## Health Education (with Home Economics) 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 | **2** | **0.21%** |
| The materials need small amendments before piloting | **5** | **0.53%** |
| The materials need significant amendments before piloting | **13** | **1.37%** |
| The materials are unsuitable for piloting | **5** | **0.53%** |
| Not Answered | **926** | **97.37%** |

**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-4EC1-6 | It is really tricky to plan much without more information around assessment! |
| ANON-767U-4EWN-Q | There is little connection to the NZC document in the materials that are available. Why is there two different documents which are so vastly different.How do the new standards allow us to prepare our young people for the 'real' world. 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??The content is so closely tied to Matauranga Maori how does this allow our other students to see themselves in the content.Also it is really difficult to assess these standards changes without being able to see the connection to the Year 12 and 13 achievement standards. We are looking at course outlines with no real understanding of what progressions look like.Where is the coverage of all the strands in the HPE curriculum document? |
| ANON-767U-4EKE-2 | 1.2 and 1.4 sound very similar. More clarification needed on the difference between "Actions" and "Strategies".We are unsure how Home Economics teachers would teach all the standards if they were not trained as Health teachers also.In our school Home Economics teachers are in the Technology Dept! |
| ANON-767U-4EUY-Z | Maybe some guidance or examples of specific context that could be used, F&N related topics versus relationship/sexuality, etc. |
| ANON-767U-4EPV-R | Some exemplars do not stick to the 800 word count word limit. There is a general lack of information, particularly around the 2 externals |
| ANON-767U-41SY-A | 1. It needs to be more inclusive of other cultures in New Zealand2. How do you include Food knowledge assessment into this material and how do you encourage students to take this subject as it seems unclear what career pathways they could take in the future with this subject.3.The material seems to be heavily Health based. |
| ANON-767U-41ST-5 | This courses need significant changes because this does not have space or time for practical based learning. I feel the learning should be students need based, what they are interested and what they really need to pracice/include in their day to day life. Nutrition aspect is barely impeded in these standards. No space to improve their skills. |
| ANON-767U-41SQ-2 | Very concerned at HOW this course would appeal to students - why would they want to take it - or see worthwhile pathways.?How can the vital Food and Nutrition knowledge be included - I feel that this knowledge should be assessed.Challenge the 1.1 Unit - needs to be completely rethought and rewritten into a Food and Nutrition context.The 1.1 wide range of cultural knowledge is not reflected in the assessment task. It is clearly Maori based and not inclusive of all cultures. Unrealistic to do in a Marae setting. |
| ANON-767U-41SB-K | The document is soo tally focussed on Maori learners - what about the multi cultural community. In our part of the country, there are few Maori students but numerous students who are from other cultures in the community. Is teaching and learning not meant to be inclusive? Is there any way that the the outcomes in the Health area can incorporate Food and Nutrition aspects into this environment? What are the needs of the students and where does the pathway for these students lead to? Looking at our own community opportunities - these are being ignored when the outcomes have been structured. It was my understanding that more realistic pathways were to be provided for our students - what are these? |
| ANON-767U-41AQ-G | There seem to be contradictions in the material. 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. |
| ANON-767U-415F-S | there does need to be more information or clarification around what the CAA's look like. There are also gaps in the practical elements of working with food. I am not sure if there is enough time allowed for teachers to add in parts they feel necessary to their course and school. |
| ANON-767U-41QN-W | There is little information on 1.3 & 1.4 so how could you pilot them? Also, 1.1 exemplars has no foods context so this is hard to understand what is required without more guidance. |
| ANON-767U-415S-6 | There is some detailed information for 1.1 and 1.2 but very little for 1.3 and 1.4. So from my perspective the subject is very narrow and and limits the teaching and learning focus of food and nutrition. Why is hauora the only view point and focus? Is this going to engage students for a whole school year?Another concern is, are we still working to create Aotearoa New Zealand in which Maori and Pakeha recognise each other as treaty partners, and in which all cultures are valued for the contributions they bring? |
| ANON-767U-41FT-R | 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. In addition, level one is supposed to be about themselves. Not about others in their community. Level one is to lay down the foundations around nutrition for teenagers. Carrying out actions to enhance the wellbeing of others is a level 2 concept. |
| ANON-767U-41EN-H | Far more supports regarding the teaching and assessment materials are needed for teachers who teach both Health and Home Economics.The name of the subject is not respectful of those who teach and specialise in Home Economics. A change is needed. |
| ANON-767U-41DT-P | The information provided by the matrix sounds great. However, the proposed Achievement Standards do not match this matrix. 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. |
| ANON-767U-41WS-8 | It seems for food and nutrition teachers and students that the concepts that are specific to us have not been included and the practical component of our subject which is of great importance has been lost in these new standards. |
| ANON-767U-41D5-Q | 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. Put the learner back in the centre of the learning - use real, rich and engaging contexts that young people can relate to easily. Some of the resources are contrived and too far removed from a young person. Learning needs to be exciting and able to change easily to meet the changing needs of the ako we teach.WHERE IS THE PATHWAY TO GAIN NUTRITIONAL KNOWLEDGE BEFORE L2? This set of standards for Health are narrow and limit the breadth of curriculum. NZ has the second highest obesity rate in the world, Home Economics (food and nutrition) focuses on the positive ways to bring about change and understand how change can happen. |
| ANON-767U-41S3-4 | Overall there aren't enough resources or clarification included to provide security. 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 emphasis on Matauranga Maori is challenging for some and again, more clarification is required to develop teachers' understanding to increase confidence. This needs to feel like a inclusive connection to Health and Home Ec and not exclusionary effort. |
| ANON-767U-4185-B | Probably the description/exemplars of what each grade actually looks like. |
| ANON-767U-414P-2 | The language of the standards need to be more consistent across them especially when it comes to the achievement criteria. |
| ANON-767U-4SVA-Q | 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.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? |

**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 | **3** | **0.32%** |
| The Course Outline(s) are unclear or do not contain enough information | **5** | **0.53%** |
| The Course Outline(s) are too similar to show multiple ways a course could be constructed | **4** | **0.42%** |
| The Course Outline(s) are not useful | **1** | **0.11%** |
| Not Answered | **938** | **98.63%** |

**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 | **0** | **0.00%** |
| The course outline(s) demonstrate this to some extent | **10** | **1.05%** |
| The course outline(s) do not demonstrate this | **1** | **0.11%** |
| Not Answered | **940** | **98.84%** |

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ANON-767U-4EW8-1 | The Outline 2 Health with Home Economics begins in an appropriate manner. It lacks the incorporation of food and practical experiences in a 21st Century world where the consumption of ultra processed foods, mental health and well being and the link to skills for food preparation lacks explicitness.This course outline needs to reflect nutrition , you can not separate it from health and well being. PE may stand alone and the practical component has not been removed, yet in well being physical exercise is just 20% of the weight issue.Food preparation skills need to be supported more explicitly. Teaching health in isolation does not assist students for future learning and life skills.Mental health a growing problem in todays society with researched evidence linked to food consumption |
| ANON-767U-41AQ-G | The course outlines are unclear and do not give teachers enough clarity to teach the unit. |
| ANON-767U-41QN-W | Unclear about when 1.3 is due as each course outline is different....varies from 17, 18 & 26 weeks. |
| ANON-767U-415S-6 | The outline gives brief examples/bullet points of matauranga Maori, how are teachers going develop their own understand and learning? What support will be given? |
| ANON-767U-41FT-R | Course outlines do not show how, in a cohesive way, home economics and health can be blended. They are essentially just health and miss the important learning home economics offers to support Akonga to successfully negotiate food and nutrition in Aotearoa . |
| ANON-767U-41DT-P | The course outlines are very similar to each other, which will limit student learning. It is hard to make a judgement on the externals due to the limited information being available. 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. |
| ANON-767U-41WS-8 | The course outlines are very narrow and do not give enough flexibility for our food and nutrition teachers and do not allow the concepts specific to us to be taught and assessed. |
| ANON-767U-41S3-4 | 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. |
| ANON-767U-4185-B | They look good, some more than others but I guess that allows them to be tailored to be relevant to the students in your kura. Was interesting and well thought out through. |
| ANON-767U-4SVG-W | It is very disappointing to find that there is only one course outline that a teacher of Food and Nutrition is likely to be able to develop a program of learning with.It seems that these course outlines are weighted in favour of Health.The concern here is that H Ec teachers will surrender and build courses based on Hospitality standard. While there is a place for Hospitality it shouldn't be because H Ec has been squeezed out by Health. H Ec should be permitted to stand alone, and Health should also stand alone. Again students choice is being reduced; as it is not uncommon for students to select H Ec and Health at Level 1.Home Economics (Food and Nutrition) has been marginalised at Level 1. |
| ANON-767U-4SVA-Q | Home Economics is blended into each course outline. Would be nice to have a separate outline for Home Ec itself and one that caters more for Food and Nutrition and the practical aspect of Home Ec. |
| ANON-767U-4S11-2 | It is important that the language is understood by students. Get rid of the jargon. |

**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 | **3** | **0.32%** |
| The standard needs significant amendments before piloting | **8** | **0.84%** |
| The standard is unsuitable for piloting | **3** | **0.32%** |
| Not Answered | **936** | **98.42%** |

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Option | Total | Percent |
| The criteria are clear | **3** | **0.32%** |
| The criteria need some clarification | **6** | **0.63%** |
| The criteria need significant clarification | **6** | **0.63%** |
| Not Answered | **936** | **98.42%** |

**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** | **0.11%** |
| Further detail is needed in the guidance | **6** | **0.63%** |
| Guidance is unclear | **7** | **0.74%** |
| Not Answered | **937** | **98.53%** |

**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 | **1** | **0.11%** |
| I could use or adapt 1 or 2 activities | **6** | **0.63%** |
| I could not use or adapt any of these activities | **8** | **0.84%** |
| Not Answered | **936** | **98.42%** |

**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 | **1** | **0.11%** |
| 1 or 2 of the activities do this | **5** | **0.53%** |
| None of the activities do this | **8** | **0.84%** |
| Not Answered | **937** | **98.53%** |

**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** | **0.11%** |
| 1 or 2 of the activities do this | **6** | **0.63%** |
| None of the activities do this | **8** | **0.84%** |
| Not Answered | **936** | **98.42%** |

**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-4E38-W | To understand Te Whare Tapa Whā authentically, it must be explored within a Māori context.....this needs to be relevant for ALL our learners from every culture within New Zealand!The videos are great BUT subtitles should be provided.Also videos that show Hauora being used in other cultures and settings and as NZ is a Migrating Kitchen and multi cultural society this is extremely important.Major concern that it states as a 2 week assessment for 5 credits, this does not relate to the the learning recommended times of 10 hours for every credit |
| ANON-767U-4EKE-2 | The wording of the criteria is unclearDescribe how Te Whare Tapa Whā informs hauora in the short term and long term, in context.How do you describe something that "informs" wellbeing? |
| ANON-767U-41QN-W | I was genuinely confused by this standard and how to apply it to my local area and a foods context. It would be helpful if you had foods exemplars/assessment schedule so I could get my head around it. |
| ANON-767U-415S-6 | As a food and nutrition teacher there are some useful activities, my students will want a foods and/or nutrition focus so why is the assessment schedule using a weaving example?This is a 5 credit assessment yet activity one states that the time frame to complete the assessment is 2 weeks, is that correct? |
| ANON-767U-41FT-R | The activities are academic and narrow . They fail to capture and ignite curiosity and excitement. My current students would find this very dull indeed. Unless it can be related to them personally they struggle to engage. There is potential for this standard to reach out and be pertinent for our Akonga but how it has been described is here is disappointing. |
| ANON-767U-41GM-J | - Explanatory notes don't match the achievement criteria (inconsistent language)- What does “demonstrate understanding” (for Achieved) mean?- “Describe” for M and “Explain” for E - this would normally be A and M criteria - how does it now differ?- Needs clarification around teaching other health models i.e. Will Fonofale be taught or assessed?- Activities are not realistic or accessible for all schools i.e. Activity B and C are not realistic- 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.- Are lesson periods long enough to support some of these activities? i.e. member of local hapu coming in to teach weaving harakeke - schools may need to consider this.- 'Local context' needs defining - is this local according to immediate area/neighbourhood? or Tāmaki-Makaurau? Could it be broadened to allow for more options of activities?- 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? |
| ANON-767U-41DT-P | The explanatory notes for this standard are VERY restrictive to teaching and learning. Only allowing a Maori context does not allow teachers to develop programmes to suit individual and class interests and backgrounds. Making students no longer the centre of their own learning. Students instead have to make judgements on different cultures and people. This AS does not link to Health or Home Economics Curriculum Level 6 and will be very difficult for students to engage with. Our current Standards ensure a greater depth of understanding of Te Whare Tapa Wha than what is proposed and assessed by this standard. The proposed assessment is well below Level 6 of the curriculum and limits student knowledge of health and nutrition. EN 2 is a major concern. |
| ANON-767U-41WS-8 | I can't see how these activities could be used or adapted to suit a food and nutrition context. Our concepts and key learnings have become very narrow and I thought the aim of the standards was to allow more flexibility for teachers and students.How do we ensure authenticity when students are feeding back on common videos?Explanatory Note 2 specifies this has to be explored within a Maori context. |
| ANON-767U-41D5-Q | This is a seriously flawed standard. It does not allow individual students to connect with the learning or bring their own perspectives and cultural capital. There is no EN linking the standard to Hand PE from NZC. Using videos for assessment purposes poses authenticity and plagarism issues. These are more suited to teaching resources not assessment. It is also asking learners to make judgements and assumptions of others well-being. It does not allow learners to achieve beyond Achieved. Where is the Food and Nutrition context in this standard that focuses on the learner which is exactly where 15 year olds like to be? The judgement standards are simplistic and do not recognise prior learning that has been happening in levels 1-5. These activities look like Maori preforming arts standards or Social Studies. |
| ANON-767U-41D7-S | Fully immersed in te ao Māori, very clear timeline, clear focus on Mātauranga Māori, connecting and prioritising Māori values, multiple engagement options, all 3 assessment tasks and resources are accessible, easy to use, connected, relevant, authentic. |
| ANON-767U-41DX-T | - Not enough clear examples of what constitutes a maori context- Teachers will require ministry support to improve competence to provide an authentic and safe maori context- How will iwi support all us? They struggle to fulfil whole school activities, let alone each department area trying to access their expertise. |
| ANON-767U-41S3-4 | Why does this survey keep referring to 3 assessment activities for this standard when I can only access 2?It is unclear what is meant by 'context'. The word is used multiple times throughout and then Explanatory Note 2 reads "To understand Te Whare Tapa Wha authentically, it must be explored within a Maori context." What does this even mean? Way more information is needed to underpin this in order to even give valid feedback. What about MY school's context? I understand the purpose and significance of developing Matauranga Maori in our bi-cultural country but what about areas like my rural South Island town. HUGE reasons to develop the knowledge but difficult for me to access compared to when I was teaching in Whaganui. Look at the 'experiences' included in the assessment activity B:-Talking with a Māori expert on a topic about te ao wairua (spiritual world) and te ao tūroa (the natural world)-Pōwhiri, whaikōrero, waiata, and kai on a local marae-Hikoi up the local maunga, with karakia and pūrākau shared throughout-Performing at a kapa haka event-Visiting a Māori Health authority to interview Māori social workers, mental health advocates, or people in other similar roles-Karakia, and gathering harakeke, to weave an object.How do I access these things? This will require resources that I don't have easy access to, increase my workload and money that our small school doesn't have. It's frustrating because on one hand it is exclusionary, making the learning more accessible to some students in New Zealand than others and on the other hand it doesn't appear to make enough space for the connection of knowledge to what MY students at MY school already possess.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.A lot more work needs to be done here. |
| ANON-767U-412N-X | Clarification on what 'demonstrate understanding' means is needed.Inconsistent language used across A, M, E. (explanatory notes do not match criteria)Does this standard extend our higher learners. I guess we go back to what is Level 6 of the curriculum.It's not clear whether other models are expected to be taught and included e.g fonofale. (just need clarification)Activities are not realistic or necessarily accessible for all schools esp activity B,C.A lot of pressure on local Kaumatua.Also resources - we have 5 NCEA full classes- to get all classes the materials/resources/speakers etc would be challenging and not sure sustainable. Maybe okay if you had 1x small class so at a large secondary school we are restricted immediately due to numbers.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.We don't want people to be put off this AS due to it being too difficult to implement if you do not have contacts or access to resources.There will be a reason but at Level 1 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.Will this create a 'set' of answers rather than a range in a class which is much more interesting than a set of answers from a video/a tangata.Being able to mix it up and change things over years could be challenging when trying to find suitable video clips that would provide the depth of answer needed for E. |
| ANON-767U-41BW-Q | What does demonstrating understanding for Achieved meanDemonstrate A, Describe M (Explain?) Explain E (Evaluate)Explanatory notes don't match achievement criteria inconsistent languageWill this extend higher kids? teaching and learning.Clarifying teaching of other models i.e will fonofale be used?Activities are not realistic or accessible for all schoolsActivity B & C not realisticWhich is local content Tāmaki Makaurau, Ōwairaka, Aotearoa? |
| ANON-767U-414P-2 | - What does demonstrate understanding for achievement mean?- Explanatory notes don't match the achievement criteria (inconsistent language)- Will there be more clarity around teaching other models i.e will Fonofale be assessed?- The assessment activities are not realistic or accessible for all schools.- What does local context mean? Tamaki Makarau, Owairaka, Aotearoa?- Clarity of Maori context. |

**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 | **4** | **0.42%** |
| The standard needs significant amendments before piloting | **6** | **0.63%** |
| The standard is unsuitable for piloting | **1** | **0.11%** |
| Not Answered | **939** | **98.74%** |

**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 | **5** | **0.53%** |
| The criteria need significant clarification | **5** | **0.53%** |
| Not Answered | **939** | **98.74%** |

**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** | **0.11%** |
| Further detail is needed in the guidance | **5** | **0.53%** |
| Guidance is unclear | **5** | **0.53%** |
| Not Answered | **940** | **98.84%** |

**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 | **0** | **0.00%** |
| I could use or adapt 1 or 2 activities | **12** | **1.26%** |
| I could not use or adapt any of these activities | **0** | **0.00%** |
| Not Answered | **939** | **98.74%** |

**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 | **1** | **0.11%** |
| 1 or 2 of the activities do this | **6** | **0.63%** |
| None of the activities do this | **3** | **0.32%** |
| Not Answered | **941** | **98.95%** |

**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 | **2** | **0.21%** |
| 1 or 2 of the activities do this | **8** | **0.84%** |
| None of the activities do this | **1** | **0.11%** |
| Not Answered | **940** | **98.84%** |

**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-4E38-W | Query - why does the suggested timeframe differ from 1.1 and they are both the same credit value.Looks very similar to Current HEc 3.2 which is very detailed and takes time - how will the learning of your practice group people be measured and how will students be able to measure their SMART goal in this timeframe?Seemed like a standard that is a quick fix rather than a long term meaningful action plan to submit to our students ... we feel it should be more real world and actual plans that can have an impact on our communites |
| ANON-767U-41AX-Q | This standard would be better as an external, where students submit their portfolio at the end of the year for assessment.Assessment schedule language is not consistent - 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. There are also no examples given for evidence of Merit in the assessment schedule. |
| ANON-767U-415S-6 | This standard has better links to food and nutrition, and should be more engaging for students. It is goof to see the assessment schedule is also food based. |
| ANON-767U-41FT-R | This is very similar to a unit of learning I do with year 10 students, level 5 of the curriculum. My challenge is to you, is it level 6? Really? It could easily be done by all of my year 10 learners. |
| ANON-767U-41GM-J | - Explanatory notes don't match the achievement criteria (inconsistent language)- "Justifying" before "explaining" is not a logical order or progression (justifying is more of an Excellence skill)- There is inconsistency of the language across standards and levels- Activity A and C are great! |
| ANON-767U-41DT-P | It is not written at Level 6 of the curriculum. Achievement should have higher requirements than 'demonstrate'.Some activity contexts link more to Social Studies rather than Health and Home Economic curriculum. |
| ANON-767U-41WS-8 | 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. |
| ANON-767U-41D5-Q | 1.2a is too simplistic and not complex enough to allow learners to gain the standard - needs reviewed.Discussing is a vague term for Achieved and should be described. Justify is beyond a L6 skill and should read as 'give reasons'. At Excellence students are unlikely to explain insignificants learnings - all learning is significant!Merit evidence statement missing for 1.2b.1.2c - context of breakfast club is a much larger project than the other two activities. |
| ANON-767U-41D7-S | 1.2A Māori framework is accessible for all learners; Māori or non-Māori because you can use your own experience - fits the framework, ensures success for all, clear for teachers to understand and follow without prior knowledge on Mātauranga Māori, kete connects well to assessment and visually appealing, love this standard, standard is created for success |
| ANON-767U-41S3-4 | Again, there are only 2 assessment activities but the survey alludes to 3.Firstly, I have taught action plan with Level 1s and Level 3s and they have consistently been their least favourite units of learning and that's why many teachers have stopped teaching them. It's a battle to get, particularly the less academic students, to keep up with the regular review and reflection on their action plans. Then at the end of their action, it winds up with them in a rush to 'make up' their entries or they just give up and don't submit. If there was one of the four I would be most likely NOT to do, it would be this one.Secondly, I feel the criterion "discussing how barriers to implementation, if any, were overcome and turned into enablers" puts students into a position where they make up how they have overcome barriers to implementation regardless of whether they are authentic or not because they will feel they are better able to meet the Merit criteria.Thirdly, I don't see any criteria on having students reflect on their action plan. At Excellence the criterion reads "explaining significant learnings from the action to enhance hauora..." but what about reviewing the action plan itself to show how and what they would do differently to make improvements? It's not clear from the criteria or the assessment activity that this is an integral part of the action plan process.Fourthly, can the action plan process be completed in a group context? This is unclear from the standard or the assessment activities. It is challenging for a teacher in a class of 30 to 'consult' with all individual students doing different action plans. I understand the draw of student agency but please keep a balance between authentic student agency and teacher workload. |
| ANON-767U-412N-X | Activity A looks good.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.Like this AS as can see 1.1 in it.Activity C- good. Just concerned re: what level 2 materials might look like and the repeat of current AS2.3 at Level 2. Although this one looks no so in-depth there is the element of repetition for students. It's a good idea. This is a shift from individual action to improve own wellbeing to improving others' well-being- usually seen at L2.I like it though as long as we consider the thinking ahead to L2 and what HP might look like there.Activity C- need to change heading as not all HP ideas match 'providing a safe space'. Title does not quite reflect the activity options. This might be confusing for people.Although teachers can provide other headings.Better progressions of A to E. Demonstrate understanding to evaluate. I think this reflects L6 of the curriculum a little better. |
| ANON-767U-41BW-Q | Achievement criteria don't match explanatory notes e.g demonstrate for achieved to discussingJustifying - explaining not logical orderConsistency across standards and levels1.2 Creating a safe space - don't think the AS title matches the activity.Similar to 1.1 |
| ANON-767U-414P-2 | - Achievement criteria don't match the explanatory notes e.g. demonstrate for achieved then discussing in notes.- Justifying for A then Explaining for an E not logical order.- Similar to 1.1. |

**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 | **4** | **0.42%** |
| The standard needs significant amendments before piloting | **6** | **0.63%** |
| The standard is unsuitable for piloting | **0** | **0.00%** |
| Not Answered | **941** | **98.95%** |

**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 | **4** | **0.42%** |
| Not Answered | **941** | **98.95%** |

**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 | **6** | **0.63%** |
| Not Answered | **940** | **98.84%** |

**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-4EPV-R | 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. |
| ANON-767U-41AX-Q | 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?? |
| ANON-767U-415S-6 | It is ashame that there is such little information for this standard and I'm told it won't be available until October. |
| ANON-767U-41FT-R | Ok, but it is so dull! We are losing the fun of learning. |
| ANON-767U-41GM-J | - 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"- How much support can kaiako give to ākonga in CAA conditions?- Will it be in exam conditions? Open book?- Will activities require the use of an electronic device? Presents issues of equity for non-BYOD schools.- If a student is away during that week of assessment will another assessment opportunity be provided? Will this be organised internally or nationally?- In 'Unpacking', what does it mean by "distinct" factors? What are "diverse" factors?- In preparation for the assessment, do kaiako teach a range of factors that can be applied in any context?- Are there suggestions of activities we could use to prepare or would this be up to each school? |
| ANON-767U-41D7-S | Can avoid all things Mātauranga Māori, discrepancies between course outlines and inclusion of Mātauranga Māori, like the use of interpersonal and societal factors, opposed to 1-dimensional, open for different contexts, does the assessment match the learning with a scenario? who writes the CAA - is it us or NZQA? |
| ANON-767U-41S3-4 | I suggest the title is modified to read "Demonstrate understanding of factors that influence wellbeing" because I can't see anything in the criteria or explanatory notes that links to a specific issue.I also suggest that Merit is changed from "Describe" to "Explain" meaning students have to give reasons to show how factors influence hauora. And the criteria would read "explaining with reasoning how the identified factors influence hauora." Otherwise what does 'describe' even mean here? The glossary defines it as "To state features of" so what does "State features of how the identified factors influence hauora" mean?The Excellence criteria works with the 'interaction of factors' aspect of it if at Merit, students have had to explain the factors. |
| ANON-767U-412N-X | - This AS is good and reflects Health Education well.-In unpacking the standard- purpose. What does distinct factors and then diverse factors mean. This is new language and confusing the way it is written. Could this be cleared up.-Do we teach a range of factors that can then be applied to a context or scenario.-Like the CAA idea. Concerns = how 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 students are absent (justified) what do we do here?Also concerns- not to make it digital due to device access for some students and schools.-Could make it clearer in notes that at each level A,M, E it includes P, I, S to help the teacher understand this. If that is the intent?-More unpacking and examples needed here to see exactly what to cover for teachers. Am only assuming it is not dissimilar to 2.1 Level 2 structure of influencing factors.-Overall good AS. |
| ANON-767U-41BW-Q | Standardised language - language in explanatory notes does not match standard i.e demonstrate - identify and provide an explanation.Conditions of assessment - how much can teachers support them during CAA - what are the conditions.Exam condition? Open Book?Use of devices (issues with equity for non-BYOD schools)Students who are away when will another opportunity be provided.What acitivirw could teachers be given to prepare? Any examples |
| ANON-767U-414P-2 | - Language in assessment criteria and explanatory notes do not align. E.g. demonstrate and then provide examples.- What is "distinct" and "diverse" factors.- Will there be example assessments for teachers to use?- How much can teachers support students during CAA?- Exam condition or open book.- Use device? What about issues for non-BYOD schools.- If students are away from school for relevant reasons will there be re-assessment opportunities? |

**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 | **5** | **0.53%** |
| The standard needs significant amendments before piloting | **7** | **0.74%** |
| The standard is unsuitable for piloting | **1** | **0.11%** |
| Not Answered | **938** | **98.63%** |

**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 | **6** | **0.63%** |
| The criteria need significant clarification | **5** | **0.53%** |
| Not Answered | **939** | **98.74%** |

**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** | **0.11%** |
| Guidance is insufficient | **9** | **0.95%** |
| Guidance is unclear | **3** | **0.32%** |
| Not Answered | **938** | **98.63%** |

**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-4EKN-B | This standard will likely be assessed via a Structured Report or Appreciation of Whakapapa, to be submitted in Term 4.This statement is not clear at all. How can a student be assessed via a structed report yet another student by the Appreciation of whakapapa when it should be one assessment schedule.Also what does the Appreciation of Whakapapa look like?L:ooks very similar to Level 2 Health promotion external in HEc BUT this is supposed to be Level 1! |
| ANON-767U-4EPV-R | We are unsure what is meant by an Appreciation of Whakapapa as the assessment task. It does not appear to be connected to this external |
| ANON-767U-41AX-Q | This standard would be better as an internal. A structured report does not accomodate all learners needs and is therefore not fair or equitable. Given that this standard is about demonstrating understanding of strategies to enhance hauora, it lends itself well to being able to demonstrate these in a practical foods situation (particularly in a food safety context). The practical component of Home Economics is vitally important, but is not reflected well in any of the standards. This standard could help to remedy that by being more open to different types of assessment. |
| ANON-767U-415S-6 | It is ashame that there is such little information for this standard and I'm told it won't be available until October. |
| ANON-767U-41FT-R | 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. |
| ANON-767U-41GM-J | - Beyond Level 1, what standards in Level 2 and 3 does this lead into?- Very wordy standards- 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"- What is "Appreciation of Whakapapa" under external assessment mean?- Very vague - not sure what the standard would entail |
| ANON-767U-41D7-S | what is whakapapa of appreciation as an assessment? is the assessment asking the students to assess their strategies in relation to all four underlying concepts? who are we enhancing hauora for? too vague |
| ANON-767U-41DX-T | - how many strategies is expected?- how does 'change' fit in this standard, it's not in the descriptors |
| ANON-767U-41S3-4 | 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." |
| ANON-767U-412N-X | -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.-The explain and evaluate section of expl. notes is not clear. What are you wanting the students to be able to do here.-I like how it relates to UHCs. This is def E question-Looks like the focus is on P and IP strategies not Societal at this level.-External mode of assessment = Appreciation of Whakapapa would need more explanation here.-Overall right idea for the AS and externally marked sounds good. |
| ANON-767U-41BW-Q | Beyond level 1Wordy achievement criteriaDemonstrate / identify etc not consistent. |
| ANON-767U-414P-2 | - Beyond level 1, much harder than other standards.- Wordy in explanation.- Language is not consistent across the material.- What is application of whakapapa? |

**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 | **1** | **0.11%** |
| Some gaps | **9** | **0.95%** |
| Large gaps | **8** | **0.84%** |
| They cover the wrong knowledge and/or skills | **2** | **0.21%** |
| Not Answered | **931** | **97.90%** |

**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 | **10** | **1.05%** |
| 1.1 does this | **2** | **0.21%** |
| 1.2 does this | **2** | **0.21%** |
| 1.3 does this | **0** | **0.00%** |
| 1.4 does this | **0** | **0.00%** |
| None of the standards do this | **3** | **0.32%** |
| Not Answered | **935** | **98.32%** |

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Option | Total | Percent |
| Yes | **3** | **0.32%** |
| They are too challenging | **1** | **0.11%** |
| They are not challenging enough | **4** | **0.42%** |
| They are a mix of too challenging and too easy | **10** | **1.05%** |
| Not Answered | **933** | **98.11%** |

**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-4EJ5-H | The standards are focused to cover Hauora, but don't cover anything about the human body. How can we talk about Hauora without learning about the physical human body? It's not in any of the Science or Biology standards either. It is an important part of Matauranga Maori and needs to be included. |
| ANON-767U-4EYH-K | The mid year set due date for 1.3 is creating massive issues when it comes to combining units throughout the year (specifically 1.1 and 1.2). When will the task be available? Are we all going to get access to it at the same time? Can we complete it earlier in the year and then submit it at the end of term 2? |
| ANON-767U-4EYB-D | It does not really have a practical component for the Home Economics (cooking skills) |
| ANON-767U-4EK6-K | Inconsistencies with the use of the word Hauora, treated as a synonym for wellbeing and health. Unclear of the distinction between one another. |
| ANON-767U-4EUY-Z | 1.1 - food context doesn't fit as well in this standard, we can see how it could be made to fit but feel it is a push (we are Food & Nutrition teachers)1.2 - Can this standard be completed as a school whanau versus community whanau? It is a doable standard in our eyes.1.3 - a little bit complex at L1? Doesn't fit cleanly with F&N - will there be a selection of scenarios, one that is food related?1.4 - Sexual health and relationships - will there be any exemplars around the relationship around healthy food?Can we teach all 4 standards from a F&N perspective?Are school able to offer a F&N and Health as stand alone subjects? Or are we expected to do 6 month courses?We are feeling that some teachers may lose their positions of subject specific specialization. |
| ANON-767U-4EPV-R | We understand that each key concept will only be 'assessed' once (e.g hauora in 1.1). We are struggling to understand how SEP or Health Promotion or Attitudes and Values can be assessed without considering whether the student has also demonstrated correct knowledge of hauora (e.g what if a student identifies a good strategy to improve personal hauora, but their explanation of how hauora will be improved is incorrect?). We need further guidance on how key concepts can only be assessed once. |
| ANON-767U-41AX-Q | 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. |
| ANON-767U-41QN-W | How does these standards progress to the Level 2 and 3 standards? It would be good to see these levels.These seem to be very "health" based, I know we can do these from a foods context but it seems like foods having to fit into health. |
| ANON-767U-415S-6 | There are large gaps of important knowledge and skills missing from these standards. The standards are going to limit learning for food and nutrition.Why is question 2 just focused on Maori students? Shouldn't this be all students in New Zealand? |
| ANON-767U-41FT-R | I cannot see my students engaging with this and will seek to look at other curriculum areas.It is way too narrow and has somehow taken a vibrant subject and turned it into a very dull one. |
| ANON-767U-41DT-P | 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. |
| ANON-767U-41WS-8 | Food and Nutrition has been undervalued in these standards. Food and Nutrition is very different to Food Technology they are two different learning areas. This subject has concepts that are specific to us and these have been lost in these standards. 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."Teaching food and nutrition might be viewed as the single most important educational activity of a society; if persons do not learn to obtain and consume food so as to sustain themselves and their dependents, all other learning is irrelevant." Quote, Dr Joan Dye GussowThis is what students in food and nutrition learn in this subject! |
| ANON-767U-41D5-Q | 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?The language used in these standards is not consistent with assessment already developed - assessment that is working for all students to access. 92008 is seriously flawed . |
| ANON-767U-41S3-4 | I see it differently when I look at them as a whole. I would prefer 1.3 and 1.4 be internal and then 1.1 and 1.2 be external.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. 5 credits for this when compared with the learning involved in the other 3 standards is unbalanced.I feel overall we are really missing some distinct focus on knowing the nutrients. This is such important foundational understanding for Levels 2 and 3. I know these standards don't stop it from being taught but without some clear focus in the assessment, they will simply become secondary.We are desperate for more detail and information. We can only assume that the clarifications of the standards are going to offer a great deal more detail but could we get some assurance of this? These standards overall are low on detail, making the whole process more difficult to give feedback on. I'd also like to think that these could be more dynamic and flexible than the last standards and if things clearly aren't working, CHANGE THEM! Don't just continue year after year with them if they aren't fit for purpose.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. Don't ask us to put our heart and soul into this update (which we will) without ensuring you are working hard to ask us what we need for support and provide it. |
| ANON-767U-414P-2 | 1.1 seems very easy compared to 1.4 which seems beyond level 6. The wording across the standards needs to be consistent especially in the achievement criteria. |
| ANON-767U-4SVA-Q | Food and Nutrition isn't specifically specified - how will this be covered? Any practical components? |
| ANON-767U-4S11-2 | It is important that their is practical skills placed in all these standards. |

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Option | Total | Percent |
| I think it should remain as Health Education (with Home Economics) | **4** | **0.42%** |
| I think it should change to Health Studies | **1** | **0.11%** |
| Not Answered | **946** | **99.47%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ANON-767U-4E4Q-Q | Food, Health and Wellbeing / Food and Health studies |
| ANON-767U-41V3-7 | Food, Health and Well-being OR Health and Food Studies |
| ANON-767U-41AQ-G | Neither - they should not be in the same category at all |
| ANON-767U-415S-6 | Health Education (with Food and Nutrition) |
| ANON-767U-41DT-P | Nutrition and Health studies |
| ANON-767U-41D5-Q | Health and Nutrition |
| ANON-767U-41S3-4 | Health and Nutrition Studies |
| ANON-767U-412N-X | 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?? |
| ANON-767U-4SVG-W | Health and Food and Nutrition as 2 separate subjects. Allow these areas to keep their unique identities. |
| ANON-767U-4S11-2 | Food and Nutrition |