## Agricultural and Horticultural Science 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 | **3** | **0.32%** |
| The materials need small amendments before piloting | **5** | **0.53%** |
| The materials need significant amendments before piloting | **0** | **0.00%** |
| The materials are unsuitable for piloting | **0** | **0.00%** |
| Not Answered | **943** | **99.16%** |

**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?**

| Response ID | Answer |
| --- | --- |
| [ANON-767U-4ESQ-P](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.8681594263&user_id=ANON-767U-4ESQ-P) | - More detail around the meaning of keys words - Practice(s) means 2? - Range means 3? - Can we please have the English words in brackets next to the Maori words. I am all for learning Te Reo, but learning a new language is hard and takes time etc. - In 1.2 can we choose a horticultural task that reflects a nationally significant product, i.e. something we grow a lot of so that there are resources to support our teaching. |
| [ANON-767U-4ES4-S](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.8681594263&user_id=ANON-767U-4ES4-S) | Maori words within the learning, teaching and assessments should include the English word in brackets. It is great to be incorporating this however, it is a better way to teach them. It will also waste time if people need to refer back to their glossary to be reminded. Have it there where everybody can see it and learn it. Then remove it in 5-10 years time when the standards are refreshed. Due to the nature of our subject, the timing of the externals should be at the end of year. This is because we need a full year to best teach all of the different management practices overtime. 1.2 should have a horticulture based task that is reflective of a nationally significant product. Taro is great but there will be limited resources and it is not a representation of what NZ Horticulture is producing. It is unclear of what 1.3 and 1.4 externals would look like. Please provide support around this. Please provide explicit clarification around the meaning of 'practices'. It should have a definition of 2. And a range being 3 or more. The teaching and learning tabs should provide more detail. For example, we should not be looking at the assessment to work out what is being looked for. Like Whakapapa refers to the living requirements for products/animals and where they came from. This definition is different to my definition which is to do with family history. |
| [ANON-767U-416V-A](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.8681594263&user_id=ANON-767U-416V-A) | Where do the current practical skills standards fit in the revised standards |
| [ANON-767U-41S7-8](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.8681594263&user_id=ANON-767U-41S7-8) | There needs to be some more clarification around assessments and what they will look like. What does decision based assessment look like. The literacy requirements of students is also going to be a huge barrier for some students. Also in terms of the glossary some of the Māori words and terms have definitions that give other Māori terms as part of their explanation and for some of us we don't know what they mean. We will also need PD around mātauranga Māori and what that looks like in Agricultural Science. Will we be supported to make connections and build relationships with our local iwi (as some parts in NZ are less connected than others). |
| [ANON-767U-412J-T](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.8681594263&user_id=ANON-767U-412J-T) | There was a range of feedback. - The range of topics is very narrow with little guidance on how they can be modified. This will make it very difficult for the majority of the country to access relevant learning experiences. - I think it is a little sad that there are no real practical standards for the students now - ie propagation, landscape plan. - The ability to contextualise so they are relevant to student interest and relevant to the area they live in. - I don't think the assessment tasks I've looked at (https://ncea.education.govt.nz/science/agricultural-and-horticultural-science/1/1/activity-c) matches the definition of a portfolio. The students get sick of writing reports. I would like a portfolio to have a report, video and a practical activity where they can explain how they are doing something (nitrate testing, or programing a sensor) and how it relates to the theory. I have great "doers" who could get better grades with more evidence than just writing. I think you should let teachers write a portfolio task and get it premoderated like ITO. - It looks like a considerable amount of work has gone into these - thank you. While there is a subject glossary, it would be good to have a means whereby te Reo terms could be clarified further to ensure contexts is correctly understood. |
| [ANON-767U-412P-Z](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.8681594263&user_id=ANON-767U-412P-Z) | More information on the externals and how they are going to work. Better provision for the matauranga Maori concepts. |
| [ANON-767U-41U2-5](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.8681594263&user_id=ANON-767U-41U2-5) | 1. Thank you for the time and thought by the RAS group and MOE. There must have been a considerable amount of time and thought to come up with the matrix, standards, activities and supporting material.  2. Please, do not put the exemplars for the internals in public domain. If this happens, teachers will have to spend further time, above getting teaching resources to create new internals for use in class. These should be accessed via MOE logins - please.  3. This is my reason for selecting the second point in question 1 above. Depending on the school the new standards will be piloted within, you will appreciate there are TWO subjects in one. There is a shortage of resources for teaching Horticulture and Agriculture. The pilots should be in schools that can teach 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 within an Agricultural or Horticultural context. Both subjects contexts need to be covered in pilot.  4. I would really value further TOD days to gather again with the Agricultrual and Horticultural Science teachers. |
| [ANON-767U-41BV-P](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.8681594263&user_id=ANON-767U-41BV-P) | Hello again.  My sense is there will be a number of schools in which currently only Agriculture or Horticulture level 1 standards are taught.  Thus, a high portion of current teachers will require further professional development prior to teaching 1.3 or 1.4.  Further, there will not be a publishing company that will create resources for students or teachers.  Most of the teachers will be in schools that have no onsite farm or orchard.  Agricultural and Horticultural Science is not something a teacher without experience can learn solely from a book or youtube - assuming they know where to find relevant industry resources.  Given the distance, the MOE has travelled so far with these new changes, the potential opportunity these changes will provide for current and future students, whānau and industry - it will not be the material that will be limiting, but more gaps in teacher professional development.  I believe these new standards and assessment material warrant experienced or competent persons who can support existing teachers in their professional development.  Not a day of training or powerpoint presentation but on-site visits to individual schools to support professional development and resource development at the school.  Thank you! |

**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.)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Option | Total | Percent |
| The Course Outline(s) are useful examples | **5** | **0.53%** |
| The Course Outline(s) are unclear or do not contain enough information | **0** | **0.00%** |
| The Course Outline(s) are too similar to show multiple ways a course could be constructed | **0** | **0.00%** |
| The Course Outline(s) are not useful | **0** | **0.00%** |
| Not Answered | **946** | **99.47%** |

**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 | **1** | **0.11%** |
| The course outline(s) demonstrate this to some extent | **4** | **0.42%** |
| The course outline(s) do not demonstrate this | **0** | **0.00%** |
| Not Answered | **946** | **99.47%** |

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

| Response ID | Answer |
| --- | --- |
| [ANON-767U-41KV-Y](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4839130492&user_id=ANON-767U-41KV-Y) | The course outlines are useful, however the links to each standard need to be clearer. The assessment outlines for External standards are also not clear. |
| [ANON-767U-412J-T](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4839130492&user_id=ANON-767U-412J-T) | - From the TOD I attended, initial thinking was to take on 3 of the 4 standards. The assessment date of Week 5 in Term 3 for the CAA did not appear to leave much time for teaching of 1.4. However, this could change post feedback from pilot schools. - I imagine we are all short of local knowledge, and this needs to be fed back. We need books, videos and resources. Our management use up all the time with local kaumatua. |
| [ANON-767U-412P-Z](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4839130492&user_id=ANON-767U-412P-Z) | Did not all match up with all the AS |
| [ANON-767U-41U2-5](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=question.2021-07-30.4839130492&user_id=ANON-767U-41U2-5) | No |

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Option | Total | Percent |
| The standard is ready for piloting | **1** | **0.11%** |
| The standard needs small amendments before piloting | **4** | **0.42%** |
| The standard needs significant amendments before piloting | **0** | **0.00%** |
| The standard is unsuitable for piloting | **0** | **0.00%** |
| Not Answered | **946** | **99.47%** |

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Option | Total | Percent |
| The criteria are clear | **2** | **0.21%** |
| The criteria need some clarification | **3** | **0.32%** |
| The criteria need significant clarification | **0** | **0.00%** |
| Not Answered | **946** | **99.47%** |

**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 | **2** | **0.21%** |
| Further detail is needed in the guidance | **3** | **0.32%** |
| Guidance is unclear | **0** | **0.00%** |
| Not Answered | **946** | **99.47%** |

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Option | Total | Percent |
| I could use or adapt all 3 activities | **4** | **0.42%** |
| I could use or adapt 1 or 2 activities | **1** | **0.11%** |
| I could not use or adapt any of these activities | **0** | **0.00%** |
| Not Answered | **946** | **99.47%** |

**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** | **0.32%** |
| 1 or 2 of the activities do this | **2** | **0.21%** |
| None of the activities do this | **0** | **0.00%** |
| Not Answered | **946** | **99.47%** |

**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 | **4** | **0.42%** |
| 1 or 2 of the activities do this | **1** | **0.11%** |
| None of the activities do this | **0** | **0.00%** |
| Not Answered | **946** | **99.47%** |

**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?**

| Response ID | Answer |
| --- | --- |
| [ANON-767U-41AF-5](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627617646.9-62692&user_id=ANON-767U-41AF-5) | Clarification on what is meant by "Whakapapa of the primary product" is required e.g. is it the genetic lineage of the product or something broader? |
| [ANON-767U-412J-T](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627617646.9-62692&user_id=ANON-767U-412J-T) | - I can't see the difference between M and E. - I think the activity is very good for students who are happy to spend time researching and writing. However this is not for every student. Coming from a background of doing a B Hort degree, we did not do much practical either, I think this was sorely lacking in my degree and would have helped to cement my learning so much better. I believe a practical element to all learning would help. - The boundaries seem wishy washy for all grades. - This is a huge standard, so I'm getting my head around teaching all of plant and animal in the context of Manaakitanga. - If the exemplar (answers) for the internal assessment activities become public, this will result in CONSIDERABLE EXTRA TIME for teachers to change and modify internals. THEN, additional time should be provided to account for this and guidance given sooner than later. |
| [ANON-767U-412P-Z](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627617646.9-62692&user_id=ANON-767U-412P-Z) | Not sure that whakapapa is the right matauranga Maori word for this standard. |

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Option | Total | Percent |
| The standard is ready for piloting | **1** | **0.11%** |
| The standard needs small amendments before piloting | **5** | **0.53%** |
| The standard needs significant amendments before piloting | **0** | **0.00%** |
| The standard is unsuitable for piloting | **0** | **0.00%** |
| Not Answered | **945** | **99.37%** |

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Option | Total | Percent |
| The criteria are clear | **1** | **0.11%** |
| The criteria need some clarification | **5** | **0.53%** |
| The criteria need significant clarification | **0** | **0.00%** |
| Not Answered | **945** | **99.37%** |

**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 | **2** | **0.21%** |
| Further detail is needed in the guidance | **4** | **0.42%** |
| Guidance is unclear | **0** | **0.00%** |
| Not Answered | **945** | **99.37%** |

**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 | **3** | **0.32%** |
| I could use or adapt 1 or 2 activities | **3** | **0.32%** |
| I could not use or adapt any of these activities | **0** | **0.00%** |
| Not Answered | **945** | **99.37%** |

**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** | **0.21%** |
| 1 or 2 of the activities do this | **4** | **0.42%** |
| None of the activities do this | **0** | **0.00%** |
| Not Answered | **945** | **99.37%** |

**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 | **3** | **0.32%** |
| 1 or 2 of the activities do this | **3** | **0.32%** |
| None of the activities do this | **0** | **0.00%** |
| Not Answered | **945** | **99.37%** |

**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?**

| Response ID | Answer |
| --- | --- |
| [ANON-767U-4EUP-Q](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627620788.16-67682&user_id=ANON-767U-4EUP-Q) | Very similar to current standard. |
| [ANON-767U-41KS-V](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627620788.16-67682&user_id=ANON-767U-41KS-V) | Some of the assessments will be inequitable in assessing understanding (e.g. play dough or Minecraft and an explanation vs written report. In addition the context taro seems to narrow. |
| [ANON-767U-418E-U](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627620788.16-67682&user_id=ANON-767U-418E-U) | I think the tasks need to be more flexible. Rather than one essay task as in the exemplar, I would like the task to be a portfolio of work. Videos and explanations of outside tasks. Discussions of field trips. A body of independent modes: kinesthetic, oral, written. |
| [ANON-767U-412J-T](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627620788.16-67682&user_id=ANON-767U-412J-T) | - The difference between M and E is unclear. - Again, this standard is very theory based. I realise that teachers can take students on trips and the like. However, I wonder if this assessment could be done in real time in the hort block. Grow veges, and give them to a food bank, or sell them. Make the subject real. - The boundaries between grades are unclear. - I probably want to mix some of the contexts you have separated here... like historical land change, cultural values, a particular crop like berries / market gardens and pastoral farming, so in my region I can look at logging/cultivation and greenhouse tunnel construction, I will interpret Manaakitanga as thriving not surviving, and we have a local business to visit - Woodhaven, that has won awards for innovative staffing. - Exemplar material should not be made public. |
| [ANON-767U-412P-Z](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627620788.16-67682&user_id=ANON-767U-412P-Z) | Manaakitanga means to extend aroha (love and compassion) to others. Not sure that this is the right matauranga Maori concept for this standard. |

**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 | **5** | **0.53%** |
| The standard needs significant amendments before piloting | **0** | **0.00%** |
| The standard is unsuitable for piloting | **0** | **0.00%** |
| Not Answered | **946** | **99.47%** |

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Option | Total | Percent |
| The criteria are clear | **2** | **0.21%** |
| The criteria need some clarification | **3** | **0.32%** |
| The criteria need significant clarification | **0** | **0.00%** |
| Not Answered | **946** | **99.47%** |

**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** | **0.11%** |
| Guidance is insufficient | **4** | **0.42%** |
| Guidance is unclear | **0** | **0.00%** |
| Not Answered | **946** | **99.47%** |

**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?**

| Response ID | Answer |
| --- | --- |
| [ANON-767U-4EUP-Q](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627615716.75-63849&user_id=ANON-767U-4EUP-Q) | Very unclear with out example assessments provided. |
| [ANON-767U-41AF-5](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627615716.75-63849&user_id=ANON-767U-41AF-5) | Is this equivalent to an open book assessment? Is it based on the learning context throughtout the year or is it assessed on a new unfamiliar context? Who marks the work? |
| [ANON-767U-412J-T](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627615716.75-63849&user_id=ANON-767U-412J-T) | - I have no idea how to go about this standard! - This standard looks like it could be extended on. IN particular the word, 'putake'. This standard could get students growing crops using Tikanga - traditional Maori crops. Or look at farming in the region closest to the student. - No I do not feel it gives fair and equitable assessment opportunities. - My school probably won't offer this. - Difficult to answer when the CAA contexts is yet to be revealed. |
| [ANON-767U-412P-Z](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627615716.75-63849&user_id=ANON-767U-412P-Z) | Better idea of how this is to be assessed. It is not very clear. More guidance will be needed. |

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Option | Total | Percent |
| The standard is ready for piloting | **2** | **0.21%** |
| The standard needs small amendments before piloting | **6** | **0.63%** |
| The standard needs significant amendments before piloting | **0** | **0.00%** |
| The standard is unsuitable for piloting | **0** | **0.00%** |
| Not Answered | **943** | **99.16%** |

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Option | Total | Percent |
| The criteria are clear | **5** | **0.53%** |
| The criteria need some clarification | **3** | **0.32%** |
| The criteria need significant clarification | **0** | **0.00%** |
| Not Answered | **943** | **99.16%** |

**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 | **3** | **0.32%** |
| Guidance is insufficient | **4** | **0.42%** |
| Guidance is unclear | **1** | **0.11%** |
| Not Answered | **943** | **99.16%** |

**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?**

| Response ID | Answer |
| --- | --- |
| [ANON-767U-4EUP-Q](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627619112.06-236&user_id=ANON-767U-4EUP-Q) | An example assessment would be helpful |
| [ANON-767U-41AF-5](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627619112.06-236&user_id=ANON-767U-41AF-5) | How many management practices woudl be expected to be learned? What is a decision-based exam? |
| [ANON-767U-41KV-Y](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627619112.06-236&user_id=ANON-767U-41KV-Y) | More guidance on A, M and E criteria, particularly for External assessments - what does E look like, what will be the layout and expectation of these externals, what specific examples should/must be covered in order to ensure all students across the country are learning the same context to ensure equitable assessment. |
| [ANON-767U-41S7-8](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627619112.06-236&user_id=ANON-767U-41S7-8) | What does decision based exam actually mean. Will the context change yearly as it does for the current 3.5? Will this not encourage students to rope learn answers? Will it look more like an unfamiliar text exam? This type of exam could be challenging for teachers and students, it has the potential to increase work load like the current 3.5 standard does in terms of creating resources or the unpacking of what the exam could look like and be difficult for Level 1 students. |
| [ANON-767U-412J-T](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627619112.06-236&user_id=ANON-767U-412J-T) | - Application of the current knowledge required will enable a reasonable attempt to be made. - This is a very topical subject. It has a lot of implications. Care must be given on how it is approached, especially as our subjects are meant to be advocates of the industry. I think this students could look at creating a mini environmental situation at school and report on it. Eg. the making of compost, growing plants to sequester carbon, finding ways to reduce cattle waste, planting riparian strips etc. It should be made very real to them. Not done just on paper, there are a lot of false claims in the news, so students actually doing a project based on this topic is important for deeper understanding. If they repeat this topic in year 12 they will have a deeper and more thoughtful understanding. - I do NOT believe it supports fair and equitable assessment for students. - Do the students choose their industry? Or are there 3 industry contexts given in the exam? - For some teachers, the need to cover BOTH Agriculture and Horticulture and being externally examined will make 1.4 the more likely to be dropped of the three standards. There is a serious amount of time required for professional development if a teacher does not have an existing Agricultural background. My own view is 1.4 offers greater to a wider range of students than a sole Hort or Ag focus by a school. |
| [ANON-767U-412P-Z](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627619112.06-236&user_id=ANON-767U-412P-Z) | More guidance is needed about how this will be assessed and more information on the contexts. |

**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** | **0.53%** |
| Some gaps | **2** | **0.21%** |
| Large gaps | **0** | **0.00%** |
| They cover the wrong knowledge and/or skills | **0** | **0.00%** |
| Not Answered | **944** | **99.26%** |

**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 | **6** | **0.63%** |
| 1.1 does this | **0** | **0.00%** |
| 1.2 does this | **0** | **0.00%** |
| 1.3 does this | **0** | **0.00%** |
| 1.4 does this | **0** | **0.00%** |
| None of the standards do this | **0** | **0.00%** |
| Not Answered | **945** | **99.37%** |

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Option | Total | Percent |
| Yes | **4** | **0.42%** |
| They are too challenging | **0** | **0.00%** |
| They are not challenging enough | **0** | **0.00%** |
| They are a mix of too challenging and too easy | **2** | **0.21%** |
| Not Answered | **945** | **99.37%** |

**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.**

| Response ID | Answer |
| --- | --- |
| [ANON-767U-4ESS-R](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627622270.96-87276&user_id=ANON-767U-4ESS-R) | We could do with English words in the standards even if in brackets as it is time consuming to go back and forth to the glossary. More explicit meaning regarding management practices. Do they need to cover 2 or 3 for 1.1 and 1.2. 1.2 needs a nationally significant horticultural task. Taro is not really a nationally significant product. External assessments need to be end of year. This helps us give a more opportunity to teach throughout the year understanding how a product process goes through the seasons. |
| [ANON-767U-41AF-5](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627622270.96-87276&user_id=ANON-767U-41AF-5) | 1.3 may be too broad and deep in terms of knowledge required for this age group. |
| [ANON-767U-416V-A](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627622270.96-87276&user_id=ANON-767U-416V-A) | There seems to be no room for the practical skills standards such as Propagation skills from Hort and Practical skills from Agriculture. These are an important part and provide an avenue for the more practical students to get outside, show off skills and learn some transferable skills that can be used in the workplace. |
| [ANON-767U-41S7-8](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627622270.96-87276&user_id=ANON-767U-41S7-8) | We will need support for mātauranga Māori concepts and context. These standards need to be well resourced especially being a small subject area. |
| [ANON-767U-412J-T](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627622270.96-87276&user_id=ANON-767U-412J-T) | - There is no place for practical investigative skills given that overlap between science and AgHortSci is not allowed. The subject is almost completely theoretical now - not what the majority of students want or need. - I just feel we have made the subject too focused on reports no matter what the medium is. I believe that year 11 should be more project based. This knowledge and depth of understanding can then be used in year 12. I think we are going to put the less academic students away from our subject. Make the subject real, use real life projects as the tools. They can get deeper and more commercial as they move into year 12. - I feel that they are not appropriate for Ag / Hort Science, they are much more in alignment with Social Sciences. - My concern is on assessment. As I have already written, I think the tasks need to be pre-moderated, and allow inclusion of videos, garden/field trip log books and verbal discussions. I think if a student can explain an action in terms of theory, that is evidence. - In terms of the Big idea, Agriculture and horticulture connect locations of purposeful production with people’s wellbeing - Some of our students involved in the primary industry are involved with spraying or quad bikes. Is there a place for personal safety to be noted. This we teach the higher level concepts, some level 1 students will be engaged in practices that carry a high risk to their personnel wellbeing. |
| [ANON-767U-41U2-5](https://consultation.education.govt.nz/ncea/ras-level-1-phase-2-test/consultation/response_view?fromQ=pasted-question-1627622270.96-87276&user_id=ANON-767U-41U2-5) | 1. EXISTING AG/Hort SUBJECT TEACHERS For the teaching of 1.3 and 1.4, there will be (in my view) a number of existing schools in which only Horticultural Science standards are taught OR only Agricultural Science standards are taught. For 1.1 and 1.2, you can keep the current context of Hort or Ag focused only.  There is no book company that will publish Teacher or Student subject workbooks for 1.3 or1.4 (as there will be for other subject areas such as Sciences.  While there is the HATA organisation, most schools do not have farms or an orchard. Agricultural Science and Horticultural Science is not something you will be competent at teaching without a level of actual industry knowledge. Given the lack of existing subject workbooks - this can be gained by teachers - by takes time (as in years) if are doing it on your own. I have no Agricultural background but has taken access to the HATA resources, industry resources and much time to join dots together.  In my view, there should be: 1. Existing Agricultural and Horticultural providers to put on PD for to support existing Teachers. There are organisations such as Fruition, OWL and Telford. 2. Resource experienced Teachers to visit other schools to support teaching staff who do not yet have the required subject knowledge.  If not, schools will potentially limit teaching 1.3 or 1.4 given the demand on their time to prepare for these new standards.  2. NEW AG/Hort SUBJECT TEACHERS Same concerns as outline in 1 above and that you have Teaching staff seeking to teach this subject qualification or experience Ag or Hort degree and the commercial contexts are easily lost or taught in a confounded way to students by accident. |