanding of government choice where affected groups have different viewpoints). |
| [ANON-767U-4E8S-W](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627617378.32-55947&user_id=ANON-767U-4E8S-W) | while the decision making concept can be applied across a wide range of situations, why is the government not one of the options. Evaluating current government decisions can be current, relevant and engaging for the students |
| [ANON-767U-4ECS-8](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627617378.32-55947&user_id=ANON-767U-4ECS-8) | While I can see echoes of a current Economics internal standard in here, it has been mixed in with concepts and tasks from other levels and Commerce subjects to create a new Frankenstein standard that is not coherent and will leave teachers and students struggling to put it together as a unified assessment. I have no idea how we are supposed to differentiate between levels of achievement (N, A, M, E). Also the suggested assessment procedures are unsuitable/insufficient for assessing group work etc. |
| [ANON-767U-4E29-W](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627617378.32-55947&user_id=ANON-767U-4E29-W) | Achievement standard title vs achievement criteria - they are not the same. Matauranga Maori - is this genuine or simply context. |
| [ANON-767U-4E2P-M](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627617378.32-55947&user_id=ANON-767U-4E2P-M) | The step ups in a achieved, merit and excellence are all problematic and the differences between the step ups are unclear. |
| [ANON-767U-4EP3-N](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627617378.32-55947&user_id=ANON-767U-4EP3-N) | I am appalled at a word limit being placed on a written assessment. I don't think 800 words equates with 8 slides or an oral presentation of 2-4 minutes. Why are limits required? It should be whatever it takes to complete the task. If the aim of the limits was to reduce the time to mark the work, then you are looking at this from the wrong perspective. |
| [ANON-767U-4EPY-U](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627617378.32-55947&user_id=ANON-767U-4EPY-U) | I would need much more detail as to how to teach the material before such an assessment. |
| [ANON-767U-4EBY-D](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627617378.32-55947&user_id=ANON-767U-4EBY-D) | There is confusion as to whether or not students actually make a decision, or if they look at a decision already made - there are implications of both possibilities that are not resolved by the descriptions of the step ups. Again, this seems very 'empty'. It is as though the course content is below Level 6 and the assessment expectations even lower again. The use of a marae is tokenism and embarrassing to see. |
| [ANON-767U-41V8-C](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627617378.32-55947&user_id=ANON-767U-41V8-C) | I can't believe how disjointed the roll out of this course seems. The first documents say that 1.1 can be on a 'hypothetical whanau'. The CM 1 course outline says students can run a business (I like this idea) yet the three learning contexts are 1)Should the marae install solar panels. 2) Should the courier buy a new van, and 3) Analyse any spending decsion by our school. |
| [ANON-767U-41AE-4](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627617378.32-55947&user_id=ANON-767U-41AE-4) | This is not a standard that excites me at all - we do similar one in year 9 and cut this from our combined course in L1 as it was not well liked and basic for our learners. I am disappointed that it makes our business studies content is accounting which it is not. Using SWOT and smart objectives as a financial tool undermines accounting and the impact of good financial decisions based on financial statements which is way more important than price comparisons etc. Where is the accounting in this! It looks like an assessment for people who don't understand accounting and therefore the students will not understand real accounting and its importance in decision making from this standard. |
| [ANON-767U-41NS-Y](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627617378.32-55947&user_id=ANON-767U-41NS-Y) | I am not going to go through each of these standards as this is too repetitive. I simply restate that this proposed course is limiting and does not provide enough to set students up for a knowledgeable subject choice in respect to Accounting in following years. I do not feel that students are being prepared for continuing a Commerce Degree with an Accounting major at Uni - but this will be dependent on what is in L2 and L3 standards.  I dont believe that the increasing number of international students will be attracted to this proposed Commerce subject because of the increased written component. Already we have seen the decrease in students attempting current 1.1 2.1 and 3.1 Accounting Standard - and this may be attributed to many students opting out of these standards as their level of English is inadequate. We should be offering more practical Accounting Standards at L1 to engage the interest of these students and increase the written components as their Language skills increase (L2 and L3). I believe 1.3 is not good in the Accounting area. I also believe these proposed standards will result in a loss of staff skilled in Accounting - who do not want to take such a watered down course. Comment on external standards impossible because these are not yet available. |
| [ANON-767U-41HW-W](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627617378.32-55947&user_id=ANON-767U-41HW-W) | Achieved, Merit and Excellence are not consistent. Achieved is Describe the process, Merit is Explain the process, yet Excellence is Evaluate the process, and the financial decision.  Explanatory Note 1 - Achieved is very low level. Identifying only. No describing. How can 'using a financial tool' be assessed?  Excellence - it is unclear as to what is the difference between the two bullet points.  This Standard is at Curriculum Level 3 'understand how people make decisions about access to and use of resources' or Level 4 ' understand how formal and informal groups make decisions that impact on communities' .  Level 5 of the Curriculum 'Understand how economic decisions impact on people, communities, and nations' . Nations- not in this standard. Governance of an iwi. |
| [ANON-767U-413A-J](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627617378.32-55947&user_id=ANON-767U-413A-J) | This standard appears to be taken from NZC level 3/4 - not at the appropriate level 5. |
| [ANON-767U-413U-6](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627617378.32-55947&user_id=ANON-767U-413U-6) | This standard shows some similarities the Decision Making standard in L1 Accounting, but appears to be looking at things rom more of a Business Studies lense. Students will NOT have any idea what Accounting is about once they have completed this internal standard and will thus not be able to make an informed choice about taking any of the separate subjects at L2 - nor will they have to grounding to be able to cope with the demands of ANY of the 3 Level 2 subjects. The criteria for A/M/E are rather vague ad do not give the students and teachers sufficient guidance as to what is expected fr each achievement level. |
| [ANON-767U-41FY-W](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627617378.32-55947&user_id=ANON-767U-41FY-W) | Demonstrate understanding of an organisation's financial decision Fundamental to "profit" is its magnitude. Opportunity cost is but one result from this. However, toku mamae that profit maximisation is not addressed. It is a singularly unique point in microeconomics and is mutually exclusive of other goals such as market share or sales maximisation. It is mathematically impossible in an imperfect market to consider alternatives or "greying" of decisions trying to include them with maximising profit |
| [ANON-767U-41GA-6](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627617378.32-55947&user_id=ANON-767U-41GA-6) | The idea of focusing on a decision made by "whānau, hapū, iwi, community organisations and businesses" is at Level 4 of the NZ Curriculum not NCEA Level 1. Obtaining information about the various organisations in some of the activities could prove to be very difficult. |
| [ANON-767U-41DB-4](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627617378.32-55947&user_id=ANON-767U-41DB-4) | 1. This standard asks us to look at a decision made by whānau, hapū, iwi, community organisations, and businesses” which is at Level 3 or 4 of the NZ Curriculum. 2. As teachers of the three subjects, it is unclear what the students have to actually do to get achieved/merit/excellence\. 3. It is SO BORING. I cannot see how this is going to be interesting or engaging for learners 4. There is no academic rigour. It is unclear what learning the students should undertake before being assessed - seems like anyone could do this right off the bat without any prior learning whatsoever. What are we assessing exactly. Furthermore a 2 minute presentation being sufficient for an answer seems like we don't think the students can do more. What is it we are actually meant to be teaching and assessing here? My students (Maori and Pakeha alike) are well capable of more than this at Y11 and any teacher that says that they can't, I suspect is underselling their students. Raise expectations and students will meet them. Chris Hipkins announced that these were going to lead to rich learning experiences (really? Did he have a look at these standards prior to saying that?) and a wide range of future pathways - I dispute that this standard does that AT ALL. 5. Economics and Accounting are both academic subjects - it is though we are completely forgetting that this is meant to be a pathway for higher level thinking. I cannot see how the students are on a pathway to higher order thinking skills. |
| [ANON-767U-419C-T](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627617378.32-55947&user_id=ANON-767U-419C-T) | For what looks to be required 5 cr seems too much for this standard. Where has the govt gone? |
| [ANON-767U-417C-R](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627617378.32-55947&user_id=ANON-767U-417C-R) | This standard could be completed in a much quicker time than suggested; what do the students then do for the rest of the year? This focus on making a decision appears to be set at too low a level, probably level 3; Year 9 students will find this easy, what does that mean for the Yr 11 student - they will be totally turned off from the subject. Is this standard your token attempt at including some Accounting as it is quite similar to the present level 1 Decision making standard, many do this in Yr 9 or 10 in their courses. As there is not enough coverage of the key Accounting skills, students will have no idea as to what is Accounting if they are considering Level 2. This standard will not give students the necessary foundation for any of the Level 2 separate subjects, or the demands expected at Level 2. The resources presented do not give sufficient information/guidance as to what is expected and I found the criteria to be very vague. |
| [ANON-767U-41U3-6](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627617378.32-55947&user_id=ANON-767U-41U3-6) | So when did government (local or central) STOP being an organisation - can we look at decisions the Local Council makes? Can we look at the May Central Government Budget and the decisions in that document? Really easy options there which someone has decided aren't useful decisions? Why? |
| [ANON-767U-41BB-2](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627617378.32-55947&user_id=ANON-767U-41BB-2) | This standard is about decision making which is found in the Social Sciences achievement objectives at Levels 3-5 of the curriculum, not Level 6. The activities do not incorporate Matauranga Maori appropriately. The use of a context of a marae is not incorporating Matauranga Maori, it is simply changing the context. |
| [ANON-767U-41BU-N](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627617378.32-55947&user_id=ANON-767U-41BU-N) | I am concerned around the tokenism of the first activity.... is this really implementation of matauranga maori? As an Accounting specialist I see this process as very low level and would not provide any challenge for my average or above average students. |
| [ANON-767U-4EAE-R](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627617378.32-55947&user_id=ANON-767U-4EAE-R) | This standard is based on Level 3 or 4 of the NZ Curriculum and is actually insulting to the intelligence of students and teachers alike A good Intermediate school would probably offer a similar unit of work.  Do students even have to make a financial decision, or just be aware that in life sometimes decisions need to be made, but only if you are an excellence student  An 800 MAXIMUM word limit is ridiculous where there are 8 or so different criteria to cover - some in 2 parts.  Yes we want students to be concise - but putting this limit (which seems pretty uniform across all subjects), shows that the left arm has no idea what the right is doing. Match the word limit to the requirement of the standard.  the first activity seems like tokenism, so we can all tick off the mātauranga Māori aspect in one clumsy go.  This standard - or some better iteration could have been used to take the bull by the horns and actually offer some tangible Financial Literacy into the subject called Commerce. You want all students to have a broad L1 education. How about including the thing a LOT of people in NZ lack into this subject called Commerce. Most people would expect some financial literacy in a course with this name. It would also give a bit of purpose and a push for student/families/whānau, hapū, iwi, community organisations, and businesses to see any value in it. |
| [ANON-767U-41UD-Q](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627617378.32-55947&user_id=ANON-767U-41UD-Q) | I question why there are 3 examples of tasks for non-profit making organisations and none for profit making organisations. Surely it is as important to examine putake for profit making organisations as well. We met as a group of 5 schools for our accord day and we all agree that we have serious concerns about the dearth of information regarding matauranga Maori and subject content and that the requirement has been put back on schools to develop material and for local Marae (completely unfunded or resourced to do this) to be asked by everyone for help. There is a feeling that we are trying to win the gold medal for sprinting before we can actually walk. The time implications for teachers are huge and incredibly stressful and something needs to be done to slow down the process into manageable chunks which it is not at the moment. |

**Is this Achievement Standard [1.2] ready for piloting?**

| Option | Total | Percent |
| --- | --- | --- |
| The standard is ready for piloting | 0 | 0.00% |
| The standard needs small amendments before piloting | [2](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627620311.65-23322&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2F95e38b7e7d%2Fsubpage.2021-07-30.0554765990%2Fpasted-question-1627620311.65-23322%2Fpasted-question-1627620311.65-23322-1627620311.96-82108%3Alist=pasted-question-1627620311.65-23322-1627620311.96-82108%2FThe+standard+needs+small+amendments+before+piloting) | 0.21% |
| The standard needs significant amendments before piloting | [9](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627620311.65-23322&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2Ff899df9e72%2Fsubpage.2021-07-30.0554765990%2Fpasted-question-1627620311.65-23322%2Fpasted-question-1627620311.65-23322-1627620311.96-82108%3Alist=pasted-question-1627620311.65-23322-1627620311.96-82108%2FThe+standard+needs+significant+amendments+before+piloting) | 0.95% |
| The standard is unsuitable for piloting | [16](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627620311.65-23322&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2F8e56cfb68e%2Fsubpage.2021-07-30.0554765990%2Fpasted-question-1627620311.65-23322%2Fpasted-question-1627620311.65-23322-1627620311.96-82108%3Alist=pasted-question-1627620311.65-23322-1627620311.96-82108%2FThe+standard+is+unsuitable+for+piloting) | 1.68% |
| Not Answered | [924](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627620311.65-23322&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2Fdf8701ce2d%2Fsubpage.2021-07-30.0554765990%2Fpasted-question-1627620311.65-23322%2Fpasted-question-1627620311.65-23322-1627620311.96-82108%3Alist=pasted-question-1627620311.65-23322-1627620311.96-82108%2F__not_answered__) | 97.16% |

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

| Option | Total | Percent |
| --- | --- | --- |
| The criteria are clear | [2](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627620328.09-45087&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2F361021060d%2Fsubpage.2021-07-30.0554765990%2Fpasted-question-1627620328.09-45087%2Fpasted-question-1627620328.09-45087-1627620328.36-90221%3Alist=pasted-question-1627620328.09-45087-1627620328.36-90221%2FThe+criteria+are+clear) | 0.21% |
| The criteria need some clarification | [5](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627620328.09-45087&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2Ff71ddbdb22%2Fsubpage.2021-07-30.0554765990%2Fpasted-question-1627620328.09-45087%2Fpasted-question-1627620328.09-45087-1627620328.36-90221%3Alist=pasted-question-1627620328.09-45087-1627620328.36-90221%2FThe+criteria+need+some+clarification) | 0.53% |
| The criteria need significant clarification | [20](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627620328.09-45087&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2F70d4f0bd17%2Fsubpage.2021-07-30.0554765990%2Fpasted-question-1627620328.09-45087%2Fpasted-question-1627620328.09-45087-1627620328.36-90221%3Alist=pasted-question-1627620328.09-45087-1627620328.36-90221%2FThe+criteria+need+significant+clarification) | 2.10% |
| Not Answered | [924](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627620328.09-45087&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2F8c00cb40c0%2Fsubpage.2021-07-30.0554765990%2Fpasted-question-1627620328.09-45087%2Fpasted-question-1627620328.09-45087-1627620328.36-90221%3Alist=pasted-question-1627620328.09-45087-1627620328.36-90221%2F__not_answered__) | 97.16% |

**Does the unpacking of the Standard and the Conditions of Assessment provide sufficient and clear guidance on the use of the standard?**

| Option | Total | Percent |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Guidance is sufficient and clear | 0 | 0.00% |
| Further detail is needed in the guidance | [9](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627620357.23-88463&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2F55c1c3d208%2Fsubpage.2021-07-30.0554765990%2Fpasted-question-1627620357.23-88463%2Fpasted-question-1627620357.23-88463-1627620357.45-77060%3Alist=pasted-question-1627620357.23-88463-1627620357.45-77060%2FFurther+detail+is+needed+in+the+guidance) | 0.95% |
| Guidance is unclear | [18](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627620357.23-88463&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2F1110ecc8ec%2Fsubpage.2021-07-30.0554765990%2Fpasted-question-1627620357.23-88463%2Fpasted-question-1627620357.23-88463-1627620357.45-77060%3Alist=pasted-question-1627620357.23-88463-1627620357.45-77060%2FGuidance+is+unclear) | 1.89% |
| Not Answered | [924](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627620357.23-88463&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2F4c3aeec59f%2Fsubpage.2021-07-30.0554765990%2Fpasted-question-1627620357.23-88463%2Fpasted-question-1627620357.23-88463-1627620357.45-77060%3Alist=pasted-question-1627620357.23-88463-1627620357.45-77060%2F__not_answered__) | 97.16% |

**Could the Internal Assessment Activities for AS1.2 be used or adapted in your local context?**

| Option | Total | Percent |
| --- | --- | --- |
| I could use or adapt all 3 activities | [2](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627620390.95-8062&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2F0ba619ba0c%2Fsubpage.2021-07-30.0554765990%2Fpasted-question-1627620390.95-8062%2Fpasted-question-1627620390.95-8062-1627620391.2-49091%3Alist=pasted-question-1627620390.95-8062-1627620391.2-49091%2FI+could+use+or+adapt+all+3+activities) | 0.21% |
| I could use or adapt 1 or 2 activities | [11](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627620390.95-8062&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2F64474a7a18%2Fsubpage.2021-07-30.0554765990%2Fpasted-question-1627620390.95-8062%2Fpasted-question-1627620390.95-8062-1627620391.2-49091%3Alist=pasted-question-1627620390.95-8062-1627620391.2-49091%2FI+could+use+or+adapt+1+or+2+activities) | 1.16% |
| I could not use or adapt any of these activities | [13](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627620390.95-8062&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2F52aa08bf24%2Fsubpage.2021-07-30.0554765990%2Fpasted-question-1627620390.95-8062%2Fpasted-question-1627620390.95-8062-1627620391.2-49091%3Alist=pasted-question-1627620390.95-8062-1627620391.2-49091%2FI+could+not+use+or+adapt+any+of+these+activities) | 1.37% |
| Not Answered | [925](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627620390.95-8062&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2F6f0e08de10%2Fsubpage.2021-07-30.0554765990%2Fpasted-question-1627620390.95-8062%2Fpasted-question-1627620390.95-8062-1627620391.2-49091%3Alist=pasted-question-1627620390.95-8062-1627620391.2-49091%2F__not_answered__) | 97.27% |

**Do the Internal Assessment Activities exemplify how mātauranga Māori can be recognised and valued in assessment? (Do they demonstrate appropriate Māori contexts for assessment? Do they provide guidance and support for teachers and students to engage with mātauranga Māori in assessment?)**

| Option | Total | Percent |
| --- | --- | --- |
| All 3 activities do this | [2](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627620409.84-87459&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2Febe93094db%2Fsubpage.2021-07-30.0554765990%2Fpasted-question-1627620409.84-87459%2Fpasted-question-1627620409.84-87459-1627620411.14-20792%3Alist=pasted-question-1627620409.84-87459-1627620411.14-20792%2FAll+3+activities+do+this) | 0.21% |
| 1 or 2 of the activities do this | [7](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627620409.84-87459&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2F06ae95f35e%2Fsubpage.2021-07-30.0554765990%2Fpasted-question-1627620409.84-87459%2Fpasted-question-1627620409.84-87459-1627620411.14-20792%3Alist=pasted-question-1627620409.84-87459-1627620411.14-20792%2F1+or+2+of+the+activities+do+this) | 0.74% |
| None of the activities do this | [13](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627620409.84-87459&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2F12fe4d2906%2Fsubpage.2021-07-30.0554765990%2Fpasted-question-1627620409.84-87459%2Fpasted-question-1627620409.84-87459-1627620411.14-20792%3Alist=pasted-question-1627620409.84-87459-1627620411.14-20792%2FNone+of+the+activities+do+this) | 1.37% |
| Not Answered | [929](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627620409.84-87459&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2F19c6915f3d%2Fsubpage.2021-07-30.0554765990%2Fpasted-question-1627620409.84-87459%2Fpasted-question-1627620409.84-87459-1627620411.14-20792%3Alist=pasted-question-1627620409.84-87459-1627620411.14-20792%2F__not_answered__) | 97.69% |

**Do the Internal Assessment Activities for AS1.2 support the engagement, access, understanding and participation of all learners?**

| Option | Total | Percent |
| --- | --- | --- |
| All 3 activities do this | 0 | 0.00% |
| 1 or 2 of the activities do this | [8](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627620431.68-8954&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2Ffe7c730d62%2Fsubpage.2021-07-30.0554765990%2Fpasted-question-1627620431.68-8954%2Fpasted-question-1627620431.68-8954-1627620432.94-83164%3Alist=pasted-question-1627620431.68-8954-1627620432.94-83164%2F1+or+2+of+the+activities+do+this) | 0.84% |
| None of the activities do this | [18](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627620431.68-8954&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2Ff2b13f89d9%2Fsubpage.2021-07-30.0554765990%2Fpasted-question-1627620431.68-8954%2Fpasted-question-1627620431.68-8954-1627620432.94-83164%3Alist=pasted-question-1627620431.68-8954-1627620432.94-83164%2FNone+of+the+activities+do+this) | 1.89% |
| Not Answered | [925](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627620431.68-8954&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2F7062ba51b1%2Fsubpage.2021-07-30.0554765990%2Fpasted-question-1627620431.68-8954%2Fpasted-question-1627620431.68-8954-1627620432.94-83164%3Alist=pasted-question-1627620431.68-8954-1627620432.94-83164%2F__not_answered__) | 97.27% |

**Do you have any further feedback on [achievement standard 1.2] and its activities? For example, if you noted that the Achieved, Merit and Excellence criteria were unclear, which grade level in particular is problematic and why? If you have noticed problems in an Activity, which one was it?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| [ANON-767U-4EAK-X](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627620446.26-45743&user_id=ANON-767U-4EAK-X) | The activity does not adequainclude commerce knowledge, and the lack of specific details on what knowledge is assessed and what we expect learners to retain from this standard means it is completely unsuitable. It does not allow learners to demonstrate actual content knowledge, and therefore is a waste of time |
| [ANON-767U-4EEV-D](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627620446.26-45743&user_id=ANON-767U-4EEV-D) | One of the issues is the continuous nature of the activities is too ridged due to the low attendance and transient nature of our school community. We need more flexibility on the assessment format. Besides, the economic models are too vague and need further clarification. Case studies need to be provided to both teachers and students as access to non-profit organisations in south Auckland could be problematic. |
| [ANON-767U-4EJV-J](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627620446.26-45743&user_id=ANON-767U-4EJV-J) | Are they expected to prepare their own balance sheet? What would they put in this? Economic models? Very vague. Only 800 words for evidence? This doesn't seem like enough evidence to show students have met the standard. There doesn't seem to be any linkage for L2 & 3 & big ideas |
| [ANON-767U-4EJ1-D](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627620446.26-45743&user_id=ANON-767U-4EJ1-D) | This standard does not link to any Economics or Accounting standard at L2 or L3.  It is unclear what the Economic models are to be used to teach this standard. It is also unclear how in depth the concepts will need to be taught/to what detail the elements are required to be produced e.g. for the income statement and breakeven analysis (which is currently being taught at NCEA L2 and L3). How will students fit this into the assessment constraint of 800 words. |
| [ANON-767U-4ECQ-6](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627620446.26-45743&user_id=ANON-767U-4ECQ-6) | Even though I am more for this standard than for any of the others, I think that it requires significant amendments as this still has gaps to give a balanced overview of the three subjects. |
| [ANON-767U-4ECM-2](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627620446.26-45743&user_id=ANON-767U-4ECM-2) | I would do activity 1.2 B as this is the hands on assessment task which is why so many of our students take Business Studies as a subject. To do a market day business. Also take the business plan out of 1.2C. |
| [ANON-767U-4EDH-X](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627620446.26-45743&user_id=ANON-767U-4EDH-X) | The work load across the activities is very unequal. One says 8 hours, one takes 6 weeks and the other takes 8 weeks to assess and that does not include the learning that would be required. Again these are very swayed, in this case towards business studies skills with no economics and minimal accounting skills being required. The task requirements examples of how it can be done do not match what is being asked to be done e.g. Use models to explain HOW the business could bring the idea to market and then used WHY models. Requirements for E too high of a level for level 1 more of a level 2/3 skill. |
| [ANON-767U-4ECS-8](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627620446.26-45743&user_id=ANON-767U-4ECS-8) | Again I can see echoes of all three current subjects in this and each make sense individually but trying to put all three into one is going to raise major problems with teaching and learning a coherent knowledge area. Again, the methods of assessment are largely insufficient for M or E |
| [ANON-767U-4E2P-M](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627620446.26-45743&user_id=ANON-767U-4E2P-M) | This standard is fatally flawed in that the discussion of using models from the three Commerce subjects means you need to teach at L6 of the curriculum but to teach students to reach excellence in the variety of models available for the 3 areas of commerce is not feasible. This means that students would be only taught 1 or possibly 2 models at the the required depth of L6 of the curriculum so we are then back to the need of having 3 separate subjects to allow the in-depth teaching required. Basically what is being tried to do is combine 3 different subjects into 1 course and 4 separate standards at L6 curriculum understanding which is ridiculous. If this type of depth is no longer required then all that has been achieved is a "dumbing down" of the three subject areas and all the subsequent fall out that would then occur when the students progress through Years 12 and 13. |
| [ANON-767U-4EPY-U](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627620446.26-45743&user_id=ANON-767U-4EPY-U) | This standard is stealing content from current Level 2 Business Studies ie the Young Enterprise practical business activity. |
| [ANON-767U-4EBY-D](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627620446.26-45743&user_id=ANON-767U-4EBY-D) | The concept of viability is quite different across Accounting, Economics and Business Studies when you are actually teaching it. The use of 'models' needs to be clarified. The list of examples includes specifics from Business Studies and Accounting but no specific examples from Economics. Can we use 2 or more from just 'economic models' or do we have to use 2 or more from a range of contexts? Whānau also seems like an inappropriate context to encourage. Not all teachers will be away that this translates to more than 'family' (which I assume is the intention). The language used in some areas is 'dumbed down' from current expectations, however there are some language/concepts currently at L2 and L3 Business Studies. Consistency of curriculum level is important. 'Stealing' from levels higher up creates concern when we have been told the there will be little or no change to our subjects at L2 and L3. |
| [ANON-767U-4ETA-7](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627620446.26-45743&user_id=ANON-767U-4ETA-7) | I am unsure what economic models you are expecting to be covered in this standard, there are so many we could use. An exemplar would be helpful I am not confident with the Maturanga Maori content in these standards. I would like some assistance with them. |
| [ANON-767U-41AE-4](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627620446.26-45743&user_id=ANON-767U-41AE-4) | Gives very little options for students. Again main focus is business studies. I already do a combined commerce course (doing all three options) and this is not one I would choose to do normally as there is little hard core content - similar to what our junior program is so it would be a repeat . Students would not engage in it again. Activity B & C very similar except C finishes at a pitch so much quicker and easier to do but worth the same amount of credits - how does that work? If you do option A - (although students will be sick of looking at other organisations by now having just done 1.1 - how do you expect us to get authentic information from businesses about financial viability - it is not information they want to give over to students. |
| [ANON-767U-41HW-W](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627620446.26-45743&user_id=ANON-767U-41HW-W) | What is an organisation? It is not detailed here like it is in Standard 1.1 , Why?  Having "how" at achievement and "why" at merit does not make the criteria clear. It is confusing as to how to distinguish between these.  What economic models can show financial viability?  Explanatory Note 2 is plural, so students need to complete more than one Income Statement.  Explanatory Note 5 explains that financial viability means the ability of an organisation to continue operating over time. So why is there the word 'remain' in the achievement criteria?  Preparing Income Statements are at Level 5 of the Accounting Curriculum "Students will understand the purpose of, and prepare an Income Statement. Statement of Financial Position Students will understand the purpose of, and prepare a Statement of Financial Position."  Organisations in glossary includes whānau, so this standard can be an assessment of exploring how a whānau remains financially viable? How could you explore this? Would a family decision meet this standard - this seems very low level. This would not be appropriate for financially struggling family and therefore this is inaccessible to some of our learners. |
| [ANON-767U-413A-J](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627620446.26-45743&user_id=ANON-767U-413A-J) | Seems to lack any economics - meant to be a mixture of 3 subjects not 2???? |
| [ANON-767U-413U-6](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627620446.26-45743&user_id=ANON-767U-413U-6) | This appears to be totally focused on Business Studies type activities and only gives a token mention on some Financial Decisions that need to be made ... this is NOT sufficient knowledge to be able to cope with L2 Accounting of L2 Economics WHY are we not offering this subject as an ADDITIONAL option TOGETHER with L1 Business Studies, L1 Accounting and L1 Economics???????? |
| [ANON-767U-41FY-W](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627620446.26-45743&user_id=ANON-767U-41FY-W) | Describe how an organisation can be financially viable How can this possibly be achieved when the #1 reason for business failure isn't profitability but cashflow? While Income Statements and Balance Sheets (This isn't the correct terminology: Statements of Financial Position - have these standards been run by the expert panel past professional organisations?) are listed. This standard does considerable disservice to akonga by not alerting them to the most significant issue facing startups and other businesses |
| [ANON-767U-41GA-6](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627620446.26-45743&user_id=ANON-767U-41GA-6) | What economic models in particular will fit into this standard? |
| [ANON-767U-41DB-4](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627620446.26-45743&user_id=ANON-767U-41DB-4) | This is an activity close to the Economics activity. The problem comes in with 1. It isn't clear if students should do 1 model or ALL models. If it is just one model then it is unclear how this leads to equitable pathways in future Level 2 standards (eg I I do this one with an income statement as my model - would this disadvantage future economics students at L2). 2. Unclear at what academic level these should be assessed at - there is very little clarification of exactly what might constitute an achieved merit or excellence - eg • using models or concepts to demonstrate understanding of an organisation's financial viability. (achieved) and • using models or concepts to show how pūtake and profit are linked (merit)... If the student draws up an income statement (using a model to show profits) then it is automatically linked to profit - It is unclear what might differentiate the two. The standard is full of holes like that. Without exemplars this is very unclear - I have taught Economics and Accounting for many years and I would have no confident in my judgements according to this standard. 3. The different models suggested have varied difficulty and complexity - how does one equitably assess. If eg an economic model such as a supply curve were used vs an income statement if an accounting model was used...can this really be judged equitably? 4. Which economic models were they thinking? There are quite a few of them! or is it any? 5. Of all the standards, this is the one with potentially the most academic rigour - but a 2 min presentation as the outcome. Is this something that NCEA wants now - no writing, no reading, no talking even...how is this preparing students for rich learning or multiple pathways ala Chris Hipkins |
| [ANON-767U-419C-T](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627620446.26-45743&user_id=ANON-767U-419C-T) | Explanatory Note 2 Models and concepts examples include: economic models. Too vague - what models could be used?? Why is this standard 6 credits. Why are the internals/externals mix 11/9 and not 10/10 like other subjects? |
| [ANON-767U-417C-R](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627620446.26-45743&user_id=ANON-767U-417C-R) | This standard does not give an equitable coverage across all 3 subjects of Accounting, Economics and Business Studies. There certainly is not enough explanation of what students will need to know in detail. How can students comment on financial viability if they do not even know how to prepare a financial statement, the difference between Assets, Liabilities, Income, Expenses. This standard appears to be very like the current Business studies standard, particularly coming up with an idea, having a market day, marketing. Economic models do not fit into this standard at all. The students that study Accounting in Level 1 currently are well prepared in financial statements and have a much greater understanding of viability - this standard will not come close to students having this knowledge. |
| [ANON-767U-41U3-6](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627620446.26-45743&user_id=ANON-767U-41U3-6) | Again, no idea of how much detail is required or expected in an ideal answer. Quite a lot of guesswork expected. |
| [ANON-767U-41BB-2](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627620446.26-45743&user_id=ANON-767U-41BB-2) | In Accounting, demonstrating understanding of an entity's viability would require significant understanding of the analysis measures of a business, looking at their accounting records over a significant period of time. |
| [ANON-767U-41BU-N](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627620446.26-45743&user_id=ANON-767U-41BU-N) | While this standard is the most promising of the 4, I am unsure about which models to use and how the level of difficulty is inequitable across these. |
| [ANON-767U-4EAE-R](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627620446.26-45743&user_id=ANON-767U-4EAE-R) | Why is this standard 6 credits - but again - there is an 800 MAXIMUM word limit is ridiculous where there are 8 or so different criteria to cover - some in 2 parts.  Yes we want students to be concise - but putting this limit (which seems pretty uniform across all subjects), shows that the left arm has no idea what the right is doing. Match the word limit to the requirement of the standard.  There is a massive difference between a business pitch and running a business - how can these even be the same standard. You cannot run a business without the pitch. I guess if we are pushed for time, we just get the kids to think about a fictitious business that they'll never do!!  Balance Sheets and Income Statements are neither models or concepts. Did somebody just throw these in to make it seem like there is an element of accounting in here?  Also Activity one smells of tokenism |
| [ANON-767U-41UD-Q](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627620446.26-45743&user_id=ANON-767U-41UD-Q) | 800 words is ridiculous for expecting an excellence level answer with that limitation. I understand that those writing this think that limiting it to 800 words will limit the students stress. Actually the opposite is true as they will stress over every single word they write down. This limit is just not realistic. I repeat my comments about matauranga Maori as I made for the last standard. Too little content is being generated by the MoE and the bulk is being dumped on teachers without resourcing them to do so. |

**Is this Achievement Standard [1.3] ready for piloting?**

| Option | Total | Percent |
| --- | --- | --- |
| The standard is ready for piloting | 0 | 0.00% |
| The standard needs small amendments before piloting | 0 | 0.00% |
| The standard needs significant amendments before piloting | [9](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dquestion.2021-07-30.9780815818&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2Ff8b0b73cb1%2Fsubpage.2021-07-30.0801517223%2Fquestion.2021-07-30.9780815818%2Fquestion-2021-07-30-9780815818-radiosubquestion%3Alist=question-2021-07-30-9780815818-radiosubquestion%2FThe+standard+needs+significant+amendments+before+piloting) | 0.95% |
| The standard is unsuitable for piloting | [22](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dquestion.2021-07-30.9780815818&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2F090ff346ea%2Fsubpage.2021-07-30.0801517223%2Fquestion.2021-07-30.9780815818%2Fquestion-2021-07-30-9780815818-radiosubquestion%3Alist=question-2021-07-30-9780815818-radiosubquestion%2FThe+standard+is+unsuitable+for+piloting) | 2.31% |
| Not Answered | [920](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dquestion.2021-07-30.9780815818&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2F937155f581%2Fsubpage.2021-07-30.0801517223%2Fquestion.2021-07-30.9780815818%2Fquestion-2021-07-30-9780815818-radiosubquestion%3Alist=question-2021-07-30-9780815818-radiosubquestion%2F__not_answered__) | 96.74% |

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

| Option | Total | Percent |
| --- | --- | --- |
| The criteria are clear | 0 | 0.00% |
| The criteria need some clarification | [6](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dquestion.2021-07-30.0321523218&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2F06de3433ca%2Fsubpage.2021-07-30.0801517223%2Fquestion.2021-07-30.0321523218%2Fquestion-2021-07-30-0321523218-radiosubquestion%3Alist=question-2021-07-30-0321523218-radiosubquestion%2FThe+criteria+need+some+clarification) | 0.63% |
| The criteria need significant clarification | [26](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dquestion.2021-07-30.0321523218&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2F51559ce7ef%2Fsubpage.2021-07-30.0801517223%2Fquestion.2021-07-30.0321523218%2Fquestion-2021-07-30-0321523218-radiosubquestion%3Alist=question-2021-07-30-0321523218-radiosubquestion%2FThe+criteria+need+significant+clarification) | 2.73% |
| Not Answered | [919](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dquestion.2021-07-30.0321523218&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2Fcab6350ace%2Fsubpage.2021-07-30.0801517223%2Fquestion.2021-07-30.0321523218%2Fquestion-2021-07-30-0321523218-radiosubquestion%3Alist=question-2021-07-30-0321523218-radiosubquestion%2F__not_answered__) | 96.64% |

**Does the unpacking of the Standard and the Proposed Assessment Approach provide sufficient and clear guidance on the use of the standard?**

| Option | Total | Percent |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Guidance is sufficient and clear | 0 | 0.00% |
| Guidance is insufficient | [3](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dquestion.2021-07-30.0866466558&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2F7a11affc3f%2Fsubpage.2021-07-30.0801517223%2Fquestion.2021-07-30.0866466558%2Fquestion-2021-07-30-0866466558-radiosubquestion%3Alist=question-2021-07-30-0866466558-radiosubquestion%2FGuidance+is+insufficient) | 0.32% |
| Guidance is unclear | [29](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dquestion.2021-07-30.0866466558&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2F8b19efb320%2Fsubpage.2021-07-30.0801517223%2Fquestion.2021-07-30.0866466558%2Fquestion-2021-07-30-0866466558-radiosubquestion%3Alist=question-2021-07-30-0866466558-radiosubquestion%2FGuidance+is+unclear) | 3.05% |
| Not Answered | [919](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dquestion.2021-07-30.0866466558&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2Ff74baa6331%2Fsubpage.2021-07-30.0801517223%2Fquestion.2021-07-30.0866466558%2Fquestion-2021-07-30-0866466558-radiosubquestion%3Alist=question-2021-07-30-0866466558-radiosubquestion%2F__not_answered__) | 96.64% |

**Do you have any further feedback on [achievement standard 1.3]? For instance, do you think the Proposed Assessment Approach will be capable of supporting fair and equitable assessment?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| [ANON-767U-4EEV-D](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627614964.48-51992&user_id=ANON-767U-4EEV-D) | The concern is "event" will require a high level of previous knowledge which our students may not have been exposed to. The "event" needs to be able to relate to all students regardless of their backgrounds. There is limited opportunity for integration with Accounting and Business Studies. Consequently, it becomes an effectively Economic assessment. We need more details before we can make more comments especially because it's an external standard. |
| [ANON-767U-4EJV-J](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627614964.48-51992&user_id=ANON-767U-4EJV-J) | Is the exam at the end of year – who marks this? This seems more like financial literacy than commerce. Where is the circular flow? |
| [ANON-767U-4EJ1-D](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627614964.48-51992&user_id=ANON-767U-4EJ1-D) | No reference to circular flow, no accounting. Seems like a banking/finance perspective rather than a business studies/accounting/economics lens.  Content is above L6 of the curriculum |
| [ANON-767U-4ECQ-6](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627614964.48-51992&user_id=ANON-767U-4ECQ-6) | It is unclear on what is required and resources to this is not yet out and ready. Even though there are things that are familiar and previous knowledge and resources can be used, it lacks cohesion. |
| [ANON-767U-4ECM-2](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627614964.48-51992&user_id=ANON-767U-4ECM-2) | You have not given us enough information or a sample of an exam in order to give any feedback. But what I do see is a mess. Lots of bits and pieces plucked from all sorts of old standards which are cobbled together and give us no clear idea of what this paper will look like - doesnt have a lot of relevance for the students. |
| [ANON-767U-4EDG-W](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627614964.48-51992&user_id=ANON-767U-4EDG-W) | I have real concerns about how the students will cope with this exam. Currently, I intend to teach this standard with more of an Economics focus. However, if the exam is written in such a way to cover all three focus areas (Accounting, Economics, Business Studies) then students may be confused by this. I would like to see exam exemplars and further guidance so I can see what types of questions students will face. |
| [ANON-767U-4EDH-X](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627614964.48-51992&user_id=ANON-767U-4EDH-X) | All of these ideas associated are straight economic ideas with minimal business studies concepts and no accounting concepts. As the new standards are suppose to be an over view of all three this is not suitable to be taught as it is. |
| [ANON-767U-4ECS-8](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627614964.48-51992&user_id=ANON-767U-4ECS-8) | There is simply not enough information given on what specifically will be in this standard for any meaningful discussion |
| [ANON-767U-4EM6-N](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627614964.48-51992&user_id=ANON-767U-4EM6-N) | Although I have no problem with the standard in general, I feel unable to fully comment or support this without more information about what the scope of the assessment will be. I don't see how schools can be expected to pilot this fairly. It is unfair on students and teachers to be expected to trial this standard and adequately prepare them for the external assessment without an indication of what they will be facing. |
| [ANON-767U-4E2U-S](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627614964.48-51992&user_id=ANON-767U-4E2U-S) | there was no assessment example and I cannot see how this could have an assessment task which was fair for a student who had focussed on accounting aspects if that was their chosen future progression. |
| [ANON-767U-4E2P-M](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627614964.48-51992&user_id=ANON-767U-4E2P-M) | Totally unfit for purpose. The same mistakes that were made when Business Studies became a UE approved subject and a massive pile of topics, models, theory etc were placed into the various externals with little or no thought into the required depth and understanding and range was so ill conceived that it was impossible for teachers to cover the material required. This is exactly what is happening here all over again and will lead to exactly the same problems and outcomes. If a student uses the run a business activity throughout the year and then come across and supply/demand theoretical question in the external then there is no way the student will be prepared at the required depth to possibly even get achieved let alone a merit or excellence. I have been teaching this subject area for over 20 years and this is totally unworkable and this should be thrown out and start again. It is a futile effort and ill conceived. Three subjects that help students become far more financially literate should never be combined especially given the current lack of knowledge in this are by students leaving school. |
| [ANON-767U-4EP3-N](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627614964.48-51992&user_id=ANON-767U-4EP3-N) | The standard is so general that I worry about how it will be assessed. It will probably take 2 or 3 years to get the assessment right and by that time students would have voted with their feet and chosen a different subject. |
| [ANON-767U-4EPY-U](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627614964.48-51992&user_id=ANON-767U-4EPY-U) | Difficult to form opinions when there is no sample exam. It is a mystery as to what students will need to know and what teachers need to teach. |
| [ANON-767U-4EBY-D](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627614964.48-51992&user_id=ANON-767U-4EBY-D) | There are already clear inconsistencies between the learning matrix, the course outlines and internal assessments. It is alarming that this is our last chance for feedback for external assessments when there is very little to see! It is also alarming that even as a pilot school you would start your year uncertain about external assessment expectations. How could you be sure you were going in the right direction. I realise the MoEs answer could be to look at the course outlines, but which one? Will there be three different sets of externals depending on the direction taken? Some of the relationships described are not interdependent - eg minimum wage, consumer legislation - this is just set by the government, no negotiation or change can occur. And if we assumed that this was an interdependent relationship (as though the goverment, ministries and departments were open to feedback - ha!) then they are outside the scope of an 'organisation' as defined in the glossary. I also asked the question on the live chat about flow-on effects vs consequences vs limitations. I was told that flow-on effects are consequences and impacts but consequences and limitations were not defined. I appreciate the difference between M and Ex being about the initial effects and wider impacts, but the flow-on effects, consequences and limitations language needs to be clearer. Interpretations of these are exactly what trips people up during moderation. And if teachers are confused, students will be confused. |
| [ANON-767U-4ETA-7](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627614964.48-51992&user_id=ANON-767U-4ETA-7) | There is so much that could be taught in this standard what do you actually want covered???  I would like to see a whole lot more guidance, some specifics on what models you are expecting us to be teaching. Some sample assessments, information on how it is going to be run. Much much more information required. |
| [ANON-767U-41AE-4](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627614964.48-51992&user_id=ANON-767U-41AE-4) | It is impossible to teach the content for this when there is no assessment to look at. Reality is interdependence is again a simple idea and not an engaging topic for teenage girls nor is it fundamental economics - it is something we would do with juniors for one hour and that is it - not a topic for a major assessment. Clarification of flow-on effects and consequences need to be addressed - they are the same but here difference between merit and excellence. Also why are we bring in rights and responsibilities, funding and banking etc - where has this come from? Circular flow maybe for some but again not something to engage learners nor benefit them in L2. |
| [ANON-767U-41NB-E](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627614964.48-51992&user_id=ANON-767U-41NB-E) | There is not enough clarity in this standard and any assessment of this is likely to involve lengthy written answers. The explanatory notes are very vague and lack clarity. They do not provide enough guidance to develop a teaching program |
| [ANON-767U-41HW-W](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627614964.48-51992&user_id=ANON-767U-41HW-W) | This standard appears as a dumbed down version of the current Level 1 Economics 3 credit internal - yet another opportunity missed to extend learners and build towards Level 2 success.  It is also difficult to see opportunities for an Accounting or Business Studies lens.  The Achieved, Merit and Excellence criteria are not clear for example, the difference between flow on effects, consequences or implications.  Explanatory Note 2 - rights and responsibilities are not an interdependent relationship.  The obvious model to use for this standard is the circular flow model, however government has been left out of the definition of organisations. Government is a key aspect of day to day workings in both the household and producer sector. |
| [ANON-767U-413A-J](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627614964.48-51992&user_id=ANON-767U-413A-J) | I need to see possible exemplars to make a sound judgement.  What is the difference between "consequences" and "flow-on effects"? |
| [ANON-767U-413U-6](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627614964.48-51992&user_id=ANON-767U-413U-6) | There is not sufficient information provided for any meaningful comments to be made ....  Appears to be a little more focussed on some of the overlap between Business Studies and Economics ... no real attempt evident to get into the nitty gritty of basic Economics or Accounting concepts that will allow for success at L2 in either of these subjects!!!!! |
| [ANON-767U-41FY-W](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627614964.48-51992&user_id=ANON-767U-41FY-W) | I do not think the Proposed Assessment Approach will be capable of supporting fair and equitable assessment. While Explanatory Note 2 mentions statutory obligations there is no mention of contract or tort with respect to commerce. Without contract and the means to settle contract disputes there is no commerce. What are "flow-on" effects? Are these embedded in ethics or finance or statutory obligation? Is it alluding to circular flow? The term is far too vague to allow for "equitable" and "fair" assessment. Akonga will be seriously underprepared for the realities of commercial life |
| [ANON-767U-41GA-6](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627614964.48-51992&user_id=ANON-767U-41GA-6) | Again much of this standard seems to be based on Level 4/5 of the NZ Curriculum. In the explanatory notes it is not clear what the difference is between a flow-on effect (Merit) and a consequence (Excellence). It is very difficult to comment on this standard when there is no example of what the assessment might look like and this will not be available until next year when the pilot is undertaken. |
| [ANON-767U-41DB-4](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627614964.48-51992&user_id=ANON-767U-41DB-4) | 1. Oh my goodness. This standard looks like it is trying to link to the circular flow model - but it isn't any circular flow model I have ever seen... eg why is government not included in the definition of organisation. How is "legislation" an interdependent financial relationship? And how might one show compromises with legislation?  2. The difference between Merit and Excellence is unclear: What on earth is the difference between a flow-on effect and a consequence and an implication?  3. If there is the intention that these standards can be delivered through a "lens" ie from an accounting approach or a business studies approach - then I am much confused as to how to show interdependence using accounting...  4. It is unclear if it is actually meant to be the "economics" interdependence here - I have great difficulty understanding how to approach the conflict and compromise aspects using the circular flow model.  5. Not having any actual exemplars to demonstrate what was intended is really poor. And if these are not available until after the pilot schools have trialed this then for planning purposes this is really unfair.  6. The whole standard is unclear - again - I have taught Accounting and Economics for many years (and been on marking panels and the like) and I am at a bit of a loss as to what is expected here.    • This Standard is a good fit for the circular flow model, however, elements of this model fall out of the definition of organisations (government is not included) and legislation is not an interdependent relationship. How can you see this working through an Accounting or Business Studies lens? |
| [ANON-767U-419C-T](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627614964.48-51992&user_id=ANON-767U-419C-T) | Why is this std an examination? What is the difference between a flow on effect and a consequence? How can we make meaningful feedback with no exemplars or further unpacking of this std. |
| [ANON-767U-417C-R](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627614964.48-51992&user_id=ANON-767U-417C-R) | What is this standard even about? There is insufficient information that would help to make a meaningful comment. This seems to be focused in Economics with the Circular Flow model but does not cover all aspects of the Circular Flow model students should understand. Legislation??? How is this an interdependent relationship. I would like to have seen some actual tasks/questions that students would have in an external exam before making a comment. This standard does not appear to work across Accounting or some of Business Studies perhaps. Therefore, students will be woefully under-prepared for Level 2 Accounting or Business Studies. It is not clear on the difference between Merit and Excellence. |
| [ANON-767U-41U3-6](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627614964.48-51992&user_id=ANON-767U-41U3-6) | What is the proposed assessment approach? All we know is that this is likely to be an exam? How can I judge this with NO INFORMATION on what this might look like? No sample questions. No idea of what an ideal answer should look like. If this is sort of based on the previous Circular Flow internal, why was the decision taken to turn it into an external? |
| [ANON-767U-41BB-2](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627614964.48-51992&user_id=ANON-767U-41BB-2) | This assessment would not support fair and equitable assessment as this could be a very basic assessment. Interdependence that does not include the government or the overseas sector is a very small Circular Flow model. |
| [ANON-767U-41BU-N](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627614964.48-51992&user_id=ANON-767U-41BU-N) | To me, this seems like the most appropriate place for learning of the circular flow model, except there is no government. I am unsure how to differentiate between merit and excellence. I have concerns around equitable assessment when there is so much uncertainty of what I could teach but does this match with what my learners may be assessed on. Clearly by trying to squash 3 subjects together it creates a lot of ambiguity and uncertainty and I am concerned about disadvantaging my learners due to lack of information. |
| [ANON-767U-4EAE-R](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627614964.48-51992&user_id=ANON-767U-4EAE-R) | So many questions before I could actually comment about this being a far and equitable assessment What is this standard actually about? Is it circular flow - where is the Government? This has the potential to be an Eco standard - but what if it is taught with an Accounting slant - then it means something totally different Where are the exemplars? Will it be a vague exam, with a question along the lines of "From something you have studied this year....." How can this be fairly marked Why is this only 4 credits? What is the difference between a flow on effect and a consequence? I guess we assume everyone can get Excellence with the same answer - again how will this be fairly marked? |
| [ANON-767U-41UD-Q](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627614964.48-51992&user_id=ANON-767U-41UD-Q) | This standard is vague. Significant course content needs to be provided by the Ministry if teachers are to be able to prepare students to be confident for going into this assessment. If the Ministry wishes to create a whole new course called Commerce which has little relationship with the current courses then the onus is on the Ministry to invest funding in providing significant resources so teachers can implement it successfully. There is a distinct feeling among Commerce teachers that we are being hung out to dry and then left there. If there were two courses - an Economics course and an Accounting/Business Studies course that reflected our current courses then this would be less of a problem. Nothing to date has given us any confidence in this process (with the overwhelming rejection in 'consultation' of there being only 1 Commerce course to the 3 RAS Commerce group members on the video sounding a long way from being convincing that even they agree with the changes). |

**Is this Achievement Standard [1.4] ready for piloting?**

| Option | Total | Percent |
| --- | --- | --- |
| The standard is ready for piloting | 0 | 0.00% |
| The standard needs small amendments before piloting | 0 | 0.00% |
| The standard needs significant amendments before piloting | [8](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627618895.66-80710&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2F52c215bbf7%2Fsubpage.2021-07-30.1014922486%2Fpasted-question-1627618895.66-80710%2Fpasted-question-1627618895.66-80710-1627618895.97-68145%3Alist=pasted-question-1627618895.66-80710-1627618895.97-68145%2FThe+standard+needs+significant+amendments+before+piloting) | 0.84% |
| The standard is unsuitable for piloting | [22](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627618895.66-80710&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2F2468fbc170%2Fsubpage.2021-07-30.1014922486%2Fpasted-question-1627618895.66-80710%2Fpasted-question-1627618895.66-80710-1627618895.97-68145%3Alist=pasted-question-1627618895.66-80710-1627618895.97-68145%2FThe+standard+is+unsuitable+for+piloting) | 2.31% |
| Not Answered | [921](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627618895.66-80710&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2Fa7d608d7b6%2Fsubpage.2021-07-30.1014922486%2Fpasted-question-1627618895.66-80710%2Fpasted-question-1627618895.66-80710-1627618895.97-68145%3Alist=pasted-question-1627618895.66-80710-1627618895.97-68145%2F__not_answered__) | 96.85% |

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

| Option | Total | Percent |
| --- | --- | --- |
| The criteria are clear | [1](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627618911.36-73044&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2Fff03ab4784%2Fsubpage.2021-07-30.1014922486%2Fpasted-question-1627618911.36-73044%2Fpasted-question-1627618911.36-73044-1627618911.6-59260%3Alist=pasted-question-1627618911.36-73044-1627618911.6-59260%2FThe+criteria+are+clear) | 0.11% |
| The criteria need some clarification | [4](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627618911.36-73044&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2Ff5979beb2d%2Fsubpage.2021-07-30.1014922486%2Fpasted-question-1627618911.36-73044%2Fpasted-question-1627618911.36-73044-1627618911.6-59260%3Alist=pasted-question-1627618911.36-73044-1627618911.6-59260%2FThe+criteria+need+some+clarification) | 0.42% |
| The criteria need significant clarification | [26](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627618911.36-73044&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2F931f58c2e6%2Fsubpage.2021-07-30.1014922486%2Fpasted-question-1627618911.36-73044%2Fpasted-question-1627618911.36-73044-1627618911.6-59260%3Alist=pasted-question-1627618911.36-73044-1627618911.6-59260%2FThe+criteria+need+significant+clarification) | 2.73% |
| Not Answered | [920](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627618911.36-73044&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2Fdbd49fdebd%2Fsubpage.2021-07-30.1014922486%2Fpasted-question-1627618911.36-73044%2Fpasted-question-1627618911.36-73044-1627618911.6-59260%3Alist=pasted-question-1627618911.36-73044-1627618911.6-59260%2F__not_answered__) | 96.74% |

**Does the unpacking of the Standard and the Proposed Assessment Approach provide sufficient and clear guidance on the use of the standard?**

| Option | Total | Percent |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Guidance is sufficient and clear | [1](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627618928.35-49958&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2F01cb5a0a99%2Fsubpage.2021-07-30.1014922486%2Fpasted-question-1627618928.35-49958%2Fpasted-question-1627618928.35-49958-1627618929.51-52313%3Alist=pasted-question-1627618928.35-49958-1627618929.51-52313%2FGuidance+is+sufficient+and+clear) | 0.11% |
| Guidance is insufficient | [4](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627618928.35-49958&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2F24b24653b9%2Fsubpage.2021-07-30.1014922486%2Fpasted-question-1627618928.35-49958%2Fpasted-question-1627618928.35-49958-1627618929.51-52313%3Alist=pasted-question-1627618928.35-49958-1627618929.51-52313%2FGuidance+is+insufficient) | 0.42% |
| Guidance is unclear | [27](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627618928.35-49958&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2Fdcca629a7a%2Fsubpage.2021-07-30.1014922486%2Fpasted-question-1627618928.35-49958%2Fpasted-question-1627618928.35-49958-1627618929.51-52313%3Alist=pasted-question-1627618928.35-49958-1627618929.51-52313%2FGuidance+is+unclear) | 2.84% |
| Not Answered | [919](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627618928.35-49958&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2Fedb8cc2192%2Fsubpage.2021-07-30.1014922486%2Fpasted-question-1627618928.35-49958%2Fpasted-question-1627618928.35-49958-1627618929.51-52313%3Alist=pasted-question-1627618928.35-49958-1627618929.51-52313%2F__not_answered__) | 96.64% |

**Do you have any further feedback on [achievement standard 1.4]? For instance, do you think the Proposed Assessment Approach will be capable of supporting fair and equitable assessment?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| [ANON-767U-4EEV-D](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627618950.55-28797&user_id=ANON-767U-4EEV-D) | The concerns regarding external assessment in the use of previous internal assessment 1.2 being applied too many variables, such as incomplete internal, new to school, or not achieved. Appears to be we are setting students up for failure. We need further clarification prior to the pilot in terms of the explanatory notes. Commerce models are too vague and need to be more specific to the particular NCEA level. Merging all three subject areas into one assessment risks students not being able to show the depth of understanding they have as the content is overloaded. |
| [ANON-767U-4EJV-J](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627618950.55-28797&user_id=ANON-767U-4EJV-J) | Who marks this common assessment task? There is no link to L2 or L3 Eco or Acc. Do we need to teach all four Commerce models for the common assessment? |
| [ANON-767U-4EJ1-D](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627618950.55-28797&user_id=ANON-767U-4EJ1-D) | Common assesment task - who will be marking? Will this create more work for subject teachers?  As this is a standardised asssesment, seems like it is required that students understand all commerce models to be able to answer the questions provided. Not all models will be relevant to each situation gven regarding price e.g. morketing mix and mark up. This is too much content to be sufficiently covered in the proposed time frame for this standard. |
| [ANON-767U-4ECM-2](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627618950.55-28797&user_id=ANON-767U-4ECM-2) | You have not given us enough information or a sample of an exam in order to give any feedback. But what I do see is a mess. Lots of bits and pieces plucked from all sorts of old standards which are cobbled together and give us no clear idea of what this paper will look like - doesnt have a lot of relevance for the students. Sounds boring |
| [ANON-767U-4EDG-W](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627618950.55-28797&user_id=ANON-767U-4EDG-W) | I have real concerns about how the students will cope with this exam. Currently, I intend to teach this standard with more of an Economics focus. However, if the exam is written in such a way to cover all three focus areas (Accounting, Economics, Business Studies) then students may be confused by this. I would like to see exam exemplars and further guidance so I can see what types of questions students will face. |
| [ANON-767U-4EDH-X](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627618950.55-28797&user_id=ANON-767U-4EDH-X) | Again straight economics - where is the business studies and accounting recognition of foundational skills???!!!!? |
| [ANON-767U-4ECS-8](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627618950.55-28797&user_id=ANON-767U-4ECS-8) | There is not enough information currently for this standard for meaningful discussion |
| [ANON-767U-4EM6-N](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627618950.55-28797&user_id=ANON-767U-4EM6-N) | I have no problem with this standard in general but there is insufficient information to fully support or comment on this standard. It is unfair to expect this to be piloted without more information as to what the assessment will look like. Although the content of the suggested course outlines links in with the standards, that is not the same as being able to adequately prepare students for the types of questions they will face in an assessment situation. There needs to be sample assessment and more guidance on teaching and learning for the students and teachers to feel confident with this.  Also, the assessment method - a common assessment task in term 3. I am curious about the reasoning for this change from an external in the exam period to the external assessed this way. My understanding of the current Mcat is that maths teachers mark these test as opposed to an independent marking panel. Is this purely a cost saving exercise to add responsibility for this marking to teachers (along with their other internal marking) without any additional compensation for their added workload. |
| [ANON-767U-4E2P-M](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627618950.55-28797&user_id=ANON-767U-4E2P-M) | Totally unfit for purpose. The same mistakes that were made when Business Studies became a UE approved subject and a massive pile of topics, models, theory etc were placed into the various externals with little or no thought into the required depth and understanding and range was so ill conceived that it was impossible for teachers to cover the material required. This is exactly what is happening here all over again and will lead to exactly the same problems and outcomes. If a student uses the run a business activity throughout the year and then come across and supply/demand theoretical question in the external then there is no way the student will be prepared at the required depth to possibly even get achieved let alone a merit or excellence. I have been teaching this subject area for over 20 years and this is totally unworkable and this should be thrown out and start again. It is a futile effort and ill conceived. Three subjects that help students become far more financially literate should never be combined especially given the current lack of knowledge in this are by students leaving school. |
| [ANON-767U-4EP3-N](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627618950.55-28797&user_id=ANON-767U-4EP3-N) | I think all standards should have 5 credits. Most schools will select standards and won't do all of them. Again the standard is so general that I have doubts about its assessment. How do I know that the version I teach will be assessed ? I also think you should call the price mechanism the demand and supply model. You have chosen to call the course Commerce but it is made up of ACC, BST and ECO models. Call the model what it is and take away the confusion. Until I see an example of a form of assessment I can't answer this question. |
| [ANON-767U-4EPY-U](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627618950.55-28797&user_id=ANON-767U-4EPY-U) | Not sure how a teacher is to know what a "Commerce model" is, if the model to be examined is not specified from a list. Will different schools teach different models? Will they all be at the same level of complexity? Why is this a CAA rather than external exam? |
| [ANON-767U-4EBY-D](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627618950.55-28797&user_id=ANON-767U-4EBY-D) | There is very little to comment on and again, the lack of information if you intend to be a pilot school is a little scary. Teachers are drafting course outlines NOW for next year. To not be able to tell students what externals are about is ridiculous. I note that this assessment talks about a 'model', ie just one. But can draw from Business Studies, Economics and Accounting. So do we have to teach all the models on the off chance that one of them will turn up? This also seems dumbed down in the sense that if it followed the current Economics 1.4 it could be the same but without government intervention which is currently 2/3 of the assessment (price min/max, subsidy/tax). |
| [ANON-767U-41AE-4](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627618950.55-28797&user_id=ANON-767U-41AE-4) | Have no idea what content this is to cover, guessing market equilibrium to a point but very vague as to how break even and mark up fit into this, as for the the non financial information again no clear links between them, is this trying to combine a tiny bit of business studies with normal economics? |
| [ANON-767U-41NB-E](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627618950.55-28797&user_id=ANON-767U-41NB-E) | There is not enough clarity over which model would be expected to be used in a Common Assessment Activity. Since this is an external teachers need to know what to expect so students can be taught the content in order to prepare students. It appears to be similar to the current Economics market standard at level 1 but adding in marketing mix, break even and mark up , muddies the waters. Not enough clarity. Also the assessment method is new and was not signalled prior to this release. Who marks the CAA, who administers it, how does it fit into the schools overall program. If lots of subjects are doing CAA's how do they impact on school timetabling. what is the time length for externals |
| [ANON-767U-41HW-W](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627618950.55-28797&user_id=ANON-767U-41HW-W) | Commerce models show skills from 3 distinct areas, will there be 3 different assessments or are we expected to cover all 3 in order to prepare learners for what they may be presented with in the assessment? This would take significant time and appears disproportionate to the credit weighting. |
| [ANON-767U-413U-6](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627618950.55-28797&user_id=ANON-767U-413U-6) | This standard appears to only really cater for Business Studies content - with a very slight overlap with some Economics. Once again how on earth is this course supposed to prepare students for the rigors of L@ Accounting and Economics??? |
| [ANON-767U-41FY-W](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627618950.55-28797&user_id=ANON-767U-41FY-W) | The Proposed Assessment Approach will be incapable of supporting fair and equitable assessment. Price is a huge topic. The rubric for Achieved with Excellence reads: Use a commerce model to evaluate price. One single "commerce" model is insufficient to determine this, particularly from the limited models offered. Historically from Adam Smith's Invisible Hand to Marx's labour value of price to gifting in the form of koha in tikanga Maori: NONE by themselves is sufficient to "evaluate" price. The idea of considering "type of product" as "non-financial" is a disservice to akonga. A luxury good is defined by the purchaser's income (YED - Income Elasticity of Demand): thus it is financial. The ideas in this standard are poorly defined, lack foundation and are inconsistently used as they stand. |
| [ANON-767U-41GA-6](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627618950.55-28797&user_id=ANON-767U-41GA-6) | Until more information is released it is difficult to really comment on this standard. It is unclear whether the assessment will cover all all three subject areas and their models or if will students be able to choose just one lens for their answers. |
| [ANON-767U-41DB-4](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627618950.55-28797&user_id=ANON-767U-41DB-4) | It is very unclear if this assessment is supposed to cover all three subjects (eg Economics price mechanism is supply and demand model which generally takes about 3 terms to cover...vs break even which is possible to teach in much less than that) - so do the students pick a model / do teachers pick a lens or is the idea to do it all?  - since no more information will be released until they are piloted and this standard is so very broad - there is not much I can say here until more information is released. It is pretty poor to ask for consultation on half completed work.  - it is very unclear as to what level (academically speaking) this will be assessed at? |
| [ANON-767U-419C-T](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627618950.55-28797&user_id=ANON-767U-419C-T) | Marketing Mix used to be 3 cr. Market (demand/supply/market) used to be 12 cr. This is now 4 cr? What is taken out. Will there be lots of different CAT in case our school assesses marketing mix and another school the price mechanism. This std should be more cr and should be the examination one not 1.3 which would be better suited for CAT. |
| [ANON-767U-417C-R](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627618950.55-28797&user_id=ANON-767U-417C-R) | "Commerce models draw from business, economics, and accounting". What are these models? It is not clear if this will draw on all 3 areas, or it might be one and if that has not been covered by the class, students then will not be able to answer questions. Also, this proposed course is assuming that all "Commerce" teachers have knowledge in all 3 subject areas - Accounting, Economics, Business Studies. If you have only taught Economics or Business Studies you will have very limited knowledge skills in Accounting. Will this not disadvantage students. This standard has not provided enough detail on the assessment to make a comment. How can I comment on this standard when there is a lack of information that will not be released until after the standards have been trialed. |
| [ANON-767U-41MW-2](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627618950.55-28797&user_id=ANON-767U-41MW-2) | The standard is quite vague. The models are not all "Models" The accounting ideas are concepts or analysis or decision making tools. Confusing Accounting with Economics. There are no sample externals. |
| [ANON-767U-41U3-6](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627618950.55-28797&user_id=ANON-767U-41U3-6) | "Commerce models draw from business, economics, and accounting. Examples include: • marketing mix • price mechanism • break even • mark-up."  Does the use of "examples include" mean these will the ones examined or just some of them? How much detail do you expect us to teach? Does the "price mechanism include government intervention or not (taxes, subsidies etc)? Again, the ministry is asking us to judge an assessment tool with little or no information? How does little or no information lead to anything useful as we're all working/judging blind? NOT ACHIEVED |
| [ANON-767U-41BB-2](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627618950.55-28797&user_id=ANON-767U-41BB-2) | This cannot support a fair and equitable assessment when in the standard it admits that the three subjects - Accounting, economics and business studies all have different models! If there is a new commerce subject that leads into all of these at level 2 then there should be models that can lead into any of them. |
| [ANON-767U-41BU-N](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627618950.55-28797&user_id=ANON-767U-41BU-N) | I believe this is heavily based on Economics and have concerns about how I will have sufficient learning time to cover all of the models covered here. I am assuming that learners will therefore have choice as to which model they use? However at Level 1 NCEA this breadth will be too uncertain for lower level learners and therefore not equitable. I really feel there is no guidance here as to what my learners will need to learn in order to have success externally. |
| [ANON-767U-4142-4](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627618950.55-28797&user_id=ANON-767U-4142-4) | I question the use of a test-style CAA for this Achievement Standard. Having an exam AS1.3 (5 credits) and a test for AS1.4 (4 credits) is having 9 out of 20 credits assessed in a format or manner that is very similar. I question whether this is inclusive of all students and whether it will create a fair and equitable assessment opportunity for all students in NZ. |
| [ANON-767U-4EAE-R](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627618950.55-28797&user_id=ANON-767U-4EAE-R) | How could this possibly be trialed?  What even is this standard, what does the assessment look like, is the CAA going to be a fixed date? How will this fit well into schemes of work.  Price means different things in Account, Economics and Business Studies (as does Profit). Were these standards written by somebody who has awareness of all three different subjects?  With this in mind - will the CAA be open to interpretation? How will it be marked? Will it be vague and wishy washy, or precise? If precise we need to knwo what needs to be covered before the CAA  The explanatory notes are vague and patronising all at the same time "Financial or non-financial information means financial information or non-financial information" and "Internal or external factors means internal factors or external factors" really are helpful in deciding what this standard is all about |
| [ANON-767U-41UD-Q](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627618950.55-28797&user_id=ANON-767U-41UD-Q) | The use of the term model is incorrect and confusing. Supply and demand is a model. Mark up is not a model. The standard also talks about models 'such as' instead of giving a definitive list. Will the standard only assess those listed or are there others that might be assessed but aren't listed. There is not enough guidance for teachers. |
| [ANON-767U-411N-W](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627618950.55-28797&user_id=ANON-767U-411N-W) | Could we please get some clarity on what the assessment approach actually is for this standard, for example: - is this to be run like the current MCAT? - who would be marking this assessment? Will it be teachers or external markers? - will this be a digital assessment? Also, it seems very early in the year to be assessing market equilibrium. This topic would come nicely towards the end of the year when all the other content has been covered so that students have a broad base of knowledge before learning about market equilibrium. If it is being assessed at the start of Term 3 this will not be possible. |

**Do the four Achievement Standards as a group credential the most important knowledge and/or skills for this subject as illustrated by the Learning Matrix?**

| Option | Total | Percent |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Yes | [5](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627622294.65-1188&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2Ff591de73d3%2Fsubpage.2021-07-30.1177486254%2Fpasted-question-1627622294.65-1188%2Fpasted-question-1627622294.65-1188-1627622294.9-26762%3Alist=pasted-question-1627622294.65-1188-1627622294.9-26762%2FYes) | 0.53% |
| Some gaps | [6](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627622294.65-1188&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2F1e3d8a62fe%2Fsubpage.2021-07-30.1177486254%2Fpasted-question-1627622294.65-1188%2Fpasted-question-1627622294.65-1188-1627622294.9-26762%3Alist=pasted-question-1627622294.65-1188-1627622294.9-26762%2FSome+gaps) | 0.63% |
| Large gaps | [23](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627622294.65-1188&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2Fcbdd580986%2Fsubpage.2021-07-30.1177486254%2Fpasted-question-1627622294.65-1188%2Fpasted-question-1627622294.65-1188-1627622294.9-26762%3Alist=pasted-question-1627622294.65-1188-1627622294.9-26762%2FLarge+gaps) | 2.42% |
| They cover the wrong knowledge and/or skills | [26](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627622294.65-1188&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2Fa9ea355267%2Fsubpage.2021-07-30.1177486254%2Fpasted-question-1627622294.65-1188%2Fpasted-question-1627622294.65-1188-1627622294.9-26762%3Alist=pasted-question-1627622294.65-1188-1627622294.9-26762%2FThey+cover+the+wrong+knowledge+and%2For+skills) | 2.73% |
| Not Answered | [891](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627622294.65-1188&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2Fd1a790f557%2Fsubpage.2021-07-30.1177486254%2Fpasted-question-1627622294.65-1188%2Fpasted-question-1627622294.65-1188-1627622294.9-26762%3Alist=pasted-question-1627622294.65-1188-1627622294.9-26762%2F__not_answered__) | 93.69% |

**Do the Achievement Standards support ākonga Māori to succeed as Māori? (select all that apply) (Do the Standards value mātauranga Māori? Do they place the learner at the centre?)**

| Option | Total | Percent |
| --- | --- | --- |
| All standards do this | [26](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627622307.78-93868&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2F145624e174%2Fsubpage.2021-07-30.1177486254%2Fpasted-question-1627622307.78-93868%2Fpasted-question-1627622307.78-93868-1627622308.05-26713%3Alist=pasted-question-1627622307.78-93868-1627622308.05-26713%2FAll+standards+do+this) | 2.73% |
| 1.1 does this | [2](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627622307.78-93868&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2F3900a7b6dd%2Fsubpage.2021-07-30.1177486254%2Fpasted-question-1627622307.78-93868%2Fpasted-question-1627622307.78-93868-1627622308.05-26713%3Alist=pasted-question-1627622307.78-93868-1627622308.05-26713%2F1.1+does+this) | 0.21% |
| 1.2 does this | [1](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627622307.78-93868&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2Ff2c126808b%2Fsubpage.2021-07-30.1177486254%2Fpasted-question-1627622307.78-93868%2Fpasted-question-1627622307.78-93868-1627622308.05-26713%3Alist=pasted-question-1627622307.78-93868-1627622308.05-26713%2F1.2+does+this) | 0.11% |
| 1.3 does this | 0 | 0.00% |
| 1.4 does this | 0 | 0.00% |
| None of the standards do this | [28](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627622307.78-93868&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2Fa93fe8753a%2Fsubpage.2021-07-30.1177486254%2Fpasted-question-1627622307.78-93868%2Fpasted-question-1627622307.78-93868-1627622308.05-26713%3Alist=pasted-question-1627622307.78-93868-1627622308.05-26713%2FNone+of+the+standards+do+this) | 2.94% |
| Not Answered | [894](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627622307.78-93868&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2Fb5577dad9e%2Fsubpage.2021-07-30.1177486254%2Fpasted-question-1627622307.78-93868%2Fpasted-question-1627622307.78-93868-1627622308.05-26713%3Alist=pasted-question-1627622307.78-93868-1627622308.05-26713%2F__not_answered__) | 94.01% |

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

| Option | Total | Percent |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Yes | [10](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627622320.71-61313&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2Fae70fc2edc%2Fsubpage.2021-07-30.1177486254%2Fpasted-question-1627622320.71-61313%2Fpasted-question-1627622320.71-61313-1627622320.97-28614%3Alist=pasted-question-1627622320.71-61313-1627622320.97-28614%2FYes) | 1.05% |
| They are too challenging | 0 | 0.00% |
| They are not challenging enough | [31](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627622320.71-61313&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2F234498ca08%2Fsubpage.2021-07-30.1177486254%2Fpasted-question-1627622320.71-61313%2Fpasted-question-1627622320.71-61313-1627622320.97-28614%3Alist=pasted-question-1627622320.71-61313-1627622320.97-28614%2FThey+are+not+challenging+enough) | 3.26% |
| They are a mix of too challenging and too easy | [18](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627622320.71-61313&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2Fbcd8cc2dac%2Fsubpage.2021-07-30.1177486254%2Fpasted-question-1627622320.71-61313%2Fpasted-question-1627622320.71-61313-1627622320.97-28614%3Alist=pasted-question-1627622320.71-61313-1627622320.97-28614%2FThey+are+a+mix+of+too+challenging+and+too+easy) | 1.89% |
| Not Answered | [892](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/manage_respondents?came_from=https%3A%2F%2Fconsultation.education.govt.nz%2Fncea%2Fras-level-1-phase-2-test%2Fconsultation%2Fquestion_report%3FquestionId%3Dpasted-question-1627622320.71-61313&came_from_title=Responses+by+Question&filters%2Fquestions%2F54725c9e14%2Fsubpage.2021-07-30.1177486254%2Fpasted-question-1627622320.71-61313%2Fpasted-question-1627622320.71-61313-1627622320.97-28614%3Alist=pasted-question-1627622320.71-61313-1627622320.97-28614%2F__not_answered__) | 93.80% |

**Do you have any further feedback on the Achievement Standards? If you noted that there is important knowledge and/or skills missing, please detail that here.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| [ANON-767U-4ES5-T](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627622333.32-69535&user_id=ANON-767U-4ES5-T) | The suite of standards overly focusses on Financial Decisions/Models This is a narrow band of assessment which, if this is a truly foundational course should provide a wider spread of opportunities to assess a greater range of knowledge and skills. |
| [ANON-767U-4ESG-C](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627622333.32-69535&user_id=ANON-767U-4ESG-C) | I don't like one mishmash of Accounting, Business Studies and Economics. Somebody, somewhere has made this choice. Why I dont know. Is it a done deal or will they consult CETA and actual teachers of one or more of these subjects? I know of few Commerce teachers in favour of this. |
| [ANON-767U-4EAK-X](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627622333.32-69535&user_id=ANON-767U-4EAK-X) | The integration of matauranga Maori with the subpar commerce content makes the integration seem tokenistic and undermines the actual learning and ability of ako to succeed as Maori - making commerce more basic and incorporating Te reo is not allowing Maori to succeed as Maori. In commerce content, there are so many authentic opportunities to embrace matauranga Maori, such as intergenerational success, ownership structures of iwi businesses, cultural values impact on demand, behavioral economics from Maori perspectives. All of this has been excluded, instead only focusing on individual families, as if Maori can't understand anything more complex. Additionally, the loss of content from. The level 1 commerce curriculum is phenomenal, and terrifying. These standards are for financial competency, not commerce. Really disappointing. |
| [ANON-767U-4EXZ-4](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627622333.32-69535&user_id=ANON-767U-4EXZ-4) | They are far too broad. Commerce is three subjects not 1 students should have options to take the commerce paper that suits them not shoe horned into to an ill fitting bunch of poorly worded standards. How can there be a total of 4 standards to cover 3 subjects are there 4 standards that cover all of history and geography or all the languages. Students and teachers deserve the ability to create courses to fit the student and subjects that fit the classes needs these standards fail miserably. Has a single commerce teacher actually said these are good or just some bozo who thinks accounting, business studies and economics are actually the same |
| [ANON-767U-4EXR-V](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627622333.32-69535&user_id=ANON-767U-4EXR-V) | Mātauranga Māori may be referenced throughout the standards, and originally this was the one area of these changes that had me excited as a teacher. However the structure that has been placed around the way these standards would be delivered and assessed has completely undermined this.  The main issue again here is the mid year exam. One, this acts as a major barrier to student agency, removing the learner from the center of their learning as all must now be prepared for a specific exam deadline twice over.  If the designers had any coherence to achieving the goals of the changes in mind, this would not be happening. They would readily acknowledge that Mātauranga Māori, but also the 'rich learning' that they aspire to with this system, is best built through community based, collective project based learning. In fact trying to explore Mātauranga Māori without connection to the community is absolutely ridiculous.  The mid year external would completely undermine this by placing significant timing constraints around any of the community based, project style learning, by forcing students to be individually prepared for an externally designed assessment task that will be unlikely to have relevant local based contexts for them to build or develop this knowledge in a meaningful and rich way.  Please stop this process, and restart with a coherent set of goals that work together, which are then designed towards by a collective of teachers, rather than by forcing a range of ideas down teachers throats, where each idea you seem to give us undermines at least one or more of the 'goals' you give for the changes. You haven't come too far to cease the horrendous damage you are currently doing to education in this curriculum area, and actually engage with teachers to design materials that actually provide the opportunities you aspired to which had educators originally excited about these changes before they realized the nightmare of counter-productive ideas that have been pushed on them despite their opposition. |
| [ANON-767U-4E6Q-S](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627622333.32-69535&user_id=ANON-767U-4E6Q-S) | Knowledge missing includes, but is not necessarily limited to, a selection from the topics below:  Economics: o Why Markets Fail (especially external costs, public goods, merit and demerit goods/services) o Government Microeconomic Intervention in Markets o The Role of Firms beyond alternative objectives o NZ in a global economy (including Economic Development) o Macroeconomic Issues o International Trade and Exchange  Business Studies: o Enterprise, business growth and size (including economies of scale) o Motivating workers o Organisation and management o Recruitment, selection and training of workers o Internal and External Communication o Marketing, competition and the customer o Market Research o Marketing Mix o Marketing Strategy o Production of goods and services o Costs, scale of production and detailed break even analysis o Business finance, needs and sources o Cash flow forecasting and working capital o Balance sheets o Analysis of accounts o Government economic objectives and policies o Business and the international economy  Accounting: o Introduction to Accounting. o Transaction Analysis, Double Entry Bookkeeping, Ledgers. Trial Balance o Basic Financial Statements for a Sole Trader o Cash Book o Source Documents and Journals o Other Payables and Receivables o Depreciation and Disposal o Bad debts, Provision (Allowance) for Doubtful Debts, Inventory Valuation o Bank Reconciliations o General Journal and Correction of Errors o Control Accounts o Incomplete Records o Clubs and Societies o Partnerships o Manufacturing o Limited Companies o Analysis and Interpretation |
| [ANON-767U-4E5R-S](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627622333.32-69535&user_id=ANON-767U-4E5R-S) | The standards can definitely support our Māori students. It's just some of the dusty old teachers that are set in their ways that will not. |
| [ANON-767U-4EQQ-M](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627622333.32-69535&user_id=ANON-767U-4EQQ-M) | There is very little "commerce" as we know. It is decision making four ways, and much of which is social studies focussed. Where is the financial capabilities? accounting or economics at the current L1 curriculum? Breakeven is currently a Level 3 skill - what is it doing here? Where is the analysis and interpretation of financial statements? processing? market? |
| [ANON-767U-4ERJ-E](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627622333.32-69535&user_id=ANON-767U-4ERJ-E) | Three good subjects have been ruined. Students currently taking Economics and Accounting are highly employable. This new course is short on specific content and is very waffley. |
| [ANON-767U-4EEV-D](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627622333.32-69535&user_id=ANON-767U-4EEV-D) | The Commerce Learning Matrix at level one indicates that commerce as a stand-alone subject does put pressure on the three subjects at level two, especially if students struggle to differentiate between areas that they enjoyed and struggled with. This may result in students moving away from Commerce on level two and three. |
| [ANON-767U-4EJ1-D](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627622333.32-69535&user_id=ANON-767U-4EJ1-D) | The achievement standards are missing basic accounting and economic concepts e.g. demand/supply, processing, classifying.  The standards are broadly looking at businesses in the NZ economy. Students will find it more difficult to understand the concepts in this context rather than within a personal context. |
| [ANON-767U-4ECM-2](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627622333.32-69535&user_id=ANON-767U-4ECM-2) | You are placing the Maori learner at the centre and you have forgotten everyone else. How fair is that? These are all a mess - whoever decided that merging the three subjects into one is was a really bad idea. You have pulled stuff from standards all 3 subjects and all 3 levels. Breakeven is Level 3 businesess studies - mimumum wage is level 2 and 3 economics. It would be better to run a standard from each subject so that they flow on to Level 2. Because Level 2 and 3 are going to have to be completely rewritten and there is no built up of knowledge from Level 1. |
| [ANON-767U-4E6V-X](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627622333.32-69535&user_id=ANON-767U-4E6V-X) | Commerce is not a subject. It encompasses a wide range of subjects not just Accounting, Business Studies and Economics. The attempt to fit three subjects into an area as wide as commerce is going to leave many students with gaps in their learning. Skills and knowledge in Financial literacy, Commercial law, Taxation, Finance are not covered in the achievement standards and the achievement objective, for a subject to be called Commerce. The content is a very broad mix and covers no particular subject in depth. It lacks rigor and does not fit with what students will be learning in the senior year. Commerce as a subject will be better suited for a programme in years 9 and 10 where students can develop the core skills needed to under take senior Accounting, Business Studies and Economics. This will not only equip all of our students to function in a society as financially savvy literate young people but also a fill their tool kit of learning allowing them to make informed financial choices and decisions. |
| [ANON-767U-4EDH-X](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627622333.32-69535&user_id=ANON-767U-4EDH-X) | There is no direct support for Maori akonga as it is purely a Maori business that you are analysing. There is a significant lack of accounting foundational skills across all standards. Some standards are very focused on one area of commerce and have minimal skills that need to be applied, while others are very complex and make very little sense. Students will struggle when heading into any of the single commerce subjects at level 2 due to a poor coverage of many key ideas and concepts that need to be established at level 1, which are currently being missed. |
| [ANON-767U-4ECS-8](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627622333.32-69535&user_id=ANON-767U-4ECS-8) | These standards do not cover the needed knowledge and skills for Commerce students in any of Accounting, Business Studies or Economics. They do not prepare students for Levels 2 or 3 and they do not prepare our students for careers in commerce unless they want to run a local business based on Maori business concepts. Not all of our students are Maori and even Maori students will not learn the needed knowledge/skills for a career in Commerce from theses draft standards. |
| [ANON-767U-4E2U-S](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627622333.32-69535&user_id=ANON-767U-4E2U-S) | Commerce covers 3 subjects. It is unclear of what the models and their depth should be. Some standards seem to lean towards economic models but require considerable twisting for accounting models to be appropriate. It would seem more appropriate to use the models in their appropriate context in separate subjects for which the models were developed and then the learning can be at the required depth for level 6 to allow students to attain understanding to achieve higher grades. |
| [ANON-767U-4E2P-M](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627622333.32-69535&user_id=ANON-767U-4E2P-M) | Only 1.1 is a possible work on, 1.2 needs a huge amount of work but still means that students will not be being taught 3 subjects at the required depth of L6 in the curriculum. 1.3 and 1.4 are a joke and are just repeating the same mistakes when Business Studies became UE approved. Trying to combine three distinct subjects into one generic subject is frankly stupid. |
| [ANON-767U-4EBY-D](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627622333.32-69535&user_id=ANON-767U-4EBY-D) | I don't know where to start with the long list of knowledge and skills that are missing. I guess when you combine three subjects you can no longer maintain the same curriculum level. Attempts to include mātauranga Māori appear tokenistic. There are so many opportunities missed due to the necessary breadth of this course when combining all the subjects. Chris Hipkins told me in an email last year that new NCEA would provide a "wide range of future possible pathways" but this subject is going no where and does not achieve that. "well-being, equity, coherence, pathways and credibility" were good intentions but as a teacher my workload has potentially tripled and for no gain to my students. I am in the dark about what this looks like and leads to. It is not equitable, the focus on whānau in some areas seems to indicate the Ministry has forgotten that we have students in our classrooms currently in emergency housing - lets show them the bigger picture so they can find innovative ways to solve problems rather than remind them of the problems their parents have. There is no coherance, although that was always going to be an impossible task for the poor SEG members asked to shove three some-what related subjects togerher. Credibility - we will be laughed at by our international students if we ever want to come back. Universities will revamp their 100 level courses so our students still have options. The practical components of our subjects have also been sacrificed. While it is true to say you could include a business activity within your teaching and learning programme, there is a culture of credit collection that needs to be addressed FIRST. As teachers we have the expectations of students and parents on our shoulders, they want to be rewarded for the work they do which under this system equates to credits. |
| [ANON-767U-4EBD-R](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627622333.32-69535&user_id=ANON-767U-4EBD-R) | These standards do not seem to have the needs of the learner at the centre as they will wildly underprepare them for the rigour of separate subjects of Accounting, Business and Economics at Level 2 and 3 and lead to students falling behind other more rigorous assessment options from overseas. The future flexibility, skill and productivity of the country is unlikely to improve when they are already many years behind counterparts from other qualification options. |
| [ANON-767U-4ETA-7](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627622333.32-69535&user_id=ANON-767U-4ETA-7) | There is very little accounting in this course. some of the standards require a depth that would be much too deep to teach in the time frame, some of it is too shallow. There is no flexibility to create a course that suits our learners. There is so much social studies in the course it won't give the students the base they need for future commerce courses. They are all a very big change from what we currently teach. There needs to be much more support and provision of resources to make this work. Please put in some funding to help the marae provide us with the support to teach the curriculum in a much more inclusive way. I am concerned about how neurodiverse learners will manage these courses with their rigid structure and the inability to make a course fully internal. |
| [ANON-767U-41AE-4](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627622333.32-69535&user_id=ANON-767U-41AE-4) | I am really disappointed in what we have been given, although they are an improvement of the first round. I am passionate about commerce but this content does not excite me nor will it my students. They love processing accounting over all the other things we teach eg marketing mix, market equilibrium etc. This practical element and sense of knowing what needs to be achieved has been removed which is a shame. I can not see any links to level 2 and 3 and find it impossible to try and plan without these links. In a commerce course that will separate into individual courses in the future it is vital they understand what accounting is, what economics is and what business studies is, this course does not allow this to happen so how are they meant to choose courses in the future? This has completely narrowed our selection for our students and not given the opportunity for them to experience all three subjects like it promised. It does not give justice to any of them (well maybe business studies) but to be fair that has been our least favourite topic out of the three at our school. I feel sorry for the students as they are not all going to have the same opportunities any more as this course is definitely going to come down to each teacher and what they are skilled at and there is very few of use who are skilled in all three areas, lucky I am one but I do not feel this course allows me to show my skills in all three areas, nor my passion for it. |
| [ANON-767U-41A1-G](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627622333.32-69535&user_id=ANON-767U-41A1-G) | Individual subjects within commerce will no longer have the time to be taught in enough depth to assist transition to level 2 and 3 for many students. |
| [ANON-767U-41NS-Y](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627622333.32-69535&user_id=ANON-767U-41NS-Y) | I believe the standards are limiting in their coverage. It appears that this is a stand alone Commerce subject at Level 1 and then it subdivides at Levels 2 and 3. In order to make valid comments I also need to see what is proposed for L2 and L3 Accounting to ensure we are preparing students adequately for University. I would like to see input from NZ Society of Accountants. I believe this hugely watered down course for Level 1 will be responsible for a decrease in students studying Accounting at secondary schools throughout N.Z. |
| [ANON-767U-415W-A](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627622333.32-69535&user_id=ANON-767U-415W-A) | Write some exemplars for teachers to use |
| [ANON-767U-41N9-5](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627622333.32-69535&user_id=ANON-767U-41N9-5) | Accounting is under represented across all the standards. There is not enough specific reference to what models will need to be covered. There is potentially not enough to prepare students for level 2 individual subjects. There seems to be a lack of practical skills such as preparing financial statements using technology. Currently it looks like the assessments don't really match the work from the standards. Overall I think the idea of Commerce is a good one. Our school currently teaches it as a Level one subject and we do 2 x Economics standards, 2 x Accounting standards and 1 Business studies standard which we assess after the BP Business Challenge. We have found that it has increased our numbers at level 2 because we branch off and do Economics, Accounting, Business Studies and Agribusiness at this point. My concern is that the new standards are taking away some of the key skills necessary to teach level 2 but at this point I also don't feel that we have enough understanding. |
| [ANON-767U-4159-C](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627622333.32-69535&user_id=ANON-767U-4159-C) | I think all the standards have improved significantly since they were first written. However, scaffolding a course through to Level 3 - it would be very useful to see the potential standards for L2 and 3 in each of the standards so we can plan how those y12 and 13 programmes develop |
| [ANON-767U-41RZ-A](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627622333.32-69535&user_id=ANON-767U-41RZ-A) | There is way too much Level 4 and 5 material in what is supposed to be a Level 6 course. Also, we have no idea what Year 12 and 13 students' courses will look like so it is impossible to judge how the proposed course at Year 11 will prepare those students for later learning. |
| [ANON-767U-41RA-H](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627622333.32-69535&user_id=ANON-767U-41RA-H) | More assessment guideline needed for assessment needed and teaching and learning resources. |
| [ANON-767U-41HW-W](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627622333.32-69535&user_id=ANON-767U-41HW-W) | It is hard to define what "Commerce" knowledge or skills are as nowhere is Commerce defined.  As 1.1 and 1.2 are very similar because in order for a business to be financially viable then decisions have to be made to enable this, and therefore a decision making process would have to be discussed, using very similar financial tools. One assessment task could cover both Standards over a short period of time and therefore the credit weighting is disproportionate to the credit weighting stated.  Overall a very disappointing set of standards that are not set up for our learners to be challenged, engaged or successful. |
| [ANON-767U-41E4-Q](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627622333.32-69535&user_id=ANON-767U-41E4-Q) | The curriculum cover's only up to Level 3-4. All the three subjects are not covered in depth and the skills are only basic level completion which doesn't set a thorough foundation for L2 Accounting, Economics or Business Studies. |
| [ANON-767U-41EJ-D](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627622333.32-69535&user_id=ANON-767U-41EJ-D) | It would be better if each standard was the same credit value. This would meet with the level of achievement outlined in each standard. At the moment, there is no reason why one standard is worth 6 credits and another 4 credits, when the material and the goal of each is similar. |
| [ANON-767U-413N-Y](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627622333.32-69535&user_id=ANON-767U-413N-Y) | I still strongly object to the amalgamation of subjects (Business Studies, Economics, and Accounting) and, that Accounting has very little space in the standard. The premise that the new subject, "Commerce" provides a broad base without too much specialisation is wrong. The amorphous, woolly subject Commerce seems to restrict options. Also, the existing, stand-alone subjects give much more flexibility for mixed courses of for students to have a taste of a subject like Accounting and then move on to other areas of the curriculum. |
| [ANON-767U-41YZ-H](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627622333.32-69535&user_id=ANON-767U-41YZ-H) | There is not enough academic rigour. or prepare students for year 12  in particular accounting and economics  there is no learning of key concepts seems to be all analysis of the financial documents and not how to prepare them  standards do not appear to be equitable in the tasks and time allocated  Cant see how these standards will help the students to achieve |
| [ANON-767U-41YF-W](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627622333.32-69535&user_id=ANON-767U-41YF-W) | Key knowledge and skills is missing from all achievement standards for Level 1 Commerce. For Accounting there are no Accounting Concepts covered in any detail. Also I have concerns about the Financial Statements and the level they are required to produce is too low. There is some analysis but not enough to prepare the students for a level 2 Accounting course. Economics nothing on basic concepts demand, supply or the market. There are some business studies concepts covered but the modern more relevant topics that would suit our students for careers in the future i.e. digital marketing and applying/interviewing for jobs etc. |
| [ANON-767U-41YS-A](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627622333.32-69535&user_id=ANON-767U-41YS-A) | Key knowledge and specialist skills are missing from all standards listed, particularly related to Economics. Looking at the course outline I feel the some students will not find the course challenging enough and achievement criteria for the grades is too low. Economics concepts are missing and these standards will definitely not prepare our students for the present L2 Commerce courses. It seems knowledge has been dumbed down. My concern is how will we prepare our students to achieve the specialist skills they will need in their future careers? |
| [ANON-767U-41Y4-B](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627622333.32-69535&user_id=ANON-767U-41Y4-B) | 1. Key building blocks in Commerce subjects is missing. Basic concepts in Economics is not covered - no demand, supply, or market concepts that are required to build on in level 2 and 3 content. Accounting does not appear to include any preparation of statements or concepts that are required to understand and interpret them at higher levels. Business studies is covered in slightly more detail, however is not looking to the future of business - no inclusion of technology or innovation. 2. Standards do not promote any writing skills which are already declining in NZ students. There seems to be no reference to the current 'What Why How' structure used through all subjects that encourages students to expand their thinking and explanations. |
| [ANON-767U-41YD-U](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627622333.32-69535&user_id=ANON-767U-41YD-U) | Some of the key knowledge and concepts across both the current accounting and economics courses have been left out here. The external factors and internal factors for the current business are covered. There needs to be some accounting concepts, preparation of statements, supply, and demand. This means that students have a stepping stone towards Level 2 and 3. My concern is that this course seriously weakens and disadvantages the students moving up NCEA Levels. It is also heavily teacher reliant and as far as content goes because there is a large analysis component. The standards also inequitable and how do we justify something like the business activity (1.2) against something like presentation for innovation which are worth the same. Here the business activity is a much harder thing to do and requires much more work. |
| [ANON-767U-41CU-P](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627622333.32-69535&user_id=ANON-767U-41CU-P) | This course WILL NOT prepare students for the L2 courses in Accounting or Economics - the standard is too low, it may be ok for Business Studies. I fear that there will be a number of teachers losing their jobs if this goes ahead as the ministry is reducing the commerce offering in schools. Students are not being exposed to sufficiently distinct content from the 3 subjects in L1 for them to make an informed decision regarding L2 Accounting, Business Studies or Economics - this is likely to reduce the number of students taking these subject in L2 & L3 and these are currently some of the most popular courses taught. NEVER MIND the fact that it is the knowledge of Accounting, Business Studies and Economics that drives any economy and we are thus setting New Zealand up for future mediocrity - so short sighted!!!! |
| [ANON-767U-41FY-W](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627622333.32-69535&user_id=ANON-767U-41FY-W) | The fundamental lack of essential accounting, business studies and economics elements in the Achievement Standards do a disservice to akonga Maori - indeed, all akonga. The premises of cashflow, contract (and tort) and basic economic concepts put in jeopardy the success of akonga either to run small businesses or progress with confidence to more in-depth study of core commercial subjects |
| [ANON-767U-41GA-6](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627622333.32-69535&user_id=ANON-767U-41GA-6) | This does not address the curriculum requirements of the three individual subjects but as it is a new subject, it still does not include government as mentioned in the significant learning. Only having four standards will make it more difficult to design a course that meets the needs of individual students, especially since they require a significant amount of written work and a lack of practical components. If a teacher were to teach these courses from only one perspective ( e.g. Business studies) would the students still be able to have success? |
| [ANON-767U-41WM-2](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627622333.32-69535&user_id=ANON-767U-41WM-2) | The concepts of government, debt, tax and profit are all missing from significant learning. Has this been sacrificed to meet Matauranga Maori? The current government is big on pushing financial literacy within schools. Not teaching them the concepts of debt and tax are extremely significant for financial literacy. Every person comes into contact with debt at times within their lives and taxes are an everyday occurrence for everyone. Why are we shortchanging the learning of our students of the most important knowledge that they gain from our subject area? There is a significant written component within all the standards and an absence of practical components; this is evident due to the lack of Accounting that has been integrated into the standards whereas the government should be looking into how technology and practical components could be used to enhance student learning. An example of this is the incorporation of software in the current Level Two standards. This could have been incorporated into the Level 1 commerce course with the introduction of spreadsheets for financial statements for example. A real opportunity has been missed here by the government, the creators of the learning matrix and the writers of the standards. The generic nature of the standards will be viewed as easy to pick up however the subject specific vocabulary required for all three will be difficult for them to understand the content. For example the word investment is used differently between the subject how will the international students be expected to understand the different meanings if the definitions are changing within the one class? The use of the Maori concept of Putake put into the standard as it has been is not integrating matauranga Maori into these subjects. This seems, like all of the standards, as a mishmash of three different subjects as well as Social Science and Matauranga Maori all together and not very successfully and without giving any substance into any of the learning areas. How can combining three very separate subjects being combined into a dumbed down version that is currently offered to students at the junior school level provide rich learning. Why has commerce been picked on? If you are combining subjects why not combine the Arts and make a subject that merges Art, Music, Dance and Drama? Oh that’s right, it won’t work. So why push it with Accounting, Business Studies and Economics. Even if they combined Dance and Drama where minimal students are either entered or attempt the external examinations as the subjects are chosen because they want to have fun and perform without the theory behind it. |
| [ANON-767U-41WA-P](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627622333.32-69535&user_id=ANON-767U-41WA-P) | Accounting Business and Economic teachers were not consulted about this change of subject!! It is like food in a blender you do not even recognize Accounting in this whole mix. Very disappointing!! |
| [ANON-767U-41DB-4](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627622333.32-69535&user_id=ANON-767U-41DB-4) | 1. The standards are so vague that it is extremely difficult to truly comment - without exemplars and more information we have no true idea what we are commenting on 2. The level at which the students should be is unclear - the terminology is unclear 3. The standards are boring - and display a true lack of imagination for the subjects 4. That this is meant to be a pathway to more specialised topics at level 2 and 3 is untrue - students will NOT learn what is required to be able to achieve success at L2 and L3 in Economics or Accounting. We are setting them up for failure. It is disadvantageous to students who actually do commerce at L1. 5. The three subjects, Accounting/Eco/Bus are not equally represented in these standards. 6. While there is some attempt to value mātauranga Māori, I wonder if we are really doing anyone any service here - a better way would be to dig deeper into the individual subjects and link there. |
| [ANON-767U-419C-T](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627622333.32-69535&user_id=ANON-767U-419C-T) | How can we make a comment here when we don't know what Level 2 or 3 looks like. Will it continue to be 1 subject Commerce? Will it separate into 3 subjects? What will skills will students need if they wish to take Level 2. These standards would not be adequate if the 3 subjects remain at Level 2 unless they are considerably watered down. Why is the mix internal/external 11/9 and not 10/10 like other subjects. Don't make this different to other subjects . Too vague in some places eg what economic models to use?? Economic models on its own is meaningless. |
| [ANON-767U-417C-R](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627622333.32-69535&user_id=ANON-767U-417C-R) | There is much Accounting and Economics missing from these Standards. It appears to be strongly focused on Business Studies instead. What time will be given to teachers to prepare for these standards? There is a lot of writing for students - this may very well put students off from studying Commerce - this has taken out a lot of fun activities. The standards read very much like a Year 10 Business course. The standards do not appear to give a clear Pathway to Accounting, Economics or Business Studies for Level 2 and Level 3. How does this standard deal with the vast difference in the language used in Accounting, Economics and Business? For example "Capital". In each of the 3 subjects Capital has a different meaning as the context is different for each. |
| [ANON-767U-41MJ-N](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627622333.32-69535&user_id=ANON-767U-41MJ-N) | The three subjects of Accounting, Business Studies and Economics are not equally represented in the new Commerce Learning Matrix. There is limited Accounting . Going forward this is a concern, are we going to be able to prepare the students adequately for Level two in any, or all, three subjects especially Accounting? How are we preparing our students for their future?? Serious consideration needs to happen here, if we want students to have the knowledge and be prepared for the 21st century! How can they do this and be prepared to work on an international playing field (where even the word "profit" is deemed to be too westernised!! |
| [ANON-767U-41MW-2](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627622333.32-69535&user_id=ANON-767U-41MW-2) | It is difficult to answer the above , as separate disciplines, Accounting and Economics have different knowledge and skills. Income statements and balance sheets are financial tools rather than economic "models" . Some of the Internal material appears quite easy, as does the circular flow standard, whereas the "price" standard could be more difficult depending on the extent to which the price mechanism is included, for example. |
| [ANON-767U-41BY-S](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627622333.32-69535&user_id=ANON-767U-41BY-S) | As a teacher I look forward to being able to offer a more integrated and practical learning experience for akonga. These standards give a much broader opportunity to learn about Commerce as a whole rather than the 3 separate subjects. Much of the negative comments and feedback that I have seen regarding the changes is based on teachers, not on what is best for students and their development. Fully support these changes and am happy to be part of a pilot for Commerce. |
| [ANON-767U-41B3-K](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627622333.32-69535&user_id=ANON-767U-41B3-K) | The combination of three subjects Accounting, Economics and Business into one is impossible. The standards are a mishmash of ideas in trying to cobble something together. The only way to do justice is to have three separate sets of standards, one set of four for each subject and then schools can choose their combination of standards as a number currently already do. What is currently there regularly makes no sense and does not seem to align to a subject. |
| [ANON-767U-41B5-N](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627622333.32-69535&user_id=ANON-767U-41B5-N) | Financial literacy - again there is not time to teach accounting or ecomomic models to have students prepared for level 2 or 3 NCEA accounting or economics - and we don't know what they will look like in 2023/4. |
| [ANON-767U-41BB-2](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627622333.32-69535&user_id=ANON-767U-41BB-2) | When trying to combine 3 subjects worth of achievement and learning objectives at Level 6 into one course, there is going to be significant knowledge and skills missing. |
| [ANON-767U-41BU-N](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627622333.32-69535&user_id=ANON-767U-41BU-N) | I have significant concerns about the lack of cohesion of these products. To me, it appears to be a mis-match of learning. There is a lack of direction or clear expectations. I am worried about the impact this will have on learners and their confidence in their own ability. |
| [ANON-767U-4142-4](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627622333.32-69535&user_id=ANON-767U-4142-4) | I can see how skills from Economics and Business Studies fit relatively easily into the Achievement Standards. I don't see how Accounting fits that easily into most of the AS, apart from Financial Statements. Where does the processing of transactions fit into any of the AS? Some of the AS seem to be written with more of an economics focus, particularly the external AS. When will we see draft assessments that would allow for a range of topics/ subjects to be assessed in the external AS. |
| [ANON-767U-4EAE-R](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627622333.32-69535&user_id=ANON-767U-4EAE-R) | What a debacle  These standards provide no depth or challenge or even much interest for students.  It seems highly theoretical - students just need to be aware things happen, rather than actually "doing" what is suggested in the name of the standards. The Achievement Criteria and Explanatory notes for all 4 standards are woefully lacking in any useful detail.  What is missing is everything currently covered in the Accounting Curriculum, most of the business studies and about 50% of economice.  How about somebody admits they got it wrong and we have three different commerce subjects back in the mix. School then have the choice to make a course like the one you suggest - maybe because they are small - like the two of the schools whose teachers have been involved in this mess. And for schools in higher decile areas (and even low decile where there is the demand - an economics term), there is a choice what to offer the specific students that attend, with a range of suitable standards to choose from |
| [ANON-767U-414X-A](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627622333.32-69535&user_id=ANON-767U-414X-A) | The key economics concepts are missing. After studying level 1 Commerce I would like a student to gain an understanding of their place in the economy - of what businesses, Government and the financial sector do so they can engage in it. By studying the financial decisions of a community organisation they don't get the bigger picture which is what I thought the change here was all about!!! So here are my thoughts- Allow Commerce- Economics level 1 and Commerce Accounting/Business level 1 In Economics students will learn key concepts of supply and demand/circular flow In Accounting/Business students can run their own business/ investigate business decision like the community decision one and learn basic Accounting concepts useful for a wide variety of careers. |
| [ANON-767U-41UD-Q](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627622333.32-69535&user_id=ANON-767U-41UD-Q) | The important skills missing is those of Accounting, Economics and Business Studies. Continues to be extremely disappointing that the consultation feedback given regarding subjects has been ignored even when it was overwhelmingly against the amalgamation. There has been no consultation with CETA - the Commerce and Economics Teachers Association even though those in charge of this process claim that teachers professional groups are being consulted. This is patently untrue for this area. There should at least be two subjects - Economics and Accounting/Business to give content the treatment it deserves. Reducing students options and foundational knowledge is of no advantage to them. Our budding tradies and entrepreneurs need a good grounding in Accounting and Business, and economics allow students to learn how to critically analyse Government decisions and policies. |
| [ANON-767U-4SVP-6](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627622333.32-69535&user_id=ANON-767U-4SVP-6) | The AS do not put Maori learners at the centre of the programme because the teacher will be too busy trying to plan a whole new programme rather than teaching the students. |
| [ANON-767U-4SSB-N](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627622333.32-69535&user_id=ANON-767U-4SSB-N) | 1) The decision-making is at level 4, not 6. There is too much of it as it seems to be in more than one proposed standard. I am unclear as to why government - which makes lots of decisions in this area - is not considered a suitable organisation to study. 2) There is a lot of written stuff, but the practical learning/hand-on learning (learning through doing) seems to have gone. No reason given for this. Many students like the learning through doing approach which must be why it has been removed. This means it's hard to see how these standards meet the "learner at the centre" claim. 3) There is not just enough detail about learning or assessment or links to levels 2 and 3 to make any real judgement on the usefulness of what has been provided. 4) What has been provided is quite bitsy and hard to link coherently. It's a bit of a slapdash "good enough" approach which does NONE of the three original subjects any justice and is a bit of a mish/mash. The course outlines reflect this as they seem a bit all over the place. Students like coherent units of study - which this isn't. 5) there seems very little Accounting and what is included is some statements without any time spent on what they are or truly represent. Hard to make or justify financial or business decisions if you've removed one of the main ways/reasons businesses make decisions. 6) In terms of the external assessment - there is not enough (actually, there's pretty close to NONE) information to make the judgements you seem to want. For example, with the price standard, do we teach/examine all the models? what depth? do we consider the impact of government on prices? 7) given that much of what has been presented isn't at level 6, is bitsy, lacks coherence and anything remotely challenging seems to have been removed - how will students who still want to do Economics or Accounting or Business Studies that these standards have not managed to put off, cope with Level 2 or 3. We have NO IDEA as unlike all other subjects, we don't know what those will look like. 8) I do not think this 11 Commerce course provides anywhere enough detail/learning or actual content to encourage students to continue studying in the wider area. It almost seems deliberate intended to discourage students altogether. Which is incredibly sad and does a huge disservice to potential students. It's also far from providing a "coherent pathway". |