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**Purpose**

This report outlines the feedback received from a Public Engagement Survey by the Ministry of Education (the Ministry) on the Phase 2 development of Level 1 products for Health Education (with Home Economics). This report will present the quantitative data collected from the survey as well as summarising the common themes and trends appearing in the qualitative data. This report will be used to inform any necessary changes to the products before they go forward for piloting as part of the Review of Achievement Standards (RAS).

**Background**

1. As at 23 August 2021, the Ministry received 42 responses to the Ministry’s online survey about the subject content developed so far for Health Education (with Home Economics). These included both multiple choice answer questions and long form, written response questions.
2. This report is organised into sections based on the questions in the survey. Each section was optional so not every respondent answered every section. The sections are:
   1. Summary of feedback as a whole
   2. General impressions of the subject content
   3. Course Outlines
   4. Individual Achievement Standards
      1. AS 1.1 and Assessment Activities
      2. AS 1.2 and Assessment Activities
      3. AS 1.3
      4. AS 1.4
   5. Impressions of the Achievement Standards as a suite
   6. Consultation on change to subject title
3. Please note that the content in this report does not reflect the opinions of the authors. The report aims to thoroughly and accurately reflect the views presented by those who fed back on the draft subject content.
4. Respondents had the option of submitting feedback as individuals or on behalf of groups, such as school departments. Except where pertinent, responses have not been identified as originating from an individual or a group.
5. **Summary of Health Education (with Home Economics)**

There were **42** responses to Health Education (with Home Economics) products. Responses about the Achievement Standards were generally critical, with only **2 / 25** responses in favour of no amendments to products before piloting.

The main themes appearing throughout the responses included:

* Concerns that Home Economics is undervalued
* Too much focus on mātauranga Māori, resulting in exclusion of other cultures
* Clearer pathways needed
* Concerns about the lack of practical components related to cooking

1. **General impressions of the subject content**

**Questions**

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

***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?***

22 respondents provided commentary.

* Several respondents indicated that further detail in regards to assessments was needed, particularly surrounding Common Assessment Activities (CAA) and exemplars.
* A large number of respondents were concerned that the two subjects, Health Education and Home Economics, appeared imbalanced within the Phase 2 products. Their concerns are expressed in the following quotes:

*“Home Ec is the ONLY subject that has been 'absorbed' into another subject in this change to NCEA but not enough has been done to alleviate the anxiety linked to this massive change. Disappointing that more hasn't been done to mitigate this. Overall the material is very Health focused and the resources haven't been created to equally meet the needs of both Health based and Home Ec based programmes.”*

*“The material has turned home economics into health, this will alienate students from the subject. The initial material states that one of the goals is to have equity however, I feel that this is not the case. A large amount of the content is covered in Health which leaves Home Ec minimalized to the point of extinction.”*

*“The name of the subject is not respectful of those who teach and specialise in Home Economics. A change is needed.”*

* Respondents felt that these Achievement Standards needed to include concepts that create a clearer pathway to Level 2 Food and Nutrition. Their views are expressed in the following quotes:

*“Need to be adjusted so that Home Economics is more inbedded - and that there is a clear pathway to Level 2 - Food and Nutrition - rather than just to Health.”*

*“The matrix written for Health with Home Economics read well and reflects the essence of the learning area but does NOT follow through into the standards for Food and Nutrition.”*

* Related to the above theme, respondents felt that there needed to be clearer career pathways in order to appeal to ākonga.
* A number of respondents were disappointed with the lack of practical tasks associated with Home Economics. Their concerns are best shown in the following quotes:

*“How will practical elements work if this is to be taught under a health department, rather than a food studies department? Will students just receive theory knowledge?”*

*“All references to food selection, and preparation have been removed. You wouldn't remove the practical component of PE why would you remove it from Food and Nutrition??”*

*“Not suitable because they do not represent the key Home Economics foundations. Missing the practical aspects entirely. This is the cornerstone of our subject and without it we are misrepresenting our subject and our Akonga are severely disadvantaged.”*

* Many respondents were concerned with the inclusion of mātauranga Māori, as they believed the content should be more inclusive of other cultures within Aotearoa New Zealand. Their concerns are expressed in the following quote:

*“The matrix states that 'health and wellbeing are understood in diverse ways, according to a person's values, cultures ...' Some standards, especially AS 1.1 do not allow for this. Current Home Economics standards are much diverse and ensure a greater understanding of nutrition and health.”*

* Some respondents were concerned with the consolidation of the two subjects as they felt kaiako who specialised in one of the subjects would not likely be trained to teach the other. Their concerns and suggestions are shown in the quotes below:

*“We are unsure how Home Economics teachers would teach all the standards if they were not trained as Health teachers also.”*

*“Far more supports regarding the teaching and assessment materials are needed for teachers who teach both Health and Home Economics.”*

1. **Course Outlines**

Chart C.1: ***Do the sample Course Outline(s) exemplify how the Significant Learning can form a coherent years’ programme with opportunities to assess the 4 Standards?***

Chart C.2: ***Do the Course Outline(s) demonstrate how teaching and learning could be grounded in mātauranga Māori?***

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

12 respondents provided commentary.

* Many respondents felt that the Course Outlines did not show how Health Education and Home Economics content could be taught cohesively. They were concerned that the content was skewed towards health, and suggested giving equal weight to food and nutrition concepts. Their fears are expressed in the following quotes:

*“Concern that there are no longer any practical cooking components of these standards and our current Home Economics Standards ensure a much more in-depth knowledge of nutrition and health. This is a concern given the high prevalence and upward trend of diet-related diseases (Obesity, Type 2 Diabetes, Heart Disease etc) in NZ. Therefore it is a major concern that nutrition education is being reduced, rather than increased.”*

*“The course outlines are very health focused with little focus on Home Economics so although the subject is Health Education (with Home Economics) it reads more like just Health with a token gesture towards Home Ec. We need to feel included and our students who are passionate about learning about Foods need to feel included.”*

1. **Individual Achievement Standards**
   1. **AS 1.1 and Assessment Activities**

Chart D1.1: ***Is this Achievement Standard ready for piloting?***

Chart D1.2: ***Are the Achieved, Merit and Excellence criteria clear enough to support consistent assessment judgments?***

Chart D1.3: ***Does the unpacking of the Standard and the Conditions of Assessment provide sufficient and clear guidance on the use of the Standard?***

***Internal Assessment Activities***

Chart D1.4: ***Could the activities for AS1.1 be used or adapted in your local context?***

Chart D1.5: ***Do the Internal Assessment Activities exemplify how mātauranga Māori can be recognised and valued in assessment?***

Chart D1.6: ***Do the activities for AS1.1 support the engagement, access, understanding and participation of all learners?***

***Do you have any further feedback on this Standard and its activities?***

15 respondents provided commentary.

* Some respondents were concerned that AS 1.1 was not inclusive of other cultures within Aotearoa New Zealand.
* Respondents felt that the Achievement Criteria needed rewording, as they felt that the language used was inconsistent and did not match the Explanatory Notes well. In particular, some respondents thought that ‘demonstrate understanding’ needed clarification.
* Respondents felt that there needed to be more of a focus on food and nutrition within AS 1.1. In particular, they were disappointed that the Assessment Activities could not be used or adapted to suit food and nutrition contexts. This concern is expressed in the following quote:

*“None of the related assessment activities have a food-based link. Leaving us as teachers to make it all up for ourselves, leaving us feeling unsupported and like foods is an afterthought. Same with the assessment schedule. In an effort to increase inclusion, this successfully works to exclude.”*

* Respondents were concerned with the two-week time frame that has been chosen for AS 1.1, particularly as the assessment is worth 5 credits.
* Respondents indicated that clarification was needed in regards to teaching other health models, and queried whether these could be taught and assessed.
* Several respondents felt that the Assessment Activities were not accessible for all schools. Their concerns are expressed in the following quotes:

*“Are there enough kaumatua or members of local iwi and/or hapu for the school to consult with? Consultation, whilst important and should be happening, puts a lot of pressure on only a few individuals, especially if this is happening across the school.”*

*“Some good examples provided but difficult to find similar examples in local area without substantial planning and consultation - time allowances for this? Who in the school will do this?”*

*“How will iwi support all us? They struggle to fulfil whole school activities, let alone each department area trying to access their expertise.”*

* Respondents suggested that it would be better to focus on the hauora of the individual rather than the hauora of others, as expressed in the following quote:

*“I like the idea of making the learning relevant to the learner therefore them reflecting on their own wellbeing in relation to their understanding of te whare tapa wha has always been good. Activity A takes the task away from the individual to reflecting on how someone else's hauora is affected. Students may not be able to connect as well to this compared to showing understanding of themselves.”*

* Several respondents indicated that ‘local context’ needed clarification, as expressed in the following quote:

*“Clarification on what 'local' means. Is this the suburb, a bit wider? is it the city or town. What does local mean. This could change how accessible things might be for certain schools.”*

* 1. **AS 1.2 and Assessment Activities**

Chart D2.1: ***Is this Achievement Standard ready for piloting?***

Chart D2.2: ***Are the Achieved, Merit and Excellence criteria clear enough to support consistent assessment judgments?***

Chart D2.3: ***Does the unpacking of the Standard and the Conditions of Assessment provide sufficient and clear guidance on the use of the Standard?***

***Internal Assessment Activities***

Chart D2.4: ***Could the activities for AS1.2 be used or adapted in your local context?***

Chart D2.5: ***Do the Internal Assessment Activities exemplify how mātauranga Māori can be recognised and valued in assessment?***

Chart D2.6: ***Do the activities for AS1.2 support the engagement, access, understanding and participation of all learners?***

***Do you have any further feedback on this Standard and its activities?***

13 respondents provided commentary.

* Several respondents felt that AS 1.2 was not well-aligned with Level 6 of the Curriculum, as expressed in the following quotes:

*“Justify is beyond a L6 skill and should read as 'give reasons'”*

*“Better progressions of A to E. Demonstrate understanding to evaluate. I think this reflects L6 of the curriculum a little better.”*

*“This is very similar to a unit of learning I do with year 10 students, level 5 of the curriculum.*

*It is not written at Level 6 of the curriculum. Achievement should have higher requirements than 'demonstrate'.”*

* There were several concerns surrounding the language used in Assessment Schedules and Assessment Criteria, as expressed in the quotes below:

*“"Justifying" before "explaining" is not a logical order or progression (justifying is more of an Excellence skill)”*

*“Activity 1.2b - for Achieved students need to "discuss" (this is a huge step up from the current "identify" in most L1 standards. For Merit they need to "justify" which currently is an Excellence level.”*

* Respondents were pleased that AS 1.2 had better links to food and nutrition concepts, although there were some concerns surrounding Activity B. Their concerns are expressed in the following quotes:

*“Eating and cooking with whanau could be used as a food and nutrition activity with some adapting. However, this is a task that is currently taught and assessed at Level 3 as part of the nutritional issue standard.”*

*“Activity B looked like it was a focus on Home Economics due to the title but then it was general in its goal contexts e.g improving time-management and study skills. This was confusing as it now longer had relevance to title of cooking and eating with whanau.”*

* A few respondents noted that the Assessment Schedule for Activity B was missing evidence for Achievement with Merit.
  1. **AS 1.3**

Chart D3.1: ***Is this Achievement Standard ready for piloting?***

Chart D3.2: ***Are the Achieved, Merit and Excellence criteria clear enough to support consistent assessment judgments?***

Chart D3.3: ***Does the unpacking of the Standard and the Proposed Assessment Approach provide sufficient and clear guidance on the use of the Standard?***

***Do you have any further feedback on this Standard?***

10 respondents provided commentary.

* There were several comments relating to the CAA, best shown in the following quotes:

*“Proposed timing of the CAA does not support the design of a local curriculum - it gives no flexibility as to when this is taught and restricts schools in their planning/curriculum design. It would be better to be assessed late in Term 3, or even in Term 4. Why not as is currently done with end of year externals??”*

*“The lack of detail on the website is concerning. We have questions around the common assessment task - would all Health students in NZ complete this at the same time (like a test)? Unclear what constitutes a common assessment task.”*

*“[H]ow much could a teacher 'help' them during the CAA- clear guidelines on this needed especially if it is not 'test' conditions. Is it open book? exam conditions? Does everyone is country do it at the same time? Just looking for consistency across schools etc and authenticity.”*

*“If a student is away during that week of assessment will another assessment opportunity be provided? Will this be organised internally or nationally?”*

* Some respondents were disappointed with the lack of information surrounding AS 1.3.
* Respondents felt that there was inconsistency in the language used across Achievement Standards, particularly within the Achievement Criteria.

*“Assessment criteria language is not standardised - language in assessment criteria doesn't match the standard i.e. "Demonstrate" for A - in explanatory notes: "identify and provide examples"”*

* Respondents indicated that ‘distinct factors’ and ‘diverse factors’ needed further clarification.
  1. **AS 1.4**

Chart D4.1: ***Is this Achievement Standard ready for piloting?***

Chart D4.2: ***Are the Achieved, Merit and Excellence criteria clear enough to support consistent assessment judgments?***

Chart D4.3: ***Does the unpacking of the Standard and the Proposed Assessment Approach provide sufficient and clear guidance on the use of the Standard?***

***Do you have any further feedback on this Standard?***

* Several respondents indicated that ‘Appreciation of Whakapapa’ required further clarification. Similarly, respondents requested more detail in regards to what is meant by ‘assessing strategies’, as expressed in the following quote:

*“What does 'assessing strategies' mean in the Excellence criterion? I tried looking it up in the glossary and couldn't find a definition? This makes it difficult to understand the difference between the Merit criterion of "showing relationships between the identified strategies and health education underlying concepts." and the Excellence criterion "assessing strategies in relation to key health education underlying concepts."”*

* A number of respondents felt that AS 1.4 was not well-aligned with Level 6 of the Curriculum, as expressed in the following quotes:

*“This is pitched at the wrong level of the NZC. This is level 7 not 6. HP is not a suitable concept for these Akonga. Review this carefully against the NZC.”*

*“L:ooks very similar to Level 2 Health promotion external in HEc BUT this is supposed to be Level 1!”*

* Respondents felt that there was inconsistency in the language used across different products, as expressed in the quote below:

*“For Achieved suddenly it reads 'identify and describe' and in the explanatory note it says 'demonstrate understanding'. This is the opposite of what the pattern is with other AS's.* […] *Either the other AS's should read 'identify at A and then at M describe (1.1,1.3) or reflect for 1.2 etc or to be consistent A in 1.4 should read 'Demonstrate understanding... ' which means identify and describe in explanatory notes.”*

1. **Impressions of the Achievement Standards as a suite**

Chart E1: ***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?***

Chart E2: ***Do the Achievement Standards support ākonga Māori to succeed as Māori? (select all that apply)***

Chart E3: ***Are the Achievement Standards appropriate to Level 6 of the curriculum? (Approximately Year 11)***

***Do you have any further feedback on the Achievement Standards?***

12 respondents provided commentary.

* A number of respondents were disappointed with the exclusion of practical tasks related to Home Economics, as expressed in the following quote:

*“Practicals for most of the standards have disappeared and this is the very reason some students choose this subject. Practical cooking skills are being lost and students learn so many skills from these eg following directions, collaboration, listening skills and problem-solving.* […] *NZ has one of the highest rates of diet-related diseases, in food and nutrition, students learn how to prepare, cook and serve nutritious meals safely alongside learning valuable nutrient knowledge. They also learn how to navigate themselves around a very complicated food world by looking at food labelling, advertising and how these influence food choices.”*

*“The standards as a whole do not take into account the vitally important component of practical skills and cookery in Home Economics. The assessment is all theory based, and do not allow for demonstration of knowledge and understanding through practical skills. There needs to be more flexibility in assessment methods to cater for all learners.”*

* Several respondents were eager to see how the subjects progress through to Level 2 and 3.
* Respondents noted that the Achievement Standards were not aligned with the Curriculum Level.

*The current Achievement Standards are not set at Level 6 of the Curriculum and there is no mention of Home Economics concepts from Level 6. The subject content is extremely dumbed-down e.g. for Achievement of AS 1.1 all that is required is 'selecting' and 'describing'. Standards are much more restrictive and narrow than our current ones and they are no longer about the individual's health and wellbeing which is of great concern.*

* Respondents were concerned that there was a large focus on mātauranga Māori within the Achievement Standards, as expressed in the following quotes:

*“1.1 doesn't seem equal in terms of learning in comparison to the other 3 standards. It is very narrow. It would be much better as a larger exploration of various cultural health models, with a focus on the Te Whare Tapa Wha, as opposed to this being the entire focus on the learning.”*

*“There is a question missing here - what about those who are not Maori in NZ but bring their own cultural capital to their learning. How can they access the learning in these standards?”*

* Respondents indicated that exemplars and PLD would be needed, as expressed in the quote below:

*“We NEED good, multiple and varied exemplars. They need to be clear, full and updated regularly. Preferably in a space only teachers can access. It is totally unacceptable that we have standards based assessment with no organised Best Practice workshops or teacher PLD linked to ensuring consistent assessment and building consistent shared understandings of teachers. Leaving that up to teachers increases workload and stress levels.”*

1. **Consultation on change to subject title**

The sector has indicated that some titles for **NZC NCEA Level 1 subjects** may be appropriate for change. The following criteria will be considered when suggesting new subject titles:

* Subject titles are consistent within a Learning Area
* Subject titles are future proofed to remain current and engaging to ākonga.

Subject descriptions will be developed to support all subject titles to avoid any ambiguity.

Chart F1: What do you think of **the proposal** to change the title of **Health Education (with Home Economics)?**

Other option(s):

10 respondents provided commentary.

* *“Food, Health and Wellbeing / Food and Health studies”*
* *“Food, Health and Well-being OR Health and Food Studies”*
* *“Neither - they should not be in the same category at all”*
* *“Health Education (with Food and Nutrition)”*
* *“Nutrition and Health studies”*
* *“Health and Nutrition”*
* *“Health and Nutrition Studies”*
* *“Health. Do we need Education or Studies on the end? No other subject except PE and Social Studies has education or studies. Possibly we do need to distinguish that we are educating people or studying health??”*
* *“Health and Food and Nutrition as 2 separate subjects. Allow these areas to keep their unique identities.”*
* *“Food and Nutrition”*