

Were you aware about the intended change to support a broad, more foundational education at NCEA Level 1, while subjects at Levels 2 and 3 would promote greater specialisation?	Were you aware about the intended change to support a broad, more foundational education at NCEA Level 1, while subjects at Levels 2 and 3 would promote greater specialisation?	To what extent do you support the Ministry's proposed subjects for NCEA Level 1? (subjects to be made available, derived/aligned with the New Zealand Curriculum)	To what extent do you support the Ministry's proposed subjects for NCEA Level 1? (subjects to be made available, derived/aligned with the New Zealand Curriculum)	Do you have any feedback on the subjects included or not included? (if you are suggesting changes please provide your rationale/reasons)	Are there further specialist subjects that you would like the Ministry to consider for development at NCEA Levels 2 and 3?	Are you familiar with the content of Te Marautanga o Aotearoa? (the New Zealand Curriculum in te reo Māori)	Are you familiar with the content of Te Marautanga o Aotearoa? (the New Zealand Curriculum in te reo Māori)	If you answered 'yes' to Question 4, do you have any feedback on the subjects that are under development for Te Marautanga o Aotearoa? (refer to Table 2 above) -	Last Modified Date	Response ID	Created Date	Submitted Date
Yes		Strongly agree				Yes			2020-02-20 15:23:33	ANON-YFPW-R96V-Z	2020-02-20 15:23:33	2020-02-20 15:23:37
Yes		Agree				Yes			2020-02-20 15:28:05	ANON-YFPW-R96V-W	2020-02-20 15:28:05	2020-02-20 15:28:10
No		Strongly agree				No			2020-02-20 15:28:32	ANON-YFPW-R96C-A	2020-02-20 15:28:32	2020-02-20 15:28:38
Yes		Agree		I think		No			2020-02-20 15:29:59	ANON-YFPW-R96S-T	2020-02-20 15:29:59	2020-02-20 15:30:08
Yes		Strongly agree				No			2020-02-20 15:32:24	ANON-YFPW-R96B-Y	2020-02-20 15:32:24	2020-02-20 15:32:42
Yes		Agree	I broadly agree with the intention to have a more focused set of subject available at Level 1.	I disagree with the intention to remove art history unless its uptake has been poor in the past. (I'm not aware of the figures.) I also disagree that psychology is appropriately seen as an aspect of social studies. Similarly, while classical studies is concerned with the past, it has a much broader disciplinary base than history, as it comprises aspects of literature, art history and political science. In general, the removal of Latin and art history, and the rolling of classical studies into history (where it will quietly cease to exist) adds up to a move away from foundational understandings of western civilisation. It is a pity that in Aotearoa/NZ, we don't seem to be able to simultaneously celebrate a Maori renaissance and revere the civilisation that has brought us so much liberty and prosperity.	No	Yes	N/A		2020-02-20 15:35:15	ANON-YFPW-R969-Z	2020-02-20 15:35:15	2020-02-20 15:35:26
No	I thought the changes were going to be within subjects themselves as in broadening the course and having fewer small 'credit value' assessment. I didn't realise it might mean some curriculum areas fading out completely.	Strongly agree		I don't understand why religious studies stays as a standalone and why it is not under Social Studies.		No			2020-02-20 15:36:28	ANON-YFPW-R96G-E	2020-02-20 15:36:28	2020-02-20 15:36:38
Yes		Strongly disagree	The importance of Art History and Classical Studies within their own field should be highly valued and respected, not taken out of the subject list. By the enormity of History as a subject within itself, there would not be sufficient time to branch into other forms of Art History and Classical Studies.	Do not exclude the humanities, Art History and Classical Studies are extremely important subjects which can branch into years of study and education and high paying jobs. The exclusion of these subjects would weaken the possible reaches of students.	Anthropology and Indigenous Studies	No			2020-02-20 15:37:25	ANON-YFPW-R96I-H	2020-02-20 15:37:25	2020-02-20 15:37:35
Yes		Agree		Like the idea of the combination to form Commerce.		No			2020-02-20 15:39:28	ANON-YFPW-R96E-C	2020-02-20 15:39:28	2020-02-20 15:39:40
Yes		Agree	Only support this if subjects such as technology are reviewed and all learning styles are considered. This is a reason why Unit Standard ITO courses have so much traction in a large number of schools.	Happy with the subject selection.	No	No			2020-02-20 15:40:48	ANON-YFPW-R96S-V	2020-02-20 15:40:48	2020-02-20 15:41:04
Yes		Strongly disagree	The idea of combining the three commerce subjects will not be great for a lot of us - not only will it limit the teaching hours for many specialist teachers, it also undervalues the key concepts needed to teach for the subjects in Y12 and 13.			Yes			2020-02-20 15:41:28	ANON-YFPW-R96P-Q	2020-02-20 15:41:28	2020-02-20 15:41:31
Yes	The subjects look good. For most New Zealanders high school graduation is where education will stop. With regard to contents, we should therefore think of secondary education as boot-camp for democracy.	Strongly agree	There is an urgent need to teach about religious diversity in New Zealand. This figure shows a map of the places of worship in New Zealand, revealing the substantial role of religion in social life: https://uoa-eresearch.github.io/religion/churches.html This map shows the ethnic diversity of the Al Noor Mosque in Christchurch, revealing the role of this Mosque in binding people across ethnic and religious divide: https://uoa-eresearch.github.io/religion/al_noor_mosque/ It is important to clarify the diversity of religion, and its social effects, to combat the sort of prejudice about religion you might receiving in these comments, for example that it is irrelevant or all one thing (e.g. Muslims are Arabs, and zealots) Anti-Muslim prejudice is particularly worrying, and will not go away without education: https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0174606	Please keep religious studies.		No			2020-02-20 15:41:40	ANON-YFPW-R967-X	2020-02-20 15:41:40	2020-02-20 15:41:53

No		Disagree	Art History should be retained as a Level One subject. Visual literacy is increasingly important in contemporary life, and the ability to read images is extremely useful for other subjects such as History and Classical Studies.	Latin should be retained. It is extremely useful to have a working knowledge of this language use in learning other languages, for understanding scientific binomials, especially in botany and medicine, and for translating documents and inscriptions in research.	No.	Yes		It is a great initiative.	2020-02-20 15:46:21	ANON-YFPW-R961-R	2020-02-20 15:46:21	2020-02-20 15:46:30
No	I understood the rationalization to be a) if level 1 was kept or not and then if it was the standards changing - no the subjects. Part of the reason I was strongly in favor of retaining Level 1 is that it is often the first taste of academic success some students get. In broadening the subjects it will make it harder for the students to gain credit in a meaningful way that can relate both to the highly academic that want to move on and education and those who just want a qualification to exit on.	Strongly disagree	As a science teacher taking away the specialization of our subject seems a lot like dumbing down the ideas and concepts that may be covered by stronger standards. I fully believe the individual subjects help in playing to a student's strength and in making those that want to carry on in a particular science find their strength. Making them wide and superficial will miss so much of the concept ideas and the current curriculum in science is far too broad for this.	As a science teacher taking away the specialization of our subject seems a lot like dumbing down the ideas and concepts that may be covered by stronger standards. I fully believe the individual subjects help in playing to a student's strength and in making those that want to carry on in a particular science find their strength. Making them wide and superficial will miss so much of the concept ideas and the current curriculum in science is far too broad for this. I cannot comprehend how Ag/Hort remains separate but Bio/Chem /ESS/ Px are lumped together. There are far too many concepts to make coherent connections if the subject specialization is removed.	Individual sciences should remain (Biology/ Chemistry etc)	No			2020-02-20 15:47:28	ANON-YFPW-R962-1	2020-02-20 15:47:28	2020-02-20 15:47:34
Yes		Strongly agree		I believe an art history component should be included in the Visual Arts as this is where I believe most of the current Level 1 uptake is. History possible as well.		No			2020-02-20 15:47:42	ANON-YFPW-R96H-F	2020-02-20 15:47:42	2020-02-20 15:48:07
Yes		Agree				Yes			2020-02-20 15:42:23	ANON-YFPW-R96F-D	2020-02-20 15:42:23	2020-02-20 15:50:38
Yes	This already occurs with Music.	Agree			This is hard to understand. Do you mean in addition to subjects already listed? Wouldn't that mean more foundational study at Level 1?	No			2020-02-20 15:54:14	ANON-YFPW-R96M-M	2020-02-20 15:54:14	2020-02-20 15:54:24
Yes	Proposed table is quite specific in some areas, and very general in others. Eg English, Maths and Science - only one L1 learning area but each language gets 4 standards? And why is History still a L1 course when Chemistry isn't?	Strongly disagree	Ridiculous to reduce Science down to 4 standards. The specialist knowledge must start to develop from L1 in order to branch successfully into 4 subjects. Why does Ag/Hort get the same number of standards as Science? The numbers in Science are SOOOO much higher! As are the number of students who specialise in L2/3 specialist sciences. This is a kick in the face for science teachers across the country.	If each language has individually 4 standards, why doesn't Chem/Phys/Bio/ESS etc? We want to start integrating our science assessments into other programs, and this signals the end of L1 science, which will affect numbers in the subjects we WANT to get people into. Such a huge oversight.		Yes			2020-02-20 15:56:22	ANON-YFPW-R96D-B	2020-02-20 15:56:22	2020-02-20 15:56:29
Yes		Strongly agree		Please do not isolate Design and Visual Communication solely in the Technology bracket, but consider this as an art practice too. It is precisely the cusp between these two supposed discipline areas where DCV resides in any meaningful way. Furthermore, it is the cusp between these two areas that makes DCV such an attractive learning space.		No			2020-02-20 15:58:01	ANON-YFPW-R96X-Y	2020-02-20 15:58:01	2020-02-20 15:58:19
Yes	Generally agreed with this.	Strongly disagree	Some very good components. There are two concerns. Processing Technologies, disappearing, Food Science should be in the Technologies, not Health and PE. Where is Computational Thinking. There is a whole strand of the new curriculum missing. This cannot be subsumed as Digital Technologies, it needs to be explicit. Electronics?	Processing Technologies needs to be in Digital Tech, it is a context for teaching the Technology curriculum. You cannot teach Processing Technologies in PE and Health as the focus is narrow minded Nutrition only. There are pathways in culinary design and academic Hospitality/Technology. These pathways close. Electronics. Is this Science, or Technology, or neither? Is an area of huge growth and potential, just lost to this system?	Computational Thinking Electronics Culinary Design	No			2020-02-20 16:05:17	ANON-YFPW-R96A-8	2020-02-20 16:05:17	2020-02-20 16:05:47
Yes		Agree		no	Performance Music	No			2020-02-20 16:09:01	ANON-YFPW-R96N-N	2020-02-20 16:09:01	2020-02-20 16:09:27
Yes	Very clear	Strongly agree		No	Would like to see statistics as a specialist subject at level 2	No			2020-02-20 16:13:05	ANON-YFPW-R966-W	2020-02-20 16:13:05	2020-02-20 16:13:11
No		Agree		If very little Accounting is to be part of the Commerce subject at Level 1 - then this will need to be taken into consideration when designing the Level 2 Accounting course. Missing this foundation learning will need to be compensated for elsewhere.	None.	No			2020-02-20 16:14:36	ANON-YFPW-R96R-S	2020-02-20 16:14:36	2020-02-20 16:14:53
Yes		Agree	80 credits requirement meant lots of assessments. Too much work for teachers and students.			No			2020-02-20 16:15:11	ANON-YFPW-R96W-X	2020-02-20 16:15:11	2020-02-20 16:15:25
Yes		Undecided	given that the NZ Curriculum is so broad anything would fit	I am unsure of how science will enable students to develop the foundations in physics, chemistry and biology that would be comparable to what counterparts have in other countries such as UK, Australia, Singapore and so on, NZ students already are behind their counterparts and lower numbers choose to go on in science and engineering - so hard to see that what is proposed wont exacerbate the trend. Also does not make sense to me moving art history into history.	NZ studies including NZ history	No			2020-02-20 16:17:12	ANON-YFPW-R964-U	2020-02-20 16:17:12	2020-02-20 16:17:22
Yes		Agree			Financial literacy Agribusiness	No			2020-02-20 16:18:55	ANON-YFPW-R96T-U	2020-02-20 16:18:55	2020-02-20 16:19:05
Yes		Agree				No			2020-02-20 16:19:34	ANON-YFPW-R963-T	2020-02-20 16:19:34	2020-02-20 16:19:49
Yes		Strongly agree				Yes			2020-02-20 16:20:00	ANON-YFPW-R962-S	2020-02-20 16:20:00	2020-02-20 16:20:08
No		Agree				Yes			2020-02-20 16:20:19	ANON-YFPW-R96U-V	2020-02-20 16:20:19	2020-02-20 16:20:28
No		Strongly disagree	Health and PE should not be one subject area. Should remain totally separate at L1	Health and PE should not be one subject area. Should remain totally separate at L1		No			2020-02-20 16:21:40	ANON-YFPW-R96V-X	2020-02-20 16:21:40	2020-02-20 16:22:00

Yes	I didn't think Art History was going to be removed at level 1. I am concerned because while the intention is to broaden learning opportunities for Maori and Pasifika learners to succeed in Art History, the opportunity to re-shape Art history to be accessible and relevant for our most marginalised groups may be potentially lost. Starting with reviewing level one would have provided the SEG an opportunity to collaborate and learn together.	Disagree	My opinion is somewhat biased. My only disagreement sits with Art History at level 1 as I do not agree - strongly that it does fit with History.	Level 1 Art history has lost the opportunity to reinvent itself and be relevant to level 1 learners. I think the more subjects the better. I give teachers more options to consider teaching and learning opportunities ahead of assessment. It would give students and their teachers greater understanding of how these changes may effect level 2 and 3 like a stepping stone, which may dispel any myths and allow time to grasp any changes and adapt teaching and learning. At the moment the classes I teach unfortunately are dictated by the outcomes of assessments and I admit, that this has been a massive struggle. Seeing the switch from assessment first to learning first is an important for a mostly "experienced" workforce and just would have helped. The school where I teach approaches curriculum very differently than most schools. At senior levels project based learning continues through levels 1 - 3. Understanding how the changes will effect such approaches to teaching and learning is important, especially in subjects with low numbers that serve our most at risk communities. Art history as a subject has potential to grow. Its withdrawal from level 1 may have an ongoing effect for level 2 and level 3 numbers.	Apologies, I cannot think.	Yes	yes, I have read it and implement kaupapa Maori approaches whenever I can.		2020-02-20 16:22:27	ANON-YFPW-R9WC-B	2020-02-20 16:22:27	2020-02-20 16:22:50
Yes		Strongly agree				No			2020-02-20 16:20:37	ANON-YFPW-R9WY-1	2020-02-20 16:20:37	2020-02-20 16:24:06
Yes		Undecided		I would like to see Numeracy included again at Level 1 for those young people who do not have the ability to complete multi-step problems for Achievement standards. I would like it to show an adult level of Numeracy. I am not sure if the ones designed to be taken from Year 7 upwards will have that skill level.		No			2020-02-20 16:24:28	ANON-YFPW-R9WS-U	2020-02-20 16:24:28	2020-02-20 16:24:41
No		Undecided	In many cases to succeed at level 2, prior knowledge from level 1 is immensely useful. Whilst having students narrow their options too early can be problematic, it is important that they do have access to subject specific material so that they can thrive at levels 2 and 3.	I am pleased to see Digital Technologies in the list. Having said that, the devil is in the details and at level 1 it is critical that we cater to students who have an interest in Digital Media (DDO) and Programming / Computer Science. Many students have an interest in both and it is important for New Zealand's role on the wider stage that these students are able to take courses that allow them to fully explore both DDO and Computational thinking (and gain separate credits for their efforts).		No			2020-02-20 16:24:30	ANON-YFPW-R9W8-Z	2020-02-20 16:24:30	2020-02-20 16:24:41
Yes		Disagree	Level 1 should have specialization options for science. There is evidence to suggest that allowing students to sit physics, chemistry and biology papers at level 1 enhances learning and ease with which senior sciences can be accessed	See above regarding level 1 science specialization		Yes	No		2020-02-20 16:26:46	ANON-YFPW-R9W9-1	2020-02-20 16:26:46	2020-02-20 16:26:55
Yes		Agree			Outdoor education should be included as it is a key part of many schools curriculum and is critical for our national identity and is shown to engage priority students	No			2020-02-20 16:27:36	ANON-YFPW-R9WG-F	2020-02-20 16:27:36	2020-02-20 16:27:45
No	There was little communication about this. The Science was discussed but not at the expense/removal of specialist sciences	Strongly disagree	Specialist sciences are more than a two year course - my subject physics, will not produce quality NCEA graduates under the proposed model - there is too much content to be covered in two years with only a basic broad introduction at L1	Specialist Sciences as currently		No			2020-02-20 16:27:44	ANON-YFPW-R9WC-S	2020-02-20 16:27:44	2020-02-20 16:27:53
Yes		Strongly agree	Looks fine to me	No		No			2020-02-20 16:27:44	ANON-YFPW-R9WE-D	2020-02-20 16:27:44	2020-02-20 16:27:54
Yes	I am concerned about losing the specific subjects for Chem, Bio and Physics etc at Level 1 and replacing with General Science	Strongly disagree	Specifically with regard to Science. There needs to be a specific knowledge base that students should know and can be assessed on. This seems to have completely disappeared from the proposed Science standards and replaced by long answer/essay/report type assessments. This will severely disadvantage many students who do not find writing an easy option. This will create major barriers to student success and will create greater inequity as more students will not be able to assess the assessments. NZQA appear to be having a big push on STEM and trying to get schools to get more students to take STEM subjects. This will turn many students off Science completely as it will be so bogged down in essay style assessments.	See above	Certainly not in the same way as the ministry have 'developed' Level 1 Science. I am really disappointed with the result and sincerely hope that this is not the final product.	No			2020-02-20 16:27:36	ANON-YFPW-R9WJ-J	2020-02-20 16:27:36	2020-02-20 16:28:01
Yes		Agree				No			2020-02-20 16:28:19	ANON-YFPW-R9WS-W	2020-02-20 16:28:19	2020-02-20 16:28:24
Yes		Agree	I'm a little concerned that the pathways are clear enough for students to see when making their choices	Media studies should not be watered down		Yes			2020-02-20 16:28:54	ANON-YFPW-R9WP-R	2020-02-20 16:28:54	2020-02-20 16:29:05
No	We expected that the standards in specialised subject areas would continue and be available.	Strongly disagree	There is no choice if these ideas are adopted - not impressed.	Schools and Teachers should be able to offer NCEA L1 AS in specialised areas as they currently exist if they deem that is the option that best suits their students and community.	No	No			2020-02-20 16:30:19	ANON-YFPW-R9WF-E	2020-02-20 16:30:19	2020-02-20 16:30:27

Yes		Disagree		There is no Media Studies at L1. Media Studies is a vital subject at L1 for engaging students learning, preparing them for the world around them and future workplaces. As a teacher of Media Studies, I get students who are passionate and excited to learn, I get great numbers through my classes which proves students enjoy it and find value in their learning. I always get very good NCEA results which is another good indicator.		Yes			2020-02-20 16:30:55	ANON-YFPW-R9W1-5	2020-02-20 16:30:55	2020-02-20 16:31:16
No		Strongly disagree		Health and Physical Education should not be a combined subject at level 1.	Separating Health and Physical Education (keeping it the same as current)	Yes			2020-02-20 16:32:15	ANON-YFPW-R9WZ-2	2020-02-20 16:32:15	2020-02-20 16:32:25
Yes		Agree				No			2020-02-20 16:32:32	ANON-YFPW-R9WH-G	2020-02-20 16:32:32	2020-02-20 16:32:40
Yes	I 100% support this move - it is 20 year overdue :)	Strongly agree	As an accounting and economics teacher, I fully support the move to combine commerce subjects with more emphasis on economics and business studies at Level 1. The only place for some accounting knowledge at Level 1 is through some component of personal budgeting and financial literacy which should be incorporated into the Level 1 commerce subject.	Financial literacy should be incorporated into the Level 1 commerce subject - it is such a key skill for the 21st Century.	Financial literacy in some form or taught through a Level 2/3 accounting programme should definitely be a major consideration for Level 2 and 3. This should include the likes of managing student loans and Kiwisaver along with the ideas of good debt (like a mortgage on a house which may well appreciate in value) versus "bad debt" like hire purchase and poor understanding of credit card debt	No			2020-02-20 16:32:33	ANON-YFPW-R9WB-A	2020-02-20 16:32:33	2020-02-20 16:32:58
No		Strongly agree		Physical Education and Health a TWO very different subject and cater for a wide and different range of students, it would be a huge loss to our community and students to combine these subject at Level One.		Yes			2020-02-20 16:33:16	ANON-YFPW-R9WM-N	2020-02-20 16:33:16	2020-02-20 16:33:27
No		Undecided		N/A	Technology Soft Materials	No		N/A	2020-02-20 16:34:24	ANON-YFPW-R9WX-Z	2020-02-20 16:34:24	2020-02-20 16:34:31
Yes		Agree				No			2020-02-20 16:34:48	ANON-YFPW-R9WA-9	2020-02-20 16:34:48	2020-02-20 16:35:04
Yes		Strongly agree		As a Home Economics teacher I'm looking forward to the change to Food Science being featured.		No			2020-02-20 16:35:06	ANON-YFPW-R9WK-K	2020-02-20 16:35:06	2020-02-20 16:35:23
No	We should not restrict ourselves. There is scope currently for schools to mix and match achievement standards as they see fit to make general courses if they think it is relevant to their community. There already is the ability to do this or go with traditional subjects. Why then restrict ourselves by creating only the combined general classes. All we should do is educate schools on how to use NCEA to create broad subject courses if this is what they wish to pursue.	Disagree	As above, leave them as is and don't restrict ourselves.	I am focused mainly on the Health & PE side. There is no need to combine it at Level 1. If schools wish to combine it then they should just create their own joint course with a mix of PE & Health standards which they see fit. No need to restrict everyone making this change. You can already do with NCEA what are are trying to by making this change.		No			2020-02-20 16:35:57	ANON-YFPW-R9WG-X	2020-02-20 16:35:57	2020-02-20 16:36:13
Yes		Disagree	Keep Latin in, promote a broad concept of knowledge and its worth, not just a school-job utility-based approach. Latin is one of the cornerstones of our academic traditions. If looking purely at utility, it's of great help to med and law students.	Keep Latin in, promote a broad concept of knowledge and its worth, not just a school-job utility-based approach. Latin is one of the cornerstones of our academic traditions. If looking purely at utility, it's of great help to med and law students. Small student numbers don't indicate worth - niche subjects have their place.		Yes	No		2020-02-20 16:36:50	ANON-YFPW-R9WR-T	2020-02-20 16:36:50	2020-02-20 16:36:56
Yes		Agree				No			2020-02-20 16:39:25	ANON-YFPW-R9WW-Y	2020-02-20 16:39:25	2020-02-20 16:39:40
Yes		Agree		As a secondary teacher I am concerned that the growing problem of illiteracy and innumeracy is not being addressed prior to students commencing NCEA.		No			2020-02-20 16:42:17	ANON-YFPW-R9W4-V	2020-02-20 16:42:17	2020-02-20 16:42:43
Yes		Agree				Yes			2020-02-20 16:42:33	ANON-YFPW-R9WT-V	2020-02-20 16:42:33	2020-02-20 16:42:53
Yes		Strongly agree				Yes			2020-02-20 16:42:51	ANON-YFPW-R9W3-U	2020-02-20 16:42:51	2020-02-20 16:43:05
No		Strongly disagree	I believe health and pe should be separate. The topics are too wide to cover purposely in a whole year and some students have passion for one but not the other. Also in a society where we have a growing mental health crisis, obesity, disease etc. It is ridiculous to think that all of these key things can be discussed in a level 1 course without jeopardising the pe curriculum at the same time. Both are so different and can't be grouped together.	As above- health and pe should be separate	No	Yes	No		2020-02-20 16:43:56	ANON-YFPW-R9W2-T	2020-02-20 16:43:56	2020-02-20 16:44:11
No		Strongly disagree	Health and physical education at level 1 are so incredibly different and fit completely different students. If you collapse this into 1 you will be ruining the purpose of both these subjects and it will make students go away from taking this subject. This process should be making subjects fit better with our students, o do t believe merging health and PE will do this for our students.	Do not merge health and PE at level one - the essence of these subjects will be lost. We need to have a practical subject for our active students separate to the health standards which target a completely different cohort of students		No			2020-02-20 16:44:21	ANON-YFPW-R9WU-W	2020-02-20 16:44:21	2020-02-20 16:44:36
Yes		Strongly agree				No			2020-02-20 16:44:53	ANON-YFPW-R9ZV-1	2020-02-20 16:44:53	2020-02-20 16:45:06
No		Strongly disagree	I don't think PE and Health should be a combined subject at level 1	Keep Health and PE separate. They are very different subjects and cater for a different type of student.		No			2020-02-20 16:45:41	ANON-YFPW-R9ZC-E	2020-02-20 16:45:41	2020-02-20 16:46:09
Yes		Strongly agree				No			2020-02-20 16:47:31	ANON-YFPW-R9ZS-X	2020-02-20 16:47:31	2020-02-20 16:48:04
No		Strongly agree				No			2020-02-20 16:49:31	ANON-YFPW-R9Z8-3	2020-02-20 16:49:31	2020-02-20 16:49:50

No		Disagree		Discontinue "English" as a subject at Level 1 and combine it with Media Studies, creating a new compulsory subject "Communication". As an NCEA English teacher I spend less and less time teaching the English language as a vehicle for communication and more and more time teaching visual literacy (films, graphic stories, static images). Communication then should branch into Communication, English Literature and Media Studies as subjects at Level 2 and 3, with more focus being on the English language as a means of communication in English Literature as a subject, with Communication retaining a balance between visual and written modes of communication. I am concerned with the phasing out of Latin as a subject at Level 1. The teaching of Latin provides English speaking students with valuable insights into the incredibly rich and braided whakapapa of their own language and enables students to develop clear understandings into processes of linguistic evolution and language change across time. This in turn reduces socially unhealthy ethno-essentialist approaches to language understanding. The reduction of possibilities for learning this foundational language would reduce the overall cultural flexibility and sophistication of students going through the NCEA system and	See above ie Communication and English Literature	No			2020-02-20 16:50:11	ANON-YFPW-R929-4	2020-02-20 16:50:11	2020-02-20 16:50:48
Yes		Strongly disagree	Reducing the number of standards does not cater to all learners and reduces flexibility	Reducing all the science subjects into 1 reduces flexibility and diversity for learners - and integration of psychology in social science - psychology is a stand alone specialised subject. Don't make any changes, it will just add stress to teachers and students unless it is for proper radical change - eg project based adaptability, integration of cross curricula subjects		No			2020-02-20 16:50:51	ANON-YFPW-R92G-J	2020-02-20 16:50:51	2020-02-20 16:51:03
Yes		Agree				Yes			2020-02-20 16:50:52	ANON-YFPW-R92I-N	2020-02-20 16:50:52	2020-02-20 16:51:10
Yes		Strongly agree				No			2020-02-20 16:50:58	ANON-YFPW-R92Q-V	2020-02-20 16:50:58	2020-02-20 16:51:12
No		Disagree	There are too many languages. People that do french only do it because there is nothing else they want to do. The fact that there is a religious studies is stupid because many will do it just because they can't do anything else.	French is irrelevant because many don't learn even after doing it for years mainly because no one is truly interested in the subject. There should be a P.E class that focuses completely on physical enhancement. This would be more effective for those who have a chosen sport outside of school and don't have time to work out.	Social class. People who struggle to create friends in classes are randomly selected and put in the same class and learn about the most rational option that the class agrees on.	No			2020-02-20 16:53:10	ANON-YFPW-R92E-G	2020-02-20 16:53:10	2020-02-20 16:53:26
No	How is getting rid of specialised subjects making L1 more foundational? Classical Studies is not just an offshoot of History. L1 Classics could be used as a foundational course like History and Geography to feed into other Social Sciences.	Strongly disagree	Classical Studies is not just a study of History, but of human nature in Ancient times which is still VERY relevant in a modern context both globally and in NZ. It seems as though there was a big generalisation on what this subject is about.	It seems as though this proposal does not fully understand how some of the proposed subjects to be excluded work. They can be foundational subjects for students to go into more specialisation. The Classical Studies course for example has a general and foundational overview of using and interpreting sources, teaching historical empathy, comparing and contrasting with other cultures. These are just some of the skills taught which are foundational pieces for all Social Sciences subjects.		No	I have not had much information on this or if it had been given it was not clear at all.		2020-02-20 16:54:17	ANON-YFPW-R92P-U	2020-02-20 16:54:17	2020-02-20 16:54:24
No		Strongly disagree	Strongly disagree with health and PE becoming one subject.	Health and PE should NOT be merged into one subject at NCEA level 1 - they are different subjects which have different aims and themes.	N/a	Yes	N/a		2020-02-20 16:54:57	ANON-YFPW-R927-2	2020-02-20 16:54:57	2020-02-20 16:55:08
Yes		Strongly agree		Like that both maths and science are one subject and not statistics or Biology or chemistry. No early specialisation	At L2 Both Maths and science could be broken into subjects like calculus Chemistry etc	No			2020-02-20 16:55:42	ANON-YFPW-R92F-H	2020-02-20 16:55:42	2020-02-20 16:55:56
Yes		Disagree		I would be really opposed to see health and PE get lumped together for level 1. I think health attracts different students (not your typical PE kids) so to put both subjects together will be a huge loss and many students would miss out.		No			2020-02-20 16:57:12	ANON-YFPW-R92I-V	2020-02-20 16:57:12	2020-02-20 16:57:54
No		Disagree		I don't feel PE and Health should be combined. We have students that choose Health, who would not do it if combined and a number of our students who take PE, would not take it if it was combined into one subject. I can understand for some subjects but definitely not these two.	Fitness Outdoor Education	No			2020-02-20 16:59:12	ANON-YFPW-R92Z-5	2020-02-20 16:59:12	2020-02-20 16:59:25
Yes		Agree				No	I am not a Maori speaker so haven't read it but do know if it's existence		2020-02-20 16:59:33	ANON-YFPW-R92H-K	2020-02-20 16:59:33	2020-02-20 17:00:01
Yes		Agree		Media studies would be better suited under the English curriculum.		Yes			2020-02-20 17:00:30	ANON-YFPW-R92B-D	2020-02-20 17:00:30	2020-02-20 17:00:44
Yes		Agree				No			2020-02-20 17:01:20	ANON-YFPW-R92M-R	2020-02-20 17:01:20	2020-02-20 17:01:30
No		Agree				No			2020-02-20 17:02:01	ANON-YFPW-R92A-C	2020-02-20 17:02:01	2020-02-20 17:02:08

Yes		Strongly agree		I love the fact that Home Economics will now be food science	No	No			2020-02-20 17:01:59	ANON-YFPW-R92X-3	2020-02-20 17:01:59	2020-02-20 17:02:12
No	As a teacher this is the first I have heard of this plan	Strongly disagree	It would appear that most subjects are unchanged, however, three distinct and diverse subjects have been bundled as Commerce. The other subjects that appear to have been stream lined generally already are taught in that way, ie Science and PE & Health Glad to see Religious Studies remains in our secular society, but not the Commerce specialities, you know the subjects which are the most Real World currently available to students. Thanks for reposting to kill our subjects and basically write of our teaching careers	See above Accounting Business Studies and Economics should all remain individual subjects. The proposal to make them only accessible at Level 2 is ridiculous, this will increase the workload needed at Level 2, which seems counterintuitive. Where will the Financial Literacy that many, many thousands of New Zealanders lack come from. And Financial Literacy is not a suitable intro to specialist Commerce subjects.	If it ain't broke, don't try to fix it.	Yes		Do you mean question 5?	2020-02-20 17:01:51	ANON-YFPW-R92D-F	2020-02-20 17:01:51	2020-02-20 17:02:19
No		Undecided				Yes			2020-02-20 17:03:00	ANON-YFPW-R92N-5	2020-02-20 17:03:00	2020-02-20 17:03:11
Yes		Strongly disagree	* combining health and physical education at level 1 does not meet the needs of our young people. With more pressure on health and pe to help reduce mental health issues in nz, collapsing these together reduces time and contact with students to achieve improved mental health.	Physical education and health should stay separate, they are significantly large in and of themselves.	Outdoor Education	No			2020-02-20 17:03:42	ANON-YFPW-R92K-P	2020-02-20 17:03:42	2020-02-20 17:04:04
Yes		Disagree	Physical Education and Health are two distinct subjects. Given the increasing rates of obesity and teenage mental health issues they should be maintained as distinct subjects	Physical Education and Health are two distinct subjects. Given the increasing rates of obesity and teenage mental health issues they should be maintained as distinct subjects		No			2020-02-20 17:05:18	ANON-YFPW-R92E-1	2020-02-20 17:05:18	2020-02-20 17:05:31
Yes		Strongly agree		Really good it's still Maths and Stats, distinguishing the two. This gives a broad focus at Level 1 in this area, leaving it open to specialise in Level 2.		No			2020-02-20 17:05:39	ANON-YFPW-R92R-W	2020-02-20 17:05:39	2020-02-20 17:05:58
Yes		Agree	Really like the addition of Māori performing arts		Not a particular subject as per say although it could be but having a big emphasis on 'Marine Science' given it's current and ever growing importance in today's world. If it were to be stand alone subject, students would be exposed to a wide variety of scientific domains due to marine science being in its very nature, an interdisciplinary field. Has lots of practical and real world applications for students and setting up some strong research programs which students could be assessed alongside would not be overly difficult in my opinion. As we need more marine scientists in this country, I believe a larger focus on marine science is needed regardless of how it is implemented or how it would look.	No	My te reo Māori is not at a good enough level to currently read through the document in te reo. However, I am aware of certain aspects and themes that run through it that come from certain words in te reo and what they mean in the Māori worldview		2020-02-20 17:05:57	ANON-YFPW-R924-Y	2020-02-20 17:05:57	2020-02-20 17:06:15
Yes	Broad, more functional doesn't necessarily help students jump into specific sciences. This will take away specificity at year 9 and 10 and can potentially really drag down students taking science at university. I think it will mean that schools will vary more in how they offer subjects. It could mean that students are taking year 12 when they are younger as differentiation will happen.	Disagree		Science is a 2 part subject - skills and content. A lot of teachers (myself included), teach the content, then the skills and then fit it into the No5 strand. Sometimes we start with No5, but content is such a huge part of science. By cutting out the content, the workload has increased exponentially, as we don't really have any frames to go on. The 3 junior levels (9,10 & 11) scaffold students into senior sciences which suddenly have a lot more information involved. It is unclear, how this will help.	Level 2 and 3 Biology have hardly any human biology in it	Yes		-	2020-02-20 17:05:56	ANON-YFPW-R92W-2	2020-02-20 17:05:56	2020-02-20 17:06:22
No		Disagree		Home Economics should stay - enough 'science' in the curriculum.	Education for Sustainability	Yes			2020-02-20 17:07:15	ANON-YFPW-R92T-Y	2020-02-20 17:07:15	2020-02-20 17:07:22
Yes		Strongly agree		No	No	Yes	No		2020-02-20 17:08:14	ANON-YFPW-R923-X	2020-02-20 17:08:14	2020-02-20 17:08:21
No		Agree				No			2020-02-20 17:08:34	ANON-YFPW-R922-W	2020-02-20 17:08:34	2020-02-20 17:08:56
Yes		Strongly disagree	The removal of generic technology weakens the conceptual framework of technology and potentially returns to a skill based focu			Yes			2020-02-20 17:09:39	ANON-YFPW-R92U-Z	2020-02-20 17:09:39	2020-02-20 17:09:51
Yes		Strongly disagree		Not enough specialized content to prepare students for level 2 sciences.		Yes			2020-02-20 17:12:28	ANON-YFPW-R9AC-N	2020-02-20 17:12:28	2020-02-20 17:12:54
Yes		Agree	Doesn't seem to be a major change for most schools. Main change seems to be in science.			No			2020-02-20 17:14:32	ANON-YFPW-R9AS-5	2020-02-20 17:14:32	2020-02-20 17:14:49
No		Undecided		Specifically for HPE curriculum. Health and physical education need to be kept as two separate options for students. It encourages so many more students to take the options that fall under the HPE banner		Yes			2020-02-20 17:20:17	ANON-YFPW-R9AB-A	2020-02-20 17:20:17	2020-02-20 17:20:27
Yes		Strongly disagree	Some schools would be advantaged by specializing more at Level 1 We should maintain these subject specialities at Level 1 for those who want this option	I disagree with rolling 4 sciences into 1 ie Biology, Chemistry, Earth and Space Science, and Physics into Science - it cuts down on options and specialization and makes the curriculum narrower at this level	No I disagree with this move	Yes		Go for it - the more the merrier in fact all subjects should be offered in te reo in all schools as a priority	2020-02-20 17:21:03	ANON-YFPW-R9A9-B	2020-02-20 17:21:03	2020-02-20 17:21:12

Yes	I was a Member of NCEA Achievement Standard Reference Group (Technology) and Curriculum Essence Review Group (Technology).	Undecided	I agree with the need for generic Technology standards (which is what I am assuming that the first part of the Technology section is referring to) I disagree with Home Economics being connected to Processing Technologies - this is a backward step and NOT representative of the discussions during the review meetings. Home Economics and Processing Technologies have conflicting conceptual frameworks. I wonder why the contributions from academics whose research in this field (at PhD level) is being ignored? Food Science is NOT Technology, unless it is situated within a product design/development context. If this proposal is endorsed it will be to the detriment of food technology - an industry needed for the future of New Zealand.	As above. I feel like my time has been wasted attending the numerous meetings last year. The premise of consultation was clearly rhetoric.	As it isn't right at Level 1, the issue will just be perpetuated in Levels 2 and 3.	No			2020-02-20 17:21:21	ANON-YFPW-R9AG-5	2020-02-20 17:21:21	2020-02-20 17:21:35
Yes		Agree		No further suggestions		No			2020-02-20 17:22:07	ANON-YFPW-R9AJ-V	2020-02-20 17:22:07	2020-02-20 17:22:19
No		Agree	It looks like a good range and eliminates a few questionable subjects.		Geography as an essential and history	No			2020-02-20 17:23:03	ANON-YFPW-R9AQ-3	2020-02-20 17:23:03	2020-02-20 17:23:17
Yes		Disagree	High level Science has been destroyed by this. Holds students back. Dis appointing that Accounting Economics and Business Studies are combined. Each serves a different student need and different types of students	Multiple languages. At going to become less relevant as time passes	Keep Economics Accounting and Business Studies separate. Seems very anti business this change	No			2020-02-20 17:23:57	ANON-YFPW-R9AE-Q	2020-02-20 17:23:57	2020-02-20 17:24:10
Yes		Strongly agree		Agricultural and Horticultural science are essential for Aotearoa's future.		No			2020-02-20 17:24:37	ANON-YFPW-R9AS-7	2020-02-20 17:24:37	2020-02-20 17:24:45
Yes		Agree				No			2020-02-20 17:25:50	ANON-YFPW-R9AF-R	2020-02-20 17:25:50	2020-02-20 17:26:04
Yes		Undecided	Where does English Language formerly esol sit.	I am hoping missing EL is an oversight as it forms an important support for migrant pathways.	English Language as it helps migrants with options for University and other tertiary study in NZ.	Yes	No		2020-02-20 17:25:40	ANON-YFPW-R9AF-9	2020-02-20 17:25:40	2020-02-20 17:26:06
Yes		Agree	Accounting is hard for many students to pick up at level 2 and level 1 provides opportunity to teach basic skills useful in everyday life which is sadly lacking in most students.	See above		Yes			2020-02-20 17:27:35	ANON-YFPW-R9AJ-3	2020-02-20 17:27:35	2020-02-20 17:27:44
No		Strongly disagree		Health and PE change is a terrible idea obviously thought up by an academic that has not been in a level 1 classroom and a separate Level 1 Health classroom. The students are totally different. This would decimate our numbers. Students who love PE wouldn't take it because of the health component. Health students won't take it because of the PE component. PE teaches skills such as self management and interpersonal skills. Foundation skills if ever I saw some. Absolutely ridiculous idea you cannot be serious.		No			2020-02-20 17:27:44	ANON-YFPW-R9AZ-C	2020-02-20 17:27:44	2020-02-20 17:28:00
No		Strongly disagree	I strongly disagree with the removal of Level 1 Biology standards. I am the TIC of a year 11 Health Science Academy which is built to cater for lower level students preparing them for level 2 Bio. The end goal of these students is to enter health careers such as nursing. We use the Bio level 1 standards in combination with level 1 standards in our 8 hour a week course and it really prepares these students to have a strong base to launch into year 12 with	Level 1 Bio standards must stay. They provide content that is not available in level 2,3 bio standards such as mammals as consumers. It provides us to add more diversity such as offering a careers based double science.	Health science or human biology	No			2020-02-20 17:28:40	ANON-YFPW-R9AH-T	2020-02-20 17:28:40	2020-02-20 17:29:26
Yes	Yes, however I was not aware that science would remove the areas of Physics, Chemistry, Earth or Earth and Space science.	Strongly disagree	I would like to see the continuation of the specialist subject areas alongside the currently changed L1 science standards. 33 standards down to 4 is more drastic than collapsing a couple of subjects which had small numbers. This will lead to less students taking science.	Include L1 Chemistry, Physics and Biology as subject areas.	No.	Yes			2020-02-20 17:29:43	ANON-YFPW-R9AB-M	2020-02-20 17:29:43	2020-02-20 17:29:50
Yes		Strongly disagree	As a commerce teacher, I would be concerned if we were offering a hybrid of accounting, economics and business. In my experience students wanting to do business choose the subject because of its entrepreneurial and innovation aspect, rather than the black and white of economic and accounting. I hope this does not dilute business which is hugely successful in the school and really important to develop 21c skills. I really believe this would be a retrospective step in the curriculum.	As a commerce teacher, I would be concerned if we were offering a hybrid of accounting, economics and business. In my experience students wanting to do business choose the subject because of its entrepreneurial and innovation aspect, rather than the black and white of economic and accounting. I hope this does not dilute business which is hugely successful in the school and really important to develop 21c skills. I really believe this would be a retrospective step in the curriculum.	I would love to see an innovation and Enterprise Course at both level 2 and 3 which incorporated the ability to run a business for the duration of the year, social media, digital tools to help businesses - bring it up to 2020!. Practical and valuable 97% of businesses in NZ are small. Universities are moving swiftly towards more practical courses so I believe we should be aligned to what industry says they need from our future workforce	Yes	No		2020-02-20 17:30:14	ANON-YFPW-R9AM-Y	2020-02-20 17:30:14	2020-02-20 17:30:32
Yes		Strongly agree				No			2020-02-20 17:30:46	ANON-YFPW-R9AD-P	2020-02-20 17:30:46	2020-02-20 17:30:57
Yes		Strongly disagree	The omission of Media Studies from this list is shortsighted given the pervasive nature of Media in student's lives.	I've mostly covered it above, but also believe that in order to support the ethical and purposeful production of digital outcomes, targeted at a specific audience, the skills and knowledge Media Studies offers are key.		No			2020-02-20 17:31:20	ANON-YFPW-R9AX-A	2020-02-20 17:31:20	2020-02-20 17:31:32
Yes		Strongly agree	I feel this would help students. A good stepping stone into level 2 and 3. This will also reduce workload for students and teachers alike.	I agree with commerce. We already run a economics and business studies course. We have phased out accounting. I agree with Maori performance		No			2020-02-20 17:34:32	ANON-YFPW-R9AA-K	2020-02-20 17:34:32	2020-02-20 17:34:44
Yes		Undecided				No			2020-02-20 17:34:43	ANON-YFPW-R9AN-Z	2020-02-20 17:34:43	2020-02-20 17:34:59
No		Strongly disagree				Yes			2020-02-20 17:35:15	ANON-YFPW-R9AK-W	2020-02-20 17:35:15	2020-02-20 17:35:27
Yes		Strongly agree				No			2020-02-20 17:35:42	ANON-YFPW-R9AG-8	2020-02-20 17:35:42	2020-02-20 17:35:50

Yes		Strongly disagree	The L1 science specialist subjects should remain. We have full L1 programmes with L1 specialist teachers within our school.	Include them. Reducing such a large amount of content and context into 4 very directed standards is not going to work.	No, maintain the status quo.	No	I am familiar with it, not all the content.		2020-02-20 17:36:01	ANON-YFPW-R9AR-4	2020-02-20 17:36:01	2020-02-20 17:36:06
No	I totally support this approach and congratulate the decision makers on keeping things broad at Level 1.	Strongly agree		Although it doesn't fit into a subject I'd still like to see some standards around learning dispositions that could be applied in all subject contexts	Innovation, Rangiratanga,	Yes			2020-02-20 17:37:22	ANON-YFPW-R9AW-9	2020-02-20 17:37:22	2020-02-20 17:37:33
Yes		Strongly agree			Financial literacy	No			2020-02-20 17:37:34	ANON-YFPW-R9AA-6	2020-02-20 17:37:34	2020-02-20 17:37:48
Yes		Agree				No			2020-02-20 17:37:46	ANON-YFPW-R9AT-6	2020-02-20 17:37:46	2020-02-20 17:37:54
Yes		Undecided			Performing arts technology	Yes			2020-02-20 17:38:25	ANON-YFPW-R9A3-5	2020-02-20 17:38:25	2020-02-20 17:38:41
Yes		Agree	Hoping that sustainability will be a core content area that crosses all subjects at Level 1 to support Level 2 and 3 specialisation. Sustainable actions are a good hook for Level 1 students Hoping that sustainability will be a core content area that crosses all subjects at Level 1 to support Level 2 and 3 specialisation. Sustainable actions are a good hook for Level 1 students	See above		No			2020-02-20 17:39:58	ANON-YFPW-R9A2-4	2020-02-20 17:39:58	2020-02-20 17:40:06
No		Strongly agree				Yes			2020-02-20 17:40:38	ANON-YFPW-R9AU-7	2020-02-20 17:40:38	2020-02-20 17:40:56
Yes		Strongly agree				No			2020-02-20 17:44:12	ANON-YFPW-R9ZV-5	2020-02-20 17:44:12	2020-02-20 17:44:21
No		Strongly agree				No			2020-02-20 17:44:20	ANON-YFPW-R9ZC-6	2020-02-20 17:44:20	2020-02-20 17:44:27
No	I feel that we don't specialise early enough	Strongly disagree	Health should not be taught & condensed with PE. They are 2 very different subjects in their own right especially at level 1. To condense it will lose the importance of health as a subject in its own right, in which we have fought hard for. The importance would be lost & PE would take over.	Yes, health should not be taught with PE at level 1. It should be its own subject at level 1, it is vital for our young people & the content is so valuable it should not be lost by being taught with PE. We say health & wellbeing are important today yet we are not prioritising it as a subject at level 1.	No	No			2020-02-20 17:44:02	ANON-YFPW-R9ZV-2	2020-02-20 17:44:02	2020-02-20 17:44:37
No		Strongly disagree				No			2020-02-20 17:44:31	ANON-YFPW-R9ZS-P	2020-02-20 17:44:31	2020-02-20 17:44:39
Yes		Strongly disagree	Placing Health and PE into 1 subject is a major concern. We have a lot of different classes at Level 1 for the reason that our PE and Health students are quite different. Yes we get some that take both subjects but I have a majority that like to do one or the other. We have a class of students this year who love Health but dislike PE with a passion. (and the opposite way round) A combined course would result in our students not having the passion. The only way I could ever see this working is if the re designed standards are generic enough to have a PE or Health focus on them.	Health and PE remain as 2 separate subjects = see notes above. The subjects are very different and often attract very different students.	Health and PE have to be separate subjects at Level 2 + 3	No			2020-02-20 17:45:17	ANON-YFPW-R9Z9-V	2020-02-20 17:45:17	2020-02-20 17:45:37
No	I am a secondary teacher and I consider myself well informed but I had no idea that we would be facing a loss of choice at Level 1. By combining economics and business studies you will kill business studies as a subject because the basic concepts of economics take a full year to cover. You will deprive students of the opportunity of the practical aspect of developing and selling a product which is where our entrepreneurial students gravitate and excel.	Strongly disagree	As above. Removing choice and limiting scope for students of different abilities and passions.	As above Economics and Business studies cater for a very different student in terms of ability and passion.	Legal studies needs to be reviewed to be an achievement standard.	No			2020-02-20 17:45:15	ANON-YFPW-R9Z8-U	2020-02-20 17:45:15	2020-02-20 17:45:39
Yes	I knew that was the idea, but had no idea that the cutting of specific subjects would be quite so broad. Media Studies in our school is a very distinct and hugely popular option. To make the vehicle by which students do social studies will make the specific media skills such as critiquing and film skills difficult to do. As a social studies teacher I am not sure that current media teachers have the knowledge to deliver a social studies human rights programme, which is what level 1 social studies is all about	Undecided	I feel there have been some mis-steps. Why is religious studies picked out of all the humanities as the only one that stays protected.	The skills we teach at level 1 that are specific to our humanities subject are very important for the level 2 programmes. A broad general programme will not help them to progress to a more specialised subject at level 2. A lot of students know exactly what they want to do and the topics they want. If a programme can be delivered via Media or Psychology medium then why not have them as a subject still? I am a senior social studies teacher and I am glad that this staying as the human rights focus is imperative - they learn so much that makes them better students and people. It is in essence a civics programme in the form I deliver it.	I just want to make sure that Social Studies remains on the list without its heart being taken out. Assessments have got more vague and harder to decipher there needs to be clarity over the requirements and far more consultation with 'chalk face' teachers The neutrality of the assessments needs to remain at both levels so teachers can have students engage using topics of their choice that fit the criteria - PLEASE do make things over specified inserting topics that you think students will like, but in reality they have zero interest in.	No			2020-02-20 17:45:20	ANON-YFPW-R9Z6-A	2020-02-20 17:45:20	2020-02-20 17:45:40
Yes		Strongly disagree	There is a devaluing of current subjects by lumping them into broader contexts. It is making subjects compete for time and is not allowing students broad choice as level 1 does now. It will also have an inflow effect for subjects at level 2 and 3 that would not have a level one curriculum.	To lump Classical Studies under History is to lack understanding in what Classical Studies teaches and offers to students both knowledge wise and skill wise. We are a broad interdisciplinary subject area of our own with huge relevance to young people's worlds and allowing them to make connections across time. We are not just 'history'		No			2020-02-20 17:45:54	ANON-YFPW-R9Z1-D	2020-02-20 17:45:54	2020-02-20 17:46:05
Yes		Disagree	I feel Science has been narrowed too much. Some form of assessment for each context strand should be available.	The lack of Achievement Standards that explicitly assess the context strands of Science limits choice in course design and removes any benchmark to measure preparedness for senior courses between schools. Even a single external for each of the context strands would address this	Not from my area of interest which is the Sciences.	No			2020-02-20 17:47:43	ANON-YFPW-R9ZQ-M	2020-02-20 17:47:43	2020-02-20 17:47:56

Yes		Agree	I support the inclusion of Maori Performing Arts. I don't know enough from a science point of view to comment on the changes to science and I'm guessing the voices from science will tell you that but I am aware that our school has delivered the separate standards from the different areas of science and used them as prerequisites for further study in the separate disciplines so I would be concerned if science teachers were concerned that the subject specific knowledge for level 2 would be at risk.	Not an objection to the changes - just an observation that in the past where changes have been made (eg alignment) that teachers have just tried to find ways to carry on teaching what they have always taught...so there may be an issue with subjects eg history that are supposed to have a history heavy focus, if taken over by teachers previously teaching classics or media studies that these become overly incorporated if the standards are not designed carefully enough to disincentivise this.		No			2020-02-20 17:49:02	ANON-YFPW-R92E-8	2020-02-20 17:49:02	2020-02-20 17:49:17
No	Interesting idea - I think this is positive for level 1 students.	Undecided	I support this idea but I also have concerns. The level 2 & 3 commerce subjects will need looked at because if students don't have all the foundation info from level 1, there will be some serious gaps at senior school which will impact on grades, scholarships etc.	As above. Commerce would be a good idea but has really big flow on effects to the senior subjects with the gaps of info the students will be missing from not specialising earlier.		No			2020-02-20 17:49:55	ANON-YFPW-R92S-R	2020-02-20 17:49:55	2020-02-20 17:50:03
No		Agree	In principle I support a broader definition for science at level 1 and more specialised at level 2/3 specifically pathways that prepare students for tertiary study. It would help if the whole plan for level 1-3 was revealed to prevent panic and conjecture of teachers in many institutions.	It would help if the whole plan for level 1-3 was revealed to prevent panic and conjecture of teachers in many institutions. General level 1 science and more specialised level 2 and 3 would make many people happy.	For science: biology, chemistry, physics, ess, environment	No	There should not be separate curricula! It should be entwined. It's like educational apartheid. Very disappointing development.		2020-02-20 17:53:45	ANON-YFPW-R92P-K	2020-02-20 17:53:45	2020-02-20 17:54:00
Yes		Agree	Overall I think the list of subjects allows for later specialization and shows good pathways for subjects throughout the levels.	I think it is a shame to just drop Art History. Could it be included in the Visual Arts or included in the new 'History' collaboration with Classical Studies? Since Art History does not have its own curriculum area it will be difficult to retain numbers if the students do not see the connections between level one 'subjects' and its inclusion in level two as a separate area.	N/A	Yes	N/A		2020-02-20 17:57:20	ANON-YFPW-R92F-9	2020-02-20 17:57:20	2020-02-20 17:57:45
Yes		Disagree	The change from Home Economics to Food Science has me concerned. More clarification needs to be given around what this name change actually means. Does this mean there will be a greater focus on the science aspect? Will we be losing other parts of the curriculum such as Nutrition, and the societal and well-being aspects? What is the justification for the name change? If the name change does reflect a change in the curriculum content and achievement standards available, will this still meet the needs of our students?		Tourism. This is NZ's largest export earner, and one of the biggest employers worldwide. As a university subject it seems ridiculous that I cannot offer our school students a university approved subject in Level 3, especially considering the expected growth in the industry in the next five years, and the number of jobs that will be available.	No			2020-02-20 18:00:45	ANON-YFPW-R92I-M	2020-02-20 18:00:45	2020-02-20 18:00:52
No		Disagree	Some changes work well and others dont	Health and Physical Education need to be separate		No			2020-02-20 18:01:40	ANON-YFPW-R92Z-W	2020-02-20 18:01:40	2020-02-20 18:02:12
No		Strongly disagree	I believe that the current subjects allow students to get a better understanding of the information given. As a former student who has chosen some of these studies that are proposed to be combined with others, I know how in depth these subjects go and don't believe this level of knowledge will be achieved if they are combined.	I do not believe level one health should be combined with level one PE. Health classes focus on different subjects that I believe need to stay as an individual subject as you will not learn all these in a combined class. Subjects will not be as in depth as in an individual class.		No			2020-02-20 18:05:23	ANON-YFPW-R92H-B	2020-02-20 18:05:23	2020-02-20 18:05:39
No	Wow, getting rid of the option for level 1 bio chem earth and space is a bad idea. This enables school to curtail assessments designed specifically around our students. This will make them hate science more and not extend the academic students. Let's dumb nz down	Strongly disagree	Keep bio chem physics and earth and space. Other decisions are fine	Science- shrinking it just to the nos will be incredibly hard to follow it on with "specialists" in level two. I thought we wanted more scientists in nz- this will get rid of this option. Also ruin the Flexibility that schools currently have- especially with the juniors doing cross curricula. Please don't dumb science down	Please put education for sustainability in science domain! Would love to teach that again. More options for current affairs- climate change, human biology.	No			2020-02-20 18:05:52	ANON-YFPW-R92B-5	2020-02-20 18:05:52	2020-02-20 18:06:09
No		Agree				No			2020-02-20 18:06:36	ANON-YFPW-R92M-G	2020-02-20 18:06:36	2020-02-20 18:06:46
Yes		Undecided	The change from specific commerce subjects to a general commerce subject could be difficult for smaller schools who have specialist teachers in one area and don't currently cover all 3 areas. This could also be true for the move from Home Economics to Food Science, where teachers come from a more practical background (ie industry).			No			2020-02-20 18:08:24	ANON-YFPW-R92D-7	2020-02-20 18:08:24	2020-02-20 18:08:33
No	Why is PE and health combining	Strongly disagree	We have a massive mental health issue and then taking away health as a subject that is just ridiculous.	It is hard enough to get through the health topics at the moment and ensure students are given tools to support their well being and now you want to take health as a subject away. Why? I don't get it		No			2020-02-20 18:10:09	ANON-YFPW-R92X-U	2020-02-20 18:10:09	2020-02-20 18:10:30

No	- previous discussions from what I had heard was that it was unknown about whether or not the single sciences would be offered at L1. This is the first I have heard it be confirmed that L1 single sciences will be scrapped.	Disagree	I disagree in regards that the assessments suggested are going to be accessible for all students, and allow particularly Maori and Pasifika students to be able to show their learning successfully. They appear to require a high level of literacy and attendance at school.	I think the jump between L1 single sciences up to L2 single sciences is already large. The jump between L1 general science to L2 single sciences is even larger. The new proposed changes and standards - as they currently appear - are going to make this jump even larger. I think we are going to turn off a lot of students with the required literacy, and despite the fact that I think scientific literacy is very important I would rather have motivated and engaged students in L1 courses. I think we need to keep some standards at the L1 single science subject area. Even if it was a reduced number of standards that schools could then individually select from and use to plan courses to tailor them for the needs of the school. Some schools have high uptakes of students in the science fields (higher than national averages) and as such have offered single science options for those keen at year 11. This has resulted in much better performances and confidence in the L2 single science subjects and many go on to study sciences further at university.		No				2020-02-20 18:11:27	ANON-YFPW-R92A-4	2020-02-20 18:11:27	2020-02-20 18:11:35
No	There was little information that subjects were under threat of removal from curricula and I see nothing that sufficiently explains how a robust education would benefit at all from such a move.	Strongly disagree	These decisions are only going to create limited experience for students - exactly the opposite of meeting their needs in a 21st century context. I think it's more important to remove the number of assessments within ALL subject areas - rather than depleting student choice and reducing opportunity.	For example Art History offers students of Art key opportunities for exploring ideas and development in art, where their own "artistry" is not assessed, or even required. Media Studies is not simply a context of social studies and is a major career pathway opportunity. It would be arrogant to remove it at a high school level, when it's a broad industry and a major subject offered by all tertiary providers.	Again, I think it's better to remove the relentless assessment pressure of the current NCEA system to allow more depth of teaching and learning. No subject needs to be "disqualified".	Yes				2020-02-20 18:12:30	ANON-YFPW-R92N-H	2020-02-20 18:12:30	2020-02-20 18:12:57
Yes		Undecided				No				2020-02-20 18:13:31	ANON-YFPW-R92K-E	2020-02-20 18:13:31	2020-02-20 18:13:43
Yes	Good idea to be more broad. Too many students have options closed to them	Undecided	I'm not sure as I would need to see how the courses can be constructed to support learners. Would be good if more of the assessments supported numeracy	Like the Maori Performing arts.	Continue with the Maori performing arts.	No				2020-02-20 18:13:53	ANON-YFPW-R926-S	2020-02-20 18:13:53	2020-02-20 18:14:03
Yes		Strongly agree	Specialisation at this level has been counter productive to the opportunities provided for learners and in the developing of a rounded student.	Applaud the changes.		No				2020-02-20 18:15:46	ANON-YFPW-R92R-N	2020-02-20 18:15:46	2020-02-20 18:15:56
No	I don't understand what is meant by Technology - Integrated through new Technology subjects. What are the new Technology subjects as no new subjects are listed?	Disagree		An area of high relevance is Digital Technologies. Many schools break this into several different courses - Electronics, Digital Media, Computer Science. These are all quite discrete areas which vitally need more students training in these areas. It would have been great if the review could have recognised this and broadened what is offered in these areas. I am also unsure where Textiles will sit under this proposed list.	Electronics Digital Media Computer Science Textiles	No				2020-02-20 18:16:49	ANON-YFPW-R92W-T	2020-02-20 18:16:49	2020-02-20 18:17:00
Yes		Strongly disagree	I strongly disagree with the removal of level 1 Biology standards.	I would suggest that Level 1 Biology standards be included. This is because they enable science courses which are 2 lines (8 hours rather than 4) for students who have already decided that they love science and want to pursue it as a career. It enables them to get a taste of the specialised sciences before they decide which ones to take at year 12. This gives them a more settled year 12 (without potential changing specialised science subjects)	Human Biology at level 1 for the Health Science Academy's to use.	No				2020-02-20 18:19:03	ANON-YFPW-R924-Q	2020-02-20 18:19:03	2020-02-20 18:19:13
Yes		Agree		Why cant Geography, History, Classical Studies, Tourism and Social Science be integrated into one subject. What is value of teaching French, Spanish and German in the 21st century? Economics should be a stand alone subject along with Financial Literacy	Level 1 Tourism should be axed.	No				2020-02-20 18:19:59	ANON-YFPW-R92T-Q	2020-02-20 18:19:59	2020-02-20 18:20:11
Yes		Undecided				No				2020-02-20 18:23:28	ANON-YFPW-R923-P	2020-02-20 18:23:28	2020-02-20 18:23:40
Yes		Undecided	I am a Health, Physical Education and Outdoor education teacher and the lack of Outdoor Education under the P.e Bracket seems odd as it is just as seperate and different as p.e is to health.	As above around Outdoor education being included. There may be other areas however That area is the one I teach in and am more aware of. The students we see taking Outdoor education are very different to the ones taking P.E and the ones taking Health. They now may not be catered for as they are forced to choose between P.e and OED.		No				2020-02-20 18:23:38	ANON-YFPW-R922-N	2020-02-20 18:23:38	2020-02-20 18:23:46
No		Undecided		Home Economics to Food science- this would totally exclude our people and society sections.	Textile design and pattern making.	No				2020-02-20 18:25:42	ANON-YFPW-R92U-R	2020-02-20 18:25:42	2020-02-20 18:26:18
Yes		Strongly disagree	Health and PE should not be put together at level one. This shows a lack of understanding of the subjects at senior level and in cases contradicts the curriculum. Disappointing this was suggested	Separate health and PE back to individual subjects at level one and beyond	None	No				2020-02-20 18:27:11	ANON-YFPW-R9YV-3	2020-02-20 18:27:11	2020-02-20 18:27:21

Yes	I knew it was being looked at but not the nature of the table	Agree	media studies in level 2 is really specific and I think that condensing it into social where it most likely will not be touched will impact those students who want to go into media/film production.	media studies in level 2 is really specific and I think that condensing it into social where it most likely will not be touched will impact those students who want to go into media/film production.		No			2020-02-20 18:27:42	ANON-YFPW-R9YV-Z	2020-02-20 18:27:42	2020-02-20 18:28:02
Yes	It was mentioned following the NCEA review last year	Agree	Agree with most of the changes. Would like to see the actual break down for something like Level 1 Commerce or Science. What will the standards look like? Will it be an equal mix of Internals and external standards? Similar weighting between standards? Any chance of some Classical contexts in Level 1 History? Some of the micro material aren't specified yet	I think that mostly it looks like a good idea. Perhaps broader studies are a good idea before subject specialisation begins with Levels 2 and 3. At present, Level 1 is quite easy and almost unnecessary as it's just another layer of examinations and lots of separate assessments. Would be better to reduce the number of standards and re-balance the workload for teachers with marking and internal moderation	There should be a foundational subject (similar in some ways to Gateway), which looks at practical skills like basic financial literacy, basic IT skills, perhaps an element like a drivers license. Something to allow for students who may not be as academically gifted to get themselves ready for the workforce.	No			2020-02-20 18:28:10	ANON-YFPW-R9YV-D	2020-02-20 18:28:10	2020-02-20 18:28:30
Yes	Very concerned that food and nutrition becomes food science under technology. We have an obesity problem in NZ and type 2 diabetes, food and nutrition is so important to teach students about healthy diets. Combining Health and PE, would be fantastic to have all schools teaching it at level 1 being compulsory. I do have concerns as above about food and nutrition.	Disagree	Underlying principles not covered	I would like to see students have to take more subjects so achieving a better idea of what areas are of interest for career purposes, Semester course.	Health as a separate subject	No			2020-02-20 18:28:29	ANON-YFPW-R9YS-W	2020-02-20 18:28:29	2020-02-20 18:28:38
Yes		Agree				Yes	none		2020-02-20 18:28:48	ANON-YFPW-R9YS-2	2020-02-20 18:28:48	2020-02-20 18:28:53
No		Strongly disagree	I do not think that economics and accounting should be combined. I do not think that art history or classics should be dropped.	Economics and accounting are quite different subjects, I can't see the advantages to combining them and think it will deter people who are more interested in accountancy. Removing art history and classics in favour of performing arts subjects seems to ignore students interested in academic arts subjects and removes the diversity of cultural subjects offered to students.	No	No			2020-02-20 18:30:37	ANON-YFPW-R9Y9-3	2020-02-20 18:30:37	2020-02-20 18:31:10
Yes	While some subjects are merged and a number are cut, the subject list does not seem to meet a vision of a "broad, foundational education". If this were the approach then a more targeted focus on generic standards would be better (ie perhaps one set per curriculum domain). If anything, the ability to create a local broad curriculum is more limited due to the narrowing in and privileging of certain disciplines/subjects at the expense of schools being able to make the choices to draw on. The ability to create courses drawing on multiple stands is now gone and the significant amount of time developing curriculum in a number of areas, including multi-disciplinary level one courses is now completely removed. It seem certain areas are more privileged than others without a rationale or justification for why (though funding and NZQA entries is the likely supposition in the absence of evidence). Some form of document for this is needed to state the actual basis of the decision making. It would be even better if a robust reason based on curriculum and relevant pathways. Overall, the current approach suggests the antithesis of a broadening but a narrowing of Level 1 options in a manner that is taking us back to the old school certificate days. To this end it seems to	Strongly disagree	For most Faculty areas these changes will have a minimal impact. It is quite normal for many schools to have generic Level 1 Science courses, Technology courses. It seems out of all of the domains, Social Science is disproportionately impacted in a negative way. The effective removal of Accounting (ie not really being addressed in "Commerce"), Classical Studies, Media Studies, Psychology is a significant blow to Faculties. For example, at my previous school there were three Level 1 Media Studies classes. At my current school, Classical Studies and Accounting have been the largest Social Science numbers and classes. Due to these pockets of variation, the impact at a local school level will be far more significant than any national number change will suggest. Even worse than this, we cannot really, in all honesty, put together an alternative course that builds coherent pathways to our level 2 subjects as an alternative that balances the cuts with the potential available options. I have some suggestions below.	I believe the Social Science learning areas identified above need to have a significant change as it is the area that is the most significantly impacted and it will have massive repercussions for Social Science Faculties. If the desire is to reduce the amount of standards being developed and to offer a broad curriculum I believe there are some balanced compromises that could be worthwhile. Suggestion 1: Look to generalise the Social Science domain into more flexible standards that could be utilised across all Social Science learning areas. For example, a standard on exploring values, would have the ability to be used in every area if put together in the right way. A generic standard on inquiry could equally apply, provided it does not follow the social inquiry model, to enable psychology, classical studies, history, or even accounting if designed in the right way. Supporting resources of how to use the standard for each subject could still be developed. Suggestion 2: Look to align similar subjects and develop partial, half or mixed level 1 matrices. For example, Classical Studies and History have enough in common that flexibility can be delivered with two dedicated history standards and two	Philosophy	No	No.		2020-02-20 18:34:24	ANON-YFPW-R9Y9-H	2020-02-20 18:34:24	2020-02-20 18:34:37
No		Strongly disagree		Do not include PE WITH HEALTH		No			2020-02-20 18:34:32	ANON-YFPW-R9Y1-M	2020-02-20 18:34:32	2020-02-20 18:35:23
No		Disagree		Wouldn't like to see so many specialist areas merged. We would lose specialist teachers in the profession and many schools would need to decrease the subjects offered - this is not in the best interest of our students.		No	N/A		2020-02-20 18:35:32	ANON-YFPW-R9YQ-U	2020-02-20 18:35:32	2020-02-20 18:35:46
Yes		Strongly agree				No			2020-02-20 18:35:48	ANON-YFPW-R9YF-F	2020-02-20 18:35:48	2020-02-20 18:36:19
No		Agree				No			2020-02-20 18:36:33	ANON-YFPW-R9YS-Y	2020-02-20 18:36:33	2020-02-20 18:36:44
No	Too much information and too much being reviewed in the sector which means many people are simply unable to keep up!!	Undecided	Need time to think it all through - difficult to have a good detailed look at it all when the first teacher only day is so late in the year	Very hard to feedback without the breakdown of standards and learning under each section.	Tokelau Language (and Level 1)	No			2020-02-20 18:37:45	ANON-YFPW-R9YP-T	2020-02-20 18:37:45	2020-02-20 18:37:59
No		Disagree				No			2020-02-20 18:41:56	ANON-YFPW-R9YF-G	2020-02-20 18:41:55	2020-02-20 18:42:01
Yes		Disagree	The lack of specialist science subjects means that New Zealand students will fall further behind other countries in the STEM subjects	See above		No			2020-02-20 18:42:43	ANON-YFPW-R9Y1-U	2020-02-20 18:42:43	2020-02-20 18:42:53
Yes		Strongly disagree	Physical education and Health need to be their own subjects.	Physical education and Health need to be their own subjects.		No			2020-02-20 18:43:26	ANON-YFPW-R9YV-Z	2020-02-20 18:43:26	2020-02-20 18:43:41

Yes		Strongly disagree	We have two classes of 31 students that take Level 1 Media studies. Many of the students want to pursue careers in the media. For students who are passionate about certain creative subjects (such as Media Studies) they can be the sole reason for them coming to school everyday. Taking away Level 1 Media Studies will have a detrimental impact on student motivation and enjoyment of learning. Students that are forced to take multiple subjects that they do not enjoy disengage with their schooling. The choice of a variety of subjects means that there are options to suit the needs of diverse learners.	Media Studies is very different from social studies. It should remain a stand alone Level 1 subject.		No				2020-02-20 18:43:37	ANON-YFPW-R9YH-J	2020-02-20 18:43:37	2020-02-20 18:43:44
Yes		Agree				No				2020-02-20 18:43:42	ANON-YFPW-R9YB-C	2020-02-20 18:43:42	2020-02-20 18:43:53
Yes		Agree				No				2020-02-20 18:44:56	ANON-YFPW-R9YD-E	2020-02-20 18:44:56	2020-02-20 18:45:04
No	This is a surprise as a teacher of visual art and art history. Art history is part of the new Zealand arts curriculum.	Disagree	So broad. Doesn't allow for specific interest. It's seems like a ploy to make it difficult so most schools will forfeit level one and concentrate on doing level 2 over 2 years. (ie Science)	Having Art History at Level One allows further in-depth research that you can tailor for the cultural milieu of our students. It slots perfectly into the Visual Arts programme. Setting it in History will likely mean it will disappear.	No.	No				2020-02-20 18:44:49	ANON-YFPW-R9YM-Q	2020-02-20 18:44:49	2020-02-20 18:45:18
No		Agree		Outdoor education should be its own stand alone subject	Outdoor education	No				2020-02-20 18:46:20	ANON-YFPW-R9YX-2	2020-02-20 18:46:20	2020-02-20 18:46:27
No	I have now read about and understand this.	Strongly agree	It would be great to know exactly what we are meant to teach students in preparation for the external assessments. The lines have become blurred in mathematics in recent years.			No				2020-02-20 18:47:22	ANON-YFPW-R9YA-B	2020-02-20 18:47:22	2020-02-20 18:47:37
No		Strongly agree				No				2020-02-20 18:49:00	ANON-YFPW-R9YN-R	2020-02-20 18:49:00	2020-02-20 18:49:07
Yes		Undecided	fewer standards worth more credits may actually prove counter productive for less able students, where failure to achieve a standard at present means a loss of 3-4 credits, whereas under proposed system would be 6. absorption of specialist science strands at L1 not a massive loss for majority of schools, however some do offer L1 bio, chem etc and it is useful for general science classes to be able to access standards from specialised streams occasionally in order to make our courses more relevant and interesting. losing them would be a loss.	see above re. specialised sciences. it is good to see AgHort sci left, this is often the highest some students will go in school, and frequently these particular kids struggle in Science so having an applied option is good.	Environmental Science. possibly linked to Ed for sustainability?	No				2020-02-20 18:50:35	ANON-YFPW-R9YK-Q	2020-02-20 18:50:35	2020-02-20 18:50:56
Yes		Undecided		I believe Classical Studies to be a worthy subject, which should be retained at Level 1. It is difficult to incorporate this rich subjects into other social science subjects. It needs to be self contained.	Philosophy The reason for this is that many schools offer Philosophy, but there are no assessments available. This means teachers have to poach standards from other subjects, which can cause confusion for students when they find that they end up doing a standard twice. Furthermore, the standards used from other subjects are not usually a good fit for Philosophy.	No				2020-02-20 18:50:46	ANON-YFPW-R9Y6-Z	2020-02-20 18:50:46	2020-02-20 18:51:05
No		Strongly disagree		Please do NOT combine PE and Health Achievement Standards. Health and PE are very valuable subjects and need to be separate to ensure students are catered for appropriately. Health is a subject that enables students to improve their wellbeing and the wellbeing of others. It teaches students important life skills, soft skills and work place skills. Students learn to see, understand and help those beyond themselves. This is taught in a different context to PE. The subject will lose its importance and value if they are combined. It also limits students options. Health is an extremely popular subject at the school I teach at. Please do not make this mistake.		No				2020-02-20 18:54:22	ANON-YFPW-R9YW-1	2020-02-20 18:54:22	2020-02-20 18:54:32
No		Undecided		Health and PE need to be separate. They are completely different subjects. Health has critical thinking of life/world/society issues. Pe is more about analysing movements and sports critiquing		Yes				2020-02-20 18:57:45	ANON-YFPW-R9YT-X	2020-02-20 18:57:45	2020-02-20 18:57:55
Yes		Strongly disagree	Combining the subjects limits student choices and makes it harder to pass. Narrows the students knowledge on specific topics.		Marine studies	Yes				2020-02-20 18:58:47	ANON-YFPW-R9Y3-W	2020-02-20 18:58:47	2020-02-20 18:58:56
Yes		Disagree				No				2020-02-20 19:00:13	ANON-YFPW-R9Y2-V	2020-02-20 19:00:13	2020-02-20 19:00:25
Yes		Undecided	Why do we offer science at level 1 yet offer history, geography as separate from social sciences. Should we not just offer geography and history as part of social studies. Had a good opportunity to include fitness for wellbeing as a requirement for all students to undertake. All studies show the benefits to society and increased academic success from regular exercise. Our society is becoming more sedentary. Should be compulsory.	As above around fitness for well being. Outdoor Education as a subject should also be included with achievement standards. From level 1 through to level 3. The pathway to the tourism industry, in particular adventure tourism (one of our nations leading industries) is clear. Let alone the learning in Outdoor Education about health and safety that is now prevalent in all industries. The risk management learning occurs in Outdoor education as a subject.	Outdoor Education achievement standards at level 2 and level 3. And/or a pathway to teaching as a profession. Typically schools will have leadership programs and students learn how to teach and lead but it is unbelievable that we do not recognise this learning through assessment towards our OWN industry and have a direct pathway.	No				2020-02-20 19:01:48	ANON-YFPW-R91Y-U	2020-02-20 19:01:48	2020-02-20 19:01:59

Yes		Strongly disagree	The narrowing of subjects concerns me greatly - health and physical education are very different subjects that attract significantly different students - social studies is already broad enough, absorbing media studies is a terrible idea - what exactly is food science? Is that food technology? As that is different to home economics	- I feel to grab the best opinion we need to see an overview of the standards - do not combine well established subjects together. Even if the standards allow for context, will mean that students can't take both health and pe or media studies and social studies - if we are combining some subjects, why not combine geography and social studies?	- Outdoor education achievement standards. Could have a focus on tourism, sustainability, doc, Ecan etc. as well as the hard skills	No			2020-02-20 19:01:47	ANON-YFPW-R91U-Y	2020-02-20 19:01:47	2020-02-20 19:02:04
Yes		Agree				No			2020-02-20 19:02:56	ANON-YFPW-R91V-R	2020-02-20 19:02:56	2020-02-20 19:03:24
No		Disagree		Pe and health as one subject in level one seems like putting English and science as one subjects. The key competencies are vastly different		No			2020-02-20 19:03:54	ANON-YFPW-R91C-5	2020-02-20 19:03:54	2020-02-20 19:04:11
No	It's not like the communication has been like, great.	Disagree	I guess I don't understand why science loses all its specialist context when social science gets to keep history/geography/commerce/religious studies contexts. We are already so far behind the rest of the world with when and where we teach our specialist science curriculum - even just "science" we teach to our year 9s is stuff they teach in the UK and US to year 7s. And then you have to cram everything into two years at levels 2 and 3! Stupid. One bonus - really pleased to see Māori Performing Arts being treated as a subject in this review. Ridiculous that it's not on the same level as mainstream PA in terms of UE.	See above re: why is specialist science being removed? the new level 1 science standards are cool for a "citizen science" perspective, but what if kids are interested in gaining credit for content knowledge rather than these very social-studies-y writing based standards?	Biochem could be cool. Environmental science instead of sustainability or as well as. More ESS.	Yes			2020-02-20 19:04:22	ANON-YFPW-R91S-N	2020-02-20 19:04:22	2020-02-20 19:04:31
Yes		Agree				No			2020-02-20 19:06:04	ANON-YFPW-R918-T	2020-02-20 19:06:04	2020-02-20 19:06:14
Yes		Agree		Processing Technology (aka food technology) is proposed to become food science - with home economics. It would be important to retain a food technology focus and not let it be subsumed by a home economics focus. The intentions between the 2 subjects are very different and the technology aspect is important in relation to continuing to create creators and future thinkers in a food and nutrition sense.		No			2020-02-20 19:07:20	ANON-YFPW-R91J-C	2020-02-20 19:07:20	2020-02-20 19:07:31
No		Strongly agree				No			2020-02-20 19:07:02	ANON-YFPW-R919-U	2020-02-20 19:07:02	2020-02-20 19:07:33
Yes	I had heard of this in brief, but not believed it.	Strongly disagree	This plan is deeply flawed. NZ is pushing HARD for STEM students and yet wants to combine all Science? Where does this help our kids? Classical Studies and History are not related. They cannot be combined. This would lessen time to teach NZ history - which we need more of, and would create a 'token' Classics addition taught by non-experts. How is Kapa Haka worthy of a space, but 16 others are not?!! How does this fit with our student base. At my school there are 3 Maori students. Three. What about the other almost 2000? This is pandering and tokenism.	As above. Latin, an awful thing to lose, but numbers in classes are reflective of the lack of drive. Classics/Ancient history must stay separate, for the proper teaching of Classics and History. Maori Performing Arts is a joke. This is a cocurricular, not a subject.		No	I am familiar with the English version.		2020-02-20 19:07:15	ANON-YFPW-R91G-9	2020-02-20 19:07:15	2020-02-20 19:07:35
Yes	I oppose the elimination of several subjects of study. This, if implemented, will have the effect of making education narrower, not broader, at NCEA Level 1. To me as a Classics teacher the elimination of Latin and (in effect) of Classical Studies are most troublesome, and represent a regrettable narrowing. In a broader perspective, the planned narrowing of science education at NCEA Level 1 is just as troubling. I feel the real reason why this is proposed is as a (weak) response to the ongoing difficulty of recruiting high school science teachers, and I urge the Ministry to find a more creative solution to this problem.	Strongly disagree	Economics, Business Studies and Accounting do not need to be kept separate at NCEA Level 1. Similarly Social Studies, Media Studies and Psychology. Agglutinating Biology, Chemistry, Earth and Space Science and Physics into a single 'Science' is an unintelligent proposal. I fear that the motivation behind it is to keep the lower classes in their place, since the Ministry must be aware that independent schools will resist this and continue to offer a stronger STEM program than is now being proposed for the public system.	I am strongly in favour of strengthening teaching of New Zealand history in schools, including at NCEA Level 1. But I oppose attempting this at the expense of Classical Studies, a subject which has proved successful in terms both of numbers and attainment. Classical Studies is a poor choice for a fall guy. I suggest reserving a clearer curriculum space for New Zealand history, while retaining Classical Studies as a distinct teaching subject. I oppose narrowing the range of languages taught by the elimination of Latin. This move to weaken the NCEA Level 1 curriculum is unconscionable.	An option would be to roll Classical Studies together with Art History.	No		Question 4? Surely Question 5?	2020-02-20 19:10:11	ANON-YFPW-R91S-Q	2020-02-20 19:10:11	2020-02-20 19:10:34
Yes	You are removing key content that is needed for success at level 2/3. By removing some core content from level 1 it will put more pressure and stress on both teachers and students to get them to the required level.	Disagree	I think you have merged very different subjects together that will mean core content for those specialised subjects at higher levels will be lost. Biology, Chemistry, Physics and Earth Science are all completely different disciplines.	I agree with Ag/hort remaining separate.	No	No			2020-02-20 19:09:43	ANON-YFPW-R91E-7	2020-02-20 19:09:43	2020-02-20 19:11:48
No		Agree	Consideration should be made about breaking up of technology. Generic technology is too vague.	Consideration should be made about breaking up of technology. Generic technology is too vague. Generic technology does not meet the needs of trades and tertiary studies in computer science.	no	No			2020-02-20 19:12:37	ANON-YFPW-R91P-J	2020-02-20 19:12:37	2020-02-20 19:13:03
Yes		Strongly disagree		Health and physical education should be two different subjects at level one because they are very specialised subjects that attract different students. If they were combined it would devalue both subjects.		Yes			2020-02-20 19:13:08	ANON-YFPW-R917-5	2020-02-20 19:13:08	2020-02-20 19:13:16

Yes		Agree				No			2020-02-20 19:14:04	ANON-YFPW-R91F-8	2020-02-20 19:14:04	2020-02-20 19:14:13
Yes		Undecided				No			2020-02-20 19:16:10	ANON-YFPW-R911-K	2020-02-20 19:16:10	2020-02-20 19:16:22
Yes		Strongly disagree	I think this limits NCEA L1 to being too general and will prevent school from customising courses to meet the needs of their students.	I think combining all the science subjects into "science" is a bad idea for the reason outlined above.		No			2020-02-20 19:18:13	ANON-YFPW-R912-V	2020-02-20 19:18:13	2020-02-20 19:18:21
Yes		Strongly disagree		Unfairness in approach. For example Languages which have very low student numbers are not grouped or bundled. Business related subjects which have far higher student numbers are bundled together and highly diluted. Numbers are based on 2019 numbers of students enrolled in standards.		Yes	None		2020-02-20 19:20:27	ANON-YFPW-R91H-A	2020-02-20 19:20:27	2020-02-20 19:20:55
Yes		Disagree	As a teacher of Media Studies I am concerned about implications for my students who need L1 to build skills, specifically practical, in order to access the higher grade boundaries in L2 and 3. I would hate to see my subject watered down and absorbed into Social Studies.	Media Studies offers vital analysis and critical thinking for teens about the world of media, that they are swamped by. We need the space within a specific subject area like Media Studies for students to explore these media issues. Look at the British Media studies curriculum which has specific areas of study, maybe the NZ one could become more prescribed at L1 in order to maintain key differences from other subject areas if that is what is the point of leaving Media out of the proposed list?	Film Studies	No		I would like to see Māori performing arts and digital arts more in the curriculum	2020-02-20 19:22:48	ANON-YFPW-R91B-4	2020-02-20 19:22:48	2020-02-20 19:23:11
No		Disagree		pe and health are far too important to combine		Yes			2020-02-20 19:25:18	ANON-YFPW-R91M-F	2020-02-20 19:25:18	2020-02-20 19:25:23
Yes		Disagree	I don't think it's the specialisation that has been the issue with NCEA level 1, but rather the assessments. By year 11, many students are ready and keen to specialise in certain areas and pursue particular interests. What is the issue is that the assessment structure has meant that students become credit-focussed too early and spend three years stressing over internals and exams. Accordingly, I think it's enough to drop NCEA level 1, giving students a chance to explore specialised subjects without the pressure of NCEA assessments.	Some of the "bundling" seems to disadvantage subject areas where earlier specialisation may be useful, such as in the sciences. In contrast, it appears odd that in other areas, such as the arts, early specialisation is encouraged. The message here seems to be that Dance, Drama, Music and the Visual Arts are more important than Biology, Chemistry, Physics, and Earth and Space Science. While I understand that the changes are meant to make NCEA more accessible to a wider range of students, isn't this proposal depriving students with scientific interests and aspirations of choice? The "arty" students have four subject to choose from, while the "science" ones have only one? I think the sciences should be "un-bundled", but still include general "Science" as a subject option, which would allow schools to decide whether they want to offer early specialisation in those fields or not.		No			2020-02-20 19:26:22	ANON-YFPW-R91D-6	2020-02-20 19:26:22	2020-02-20 19:26:48
Yes		Strongly agree	Like the idea that students are given broad study rather than early specialisation. This frees them up to keep their options broader.	Just that I strongly agree with the stream lining of subjects to simplify student choice and keep options broader for longer.	No	No			2020-02-20 19:27:08	ANON-YFPW-R91X-T	2020-02-20 19:27:08	2020-02-20 19:27:24
Yes		Undecided				Yes			2020-02-20 19:27:22	ANON-YFPW-R91A-3	2020-02-20 19:27:22	2020-02-20 19:27:32
No		Strongly disagree		Merging health and PE together is an insult to health education and the students who choose it. They are NOT the same, and cater to different groups of students. Health is forgotten issue in NZ.	Yes, social work	No			2020-02-20 19:28:18	ANON-YFPW-R91N-G	2020-02-20 19:28:18	2020-02-20 19:28:26
Yes		Agree	I appreciate that art history and classics are only viewed as possible contexts for a history course. However, I would appreciate to know how this would fit into the new standards being developed.	See above.	Politics Environmental Studies	No			2020-02-20 19:29:48	ANON-YFPW-R91K-D	2020-02-20 19:29:48	2020-02-20 19:30:03
Yes	A Teacher but went to two of your roadshows aswell	Strongly agree	As a Food and Nutrition teacher, I love the alignment for the new "Food Science" subject. Great name! Assume this will move away from the health and well-being focus that is currently a lot of Home Ec standards. Really like that you have incorporated Processing into the same subject. Great vision!	no	no	No			2020-02-20 19:30:58	ANON-YFPW-R916-R	2020-02-20 19:30:58	2020-02-20 19:31:07
Yes		Strongly agree				No			2020-02-20 19:31:22	ANON-YFPW-R91R-M	2020-02-20 19:31:21	2020-02-20 19:31:43
Yes		Strongly agree				No			2020-02-20 19:31:34	ANON-YFPW-R91W-S	2020-02-20 19:31:34	2020-02-20 19:31:44
Yes		Agree			Health and well-being	No			2020-02-20 19:31:42	ANON-YFPW-R914-P	2020-02-20 19:31:42	2020-02-20 19:32:08
Yes		Strongly disagree	Pupils already know at level 1 what science they have a passion for and as such having a general science course will cause more students to be disengaged and opt out of standards for the science(s) that they already know they do not want or need for their future pathway. To be successful at level 2 separate sciences, a broad understanding of the specialist sciences is an advantage as well as preparing pupils better for scholarship in future years. I think that removing separate sciences at level 1 is opting for mediocrity and is diluting the learning.	Pupils already know at level 1 what science they have a passion for and as such having a general science course will cause more students to be disengaged and opt out of standards for the science(s) that they already know they do not want or need for their future pathway. To be successful at level 2 separate sciences, a broad understanding of the specialist sciences is an advantage as well as preparing pupils better for scholarship in future years. I think that removing separate sciences at level 1 is opting for mediocrity and is diluting the learning.		No			2020-02-20 19:32:47	ANON-YFPW-R91T-P	2020-02-20 19:32:47	2020-02-20 19:32:58
Yes		Undecided			Very, very supportive that Agriculture and Horticulture has been included.	Yes			2020-02-20 19:33:05	ANON-YFPW-R913-N	2020-02-20 19:33:05	2020-02-20 19:33:22

No		Undecided	I'm commenting as a former health education teacher with a lot of experience in various youth sexual health promotion programmes since I left teaching and both when I was a teacher - and since I left - the quality of health education is utterly terrible! With the exception of the odd passionate and educated teacher, most teachers and schools won't touch the subject and certainly are incapable of delivering it in any effective or engaging way. And it's a problem. Kids aren't getting life skills or becoming health literate through school with the minimal health education they get, and - while a good HPE teacher could intertwine the subject very well with great outcomes for rangatahi - tell me where the competent teachers are? Because they're not any of the 99% of PE jocks that are coming out of teachers college who are just overpaid coaches, that is for sure. Health is important. Why don't you do an inquiry on how schools are letting our rangatahi down in that space across the board. And then why don't you start recruiting and training teachers who aren't afraid to say vagina or talk about porn.	Health - I know there is the odd PE teacher who teaches the whole HPE curriculum through movement. But they are few and far between. If you lump health with PE prepare to see Health die completely. Because the overpaid masoginistic coaches you call PE teachers certainly aren't going to do it. There are so few health teachers in schools, and health - as a subject on it's own that is valued and given adequate time and resource - we are so far behind what our rangatahi need. Our kids are learning about sex through porn. And our schools are getting in a presenter to assembly who can crack a few jokes (and this isn't effective pedagogy), and then ticking the box to say they've delivered a sex ed curriculum. Who cares if you can do calculus if you don't know what a healthy relationship looks like, or consent, or how to access effective contraception (so you even can exercise choice), or strategies to support your mental health, etc. etc. It's not working now, but I'm not confident throwing it the PhysEders is going to help at all either. You need to work with MoH and do something!!!	Humanities? Life Skills? Putake Taiao (Sustainability through a Maori world view)?	No			2020-02-20 19:33:26	ANON-YFPW-R912-M	2020-02-20 19:33:26	2020-02-20 19:33:33
Yes		Disagree	Some of the changes do not reflect the number of students taking the subjects. Science at level 1 will make it hard to specialise at level 2. Same for Commerce, it will be hard to cover business and economics and then progress to macro economics or technical economic theories	From experience not covering accounting til level 2 is likely to make level 2 course to cover the basic elements of journals, debit and credits etc. Economics and business are very different and should be kept separate. One is theoretical based - Economics. Business is vocationally orientated. These subjects should be kept separate. From the external exam perspective, Economics has more students sitting the external exams than level 1 Geography.	Not at the moment	No			2020-02-20 19:35:40	ANON-YFPW-R91U-Q	2020-02-20 19:35:40	2020-02-20 19:35:50
No	By Year 11 students should be able to study in areas of interest. The list above is overly generic	Strongly disagree	Overly generic	Where is Outdoor Education. It an important area for students "for NZ as a whole...recreation & tourism	Outdoor Education	Yes			2020-02-20 19:36:21	ANON-YFPW-R91V-Z	2020-02-20 19:36:21	2020-02-20 19:36:47
No	News to me the removal of separate sciences at level 1	Agree	Fine to not specialise until level 2	Lack of separate sciences may prompt some private schools to go to Cambridge exams which will further undermine NCEA		No	You mean question 5		2020-02-20 19:38:17	ANON-YFPW-R91V-W	2020-02-20 19:38:17	2020-02-20 19:38:24
No	I didn't know about the subject reorganization/regrouping until read the papers, which to certain extent make sense.	Agree		I think it's more balanced and more inline with other assessment system such as IB (they have the different strand as well for the students to choose)		No			2020-02-20 19:41:40	ANON-YFPW-R91V-A	2020-02-20 19:41:40	2020-02-20 19:42:02
Yes		Strongly agree				Yes			2020-02-20 19:41:59	ANON-YFPW-R91V-T	2020-02-20 19:41:59	2020-02-20 19:42:29
Yes		Undecided				Yes			2020-02-20 19:42:36	ANON-YFPW-R91V-B	2020-02-20 19:42:36	2020-02-20 19:42:50
Yes		Agree				No			2020-02-20 19:45:42	ANON-YFPW-R91V-Z	2020-02-20 19:45:42	2020-02-20 19:45:59
No		Undecided				No			2020-02-20 19:46:09	ANON-YFPW-R91V-E	2020-02-20 19:46:09	2020-02-20 19:46:16
Yes	This is a good thing.	Strongly disagree	Health and Physical education are very different subjects, they need to be separate courses taught by specialist teachers, not make do with pe teaching health and vice versa.	Health and Physical education are very different subjects, they need to be separate courses taught by specialist teachers, not make do with pe teaching health and vice versa.	Programming specific course	No			2020-02-20 19:46:18	ANON-YFPW-R91V-H	2020-02-20 19:46:18	2020-02-20 19:46:34
Yes		Agree			Technical performing arts (lighting/sound/audiovisual design)	No			2020-02-20 19:47:50	ANON-YFPW-R91V-Q	2020-02-20 19:47:50	2020-02-20 19:47:58
Yes		Disagree	In our current climate of the Media playing such a huge role in society, especially for our young people, removing media studies at Level one is absolutely ridiculous. Students need to be able to critique and engage with media in an informed manner. Killing this subject at Level 1 will absolutely mean significantly reduced numbers at L2 and L3 therefore meaning the subject as a whole will die out.	See above comment.	Sociology!	No			2020-02-20 19:50:20	ANON-YFPW-R91V-C	2020-02-20 19:50:20	2020-02-20 19:50:45
Yes		Agree				No			2020-02-20 19:51:11	ANON-YFPW-R91V-V	2020-02-20 19:51:11	2020-02-20 19:51:20
Yes		Agree			Electronics as part of the Technology Area	No			2020-02-20 19:51:41	ANON-YFPW-R91V-Q	2020-02-20 19:51:41	2020-02-20 19:52:09
No		Strongly disagree	While HPE knowledge can be integrated, they knowledge and learning related to each subject area us quite different and appeals to different students. Many students achieve highly in PE because it is a learning area they are engaged in and find exciting, combining with health will significantly decrease boys achievement.			No			2020-02-20 19:54:52	ANON-YFPW-R91V-X	2020-02-20 19:54:52	2020-02-20 19:55:01
Yes	aware but do not approve	Strongly disagree	level 2 chemistry and physics lead on from level 1 chemistry and physics. Will level 2 standrads now be dumbed down to take this into account	level 2 chemistry and physics lead on from level 1 chemistry and physics. Will level 2 standrads now be dumbed down to take this into account		No			2020-02-20 19:56:55	ANON-YFPW-R91V-R	2020-02-20 19:56:55	2020-02-20 19:57:01
Yes		Undecided				No			2020-02-20 19:56:53	ANON-YFPW-R91V-F	2020-02-20 19:56:53	2020-02-20 19:57:03
No	As a Mathematics teacher, it seems that the status quo will remain?	Undecided				No			2020-02-20 19:57:27	ANON-YFPW-R91V-1	2020-02-20 19:57:27	2020-02-20 19:57:37
Yes		Undecided		Excellent to include Maori performing arts, although some schools are already doing that.. Diluting the science areas into one won't give students an indication of which is their strength to follow into NCEA L2 and beyond.		No			2020-02-20 19:58:05	ANON-YFPW-R91V-F	2020-02-20 19:58:05	2020-02-20 19:58:16

No	This could be because my child is only primary school age, but it might have been useful for this info to have been put on all primary school newsletters at least once or twice.	Strongly agree	I think simplifying the system is good for year nine and ten. They are coming from having no choice as to topics to having much more freedom. It's also unlikely all children know what they want to do at uni/work at the age of 13-14, so having broader subjects gives them a better chance to "try before they buy".	I'd prefer Latin to remain. I understand finding teachers for this is hard, but for kids getting into sciences/horticulture and English literature, Latin is vital. Please please keep this!	Perhaps more computer tech subjects; design/programming/project management.	No				2020-02-20 19:59:26	ANON-YFPW-R9VB-9	2020-02-20 19:59:26	2020-02-20 19:59:39
No		Strongly disagree				No				2020-02-20 19:59:46	ANON-YFPW-R9VD-B	2020-02-20 19:59:46	2020-02-20 20:00:00
No		Agree				No				2020-02-20 19:59:45	ANON-YFPW-R9VM-M	2020-02-20 19:59:45	2020-02-20 20:00:02
Yes		Agree				Yes				2020-02-20 20:01:04	ANON-YFPW-R9VA-8	2020-02-20 20:01:04	2020-02-20 20:01:16
Yes		Strongly agree			Applied Science	No				2020-02-20 20:00:58	ANON-YFPW-R9VX-Y	2020-02-20 20:00:58	2020-02-20 20:01:26
Yes		Agree	I think the proposals are pretty good. The broadening of certain areas at Level 1, in particular the social sciences, seems a good idea. Bunching all of commerce together and all of science together may cause some trouble down the lines in my opinion.	Grouping all of science may actually make it harder to extend the specialisation at Level 2. Without a full years' grounding in the specific area, it may mean more gaps need filling.	I would encourage the Ministry to separate Calculus, Statistics and General Mathematics at Level 2. The current set up (especially around examinations) does not work for those students who wish to specialise in each branch of mathematics. It would be great to see data science and discreet/decision maths brought into Level 2 and 3 mathematics also. With the development in technology, and the drive of the IT industry, these 2 areas of maths will support more students move into the industry.	No			2020-02-20 20:02:37	ANON-YFPW-R9VN-N	2020-02-20 20:02:37	2020-02-20 20:03:00	
No		Strongly disagree		Individual sciences not included. The science standards proposed do not provide content that will lead easily to L2 sciences, they are very general and a lot of content will be lost. Much of this taught at L 1 is built on in L2. If these changes proceed, this material will need to be covered at L 2, adding even more to the workload of students specialising in sciences.		No				2020-02-20 20:06:12	ANON-YFPW-R9VK-J	2020-02-20 20:06:12	2020-02-20 20:06:27
Yes		Agree				No				2020-02-20 20:07:44	ANON-YFPW-R9VR-S	2020-02-20 20:07:44	2020-02-20 20:07:58
Yes		Disagree	I would like to see health and PE remain separate subjects. Our country is dealing with so many health related issues that with the proposed merging will go untouched. There needs to be a separation of these two subjects before I will be happy.	There needs to be a separation between PE and Health. They should not be under the same heading. Too many health related issues happen in our country which can be explored in a separation. Together the health components will go missed or surface level at best in one or two topics as teachers battle to cover both Health and PE related topics.		Yes			2020-02-20 20:07:43	ANON-YFPW-R9V6-W	2020-02-20 20:07:43	2020-02-20 20:08:02	
No	Where did Home Ec become Food Science ?	Strongly disagree	Health ,PE and Home Economics have strong connects Home Ec sl much more than Food science !!	See answer 2. Do they expect Home Ec to be under the science umbrella ?? Or stand alone.		Yes				2020-02-20 20:09:11	ANON-YFPW-R9V4-U	2020-02-20 20:09:11	2020-02-20 20:09:22
No	Why is science so reduced compared to other subjects? We have lost so much! I am horrified! Science teachers will need a great amount of time and pd around these monumental changes to what and how we teach.	Strongly disagree	They have killed science. Science is content heavy for a reason, you have to know the basics before you can draw conclusions on issues and investigations. Where is the understanding of how the world works? Where will we be able to give students a taster of bio, Chemistry and physics in year 11 so they know what they are good at and find interesting?	BIOLOGY, CHEMISTRY AND PHYSICS in Level 1! There is not enough choice, variation and options to design courses that fulfill the needs of priority learners (those that struggle and those that excell)	Human biology	No				2020-02-20 20:09:35	ANON-YFPW-R9VT-U	2020-02-20 20:09:35	2020-02-20 20:10:02
Yes	I was aware. And as initially pitched, it seemed like a reasonable idea. Although I am somewhat disappointed with the proposed plan. Instead of focusing on Level 1 on 'foundational education', it has effectively created 'foundational subjects' - particularly in the Social Sciences. This is worrying, as it will likely guide students into these same subjects for their more specialized work at Levels 2 and 3, as this is what they will know and be familiar with. Rather than limiting the number of subjects, as in the proposed model, I would encourage the ministry to focus on the key aspects of the foundational education which they would like students to gain and integrate these within the existing subjects. Otherwise, despite the opening up of specialization at Levels 2 and 3, I suspect we will simply see high numbers continuing on in the same subjects offered at Level 1 - which would be a rather sad, homogeneous, and rather limited educational profile for such a diverse country.	Disagree	I am firmly against the proposed 'streamlining' of subjects, as the 'foundation subjects' do not act as appropriate gateways for the more specialized subjects at Levels 2 and 3. For instance, Classical Studies is not part of History, but represents a discrete study which includes archaeology and the study of languages which are not part of normal history programs. Lumping Media Studies and Psychology under Social studies is also a grave injustice to these areas. The lack of differentiation in the Sciences is also worrying.	As noted above, Classical Studies is not part of History. It is not taught as part of a History program or department at any of the four major universities in the country. It is a very distinct discipline. Additionally, as has been demonstrated by its VERY long tradition as the corner stone of a liberal arts education, it is an excellent foundation for wider education. It allows the detailed study of cultures from Europe, Africa, and Asia using a wide range of evidence types, which pull from across the languages, fine arts, humanities, social sciences, and hard sciences - utilizing archaeology, literary study, ethnography etc. Additionally, as if often noted, the Classical world still has a profound impact and resonance on the modern world (as the basis for modern democracy and republicanism) as well as here in New Zealand (as seen in the engagement of Maori artists, like Marian Maguire, with classical motifs, etc.). It would be a travesty to remove this gateway to an incredibly diverse range of subjects and areas from Level 1.	There are many, although I know space is limited.	Yes	No			2020-02-20 20:15:02	ANON-YFPW-R9VU-V	2020-02-20 20:15:02	2020-02-20 20:15:21

No		Strongly disagree	What is being done to Accounting ,Economics and Business Studies is ludicrous. They have a huge market share yet they are to be amalgamated while recreational subjects like art , dance, music and drama get to stand alone. They should work together too, in the same way as Commerce. The Commerce subjects are important in the world so they need to stand alone. Statistics show that Economics has the 6th highest number of student doing the subject Accounting the 9th and Business Studies the 13th. Dance only has 1500 students and is 27th Drama is 15th. All of these art subjects plus the languages lag far behind the 3 commerce subjects but they get to stand alone. Sure the powers that be can see that Commerce subjects are important - too import to be consigned to a package. They are big enough to stand alone	Do not lump the commerce subjects together	No more subjects that result in student having no viable career path, limit the Arts subjects - the Arts particularly	No				2020-02-20 20:17:17	ANON-YFPW-R97Y-1	2020-02-20 20:17:17	2020-02-20 20:17:47
No	It had not been made clear through previous consultation or revelation of standards that L1 Science would replace biology, chemistry, physics and ESS at L1.	Undecided	It is still not clear how we are proceed into Level 2.	If we take out the majority of the content at Level 1, especially with regards to science, students are really starting from 'scratch' at Level 2. However, if there will now be scope for us to start Level 2 at Year 11 and create a 2 year course for each science, then I think I would support this change. This would not fit with the philosophy of creating a broad base for all school leavers though...	no	No				2020-02-20 20:17:55	ANON-YFPW-R97Y-X	2020-02-20 20:17:55	2020-02-20 20:18:02
No	It appears technology, languages, art,dance, drama have diversification but science and social science do not	Disagree	Don't agree with Social Studies with media and psychology as contexts. It is too vague a subject area. Media fits more closely with English. Psychology preferred with Social Studies context	As above. I can't see how Social Studies fits along side subjects like history, geography and economics	Planning	No				2020-02-20 20:20:37	ANON-YFPW-R97C-B	2020-02-20 20:20:37	2020-02-20 20:21:00
Yes		Strongly disagree		Why have geography and history been kept as subjects? Dance and drama? However science has lost biology, chemistry, physics. This seems inequitable and I would like to know why. I find the new level 1 science standards severely lacking but thought that a single science course would cater a pathway for clever kids. I am very disappointed in this. Furthermore when completing feedback on the science standards, I feel that the feedback questions were written poorly so I couldn't real submit my views. There is too little consultation with general teaching body. I can't believe that people think report writing could possibly target our priority learners. Sad day NZQA. This will create a two tier system I fear where rich schools offer GCSE or IB and poor schools only offer this. Please rethink this, we have some really clever kids who enjoy being challenged and would like to have a variety of subjects to do this. All kids should have this option, not just a wiffly waffly option.	No	No				2020-02-20 20:21:23	ANON-YFPW-R97S-U	2020-02-20 20:21:23	2020-02-20 20:21:47
Yes		Strongly agree		Cannot support Home Economics being in Food Science.	Child Development	No				2020-02-20 20:21:44	ANON-YFPW-R978-Z	2020-02-20 20:21:44	2020-02-20 20:21:58
No	How is this broadening when its getting rid of the Sciences. Four standards for Science compared to the Languages and Arts. IS that 20 standards for Arts?? Year 11 is the final year (in most schools, for some it is Y10) where Science is a compulsory subject. Also, how can we look at Level 1 in isolation, surely we need to look what is in store for L2 and L3 - is there just science with 4 standards at L2 and L3 and 20 language standards?	Strongly disagree	same as above	Biology Physics Chemistry These subjects provide pre-learning opportunities for L2 and L3 - if these still exist. Yes it is content focused. NCEA students are completing with CIE and IB students and with less specialisation, NCEA kids are going to be left behind. More schools are going to adopt CIE and IB - so we might as well be back in School C and Bursary exams.	how do we know , as these have not been released.	Yes	i do support this, but not at the expense of losing current learning areas	have seen element of Te Marautanga in the Science standards		2020-02-20 20:22:07	ANON-YFPW-R979-1	2020-02-20 20:22:07	2020-02-20 20:22:34
Yes		Strongly disagree				Yes				2020-02-20 20:26:07	ANON-YFPW-R97G-F	2020-02-20 20:26:07	2020-02-20 20:26:13
Yes		Agree		Classical Studies is a popular subject, if it is not in level 1 will it be in level 2?		Yes				2020-02-20 20:26:46	ANON-YFPW-R97J-J	2020-02-20 20:26:46	2020-02-20 20:27:29
No		Agree		No	No	No				2020-02-20 20:27:26	ANON-YFPW-R97Q-S	2020-02-20 20:27:26	2020-02-20 20:27:38
No	The only changes to this are in the Social Sciences or Languages. Classical Studies, Art History, and Latin are as valuable, and are arguably MORE valuable than Commerce. They teach critical thinking and writing, as well as promoting thinking outside the box. I would suggest focusing on Commerce for deletion. Business owners are interested in employees who can learn and think for themselves, like those students who have taken Social Sciences and Languages.	Strongly disagree	Particularly with Commerce.	Classical Studies, Art History, and Latin are extremely important for well-rounded students and people after they are students.	No	No				2020-02-20 20:27:38	ANON-YFPW-R97E-D	2020-02-20 20:27:38	2020-02-20 20:28:04

Yes		Agree		I would still like to see Accounting at Level 1. I feel that it has relevance for students who build on their knowledge at Level 1 towards Level 2.		No			2020-02-20 20:28:50	ANON-YFPW-R975-W	2020-02-20 20:28:50	2020-02-20 20:29:06
Yes		Agree	NZ has a narrow curriculum at present as students can only select 5/6 subjects. Level 1 should still be broad so a general more knowledge is obtained a better understanding of the world around them.	I would like to see Ag Hort come under science as Ag Hort is an application of science. This area is a growth area with climate changes and increasing populations - students could use the horticulture growth as one of the big ideas suggested in the 4 standards in science. Similarly with agriculture - impacts / benefits of practices.	In L2 and 3 science having the standard alone - Chem, Phy, bio and ESS plus possibly a subject that looks at biochem or biophysics or environmental science as in the real world one area of science is not isolated from the others - the content covers would be different from the standard alone courses.	No			2020-02-20 20:30:31	ANON-YFPW-R97P-R	2020-02-20 20:30:31	2020-02-20 20:30:46
Yes	I think the merge of all those science subjects is too large. You will have too many topics to cover or will compromise the opportunities students get to have any understanding of some of those key sciences.	Agree				Yes			2020-02-20 20:30:44	ANON-YFPW-R977-Y	2020-02-20 20:30:44	2020-02-20 20:30:55
Yes		Strongly agree				No			2020-02-20 20:34:46	ANON-YFPW-R971-S	2020-02-20 20:34:46	2020-02-20 20:35:12
Yes		Agree		I feel maths and statistics should be separate courses.		No			2020-02-20 20:37:01	ANON-YFPW-R97Z-2	2020-02-20 20:37:01	2020-02-20 20:37:12
Yes		Strongly agree	However the range of standards offered needs to reflect a diverse range of contextual learning that will stimulate student's interest, especially in the sciences.	Religious Studies should be removed as this is a subset of Social Studies and therefore a specialist area that should be available at Level 2.	YES - Tourism , Outdoor Education,	Yes		NO	2020-02-20 20:37:13	ANON-YFPW-R97H-G	2020-02-20 20:37:13	2020-02-20 20:37:33
No		Undecided				No			2020-02-20 20:37:31	ANON-YFPW-R97M-N	2020-02-20 20:37:31	2020-02-20 20:37:39
Yes		Strongly disagree	Science! We are dumbing it down. Where are our pure Sciences and where is CHOICE?	Students need a broad background in the single sciences. We are dumbing it down. Will L2 pure sciences sit proper external exams? When will we prep the students to sit 'proper' exams - only once they are in level 2?	Level 1 Biology, physics, chemistry and EOS.	Yes			2020-02-20 20:38:32	ANON-YFPW-R97D-C	2020-02-20 20:38:32	2020-02-20 20:38:45
Yes	sensible groupings	Strongly agree				No			2020-02-20 20:40:08	ANON-YFPW-R97X-Z	2020-02-20 20:40:07	2020-02-20 20:40:19
No		Strongly disagree				Yes			2020-02-20 20:41:32	ANON-YFPW-R97A-9	2020-02-20 20:41:32	2020-02-20 20:41:38
No		Strongly disagree	How come the sciences are rolled into one "skills based" subject, while technology, arts and social science specialise and have 4-5 subjects each? Surely the same argument that did that to science would apply to those other areas?	How come the sciences are rolled into one "skills based" subject, while technology, arts and social science specialise and have 4-5 subjects each? Surely the same argument that did that to science would apply to those other areas?		No			2020-02-20 20:44:50	ANON-YFPW-R97N-P	2020-02-20 20:44:50	2020-02-20 20:44:54
Yes		Strongly disagree	Depleting the base will only cause less specialization not more.	Business, accounting and economics are separate and distinct subjects. If taken out at level one or watered down then these subjects at level 2 and three will have a weaker base. Taking out accounting is disappointing as students need financial skills to be responsible citizens		No			2020-02-20 20:45:29	ANON-YFPW-R97K-K	2020-02-20 20:45:29	2020-02-20 20:45:53
Yes	Through distribution of documents on subject association feeds.	Disagree	There are anomalies eg why does Religious Studies remain as an extant subject, when few non-religion aligned schools teach it and more important subject areas such as Media Studies appear to be sidelined at Level 1. In a world where our reality is primarily constructed through pervasive forms of media, understanding and guiding our students place in such worlds is vitally important. Indeed, I believe that Media Studies could displace English as a core subject; they share content to some extent (eg textual analysis, genre study) but Media Studies adds the vitally important component of context (social, cultural, political, ideological contexts). "To change the world as it is, you need to understand the world as it is". (Laura Mulvey, Afterimages, 2019).	Media Studies need to be reinstated at Level 1, for the reasons provided above. I would like to know who was consulted in respect of the perceived value of subject areas, and how consultations took place. It appears to be a pruning exercise, with little rationale provided regarding the proposals here.	No. There is a wealth of offerings here. It is just that the ordering of priority and importance is wrong.	Yes	To a certain extent.	N/A	2020-02-20 20:46:02	ANON-YFPW-R976-X	2020-02-20 20:46:02	2020-02-20 20:46:45
Yes		Strongly agree	I believe in "common knowledge" which I believe has been lost in the current system. It is exciting to see science regrouped with perhaps the possibility that there could be an exam question at level 1 that features aspects of Chemistry, Physics and Biology like there was before these became mutually exclusive a couple of decades ago.			No			2020-02-20 20:51:36	ANON-YFPW-R97T-V	2020-02-20 20:51:36	2020-02-20 20:51:53
No	No, I was unaware of this. However it makes sense, and is a good idea. It follows international education systems (e.g. UK, Germany, Scandinavian countries) where Year 11 is general and Years 12/13 are specialised.	Strongly agree	I think the subject range is good. It allows students to have some choice and flexibility in what they learn, while also keeping things general which I think is a good idea. Specialisation makes more sense when students are older and have a solid foundation in more core areas.	I think the list is good.	I think at Levels 2 and 3 it would be a good idea to develop a specific vocational qualification and a more traditionally 'academic' qualification (so split NCEA into 2 qualifications / pathways). This might mean developing specialist subjects for the vocational qualification, as I think there is a good range of academic subjects already. I believe this idea is being looked at already, but again this would match what happens internationally (e.g. A Levels and BTEC in the UK).	No	I teach in an English medium environment, so I am not familiar with this.	N/A	2020-02-20 20:52:10	ANON-YFPW-R97Z-T	2020-02-20 20:52:10	2020-02-20 20:52:28

No		Strongly disagree		Removing Classics from being a sole subject at level one and only a 'lesser' subject of history would impact classics at level 2 and 3. Classics at level 1 has higher roll numbers than level 2 and 3 in my experience and to remove this as an option for students is highly problematic. Likewise, adding psychology and media studies as part of social studies is also highly problematic. At my school, psychology has over 50 students at level 1 completing this course and social studies has 62- these subjects are massive career pathways for these students, and limiting these subjects at level 1 will be detrimental for level 2 and 3 in my opinion. These subjects have varying requirements that don't necessarily overlap so the individual skills learnt in these subjects individually would be lost at the integration of the subjects.	I would suggest adding philosophy as an actual subject- currently the use of religious studies standards allows philosophy to be taught in schools, but this can also be limiting based on the religious requirements of the religious studies standards. Philosophy offers another dimension of thinking and analysis for students and opens up another career path for students.	No			2020-02-20 20:53:17	ANON-YFPW-R97U-W	2020-02-20 20:53:17	2020-02-20 20:53:26
Yes		Strongly disagree	The rationalisation of some subjects as belonging in others shows little understanding of those areas.	Level One Classical Studies is a broad foundational course. It encompasses art history, history and literature. It may be possible to recreate this mix with English, History and Art History, but Art History will not exist at Level One either. Furthermore, why remove Latin as a language? All languages require foundation at Level One. It may only produce a small cohort, but it is a devoted, and often highly intellectual one. Social Studies would have to be entirely redesigned if it were to incorporate Media Studies and Psychology. As it stands, it is probably the weakest of the social sciences in terms of accessibility due to the nature of its externals which are difficult given their decontextualisation. Both Media and Psychology have a much firmer basis for teaching and learning. It seems to me that this list requiring a 'broader foundation' is simply a rationalisation for dropping subjects that don't have large cohorts opting for them in order to save money in development and delivery of qualifications.	Philosophy. I think that Social Studies should be replaced by Civics at Level One and Sociology at Levels 2 and 3.	No			2020-02-20 20:54:13	ANON-YFPW-R9HY-J	2020-02-20 20:54:13	2020-02-20 20:54:29
Yes	Aware and in very broad general agreement but the proposed outcome is far too generalised and too weighted towards, eg the arts and technology. Fine to make these available but most definitely not appropriate for the general population of Y11 students in NZ. Has any thought been given to the availability of appropriately trained teachers? Doubtless 'on the job' training will be offered. This is not satisfactory for practising teachers who already have an overfull workload	Strongly disagree	These descriptors do not match your question which asks for extent of support. Variations on 'agree' are not fit for purpose	Yes, but this feedback is more suited to being given in response to your subject specific questionnaire	No	No	n/a		2020-02-20 20:54:37	ANON-YFPW-R9HV-F	2020-02-20 20:54:37	2020-02-20 20:54:47
Yes	I knew the process was occurring but had not looked at it in any detail.	Disagree	There are some big ideas in Science recognized internationally and these will be pushed out or totally missed. This plan will reduce scientific literacy in the wider community.	Science is fundamental to life. All citizens need a basic understanding and a foundational level of scientific literacy. This will be harder to achieve with the proposed changes.	Human Biology	No			2020-02-20 20:55:52	ANON-YFPW-R9HC-V	2020-02-20 20:55:52	2020-02-20 20:56:03
Yes	I knew the process was occurring but had not looked at it in any detail.	Disagree	There are some big ideas in Science recognized internationally and these will be pushed out or totally missed. This plan will reduce scientific literacy in the wider community.	Science is fundamental to life. All citizens need a basic understanding and a foundational level of scientific literacy. This will be harder to achieve with the proposed changes.	Human Biology	No			2020-02-20 20:56:21	ANON-YFPW-R9HS-C	2020-02-20 20:56:21	2020-02-20 20:56:26
No		Agree				No			2020-02-20 20:58:25	ANON-YFPW-R9H8-H	2020-02-20 20:58:25	2020-02-20 20:58:39
No		Undecided		Im confused why there are only science specialisations at level 2. This is not what was advertised on the article		No			2020-02-20 21:01:04	ANON-YFPW-R9H9-J	2020-02-20 21:01:04	2020-02-20 21:01:24
Yes		Strongly disagree	Home Economics is totally different to the proposed food science. Where is the nutrition and determinants of health going to be placed?			No			2020-02-20 21:02:29	ANON-YFPW-R9HG-Z	2020-02-20 21:02:29	2020-02-20 21:02:36
Yes		Undecided	Some of the changes I feel are appropriate however I am very surprised about Media studies and business studies no longer being their own subject areas at level one as these subjects have huge interest at the school I teach and have strong achievement, engagement and unique learning opportunities.	Media and business studies - see above.	I wonder if at levels 2 or 3 the sciences break off into their specialist areas, and media studies and business studies become present as focus subjects.	No	I would like more support on this as a teacher.		2020-02-20 21:02:59	ANON-YFPW-R9HU-3	2020-02-20 21:02:59	2020-02-20 21:03:09
Yes		Disagree			Health and PE needs to be separate, big subjects and vital learning.	No			2020-02-20 21:05:33	ANON-YFPW-R9HE-X	2020-02-20 21:05:33	2020-02-20 21:05:42
Yes		Strongly disagree	This will condense a lot of subject areas into unteachable packages.	Physical Education and Health NEED to be separate. There is too much content to be taught in both subject areas to condense into one subject.	Outdoor Education Life Skills (understanding debt, loans, taxes etc).	No	99% of the curriculums I see are not the Te Marautanga o Aotearoa		2020-02-20 21:05:29	ANON-YFPW-R9HQ-A	2020-02-20 21:05:29	2020-02-20 21:05:44

Yes		Strongly disagree	Regarding Media Studies being included as part of a Social Studies topic. This is concerning as we are at a time when our students need critical media literacy more than ever - and that can only be expected to increase. The implicit rationale that this could be addressed in English and Social Studies reflects an undervaluing of the specialist knowledge of Media teachers. Media needs to remain an individual topic at all three levels in order to encourage more people to become media literate - something that cannot be done if Media is buried among other disciplines in a Social Studies class. BTW Social Studies is not a common topic taught at senior levels so to have this as a topic means that each discipline would only be given lip service at best. Not a satisfactory situation.	As above: Regarding Media Studies being included as part of a Social Studies topic. This is concerning as we are at a time when our students need critical media literacy more than ever - and that can only be expected to increase. The implicit rationale that this could be addressed in English and Social Studies reflects an undervaluing of the specialist knowledge of Media teachers. Media needs to remain an individual topic at all three levels in order to encourage more people to become media literate - something that cannot be done if Media is buried among other disciplines in a Social Studies class. BTW Social Studies is not a common topic taught at senior levels so to have this as a topic means that each discipline would only be given lip service at best. Not a satisfactory situation.	Not at this time. There is already a broad range of subjects at levels 2 and 3.	Yes		no.	2020-02-20 21:06:12	ANON-YFPW-R9HP-9	2020-02-20 21:06:12	2020-02-20 21:06:30
No		Disagree	Keep Health and PE seperated. Mental health is a growing and can be cover more in health and not token in PE		Sport psychology Coaching	No			2020-02-20 21:06:22	ANON-YFPW-R9H7-G	2020-02-20 21:06:22	2020-02-20 21:06:42
No	It appears that y11 is now the end of junior school learning, rather than the start of the senior program. Is this what is intended?	Agree		Students options now seem too narrow. Students that were once able to do a majority of humanities subjects or those with passion for sciences will now be filling timetables with subjects they are less interested in and may lead to more disengagement. I would also like to see Possibility of L1 environmental sustainability standards	I would like to see ethics courses, Human Biology return Or a sports Science	Yes			2020-02-20 21:06:46	ANON-YFPW-R9HF-Y	2020-02-20 21:06:46	2020-02-20 21:07:03
Yes	This must be a good thing, as too much specialisation too soon can make changing direction very difficult. In addition, I consider it vitally important that students receive an education, and are not just taught to pass assessments.	Strongly agree				No			2020-02-20 21:10:46	ANON-YFPW-R9HZ-K	2020-02-20 21:10:46	2020-02-20 21:10:59
No	I was aware of the proposed changes, but was not informed of the actual changes. As, for the new commerce subject, very unaware.	Strongly agree		I am a teacher of Business Studies in a Wharekura and I am excited at the opportunity this situation offers. However, I am curious at what will be in this new structure for Māori, in particular, Business Studies..		Yes	I am currently completing a Masters in Māori Medium education at Waikato University and I am veru=y aware of the structure of the Marautanga of Aotearoa as my dissertation is to do with creating a Māori specific Business Studies marau.		2020-02-20 21:10:31	ANON-YFPW-R9H1-A	2020-02-20 21:10:31	2020-02-20 21:11:11
Yes		Strongly disagree		Combing history and classical studies is a good idea but rather than dropping art history at level one why isn't this combined with history and classical studies. The skills needed for all three subjects is similar however, art history does require its own meta language which is fundamental to success in the subject and thus should be included in with history and classical. Fundamentally these three subjects all teach history but with different focuses in time period therefore providing a more well rounded student.		Yes		No	2020-02-20 21:11:03	ANON-YFPW-R9HH-1	2020-02-20 21:11:03	2020-02-20 21:11:30
No		Agree				No			2020-02-20 21:13:40	ANON-YFPW-R9HB-U	2020-02-20 21:13:40	2020-02-20 21:13:50
Yes		Agree				No			2020-02-20 21:13:45	ANON-YFPW-R9HM-6	2020-02-20 21:13:45	2020-02-20 21:14:06
No		Agree				No			2020-02-20 21:18:22	ANON-YFPW-R9HD-W	2020-02-20 21:18:22	2020-02-20 21:18:46
Yes	Will be better for a more contextualised learning approach	Strongly agree		I think it is a good and logical combination. Students can get a more rounded view before specialisation and develop a broader knowledge base.	No	No			2020-02-20 21:19:53	ANON-YFPW-R9HX-H	2020-02-20 21:19:53	2020-02-20 21:20:07
No		Strongly disagree	Outraged by suggestion for pe and health, been teaching since 99...this is a step backwards	Kepp pe and health seporate..they are different and vital		Yes		No	2020-02-20 21:20:03	ANON-YFPW-R9HA-T	2020-02-20 21:20:03	2020-02-20 21:20:13

No		Disagree	Media Studies should be aligned with English, not Social Studies The production task does not align with the Social Studies curriculum, but aligns with the making meaning and creating meaning in the English Curriculum. The narrative conventions align with English, not Social Sciences. The genre study does not align with Social Sciences but is more a cross-curricular discipline.	Media Studies should be aligned with English, not Social Studies The production task does not align with the Social Studies curriculum, but aligns with the making meaning and creating meaning in the English Curriculum. The narrative conventions align with English, not Social Sciences. The genre study does not align with Social Sciences but is more a cross-curricular discipline. There are two many Science options. Level One Science should be limited to General Science and Biology. Students can specialise in level two and three	Philosophy - Ethics.	No				2020-02-20 21:20:58	ANON-YFPW-R9HN-7	2020-02-20 21:20:58	2020-02-20 21:21:09
Yes	I was aware but disagree with the way these have been broadened. Subjects such as Media Studies, while having overlap with other subjects, require some level of specialist knowledge, as evidenced by the amount of PD that many English teachers forced to transition into Media tend to go through.	Strongly disagree	It feels very disrespectful for a number of subjects that have struggled to make themselves stand out. While yes, integration is great, some disciplines such as Media Studies, have enough content and skills unique to the subject that make it one that is better taught when not lumped under other umbrellas. I am sick and tired of the overwhelming perception that Media is either just "English with more movies" or "Social Studies with movies" and feel that this is just going to contribute to that perception, despite being multidisciplinary in most of its facets. I feel like limiting subjects in this way and jamming them into umbrellas like this puts us in danger of the situation some primary schools ended up in where they focused too much on these supposed "core" subjects for and abandoned other subjects just to make their performance appear better based on the National Standards that the government prioritised.	Keep Media Studies at Level 1 as a distinct subject. Only about 1/3 of the subject easily crosses over with Social Sciences (which it is lumped under in this proposed plan) and is arguably a subject that needs to grow in the modern day of fake news and media bombardment. We're a multidisciplinary subject that while having some similarity with others, our focus is specifically on the media (whether it be on popular genres and society, media as a business, film production, close reading through a media lens (which does differ a fair amount from English) and by its very nature will be incorporating a number of disciplines from sociology, psychology, economics, English, geography, history, design etc in almost every standard available and to lump it in with other subjects is a slap in the face to anyone who has worked to make the subject respected in schools. If they're not willing to do this, they might as well either scrap all of Level 1 or include the subjects that they're getting rid of (even if they just keep some standards available so that courses can be better tailored to specialisations or flexible courses) because many of these subjects have either fought for respectability or slide into other courses (better than other courses slide into the subject).		No				2020-02-20 21:22:01	ANON-YFPW-R9HK-4	2020-02-20 21:22:01	2020-02-20 21:22:28
Yes		Undecided				Yes				2020-02-20 21:24:37	ANON-YFPW-R9HR-B	2020-02-20 21:24:37	2020-02-20 21:24:49
No		Strongly agree				No				2020-02-20 21:25:40	ANON-YFPW-R9H4-D	2020-02-20 21:25:40	2020-02-20 21:25:46
No		Agree	Most look logical but home economics changing to food science could be completely different subjects??	Most look logical but home economics changing to food science could be completely different subjects?? Is it preparing students for food technology or food and health??		No				2020-02-20 21:28:13	ANON-YFPW-R9HT-D	2020-02-20 21:28:13	2020-02-20 21:28:32
Yes		Strongly agree			Sculpture, Painting, Printmaking, Design and Photography	No				2020-02-20 21:29:17	ANON-YFPW-R9H3-C	2020-02-20 21:29:17	2020-02-20 21:29:40
Yes		Strongly disagree	Geography's numbers have been falling for years, yet they get to stand alone. Economics and business studies are markedly different and many students subscribe to those as separate subjects. What logic is behind the change? What is the essential knowledge we believe students need access to, and how has this influenced the decisions?	I would combine business and accounting, leave economics separate. This aligns better with the content, and allows courses to not just teach surface level knowledge. Geography and other social studies should be combined. How would this allow for course design/ specialisation as schools so required - my school has 28 class of social science/ commerce subjects at level 1. This is looking like a one size fits all for everyone, which is not appropriate for New Zealand's diverse learners		Yes				2020-02-20 21:30:24	ANON-YFPW-R9H2-B	2020-02-20 21:30:24	2020-02-20 21:30:48
No		Strongly disagree	I strongly disagree with losing Health as a subject. Health is a varied and rich subject which covers subjects and skills which will set students up for a LIFETIME of improved wellbeing. Given the government's focus on improving wellbeing, this makes absolutely no sense.	I strongly disagree with losing Health as a stand alone subject. Health is a varied and rich subject which covers topics and skills which will set students up for a LIFETIME of improved wellbeing. Given the government's focus on improving wellbeing, this makes absolutely no sense. Health feeds into every facet of human life. Relationships, communication, mental health. Students learn skills that will make them more empowered, happier and better future employees. Not only this, but it teaches them how to cope with the pressures of studying and learning itself. Arguably, it is one of the most important subjects currently available.	No	No				2020-02-20 21:31:44	ANON-YFPW-R9HU-E	2020-02-20 21:31:44	2020-02-20 21:32:07

Yes		Agree	I largely agree that a broader, foundational level 1 qualification would be an improvement on the current structure. However, I have concerns about the loss of Media Studies as a subject specialism (to be commented on below).	I think there is a strong case for retaining Media Studies at Level 1. In the Ministry's own words: "the media shapes our understanding of the world, reflecting and communicating aspects of our public and private lives and contributing to the creation of personal, social, cultural, and national identities." This shaping, in a so-called 'post-truth' world, is a profound and critical literacy is needed more than ever. Young people need to be able to think critically about the media and, in turn, learn to communicate their own voices. While it could be argued that other subject areas, namely Social Studies and English, could furnish these skills, I would argue that Media Studies teachers have strong specialist knowledge that is unlikely to be mirrored elsewhere. Furthermore, the Design and Production standards - precisely where students learn to 'become the media' - are unique to Media Studies and student learning progresses over a number of years. Level 1 Media offers a wide exploration of media concepts and a first taste of media production which is built on at Levels 2 and 3. Its removal would be a significant loss.		No				2020-02-20 21:34:27	ANON-YFPW-R94Y-X	2020-02-20 21:34:27	2020-02-20 21:34:37
Yes		Disagree		PE/Health combo not acceptable. Groups will conflict at the idea of more theory when they really want more practically performance based standards. PE is chosen to try to be more hands on. Why on earth is PE turned into a philosophical societal subject? Students learn so much more when they are able to spend good amounts of time focusing on practical application.	Outdoor Education Achievement standards which are practically applied and not waffle written reports of crap they completely don't care about	Yes				2020-02-20 21:35:10	ANON-YFPW-R94C-8	2020-02-20 21:35:10	2020-02-20 21:35:33
Yes		Agree		Philosophy needs to be included as a subject choice.	Philosophy.	No				2020-02-20 21:37:32	ANON-YFPW-R948-W	2020-02-20 21:37:32	2020-02-20 21:37:40
No	I feel its been sprung upon me.	Strongly disagree	I think you need a good run into L2 which students need to do well in for uni entry/scholarships, trades, etc. You can't just suddenly put the pressure straight on at L2.	HEALTH should be a stand alone subject. Teaching resilience, hauora/wellbeing, sexuality, nutrition, and so much more is required in our society today. Disfunctional homes and an inability for young people to bounce back from difficulties make health teaching an essential part of the curriculum. We give up to date and clear information to confused teens.	Just please keep health.	No				2020-02-20 21:37:20	ANON-YFPW-R94S-R	2020-02-20 21:37:20	2020-02-20 21:37:47
No	I feel its been sprung upon me.	Strongly disagree	I think you need a good run into L2 which students need to do well in for uni entry/scholarships, trades, etc. You can't just suddenly put the pressure straight on at L2.	HEALTH should be a stand alone subject. Teaching resilience, hauora/wellbeing, sexuality, nutrition, and so much more is required in our society today. Disfunctional homes and an inability for young people to bounce back from difficulties make health teaching an essential part of the curriculum. We give up to date and clear information to confused teens.	Just please keep health.	No				2020-02-20 21:37:57	ANON-YFPW-R94G-C	2020-02-20 21:37:57	2020-02-20 21:38:01
Yes		Agree	Students will feel less pressure if the subjects are more general at level 1.	I am a French and History teacher. I see this change as a positive step towards students feeling less pressure to specialise their subject choice and that this may result in less rivalry between subject options for student numbers. I work in a small school for 400 which means we have pressure to offer a diverse range of subjects but also financially cannot maintain small classes. My students in my history class would love to learn a bit of classical history but not have to choose it as a specialist subject over another. I can also see that this could make some uncomfortable change for some teachers who are specialists in certain areas but overall I think it's forward thinking.		No				2020-02-20 21:37:55	ANON-YFPW-R949-X	2020-02-20 21:37:55	2020-02-20 21:38:07
Yes		Agree				No				2020-02-20 21:42:02	ANON-YFPW-R94Q-P	2020-02-20 21:42:02	2020-02-20 21:42:09
Yes		Strongly agree		New Zealand sign language is an official language of NZ with its own unique culture. I would like to see it as a stand alone subject rather than grouped with the foreign languages. NZSL does not belong to another country, but rather is entwined with New Zealand culture and history. Unit standards used to provide a richer understanding of Deaf culture, history and linguistics. Many of the resources available to foreign language teachers stem from the country of origin- this is not available to NZSL teachers. It would be wonderful to see NZSL align with te reo, which have much more in common. Currently this subject is very slow to grow and has largely only been taught to Deaf and hard of hearing students. There is a huge demand from schools but limited NZSL teachers..		Yes				2020-02-20 21:41:56	ANON-YFPW-R94I-F	2020-02-20 21:41:56	2020-02-20 21:42:09

No	This document outlines more clearly the intentions when moving into levels 2 & 3	Agree	I think it is fantastic to see the Arts remain and Māori Performing Arts now included within this area and provides opportunity to build greater links within these subjects	Art History would benefit from being available at level 2 and 3 still for the specialist options Under technology and new technologies subjects such as textiles and costuming would have a place (as not specified) Performing Arts Technologies could also be included (or will they remain now with Skills Active)	As noted above, performing arts technology standards Sustainability developed further as a subject	Yes	Aspects of this, through mentoring and supporting others. Via PLD but it remains hidden at times within school.	Hauora is certainly something we need to embrace more as mindfulness and mental health is so important with our youth and communities. To better understand this across the school community and support those at risk.	2020-02-20 21:43:36	ANON-YFPW-R94E-A	2020-02-20 21:43:36	2020-02-20 21:43:51
No		Disagree		There has to be more History and Geography as current Social Studies model doesn't build foundations of knowledge about the world. We are a part of the big world and should be ignorant about it. Also NZ history should be taught purposely.		Yes			2020-02-20 21:45:09	ANON-YFPW-R945-T	2020-02-20 21:45:09	2020-02-20 21:45:24
Yes		Undecided				No			2020-02-20 21:45:14	ANON-YFPW-R94P-N	2020-02-20 21:45:14	2020-02-20 21:45:32
Yes		Agree				No			2020-02-20 21:50:55	ANON-YFPW-R941-P	2020-02-20 21:50:55	2020-02-20 21:51:39
Yes	i attended meetings	Agree		i am happy that the subject I teach is included in the list	Do not know	No	I am aware but not familiar		2020-02-20 21:52:25	ANON-YFPW-R94Z-Y	2020-02-20 21:52:25	2020-02-20 21:52:54
No	The change from offering different science subjects to science as one subject in the NCEA level 1, makes sense to provide foundation education and then move on to specialised education.	Strongly agree	Students will be able to test out their liking for the general subjects during Level 1 and possibly get a sense of what to lean towards in Level 2.	This looks like a perfect rationale for change. However, not clear what the course offering is 'integrated through new technology subjects'.	Yes, Mathematics and Statistics should be specialised course offering in Level 2 and 3.	No			2020-02-20 21:54:45	ANON-YFPW-R94B-7	2020-02-20 21:54:45	2020-02-20 21:54:57
No		Agree			Agriculture and Horticulture	Yes			2020-02-20 21:54:38	ANON-YFPW-R94H-D	2020-02-20 21:54:38	2020-02-20 21:55:05
Yes		Agree		None	No	No			2020-02-20 21:56:44	ANON-YFPW-R94M-I	2020-02-20 21:56:44	2020-02-20 21:57:08
No		Strongly disagree	I dislike that there are less life based subjects included for example a lot of what we do in accounting includes financial literacy skills which are so important for all students.. we should be encouraging real life subjects that students will actually have use for in the real world. A lot of my students and research shows that accounting and Financial literacy skills are skills that students say they use the most when they leave school.. it is an academic subject that also has practical importance..i feel like it should be valued more instead of taken out at level one	As above i strongly disagree with the removal of accounting. This should be included as a subject and include a financial literacy slant, it has great value for all students. As a parent this is a very valuable skill and subject i would like to see for my child		No			2020-02-20 21:59:11	ANON-YFPW-R94D-9	2020-02-20 21:59:11	2020-02-20 21:59:35
Yes		Agree				No			2020-02-20 22:00:12	ANON-YFPW-R94X-W	2020-02-20 22:00:12	2020-02-20 22:00:37
Yes	But I did not realize this would mean that the 3 commerce subject would not be grouped together into a watered down version of what is currently taught. What is the difference between Year 10 Financial Education and the Level 1 Commerce subject then?	Undecided	I would need to see the proposed content to be covered before being able to give an opinion.			No			2020-02-20 22:01:19	ANON-YFPW-R94N-K	2020-02-20 22:01:19	2020-02-20 22:01:38
Yes		Disagree	I believe that there is a disproportionate weighting on how some of the subjects have been generalised to broad.	Given how large commerce is as a job opportunity and university degree. To have the three subjects all placed together and called commerce seems a little too broad. Also given how different the three subjects are you may be disadvantaging students who then choose to specialise in the higher levels.		No			2020-02-20 22:01:07	ANON-YFPW-R94A-6	2020-02-20 22:01:07	2020-02-20 22:01:39
Yes		Undecided		The strong numbers in Economics, Accounting and Business Studies would indicate that they are well supported and there is a case for them to stand alone. Also would suggest Geography and Social Studies combining		No			2020-02-20 22:03:34	ANON-YFPW-R94K-G	2020-02-20 22:03:34	2020-02-20 22:03:54
No		Undecided	I want to know the thinking behind the decision to remove home economics. Was there robust evidence behind this decision? Was there any consultation with subject experts or nutrition/food literacy experts? This decision can have an impact on the wellbeing of young people. It is not just a curriculum decision.	I want to know the thinking behind the decision to remove home economics. Was there robust evidence behind this decision? Was there any consultation with subject experts or nutrition/food literacy experts? This decision can have an impact on the wellbeing of young people. It is not just a curriculum decision.		No			2020-02-20 22:05:26	ANON-YFPW-R946-U	2020-02-20 22:05:26	2020-02-20 22:05:45
Yes		Disagree		Hard to say as it depends what content will be included and excluded. If the right components for Acc-Eco-Bus were included it could make a good course.	Sociology. Early childhood education.	No			2020-02-20 22:11:15	ANON-YFPW-R94R-Q	2020-02-20 22:11:15	2020-02-20 22:11:24
Yes		Agree		As a Physical Education teacher I would be concerned combining with Health at Level 1 is going to increase the writing involved for assessment, and move away from the core motivation for many students to select PE in the first place - to be active.		No			2020-02-20 22:12:10	ANON-YFPW-R94W-V	2020-02-20 22:12:10	2020-02-20 22:12:18
No		Disagree				Yes			2020-02-20 22:12:10	ANON-YFPW-R944-S	2020-02-20 22:12:10	2020-02-20 22:12:23
No		Undecided				No			2020-02-20 22:13:11	ANON-YFPW-R94T-S	2020-02-20 22:13:11	2020-02-20 22:13:24
No		Strongly disagree		Health is a very important subject for young people to learn at school and shouldn't be removed at all		No			2020-02-20 22:17:56	ANON-YFPW-R943-R	2020-02-20 22:17:56	2020-02-20 22:18:06
No	I understand that there were a larger range of nzqa assessments, yet my school doesn't offer many of them	Strongly disagree	Science must separate to insure people who want to learn can learn	I am unsure what the news is on MCAT algebra level 1 test. The test must stay, (I heard it was discontinuing) This 'difficult' test is there to challenge students	some sort of MCAT level 2 during the year, like a 'major' math test of general knowledge or something part way through the year, this would promote study and be a challenge to students. offering growth in learning.	No	I am aware what 'Te Marautanga' even means		2020-02-20 22:18:05	ANON-YFPW-R942-Q	2020-02-20 22:18:05	2020-02-20 22:18:11

No		Strongly disagree	Ridiculous, is like they have no idea at all.	Heath and PE should remain two separate subjects at level 1. It would be a nightmare if they were combined. This proposal really shows the lack of understand and how out of touch the ministry is.		No				2020-02-20 22:20:48	ANON-YFPW-R9QY-U	2020-02-20 22:20:31	2020-02-20 22:20:57
No	I would be interested to know what "more foundational" means. Does it mean the subjects you are closing to close down are useless as a foundation to knowledge? Surely many students would value art history or Classics at that level? Why are they being disposed of?	Disagree	I think the level one year should be broader and should be based around student interests before they have to be constrained into an agenda	I agree that some of the sciences could be joined together as one subject as they were in the past. However Classical studies should not be downgraded as a lower part of history. The subjects complement each other and both involve critical thinking yet Classics involves art, literature mythology and some history. It is surely part of any English speaking country's heritage? Students love the subject. Many Classics teachers are not historians and would be very sad to see such a popular subject disappear	Not sure what the Ministry intends to remove at this point	Yes	I agree that this aspect of the curriculum is very valuable as part of a balanced education in NZ			2020-02-20 22:23:02	ANON-YFPW-R9QV-R	2020-02-20 22:23:02	2020-02-20 22:23:34
No		Undecided		I am concerned about the re-branding of Home Economics to Food Science. What about the teaching of Nutrition? So important in NZ society today especially with the huge obesity problems and the loss of basic cooking skills. Sure we can include food science but isn't it better to be taught at more senior levels or as a component of a food and nutrition course.		No				2020-02-20 22:23:07	ANON-YFPW-R9QC-5	2020-02-20 22:23:07	2020-02-20 22:23:36
No		Agree	We need more vocational options to be encourage rather than academic-only 'uni' subjects.	Some subjects are too different to be combined into one subject, eg: history and classics, and media social studies and psychology.	We need more vocational options to be encourage rather than academic-only 'uni' subjects.	No	NZ curriculum yes, but a different Maori one no I'm not familiar.			2020-02-20 22:33:37	ANON-YFPW-R9Q8-T	2020-02-20 22:33:37	2020-02-20 22:33:51
Yes		Strongly disagree		Home economics is such an important subject especially with our current state of health in NZ. By changing it to food science we are losing a key subject area that will have detrimental flow on effects.		Yes				2020-02-20 22:44:11	ANON-YFPW-R9Q9-U	2020-02-20 22:44:11	2020-02-20 22:44:20
Yes		Disagree	The idea that Classical Studies and Art History are considered as contexts within History does them both a huge disservice. They are quite different disciplines, involving different perspectives and skills. This is a way to remove these subjects from our tamariki, not provide a broad foundation. Likewise, Media Studies and Psychology have much more to offer than 'contexts' within Social Science.	I don't understand the rationale for folding Classics, Art History, and history into one subject. These are not as related as Chemistry and Physics. I don't understand the rationale for folding Media Studies, Psychology, and Social Studies into one subject. These are not as related as Statistics and Mathematics.		No				2020-02-20 22:46:10	ANON-YFPW-R9QG-9	2020-02-20 22:46:10	2020-02-20 22:46:21
No		Disagree		Grouping together the sciences will disadvantage those who plan to take those courses as they will have less time on each subject and not receive the valuable learnings needed to jump to level 2,3 and university level. Same applies with accounting and economics - seems like a cop out to throw it under the commerce name tag. Social studies is too broad of a range to have at level 1. Should be used as a junior school subject only.		No				2020-02-20 22:51:02	ANON-YFPW-R9QJ-C	2020-02-20 22:51:02	2020-02-20 22:51:20
No		Strongly disagree	This is the worst idea the ministry has ever suggested. I am appalled that you think so lowly of our professionals that you think you can merge our specialist subjects into one. Especially replacing classics which is a multi curricular subject. Absolutely ridiculous.	This makes zero sense to remove subjects when level one is optional anyway with the new changes.	How about you leave them all alone.	No				2020-02-20 22:57:49	ANON-YFPW-R9QE-7	2020-02-20 22:57:49	2020-02-20 22:58:02
No		Strongly disagree	Removing subjects such as art history and classical studies greatly reduces options for students. This is especially the case for those students who do not wish to follow a more mathematical or scientific pathway, but rather one in the humanities. As someone with a degree in both history and classics I can say with absolute certainty that both of these subjects are interesting and important for understanding modern ideas i.e democracy which is a concept derived from classical philosophy and literature and this is only one example. Latin is also a useful subject not just for those studying classics but also for those who are considering going into medicine and to remove it is a disservice to students.	Science should not be merged as their separate disciplines are vastly different and having them separated allows for greater student success as they are able to learn and explore aspects of science that they are good at and that they enjoy rather than making them attend classes where they feel they do not belong which can in turn affect their view of science in a negative way and potentially influence their chosen career pathway away from that of a scientific one.		Yes				2020-02-20 23:30:15	ANON-YFPW-R9QP-J	2020-02-20 23:30:15	2020-02-20 23:30:32
No		Agree				Yes				2020-02-20 23:51:03	ANON-YFPW-R9Q7-5	2020-02-20 23:51:03	2020-02-20 23:51:18

No		Disagree	<p>This is a repeat of the broad subjects present in the middle school curricula. Grouping things like Classics and History as well as grouping topics such as all of the sciences (particularly when by NCEA 1 all students will have a brief knowledge of all fields involves) is an excellent way to deter those interested in one from choosing either.</p> <p>This reform seems to favour large groups of mediocrity over small groups of excellence, particularly in core fields such as the sciences, at a level where many struggle to be interested due to the lack of relevance, forcing the broadening of their subjects will likely reduce their success.</p> <p>There is a tacit acknowledgement of this present in the reform already, for example agricultural and horticultural science is left separate from this agglomeration. Is it perhaps because those who are interested in it may not want to take physics? The same applies for biology, chemistry, and physics. Many who enjoy one do not engage well with the other.</p> <p>(Also the renaming of home economics seems to reflect a lack of interest in teaching students life skills, a field which many desperately need)</p>		No			2020-02-21 00:42:55	ANON-YFPW-R9QH-A	2020-02-21 00:42:55	2020-02-21 00:43:11
Yes		Strongly agree		No	Yes		Yes, for languages it is incredibly vague , which makes teaching required content for successful outcomes challenging. While this is positive in terms of being creative in your planning, it doesn't line up so well with NCEA requirements	2020-02-21 01:32:06	ANON-YFPW-R9QB-4	2020-02-21 01:32:06	2020-02-21 01:32:19
Yes		Agree	Totally agree with Science and Commerce with further specialty aimed at Levels 2 and 3. Home Economics to Food Science is evident since like PE studies aspects of 'science' are incorporated in both learning areas. Construction and manufacturing allows for processing standards and 'hands-on' applications which I believe works well with Level 1 cohort. Looks good overall.	I am in agreement with the suggested changes - there is a reduction while allowing for learning developments in preparation for more specialist subjects at levels 2 and 3 (especially Level 3)	Yes		Technology will include Textiles? Further development of Food Science with both theoretical and practical applications as in PE.	2020-02-21 02:31:25	ANON-YFPW-R9QM-F	2020-02-21 02:20:55	2020-02-21 02:31:52
No	Not aware until a new article appeared today (In mid Feb 2020)... And even then... No link to the questionnaire provided!	Strongly disagree	Removing Latin is disgusting, esp with other lesser languages kept in place, and combining core sciences etc is plain stupid (yet keeping agriculture separate). removing or combining core hard subjects and increasing or replacing with current fads in socialist wants will do nothing for the education of our youth. These sorts of changes move away from core critical learning and dumb down even further nzs already poor education.	Removing Latin is disgusting. This is a language that forms the basis of many major subjects for higher education, such as English, sciences, law, Medicine and music. Even worse when you see languages like Tongan being taught and kept! If your going to combine science to one subject at level 1, then do so with ALL sciences (i.e. Why is agriculture kept separate?) I'm unsure how media studies, social studies and psychology are even remotely related... (nor why psychology is being taught at high school at all). Or why the hell religious studies is being taught at high school at all! Why is there a creation of Maori performing arts as a subject? Surely this could fall into dance or visual arts? How does this progress to a career or enable future endeavours?	No		Stop trying to over specialise high school. Stick to core basics and teach them properly. Nz education system is nothing short of appalling now... And only, it would seem, getting worse!	2020-02-21 03:44:12	ANON-YFPW-R9QD-6	2020-02-21 03:30:18	2020-02-21 03:44:18
No		Strongly disagree		Level 1 Health and Physical Education should remain as the three different topics- Sports and exercise science Health science Food science This is more applicable to the real world and the learning that goes on within these subjects	No		Health science and psychology	2020-02-21 04:54:25	ANON-YFPW-R9QA-3	2020-02-21 04:54:25	2020-02-21 04:54:40
Yes		Disagree	Some changes make sense eg. science. Pleased to see technology not all rolled into one.	Not included - Level One Classical Studies This shows a lack of understanding of how broad Classical Studies is, it covers such a broad areas of skills and topics that it would be disappointing to see it go and fits in with the broad foundational vision for level one. As indicated above History will only be able to meet the area of Classical Studies to a low level. Very short sighted on the MOE's part.	Yes		I am really pleased to see performance included, students spend large amounts of learning on this and to have clearer standards on this will be awesome.	2020-02-21 05:16:58	ANON-YFPW-R9QN-G	2020-02-21 05:16:58	2020-02-21 05:17:11
Yes	And I think it's great!!	Strongly agree		I like how the subjects have been broadened. We just need to ensure schools re-align their programmes and don't just plonk what they are doing now within this new framework.	Yes		I would like to see Health and Physical Education integrated at Levels 2 and 3, like what has been done at Level 1. Also, anything that could lead to less focus on assessment and more focus on learning would be great.	2020-02-21 05:30:04	ANON-YFPW-R9QK-D	2020-02-21 05:30:04	2020-02-21 05:30:23

Yes	I knew this because I attended one of the hui around it last year	Undecided		I believe art history and classical studies should be retained as separate subjects	No				2020-02-21 05:58:00	ANON-YFPW-R9Q6-R	2020-02-21 05:58:00	2020-02-21 05:58:10
Yes		Agree		History of the world should be more important than religious studies. Classical history should be kept at a full level. It is important to know how decisions made way back in time affect us nowadays. Unfortunately te tiriti and maori history has been re written many times. Keep to teaching our tamariki the historic facts. Dont reduce classics.	Keep history in there with full classics	No			2020-02-21 06:04:48	ANON-YFPW-R9QR-M	2020-02-21 06:04:48	2020-02-21 06:05:11
Yes		Agree	But concerned about Media Studies falling under Social Studies	Media Studies is a key subject in its own right, in a day and age where we need to support students to think critically of the media and world we live in - this subject is very important.	Not at this moment.	No			2020-02-21 06:07:13	ANON-YFPW-R9QW-S	2020-02-21 06:07:13	2020-02-21 06:07:23
Yes		Agree				Yes			2020-02-21 06:09:56	ANON-YFPW-R9Q4-P	2020-02-21 06:09:56	2020-02-21 06:10:06
No	Neither were the university offering the course!	Strongly disagree	There is a distinct difference in a subject such as Health and PE. How do you propose to deliver it? What is happening to all the trained teachers?	Also as above a distinct difference between Psychology, media studies and Social studies. It will water subjects and interests down.	Losing subjects at level 1 will make the jump enormously big for the students.	No			2020-02-21 06:17:38	ANON-YFPW-R9QT-P	2020-02-21 06:17:38	2020-02-21 06:17:54
No		Disagree	Surely providing students with more options as early as possible gives them a better idea of what they are interested in. Please don't remove important areas from the arts and social sciences as these are what teach kids about human interaction, which is so missing in our disconnected society.			No			2020-02-21 06:30:53	ANON-YFPW-R9Q3-N	2020-02-21 06:30:53	2020-02-21 06:31:03
Yes		Agree		Pleased that Science at Level one becomes broad, with specialisation not coming in until later.	Environmental science or education for sustainability - this crosses both science and social science and could currently be taught in both Geography and Science at Level one however as education aims to prepare our students for the future this will be one of the biggest impacts on our students lives in our changing world and the ability to increase knowledge on the subject is crucial.	No			2020-02-21 06:51:24	ANON-YFPW-R9Q2-M	2020-02-21 06:51:24	2020-02-21 06:51:35
Yes		Strongly agree		I don't agree that subjects need to be fully removed, unless they are not taken by any students, could they not remain as subjects but only offered through Te Kura? That way schools can still offer the subject. It is likely that only motivated students will be interested in taking these.		No			2020-02-21 07:04:06	ANON-YFPW-R9QU-Q	2020-02-21 07:03:08	2020-02-21 07:04:11
Yes		Strongly disagree	This will further increase the gap between L1 science and level 2 specialised science it is Death to Stem careers	Keep sciences separate to allow more interesting and logical flow for the subject	Leave level 2 alone.	No	Maori is important for Maori but doesn't prepare NZ kids to be global citizens.		2020-02-21 07:04:33	ANON-YFPW-R9FY-G	2020-02-21 07:04:33	2020-02-21 07:04:53
No	If I had known that my subject would be butchered during this process, there is no doubt that I would have put my name forward for the panel!	Strongly disagree	You are going to take the essence of my subject away (Health and PE). There are students that like Health or PE and combining them would limit this option for them. We have a generation of children with resilience issues and you want to get rid of the one subject that directly focuses on the skills to develop resilience?	I would much rather see much more broader standards within the PE and Health curriculum rather than absorbing them into one, and thinking that's gonna solve any problems. If anything it will create more! Health and PE have some similarities and also some differences that are a vital reason as to why they should be separate. In what possible way can you combine a Health standard with a PE one that addresses issues around gender and sexuality? In what possible way can managing changes in relationship, in family dynamics, be absorbed/combined with PE?	I would like to see my standards for both PE and Health to be more relevant to the real life. Some of these standards are an absolute battle as they have no relevance to real life and take away from the essence of the subject. I've often had feedback from my students that my expectations are more than what is expected in a first year uni paper but that's what the standard is requiring from the student.	Yes	No		2020-02-21 07:10:11	ANON-YFPW-R9FV-D	2020-02-21 07:10:11	2020-02-21 07:10:21
Yes		Disagree	Food Science is not the term to use for Home Economics. It is a completely different subject. I completed a Food Science degree and it is not the same. It is fine to use for the technology part of food but not Home Economics which is based on Sociology.	Students need to know the importance of nutrition on their lives and their families and society. We need to educate people so they can look after themselves in a rapidly changing world. Food Science will not do this.	Home Economics it is vital that students have a chance to explore food issues and see the importance and effect on society.	Yes	No		2020-02-21 07:13:38	ANON-YFPW-R9FC-T	2020-02-21 07:13:38	2020-02-21 07:13:55
Yes		Undecided				No			2020-02-21 07:19:32	ANON-YFPW-R9FS-A	2020-02-21 07:19:32	2020-02-21 07:19:40
Yes		Agree			Biotechnology	No			2020-02-21 07:23:20	ANON-YFPW-R9F8-F	2020-02-21 07:23:20	2020-02-21 07:23:30
Yes		Strongly agree				No			2020-02-21 07:23:21	ANON-YFPW-R9F9-G	2020-02-21 07:23:21	2020-02-21 07:23:34
Yes		Agree		No	No	No			2020-02-21 07:23:31	ANON-YFPW-R9FG-X	2020-02-21 07:23:31	2020-02-21 07:23:58
No		Disagree				Yes			2020-02-21 07:25:26	ANON-YFPW-R9FJ-1	2020-02-21 07:25:26	2020-02-21 07:25:35
No	I only found out about the proposed changes through a professional Facebook group	Strongly disagree	I think specialisation from level 1 is important as it supports learner choice, interest and engagement. The proposed changes remove valuable subjects and content from the curriculum at level 1. These should remain as we want young people to explore different subject areas without making them homogenous with other subjects. It takes value away from these courses. For example, I am a Health and Physical Education teacher. They are 2 very distinct subjects that should not be taught together. Already we struggle to fit in all that we would like to teach at level 1. It takes away the depth and richness of the learning as well as the value of each subject.	I strongly believe that Health and Physical Education should remain separately taught (see reasons above).		No			2020-02-21 07:34:57	ANON-YFPW-R9FQ-8	2020-02-21 07:34:57	2020-02-21 07:35:24

No	As usual it's a complete last minute mess. I still have no idea what next year will look like. When will I find the standards I need to teach? In the past it has all happened over the summer holiday - a time when I should NOT be expected to work. You need to have the standards in place BEFORE the end of Term 2, so we can decide what we're doing during T3, and then plan and create a course during T4, so that we're ready for start of next year. It's not going to happen is it?	Undecided	I'm amazed that New Zealanders agreed with this. Presumably none were Science teachers. You've removed all the content at Level 1 and made Level 2 more specialised. There was already a huge step from L1 to L2 as reported by students, and now you've emptied the content from L1 it's going to be even more difficult. I guess NZ will rely on immigration of scientists (like me) for the next decade.	I'd like to see some Science taught at L1, not this project based stuff with little/no content. All the research shows that specialisation (i.e. at L2) requires content knowledge first. At the moment in my school we're thinking of going straight to L2 over 2 years (Y11 and 12) and ditching L1 Science altogether. And maybe look at Cambridge International Examinations so we can deliver our subject effectively. L1 Science may be kept on for the least academically able.	Psychology. The kids love it. CIE do a very good course for AS/A2.	Yes	Have you seen the UK National Curriculum or Science from the 90s?	Was it designed by an unqualified committee rather than informed specialists? Looks like it.	2020-02-21 07:38:05	ANON-YFPW-R9FV-V	2020-02-21 07:38:05	2020-02-21 07:38:27
No		Undecided		Education for Sustainability should be included as it is part of the curriculum?	Education for sustainability	No			2020-02-21 07:38:23	ANON-YFPW-R9F5-C	2020-02-21 07:38:23	2020-02-21 07:38:32
Yes		Strongly disagree				Yes			2020-02-21 07:41:40	ANON-YFPW-R9FP-7	2020-02-21 07:41:40	2020-02-21 07:41:46
No		Disagree		I don't agree that Health and Physical Education should be combined, especially given the high level of social and health issues our students are currently grappling with.	No	No			2020-02-21 07:43:40	ANON-YFPW-R9FF-W	2020-02-21 07:43:40	2020-02-21 07:43:53
Yes		Agree		The broader subjects at level 1 are great, and still look like they would cover the foundations of the subject matter.	No.	Yes	The lack of teaching resources and exemplars have been an issue, would be great to see greater development of these subjects, particularly at Level 3.	See response to Q,5	2020-02-21 07:44:38	ANON-YFPW-R9F1-8	2020-02-21 07:44:38	2020-02-21 07:45:12
Yes		Strongly disagree		Maori performing arts should not be counted as a subject but a hobby.		Yes			2020-02-21 07:46:00	ANON-YFPW-R9FZ-H	2020-02-21 07:46:00	2020-02-21 07:46:14
No	This is a great mistake, especially in the sciences and will lead to a further "dumbing down" of our curriculum content and skills. Many of our students are capable of and benefit greatly from the extension and challenges of the specialist sciences. Our economy needs to encourage students into specialist areas so that we have the "people resources" to further develop science and technology in NZ. Catching students with this interest early is very important.	Strongly disagree	see above	see above	none	No	not directly relevant to my area	no	2020-02-21 07:47:14	ANON-YFPW-R9FH-Y	2020-02-21 07:47:14	2020-02-21 07:47:40
Yes		Agree		The explanation that 'context' within a wider subject gives a degree of 'specialisation' is sound enough. There will be push-back from such subject areas as Classical Studies but it fits (certainly at Level 1) within History or Social Studies as a possible context.		No	I am uncertain whether it is simply a translation of the NZC in English or if it is framed explicitly around key concepts in Te Ao Maori.		2020-02-21 07:48:23	ANON-YFPW-R9FB-5	2020-02-21 07:48:23	2020-02-21 07:48:57
No	Makes common sense: for example for something like Science to be combined in Level 1 and Health to be combined with Physical education	Strongly agree				No	Would love to learn more about it		2020-02-21 07:49:55	ANON-YFPW-R9FM-4	2020-02-21 07:49:55	2020-02-21 07:50:05
No		Strongly disagree	There is no provision for specialist sciences (Chem, Physics, Bio or any school designed course) - for our school this would mean the loss of 4 class at year 11.	There is no provision for specialist sciences (Chem, Physics, Bio or any school designed course) - for our school this would mean the loss of 4 class at year 11.		No			2020-02-21 07:50:46	ANON-YFPW-R9FD-U	2020-02-21 07:50:46	2020-02-21 07:50:55
Yes	I was aware of the change but am concerned that what has been proposed will not necessarily support the intention. If, as we as educators are frequently told, STEM subjects are essential (and as a social sciences teacher I agree that they are), why are science and technology the areas that have been so significantly reduced in terms of the depth that is going to be available for schools to use in creating courses? I know there is a difference between curriculum and assessment, but 'that horse has well and truly bolted'. This proposal is at risk of further watering down our declining standards in education. There is a problem with variations in achievement levels but these need to be addressed by improving resourcing in school, reducing societal inequalities, focusing on training and employing specialist subject teachers, not further rounds of reducing what we expect from young people.	Disagree	Why take away the ability for schools to offer specialist science and technology courses at level One (effectively that will be the result of this change). yes, it is essential that young people have a broad understanding across a range of curriculum areas, but reducing flexibility for schools to design courses for their students is not the answer.			No			2020-02-21 07:53:59	ANON-YFPW-R9FA-R	2020-02-21 07:53:59	2020-02-21 07:54:04

Yes		Disagree	I think starting to diversify at year 11 is appropriate. It give the students time to specialize and then change their mind in year 12 or 13.	In HPE. Health and Physical Education are distinct subjects with their unique vocabulary and focus on the human condition. Many students would embrace a combined focus, many would not choose the subject if it was combined at year 11.		Yes			2020-02-21 07:56:03	ANON-YFPW-R9FN-5	2020-02-21 07:56:03	2020-02-21 07:56:18
No		Strongly disagree	Science needs to have more specialization even at Level 1. There should be more Science at every year level including primary. Students are using technology based on Science and do not understand how it works. Our citizen Science in NZ is appalling. How many Year 9's have I taught, they can't believe the moon goes around the Earth, while the Earth goes around the Sun, it's absolutely shocking to me.	I would suggest that Science in middle years 7, 8, 9, 10 have more than three hours per week by creating a subject called *Guardianship/Stewardship/Kaitiaki whereby students learn some Earth Space, Ecology, and Physics that allows them to make knowledgeable decisions about looking after our planet. Us older ones used to watch documentaries with our parents every week, but this generation have no exposure to the big picture of our place in the universe, as the caretakers of Te Ao. I have taught in another country in Europe, where every 11 year old can name 10 native trees and all the native animals and birds, and know what they could eat if they were stuck out in the wild. This would be such a fun subject.		Yes		When I read it 3 years ago, I was worried about Putaiao as a subject, because I thought it was too insular and did not give Maori students exposure to key concepts enabling them to progress to university careers. We had students coming from a Kura to study Chemistry with us, because their teachers really didn't have the expertise needed to access pre Medical school understanding.	2020-02-21 07:59:35	ANON-YFPW-R9FK-2	2020-02-21 07:59:35	2020-02-21 07:59:41
Yes		Undecided		As a science specialist, the broad brushstroke science at level 1 provides very little access to the level 2 specialist sciences (chem/phys/bio). Likely school responses might be: * add one or more locally developed courses that support preparation for level 2 - but not assessed against level 1. (target group for most schools is probably 30% of a cohort) * push the 'foundation level 1 science' back into year 10 to make room for a course(s) mentioned above	Yes. There is a disconnect between the range of subjects offered in traditional high school and the current demographic. Most curricula are driven by a vaunted academic pathway, this is relevant to about 30% of a cohort. When courses are designed by the school to match possible standard assessments for non-academic pathways; the Subject ceases to exist. Things like subject endorsement disappear. I note that micro-credentials are being explored and would like to express my support for that development. It will lead to a two tier system within a high school; but it doesn't need to be exclusively streamed.	Yes	limited to science	N/A	2020-02-21 08:00:53	ANON-YFPW-R9F6-D	2020-02-21 08:00:53	2020-02-21 08:01:12
Yes		Agree				No			2020-02-21 08:02:59	ANON-YFPW-R9FR-9	2020-02-21 08:02:59	2020-02-21 08:03:07
No		Agree				No			2020-02-21 08:05:20	ANON-YFPW-R9FW-E	2020-02-21 08:05:20	2020-02-21 08:05:33
Yes		Undecided				Yes			2020-02-21 08:05:46	ANON-YFPW-R9FT-B	2020-02-21 08:05:46	2020-02-21 08:05:49
Yes		Agree		Possible to move Media Studies to sit under English and/or Social Studies, has connections in both subject areas. Perhaps different focuses.		No			2020-02-21 08:05:44	ANON-YFPW-R9FA-B	2020-02-21 08:05:44	2020-02-21 08:05:50
Yes		Agree	There could still be some more work done to future minimise the subject range available at Lv 1. Dance, Drama, Music - combined as Performance Arts. I do have concerns with Health and Physical Education being combined, but this would depend on how the standards are developed. I would hate to see, two health and two PE-based standards.			Yes			2020-02-21 08:06:58	ANON-YFPW-R9F3-A	2020-02-21 08:06:58	2020-02-21 08:07:05
Yes		Strongly agree		Could Italian be included?		No			2020-02-21 08:08:08	ANON-YFPW-R9F2-9	2020-02-21 08:08:08	2020-02-21 08:08:15
Yes		Strongly agree				No			2020-02-21 08:08:10	ANON-YFPW-R9FU-C	2020-02-21 08:08:10	2020-02-21 08:08:22
Yes		Strongly agree				No			2020-02-21 08:08:31	ANON-YFPW-R9MV-Q	2020-02-21 08:08:31	2020-02-21 08:08:37
Yes		Strongly disagree				No			2020-02-21 08:08:40	ANON-YFPW-R9MV-M	2020-02-21 08:08:40	2020-02-21 08:08:45
No		Strongly disagree	The wider choice students have, the more likely they are to engage with their studies.	If the government wants to "support the inclusion of important and rich learning from the National Curriculum" and "create well designed and coherent local curricula, which support pathways for individual learners" then removing subjects from the curriculum is not an acceptable way to go. Media Studies is a very popular choice and provides a strong investigative learning process for students.		Yes			2020-02-21 08:11:34	ANON-YFPW-R9MS-H	2020-02-21 08:11:34	2020-02-21 08:11:49
Yes		Agree				No			2020-02-21 08:11:46	ANON-YFPW-R9MB-P	2020-02-21 08:11:46	2020-02-21 08:12:06
Yes		Agree				No			2020-02-21 08:13:10	ANON-YFPW-R9M9-Q	2020-02-21 08:13:10	2020-02-21 08:13:24
Yes	Yes I was aware. However, I believe that some subjects require specialist knowledge and therefore I disagree.	Strongly disagree	It feels that subjects are being singled out as not being worthy enough to stand on their own (despite having huge interest from students). There are so many elements of Media Studies that require specific teaching, as opposed to lumping it with other subjects as a subject option to cover.	We NEED to keep Media Studies at Level 1 as a standalone subject. Why are some subjects being singled out? If the curriculum has a "future focus", it is essential that students are given the choice to pursue subjects which support their career goals (or even if they do not want to work in the Media industry, digital literacy and safe news consumption are skills which are REQUIRED to live responsibly in this day and age). Why single out specific subjects? Why not scrap Level 1 altogether?		No			2020-02-21 08:16:05	ANON-YFPW-R9MG-S	2020-02-21 08:16:05	2020-02-21 08:16:37

No	At the information days for School Senior Leaders there was no indication that there would be any modification to the subject list. However, we are not surprised as it was not a consultation but rather a delivery of what would happen.	Strongly disagree	Putting Economics, Accounting and Business Studies under the commerce hat will denigrate the subject and it will be perceived as inferior / second rate subject. In an era when participation of Physical Education and Health are being promoted, the combining of these learning areas would marginalise them. When combining all Sciences to only provide 4 possible standards this will reduce the flexibility that schools currently have to meet student needs. Students will also have less experience in the breadth of Sciences and this will impact their ability to make good career decisions for the future.	It would be interesting to know who is making these decisions, what their level of expertise and experience is. Also, why is this so last minute as we head into the jumbo days this year. The consultation is very rushed and pre-determined.	Lets get Level 1 right first and ensure that it meets the needs of our young people before we start tampering with Level 2.	Yes		No	2020-02-21 08:20:06	ANON-YFPW-R9MJ-8	2020-02-21 08:18:00	2020-02-21 08:20:23
Yes		Agree				No			2020-02-21 08:19:55	ANON-YFPW-R9MQ-F	2020-02-21 08:19:55	2020-02-21 08:20:39
Yes		Agree		Media Studies at level 1 should remain as a separate entity. The media industry is a large, and rapidly increasing, part of the New Zealand economy. The introduction of Amazon Studios to Auckland is just the latest sign of its growth. I have only ever taught media studies at level 2 & 3 because I am at a small school and the school are worried about having too many subjects at level 1. However, the issue that comes with this that students already have a mindset that what they take at level 1 is what they will continue doing for the rest of their time at school. This means we are not getting the numbers we need at the other end to support the industry.	A return of Home economics would be great.	No			2020-02-21 08:21:39	ANON-YFPW-R9ME-3	2020-02-21 08:21:39	2020-02-21 08:21:48
Yes		Strongly disagree		I believe that Science should not be broadened to general Science to encompass all Sciences. This is unfair for students wanting to extend their knowledge in a particular subject at higher levels. Year 10 curriculum is broad to give foundation knowledge, level one should be able to give foundation knowledge in a more specific sense to give students the opportunity to seek further specialization at level 2 and 3. I agree there should be a broad subject course for level 1, however, we should not get rid of all specialty areas at level 1.	Human Biology/ Physiology	No			2020-02-21 08:21:40	ANON-YFPW-R9MS-K	2020-02-21 08:21:40	2020-02-21 08:21:49
Yes		Agree				No			2020-02-21 08:22:47	ANON-YFPW-R9M7-N	2020-02-21 08:22:47	2020-02-21 08:22:54
No	My only concern would be to make sure that L2 & 3 do allow more specialisation.	Strongly agree	I think the table above shows a good balance and makes sense.	No	No	No			2020-02-21 08:22:43	ANON-YFPW-R9MP-E	2020-02-21 08:22:43	2020-02-21 08:23:01
Yes		Undecided	Disappointed to see the minimalisation of both Classical Studies and Art History. While I am not opposed to them being placed with History there is a clear indication that there will be little opportunity to focus on them as specific areas of study. The implications of this at Level 2 and 3, in terms of a flow on effect, are possibly lower numbers choosing these subjects.	By allowing standards within History to be flexible enough to focus on either Classics or Art History specifically. This allows for a wider base and more varied course at level 1.		Yes			2020-02-21 08:22:49	ANON-YFPW-R9MF-4	2020-02-21 08:22:49	2020-02-21 08:23:10
No		Disagree				No			2020-02-21 08:24:11	ANON-YFPW-R9M1-F	2020-02-21 08:24:11	2020-02-21 08:24:26
No	NOT previously aware about reduction in subjects	Agree	I like the principle of broad base L1 then specialisation above that	Schools that are strong in the excluded subjects eg Media Studies will be greatly impacted. We offer Media Yr 9-13 and the junior programme develops the practical skills and concept-based critical thinking required for success at L2-3. Schools that do not have a specialist/trained media studies teacher might be relieved that they don't have to offer a potentially resource-heavy subject (in terms of equipment/facilities)	Law/civics/politics	Yes			2020-02-21 08:24:20	ANON-YFPW-R9MZ-R	2020-02-21 08:24:20	2020-02-21 08:24:28
No		Strongly disagree		Accounting/Business/Economic are all specialists subject in their own right. I moved to a new school last year and they didn't offer level 1 business so when I started level 2 there was a huge knowledge gap. Please do not combine these as it will not work. Year 10 and under yes no problem.	No	Yes	No		2020-02-21 08:28:38	ANON-YFPW-R9MB-Z	2020-02-21 08:28:38	2020-02-21 08:29:00

Yes		Strongly disagree	With the livestreaming of the Christchurch atrocity, the Momo Challenge hoax, the Cambridge Analytica personal data scandal, as well as the prevalence of cyber bullying and other online dangers, Media Studies has never been more relevant or more important. We should be making it compulsory at Year 10, not phasing it out in Year 11. The ministry claims to be committed to providing students with 21st century skills and the tools to navigate the new and changing digital landscape. Phasing out L1 Media Studies is a direct contradiction of that aim. In what world is the study of religion more important for 15-year-olds than the study of the way they spend almost all of their spare time, receive and share information, communicate with each other and consume entertainment? It's incredible to think someone thought this was a good idea.		No				2020-02-21 08:30:01	ANON-YFPW-R9MM-B	2020-02-21 08:30:01	2020-02-21 08:30:23
Yes		Strongly disagree			No				2020-02-21 08:30:39	ANON-YFPW-R9MD-2	2020-02-21 08:30:39	2020-02-21 08:30:53
No		Strongly agree		no	Tourism	No			2020-02-21 08:32:05	ANON-YFPW-R9MX-P	2020-02-21 08:32:05	2020-02-21 08:32:34
Yes		Undecided	-some concern over conflation of subjects that may be better taken apart -concern over time and resource constraints -potential for students to miss out on taking one subject because it has been put together with another (Classics students might not take History because they'd never get past Treaty of Waitangi and WW2) -While media studies takes a lot from psychology, those wanting to go into a clinical setting further in their studies may not benefit from a class that focussed on semiotic readings of texts and their psychological effects- interest tends to be in abnormal or developmental psychology -some students really do know what they want. It may not be popular, but for students looking to go into science fields, Latin may be a really useful subject to take		No				2020-02-21 08:36:22	ANON-YFPW-R9MA-Y	2020-02-21 08:36:22	2020-02-21 08:36:30
No		Disagree		Keep Physical Education and Health Education Level 1 separate		No			2020-02-21 08:36:56	ANON-YFPW-R9MK-9	2020-02-21 08:36:56	2020-02-21 08:37:03
Yes		Disagree	Physical Education and Health should be separated. There will be a heap of students who are interested in Health but not in the Physical Education element. This will limit the number of students wanting to take just Health because they won't want to do the practical.	Give the option of either full Physical Education, full Health or a combination of Physical Education and Health. See above for reason.		No			2020-02-21 08:36:51	ANON-YFPW-R9MN-C	2020-02-21 08:36:51	2020-02-21 08:37:06
Yes	Yes, I was aware but not the rationale behind it - to ensure students are not pigeon holed at level 1	Agree		I don't understand what "integrated through new Technology subjects" will ensue for the subject of Technology		No			2020-02-21 08:40:13	ANON-YFPW-R9MR-G	2020-02-21 08:40:13	2020-02-21 08:40:25
Yes		Disagree		Philosophy or Critical Thinking needs to be included. Without proper rational grounding countries will fragment. Look at UK and US. Many of my colleagues cannot follow an argument in a workshop, let alone in person. If we are to survive and prosper, and create a wonderful nation we require courses in rational thinking.	Philosophy.	No			2020-02-21 08:40:41	ANON-YFPW-R9MW-N	2020-02-21 08:40:20	2020-02-21 08:40:45
Yes	However NCEA review has been poorly communicated. When approaching the review the voice of the teachers on the review panels has been largely ignored. The broadening of Level 1 NCEA does not have to mean that it should be simplified or 'dumbed-down'. However this has been the outcome of the review. By broadening Level 1 the Ministry has indicated that it has no faith in schools to provide options to their students. Schools currently create bespoke courses for their level one students picking and choosing the credits they offer. This tailor made approach ensures that the students benefit from both breadth and crucially depth. The NCEA review at level one removes this depth leaving a shallow and meaningless qualification that does not meet the needs of the broad population. It therefore fails to do the very thing it set out to achieve.	Strongly disagree		The proposal to merge Classics with History is a classic Ministry oversight. We have just been informed by the Ministry that New Zealand History is crucial. So much so that it is now compulsory. Its that important. Yet we'll merge Classics into that subject as History isn't important. The mixed messages here are baffling. Why take time away from History when you yourselves say that its very important?	We already have these specialist subject. Leave this to the schools to decide. They know their students best.	No			2020-02-21 08:41:56	ANON-YFPW-R9M4-J	2020-02-21 08:41:56	2020-02-21 08:42:07
Yes		Undecided				No			2020-02-21 08:43:01	ANON-YFPW-R9MT-J	2020-02-21 08:43:01	2020-02-21 08:43:14

No	Not until media coverage of the proposals to scrap Latin and reduce Classics and Art history.	Strongly disagree	Arts subjects are already far too devalued in society and our education system. The further reducing the availability of these subjects will only serve to further undermine the viability of these important disciplines.	Latin, Classics, and Art History must continue to be offered across the NCEA spectrum. Latin, for example, has a range of modern applications, especially in the legal and scientific fields, and subjects like Classics and Art History contribute greatly to our understanding of the development of our contemporary society. Removing the pathway into these subjects at NCEA Level One will likely have significant impacts on student numbers flowing through into Levels Two and Three, as they will be seen as less valuable and students will be essentially funneled through into subjects other than these due to the generalist nature of them. Classics, in particular, will struggle with History as a subject already needing to cover a wide gambit of Aotearoa New Zealand history and world history, leaving scant room for the teaching of Classics.		Yes				2020-02-21 08:44:24	ANON-YFPW-R9M3-H	2020-02-21 08:44:24	2020-02-21 08:44:32
Yes		Strongly disagree	It is such a gaping hole getting rid of Media Studies. This subject allows students to critically reflect on what is happening around them right now, how media types are used to sway the direction of people, states, nations. It also allows for creativity and develops collaboration and project based learning. It is the subject that others could look to, to see how the NZ curriculum is effectively implemented.	It is such a gaping hole getting rid of Media Studies. This subject allows students to critically reflect on what is happening around them right now, how media types are used to sway the direction of people, states, nations. It also allows for creativity and develops collaboration and project based learning. It is the subject that others could look to, to see how the NZ curriculum is effectively implemented.		Yes				2020-02-21 08:48:08	ANON-YFPW-R9M2-G	2020-02-21 08:48:08	2020-02-21 08:48:19
Yes		Agree				No				2020-02-21 08:50:04	ANON-YFPW-R9KJ-N	2020-02-21 08:50:04	2020-02-21 08:50:13
Yes		Undecided	I am concerned about the suggested changes to the science curriculum being less content based. For L2 sciences and beyond scientific concepts are required for learning and without this bases at Level 1 scientific concepts will be difficult to learn at Level 2.	See above	Anatomy	No				2020-02-21 08:51:57	ANON-YFPW-R9KJ-J	2020-02-21 08:51:57	2020-02-21 08:52:20
No		Disagree	Communication and Marketing are very key components of the job market today and these are not well covered by schools but are specialisations at university. I think Media Studies should be offered at year 11 as should Marketing as a key part of a broad business course.	As Above	Marketing, Communication Studies	No				2020-02-21 08:53:12	ANON-YFPW-R9KC-Y	2020-02-21 08:53:12	2020-02-21 08:53:25
Yes		Agree		In particular for PE and health, I think it needs to be combined as they do work in conjunction and can be linked together.	N/A	No				2020-02-21 08:54:52	ANON-YFPW-R9K8-M	2020-02-21 08:54:52	2020-02-21 08:55:06
Yes		Agree		I believe that a Level 1 education should be broad and be focused on the learning of a general range of skills rather than specialising so early. As a Careers Advisor, too often students specialise too early and then realise they have inadvertently shut themselves out of a future pathway due to the specialisation of subjects at school. What I would hope, is that within these broad subject areas, that teacher has the flexibility to create courses that have a local context and are responsive to their particular cohort.	I think that the Government has an opportunity here, to look much more carefully into the skills shortages that we as a country are experiencing. I developed and now teach Early Childhood Studies at Level 2 and 3, using both Early Childhood Unit Standards and Home Economics Achievement Standards. Ensuring that either combinations such as this could still continue, or I would hope that the Government looks into those subject areas in Level 3, 4, 5 New Zealand Certificates at Tertiary level which have high numbers to see what our students want to study.	No				2020-02-21 08:55:05	ANON-YFPW-R9K9-N	2020-02-21 08:55:05	2020-02-21 08:55:16
Yes		Disagree	subjects are important to specialise in in year 11 as they can figure out what they want earlier and they don't have to worry about learning about multiple things at once and overwhelming themselves			No				2020-02-21 08:56:18	ANON-YFPW-R9K3-3	2020-02-21 08:56:18	2020-02-21 08:56:32
Yes		Undecided		Outdoor education should be included under PE at L1. It is a significantly different to PE and Health and most NZ secondary schools deliver Outdoor education as a stand alone subject.	Outdoor Education should be separate to PE and Health and have its own Achievement standards at L2 and L3.	No				2020-02-21 08:59:02	ANON-YFPW-R9KQ-D	2020-02-21 08:59:02	2020-02-21 08:59:17
No	I was aware of a review but the information above is new. I thought the purpose of the review was to review standards across subjects in order to make it more equitable. As an English teacher, this is a concern, as I believe (as do colleagues and students) that it is much harder to gain credits in English than in other subjects.	Disagree	I am concerned that Art History is to be discontinued as a subject. It is an incredibly rich area of study that should stand on its own. Even though it may be incorporated into Art, it is a separate distinct subject and should be recognised as such. I am greatly concerned about the relegation of arts subjects at school and university.	See above. Keep Art History!		No				2020-02-21 08:59:07	ANON-YFPW-R9KE-1	2020-02-21 08:59:07	2020-02-21 09:00:18
No		Strongly disagree		Accounting is one area which students enjoy a lot. Under the proposed changes there is basically no acknowledgement of this. I strongly suggest that Accounting remain as a separate subject at level one.		No				2020-02-21 09:00:18	ANON-YFPW-R9K5-H	2020-02-21 09:00:18	2020-02-21 09:00:27

No	It was hoped that in SCIENCES there would be room to retain the individual Sciences. I believe that these distinct subjects need to remain, especially with respect to the proposed 'achievement standards' that assess the 'important' learning at Level 1.	Strongly disagree	I completely disagree with the fusing of all Sciences into one. The strands are separated in the NZ Curriculum Document and so the opportunity should be available to schools to ASSESS ANY COMBINATION OF THE STRANDS within this document. The skills required to move into Level 2 and Level 3 specialisation that allow students to be successful at a high level in these subjects MUST be assessed at Level 1 to give an indication of their ability to cope with Level 2 and Level 3.	I completely disagree with the fusing of all Sciences into one. The Science strands are separated in the NZ Curriculum Document and so the opportunity should be available to every school to ASSESS ANY COMBINATION OF THE STRANDS within this document - both NoS AND CONTENT. The skills required to move into Level 2 and Level 3 specialisation that allow students to be successful at a high level in these subjects MUST be assessed at Level 1 to give an indication of their ability to cope with Level 2 and Level 3. A lack of specialist teachers in subject areas should not be driving what students are assessed on.		No	Thought that there was one Curriculum for all. Is there a translated copy?		2020-02-21 09:00:55	ANON-YFPW-R9KP-C	2020-02-21 09:00:55	2020-02-21 09:01:11
Yes	Most students are ready for more specialization and at year 11. Most will have a sense of direction and are ready for more rigour in their studies.	Strongly disagree		see above	Financial literacy may be at year 10	Yes			2020-02-21 09:00:57	ANON-YFPW-R9K7-K	2020-02-21 09:00:57	2020-02-21 09:01:21
Yes		Agree				Yes			2020-02-21 09:01:18	ANON-YFPW-R9KF-2	2020-02-21 09:01:18	2020-02-21 09:01:26
Yes		Strongly disagree	The combining of Business Studies, Accounting and Economics really shows that the Government or whoever that decided on this change has absolutely no idea the essence of the subjects in question. The specifics and the nature of the subject is not applicable to be combined and it is absolutely not ideal. In Year 10, we have subjects that are doing this and it really does not work at all. Not being able to go in depth in the subject and just dabbing at the surface just makes it a waste of time as the students would go away none the wiser.	The combining of Business Studies, Accounting and Economics really shows that the Government or whoever that decided on this change has absolutely no idea the essence of the subjects in question. The specifics and the nature of the subject is not applicable to be combined and it is absolutely not ideal. In Year 10, we have subjects that are doing this and it really does not work at all. Not being able to go in depth in the subject and just dabbing at the surface just makes it a waste of time as the students would go away none the wiser. Please do get teachers who are really an expert in the subject to be on the board rather than always getting teachers who have no idea about the subjects to be providing their two cents worth.	I was hoping that the Government would be able to look into the consistency of Level 2 and 3 subjects across all subjects. The problem here is that some subjects have way easier credits than others and hence it would become easy to understand why the students would shun away from some subjects and take others instead. It should be consistent in terms of the difficulty and complexity of the topic and this again would involve the subject expert groups (assuming they are indeed experts in the subject and not just because they have been teaching this subject the longest).	No			2020-02-21 09:01:40	ANON-YFPW-R9KZ-P	2020-02-21 09:01:40	2020-02-21 09:01:55
No		Strongly disagree	Specific foundational knowledge allows students to develop a strong understanding, and application of, different disciplines. This reduces equity and enables better outcomes for students. Merging subjects causes the level of knowledge to drop and will continue to see New Zealand students disadvantaged compared to those countries leading educational league tables.	Keep Science separate - the system allows choice currently, same applies to Commerce subjects and Health and PE. Also do not think media Studies should be combined with Social Studies. Agree with Technology changes and History changes. Maori Performing Arts inclusion is great.	Maori Performing Arts all the way through	No			2020-02-21 09:03:03	ANON-YFPW-R9KB-X	2020-02-21 09:03:03	2020-02-21 09:03:15
Yes		Disagree	The proposed changes will narrow down the way the curriculum can be delivered. It makes it difficult for schools deliver cross curricular and integrated teaching programs. It appears to be narrowing down the options given to students, which could be limiting to some priority learners.	What are the practical constraints of the Accounting? The fact that Accounting is a practical subject that gives students an opportunity to improve financial literacy means it should be included, not excluded.		No			2020-02-21 09:03:04	ANON-YFPW-R9KM-9	2020-02-21 09:03:04	2020-02-21 09:03:23
No		Undecided				No			2020-02-21 09:03:11	ANON-YFPW-R9KD-Z	2020-02-21 09:03:11	2020-02-21 09:03:33
Yes		Agree		Would be nice to keep Latin as a subject. Understanding Latin gives you a head start of terms used in academia. Obviously ancient Greek too.	IT skills and literacy are missing from a lot of workplaces. A lot of people are unfamiliar with the basics of using a PC or Mac or other basic devices.	No			2020-02-21 09:04:10	ANON-YFPW-R9KM-M	2020-02-21 09:04:10	2020-02-21 09:04:40
Yes		Strongly disagree	It is shocking that Level 1 Media Studies is not on the list and we have been encouraging students to have maximum media literacy considering we live in such a complex media landscape.	Media Studies should be a SEPARATE and specific subject. It contains topics that no other subjects cover - critical thinking, close reading, production skills, use of digital technologies and offers an excellent forum for student voice, narrative, story telling, representation, ethical considerations and incorporating biculturalism like no other. We connect with the community and offer real world experiences.	Keep the Media Studies course a specialist subject, but keep the Level 1 in the course outline as it offers excellent skills for all students. Students say "I would have left school if it wasn't for Media Studies, which kept me coming back". Parents say "I wish I had the opportunity to study this subject".	Yes	No.		2020-02-21 09:04:55	ANON-YFPW-R9KA-W	2020-02-21 09:04:55	2020-02-21 09:05:09
No		Strongly disagree	what a shambles and a dis-service to the students. This will turn students off learning forcing them to do subjects they aren't interested in - e.g not all students who do health want to do PE.	Do not combine PE/Health/Home ec as they are all very specialist topics.	no	No			2020-02-21 09:08:10	ANON-YFPW-R9KN-A	2020-02-21 09:08:10	2020-02-21 09:08:18
Yes		Agree				Yes			2020-02-21 09:09:42	ANON-YFPW-R9KK-7	2020-02-21 09:09:42	2020-02-21 09:09:51
No		Strongly agree	I think assessment at Level one should largely be abolished with the focus shifted to Level 2. These are anxious times and there is too much assessment.	There are far too many Social Sciences available at Secondary, including subject in my view best left to University - eg Psychology, Criminology, Sociology The well-rounded course of education that used to be offered, one that gives students a lot of choice in future paths is being eroded by timetables heavily weighted in one discipline. I don't think that this is a trend to be encouraged. Some students are starting to know more and more about less and less - ie a narrowing field rather than a broad foundation.		No			2020-02-21 09:10:01	ANON-YFPW-R9KG-J	2020-02-21 09:10:01	2020-02-21 09:10:14

Yes		Undecided	I feel that NCEA Level 1 is a benchmark for teaching students the expectations of Level 2 and 3. I feel that they mature during year 11 and rise to the challenge of the program. By taking away the opportunity at level 1, it will be another year where they are not serious about their education and make a commitment to learning. I think that the seriousness being accountable for their learning is apparent when they reach level 1. I see a big shift in their mindset when they reach level 1. To take it away completely is like taking away the foundation of a building.		Consider in the social studies integrating a course "Driver's Education. This course could be simulation of driving on the road, and all taught in our school, and for credits. It would help the road toll for teenage drivers. I did a similar course in the 70's at my high school, and it was very successful and popular and all of us looked forward to taking Driver's Education. The Ministry could set up simulations and the students sit at their desks and practice driving. With the technology available today, I don't see this as impossible. Now, the students get credits for a Learners license and a restricted license, so this could also be a course where they received credits - perhaps unit standards. It would be a life skill that they would take with them throughout their life. There are many courses that NCEA have that are practical in nature, like Financial Literacy, Barista, fork lift driving, etc, I feel that this could benefit the student, society and school.	No				2020-02-21 09:10:43	ANON-YFPW-R9KR-E	2020-02-21 09:10:43	2020-02-21 09:11:10
Yes		Strongly disagree	I strongly disagree that media studies would be "only supported as [a] possible context[s] for Social Studies." Media studies is an absolutely crucial subject for young people to be introduced to, ideally from junior level if not level 1 at the latest. It is outrageous to think that as we move into a more digital and media focused future, we would actually move away from teaching media studies and consider it so unimportant as to not even warrant it as a subject in its own right at level 1. How are young people supposed to begin to understand the ways that media impact them if they are not exposed to this learning from early on? It's completely backwards thinking to start reducing media teaching - it is far more relevant to our students' every day lived experiences than the likes of history, for example.	I strongly disagree that media studies would be "only supported as [a] possible context[s] for Social Studies." Media studies is an absolutely crucial subject for young people to be introduced to, ideally from junior level if not level 1 at the latest. It is outrageous to think that as we move into a more digital and media focused future, we would actually move away from teaching media studies and consider it so unimportant as to not even warrant it as a subject in its own right at level 1. How are young people supposed to begin to understand the ways that media impact them if they are not exposed to this learning from early on? It's completely backwards thinking to start reducing media teaching - it is far more relevant to our students' every day lived experiences than the likes of history, for example.		Yes				2020-02-21 09:11:53	ANON-YFPW-R9K4-G	2020-02-21 09:11:53	2020-02-21 09:12:08
Yes		Undecided	I am undecided as more clarification is needed to show the impact of the proposed changes.			Yes				2020-02-21 09:13:17	ANON-YFPW-R9KT-G	2020-02-21 09:13:17	2020-02-21 09:13:27
No	I am a Visual Arts teacher and have been following my area closely. I am aware of the proposed changes to the standards within Visual Arts, but did not realise that other learning areas would become broader. At my school we offer a design course and a painting course at level 1, which will lead to specialised pathways at level 2 and 3. This seems logical but will this be impacted?	Agree	In my opinion, the KC's and Curriculum Strands have become diluted over time with more emphasis on the AS language. I think more alignment with the strands and curriculum level 6 is what NCEA level 1 needs.	I believe Media Studies should be part of the English LA as well as Digital Technologies and even Design. I really don't see the connection to Social Science (Social Studies). If students can take a Media Studies course at level 2 and 3, will the Social Science teachers have the skills to teach them about Indesign (magazine design). It would be a shame to take the practical aspect of Media Studies out.	A Visual Arts subject dedicated to Animation or Moving Image should exist. I feel it should have it's own set of AS. The emphasis placed on the moving element outweighs the elements of design.	No				2020-02-21 09:13:58	ANON-YFPW-R9K3-F	2020-02-21 09:13:58	2020-02-21 09:14:17
No		Agree	NZ is going to fall behind other nations even further. STEM subjects get devalued even further by reducing the emphasis on Science. There is a clear imbalance: 1 Science (proper science rather than applied) and 5 Arts subjects? I don't think any other country in the world would seriously consider this.	If students can only pick up a subject like Physics at Level 2, Universities will have to dumb down their first year of a degree programme to a foundation year.	Programming and Data Science.	No				2020-02-21 09:14:16	ANON-YFPW-R9K2-E	2020-02-21 09:14:16	2020-02-21 09:14:25
No		Strongly disagree				No				2020-02-21 09:15:21	ANON-YFPW-R9KU-H	2020-02-21 09:15:21	2020-02-21 09:15:35

Yes		Strongly disagree		Media studies must be included in level 1 as a core subject! How many times a day do people access the internet on their devices? How many times a day/week do people watch tv or films? How many people use social media? How do people access news content? Compare this with how often people use trigonometry or algebra in their everyday lives (not that I think maths isn't important, but I'm trying to make a point!). Media studies is vital to ensure our young people are learning to critically analyse the media they consume and to equip them to use it appropriately. There is a direct correlation between social media access and an increase in youth anxiety and depression etc. There are also more and more people using social media as their job, with a huge increase of influencers. Businesses also expect employees to use social media to promote their products and services, and employ people to manage social media accounts, among other media-related roles. The media and digital content has infiltrated so many aspects of modern life, and if NCEA is about preparing young people for the changing workforce then media studies must be a subject that is taken seriously and is provided to every NZ		No			2020-02-21 09:16:13	ANON-YFPW-R9NY-R	2020-02-21 09:16:13	2020-02-21 09:16:36
Yes		Undecided	Mostly agree, but some issues	Why the special treatment for AgHort? Food Science is a completely different subject to home economics, and should be part of science. Why not streamline languages into just one (or maybe two) subjects?	Subjects based on areas of employment rather than areas of academic study - why do we teach biology, chemistry and physics but not engineering, medicine or biotechnology? Why accounting but not marketing? Why geography but not surveying?	No			2020-02-21 09:17:10	ANON-YFPW-R9NV-N	2020-02-21 09:17:10	2020-02-21 09:17:20
No		Disagree	Health and Physical Education work well together in the junior school, but by year 11 the content and students who opt into Health as a separate subject and PE as a separate subject is vast. If these two were combined it would be detrimental to all students in these areas.	see above. Currently working at Wellington High School in the PE department we have 4 separate stand alone courses - Sports Science, Recreation, Outdoor Education and Health. I feel that the content in these 4 areas is varied enough and caters for a wide variety of students needs. I have taught in other schools where the Health, Outdoor Education and PE are combined and I do not think it works well because some students just are not motivated in some aspects and can opt into courses (even with prior knowledge) surprised to find out the units are not really what they enjoy.	no	No			2020-02-21 09:17:28	ANON-YFPW-R9NC-2	2020-02-21 09:17:28	2020-02-21 09:17:46
No		Strongly agree				No			2020-02-21 09:18:04	ANON-YFPW-R9NS-J	2020-02-21 09:18:04	2020-02-21 09:18:25
Yes		Strongly agree	This is a natural move to keep options and choices broad for all akonga whilst providing foundation qualifications for those who are nearing the end of their secondary school experience. Really prevents over specialisation and unwise limiting of range of essential learning areas, all of which help produce well-rounded students.	I am very pleased to see that Classics, Art History, Media Studies and Psychology are alluded to as possible inclusions within the opportunities offered inside the redefined learning areas. I am even more pleased that Religious Ed is included in the range of learning experiences. I am ecstatic that early specialisation in and concentration on individual Sciences is being discouraged at this Level One. Let's make it impossible to do "TRI SCI" at Level One.	Film production/film making/film acting	No			2020-02-21 09:19:01	ANON-YFPW-R9N8-Q	2020-02-21 09:19:01	2020-02-21 09:19:32
Yes		Strongly agree		Great to see Ag/Hort Science retained. Just needs more Careers advice support and more specialist teachers. Remove the stigma that it is for the less able students		No			2020-02-21 09:19:42	ANON-YFPW-R9N9-R	2020-02-21 09:19:42	2020-02-21 09:19:59
No		Undecided		Why is Textiles not a stand alone subject? Is it part of Materials Technology? Hard materials and soft materials are 2x totally different fields of study so they should be separate subjects. The Textile industry is a multi billion dollar industry so it seems bizarre that it is not its own subject.	Fashion and Textiles	No			2020-02-21 09:21:02	ANON-YFPW-R9NJ-9	2020-02-21 09:21:02	2020-02-21 09:21:17
Yes		Agree				No			2020-02-21 09:21:26	ANON-YFPW-R9NL-G	2020-02-21 09:21:26	2020-02-21 09:21:38
No	Unaware of plans to reduce availability of some subjects at level 1. E.g. Media Studies.	Undecided	Although I see the sense in simplifying this, it worries me that some subjects are seen as having more value than others (e.g. religious studies over media studies and psychology).	Media Studies is invaluable in helping students understand our world and society. With increasing mental health issues, it's crucial we are teaching young people this social science.		Yes			2020-02-21 09:21:43	ANON-YFPW-R9NE-4	2020-02-21 09:21:43	2020-02-21 09:21:56

No		Strongly disagree	In this day and age of mass information via the internet (social media, film, news, instagram, twitter etc.) it is imperative that Media Studies is seen as a CORE SUBJECT to support student use of this we critical awareness and ethical lenses. Put simple Media Studies is the new CORE SUBJECT for the 21st century.	In this day and age of mass information via the internet (social media, film, news, instagram, twitter etc.) it is imperative that Media Studies is seen as a CORE SUBJECT to support student use of this we critical awareness and ethical lenses. Put simple Media Studies is the new CORE SUBJECT for the 21st century.	Yes				2020-02-21 09:22:10	ANON-YFPW-R9N5-M	2020-02-21 09:22:10	2020-02-21 09:22:25
No	I feel this aspect of the change was not a widely publicised as others. Its disappointing to see some very popular subjects combined with others and now only "contextual".	Strongly disagree	It becomes concerning that the next step will be that schools stop offering these subjects as lower levels (9&10) because students will have "pause" them for a year before taking them again. my Son plans on taking Latin as his language from yr 9 and we are disappointed this will no longer be a practical option for him.	Combining subjects and making them contextual only will have major impacts on later years and tertiary study. It is likely students will move away from these subjects at higher and lower levels and we will see large decline in uptake which will then be used to remove these all together. Many schools offer these subjects as electives in lower years and I suspect will move away from this going forward. How do you expect a student to study a language in Yr 9 &10, stop in yr 11 and then start again? what is the likelihood they will do this, when they will have to take a "filler/subject in yr 11?"	No		Make sure schools continue to be able to offer composite subjects - i.e. my daughter has done "Humanities" at her school which is offered for level 1-3 and consists of: 6 english credits 8 history credits 4 Classics credits but removing level 1 classics now makes this redundant and will likely see the end of this very popular programme		2020-02-21 09:22:41	ANON-YFPW-R9NP-F	2020-02-21 09:22:41	2020-02-21 09:22:50
Yes		Strongly agree			Yes		More expectations of follow-through of students from Primary to Intermediate to Secondary school with Maori language acquisition.		2020-02-21 09:25:48	ANON-YFPW-R9N7-P	2020-02-21 09:25:48	2020-02-21 09:25:56
Yes	Sensible	Strongly agree			No	Some knowledge but not as familiar. From what I do know, like the direction it is taking.			2020-02-21 09:26:42	ANON-YFPW-R9NF-5	2020-02-21 09:26:42	2020-02-21 09:26:58
Yes		Undecided	Concerns that combining science and commerce will lead to more schools dropping level one entirely		No		Upgrading the maths and statistics standards at level 2 to eliminate/combine all the small 2 credit standards		2020-02-21 09:27:29	ANON-YFPW-R9N1-G	2020-02-21 09:27:29	2020-02-21 09:27:41
No	The merger of some subjects is further restricting schools and students. I work in a school where many students leave when 16 so only have Level One.	Disagree	Media Studies is interesting since it is the biggest growing subject...		No				2020-02-21 09:27:58	ANON-YFPW-R9NZ-5	2020-02-21 09:27:58	2020-02-21 09:28:04
Yes		Agree		Unsure why Classics is included under History - most schools do not offer Level 1 Classics	No		New Zealand History		2020-02-21 09:28:18	ANON-YFPW-R9NH-7	2020-02-21 09:28:18	2020-02-21 09:28:27
Yes		Strongly agree			Yes				2020-02-21 09:29:12	ANON-YFPW-R9NB-1	2020-02-21 09:29:12	2020-02-21 09:29:24
No	Not specifically. There seems to be some privilege among subjects that have been retained in their own right and others that have been clumped together. For example Health and Physical Education have been lumped together as the same subject but are two distinct curriculum bound together by common underlying concepts. Other curriculum with multiple subject disciplines are likely to feel the same about this proposed decision. It is likely you have thought of this already, but as a possibility optional stds in multi discipline curriculum could be offered so teachers still have some choice about the focus of their programmes rather than watering the content down to cover a broad range of knowledge, skills, understanding.	Disagree	See above...and watered down course content knowledge, understanding, skills. isn't this more typical of our Yr 10 curriculum. Why replicate it at Yr 11?	There seems to be some privilege among subjects that have been retained in their own right and others that have been clumped together. For example Health and Physical Education have been lumped together as the same subject but are two distinct curriculum bound together by common underlying concepts. Other curriculum with multiple subject disciplines are likely to feel the same about this proposed decision. It is likely you have thought of this already, but as a possibility optional stds in multi discipline curriculum could be offered so teachers still have some choice about the focus of their programmes rather than watering the content down to cover a broad range of knowledge, skills, understanding.	No	I have some knowledge but it is limited.			2020-02-21 09:29:16	ANON-YFPW-R9NM-C	2020-02-21 09:29:16	2020-02-21 09:29:28
No	I was aware of the idea - not of the potential implications.	Strongly disagree	The proposed amalgamation of certain subjects into broader ones is flawed. History and classics are entirely separate subjects. As are psychology and media studies - neither are social studies. I believe specialised subjects will lose what makes them special and lose the value that they give.	History - remains history Classics - remains classics. At the moment, if there isn't interest, schools don't offer it. Why change what is working? Media and psychology - ????	No				2020-02-21 09:29:43	ANON-YFPW-R9ND-3	2020-02-21 09:29:43	2020-02-21 09:29:52
Yes		Disagree	I don't agree with removing Accounting and Economics at Level 1. I can understand combining Eco and Bus St and Level 1 but not Accounting. The NZ Curriculum wants students who are financially literate. Many students do Accounting in Year 11 and then drop it in Year 12 to pick up 3 Sciences, so if there is no Accounting offered in Year 11 then many students will miss the opportunity it study it ever in their time at school.	I don't agree with removing Accounting and Economics at Level 1. I can understand combining Eco and Bus St and Level 1 but not Accounting. The NZ Curriculum wants students who are financially literate. Many students do Accounting in Year 11 and then drop it in Year 12 to pick up 3 Sciences, so if there is no Accounting offered in Year 11 then many students will miss the opportunity it study it ever in their time at school.	No				2020-02-21 09:31:03	ANON-YFPW-R9NA-Z	2020-02-21 09:31:03	2020-02-21 09:31:19
Yes		Strongly agree	The proposed subjects make real sense		No				2020-02-21 09:32:56	ANON-YFPW-R9NN-D	2020-02-21 09:32:56	2020-02-21 09:33:06

No		Agree		I would suggest changing the target subject title Commerce to Commerce and Economics. Economics is a broad study and Commerce is a subcategory of it. It would make sense to add both to the title.	I would like Ministry to consider adding Political Science, Sociology and Psychology to NCEA Levels 2 and 3 curriculum.	No				2020-02-21 09:33:04	ANON-YFPW-R9NK-A	2020-02-21 09:33:04	2020-02-21 09:33:18
Yes	I was informed. But I do not agree with this. We have many specialist teachers in our profession and students have benefitted from being able to choose subjects that serve their own interests. Having a variety of subject choices allows students choice and individualised programs that support their passions, culture and unique interests.	Strongly disagree	It is unfathomable that Media Studies is not offered at level 1. This course has scaffolded students for success in level 2 and 3 and allowed students to learn in a contemporary, topical and hugely relevant subject. It seems bewildering in an age of post-truth politics and social media technologies that this subject is not seen as relevant for our young people. It should not be just a unit squeezed in between geography lessons. The students at this school who take media studies from level 1 enjoy this subject, are highly engaged and they develop critical thinking skills to take on to excellence level in later years.	Media Studies MUST be included at level 1. This is the reason why: - our students interact with the media more than any other age group. They need to be media savvy and critical, connected users. - students need to understand representation in the media. - students enjoy the production of media products and develop a solid foundation in level 1 that they take on to level 2 and 3. - To excel at level 2 and 3 students need prior knowledge to understand the theories taught at these levels.	Film Studies. Art History including past and present. Classical Studies.	No				2020-02-21 09:33:24 2020-02-21 09:34:03	ANON-YFPW-R9N6-N ANON-YFPW-R9NR-H	2020-02-21 09:33:24 2020-02-21 09:34:03	2020-02-21 09:33:41 2020-02-21 09:34:16
No		Agree		Would like the history/classics mash to be more 50/50 not just a low inclusion of classics	no	No				2020-02-21 09:34:14	ANON-YFPW-R9N4-K	2020-02-21 09:34:14	2020-02-21 09:34:23
Yes		Agree	Music and Geography placement look very sensible to me.	No		No				2020-02-21 09:34:22	ANON-YFPW-R9NT-K	2020-02-21 09:34:22	2020-02-21 09:34:41
Yes		Agree		I suggest that Level 1 Visual Arts move away from folio based assessment entirely and instead focus on a broad foundation course for level 2 and level 3 Visual Art.	I suggest that Visual Art should move away from separate fields and take a more integrated approach across the NCEA levels. This will enable students greater freedom to explore a range of art-making media to explore themes/ideas in their work. Currently, the final folio submission demands that the submission is predominantly in the artistic field of the standard (Paint, Print, Sculpture, Photo or Design).	No				2020-02-21 09:34:53	ANON-YFPW-R9N2-H	2020-02-21 09:34:53	2020-02-21 09:35:05
No		Undecided	Much of student learning is based on their engagement with the material. As such having subject specialisations that appeal to students is important to keeping them engaged in their schooling and as a bridge into the wider disciplines. Various specialist subjects (e.g. Classical studies, Latin, Earth and Space Sciences) may be important for keeping up a level of student interest. I am thinking especially of boys with my example subjects at the moment who I understand fall behind in NCEA results. I am sure that all of the merged subjects will have similar groups who find them an important part of keeping school interesting and relevant to them. Getting rid of them puts these marginalised students future at even more risk.	As above. In particular I am thinking of Latin, Classics and Earth&Space sciences, but the same can likely be said for any. I do like the idea of Technology being spread across the various subjects rather than taught as a subject in its own right.	I think something formal in the project management space would be good (this is stuff that is covered mostly in the technology sphere at the moment, but is a lot more widely applicable than to just technology).	No				2020-02-21 09:36:01	ANON-YFPW-R9NU-M	2020-02-21 09:36:01	2020-02-21 09:36:10
Yes		Agree	I like the broadened approach to Commerce and Science although subject purists are concerned. I also approve of the removal of the old Home Economics and rebranding the focus as Food Science, and hope that it supports its positioning within a technology Learning Area. I am a little concerned that the disappearance of Health as a stand alone subject may mean that we lose students who might not be disposed to taking PE as a subject but are very interested in Health. There is also a possible impact on staffing. Removal of subjects such as Media Studies, Classics and Art History and a broadening to such subjects as Social Studies also seems sensible to align with the concept of a broad base to foundation year of NCEA. I assume that the matrix at Level 2 will start to broaden?			No				2020-02-21 09:36:17	ANON-YFPW-R9PV-T	2020-02-21 09:36:17	2020-02-21 09:36:28
No	I was unaware of the scope of the changes. Whilst the proposals to roll Physics, Chemistry and Biology into Science makes sense as few schools would specialise at Level One there are enormous concerns at how Level 1 Science has been broadened to such a degree that Physics, Chemistry and Biology have essentially been removed. It is important that in the desire to "broaden" subject are not dumbed down or degraded to such a point that they become unrecognisable. I would call the L1 Science proposals not Science but almost a General studies or Environmental course.	Agree	on the condition that substance is not lost. For instance if you are intend to roll Economics, Accounting and Business studies into a new Commerce subject it is important this doesnt just become a pseudo Business Studies course with no economics or accounting elements. Level One is also very straight forward, one would hope there is real rigour at this level with externals to prepare students for what is to come.		The concern here is nothing is proposed for Level 2 and 3. One would hope that Classics, Accounting etc will be left alone at these levels and not follow the broad direction where they would disappear into Commerce or history.	No				2020-02-21 09:36:26	ANON-YFPW-R9PV-Q	2020-02-21 09:36:26	2020-02-21 09:36:33

Yes		Undecided		With regard to Accounting it is like Mathematics in that learning is sequential. Teaching a small portion of Accounting at Level 1 will mean there will be a flow on affect and the content at Levels 2 and 3 will need to be addressed accordingly. Hence we are not preparing those students who wish to study accounting and finance at University.		No			2020-02-21 09:36:57	ANON-YFPW-R9PC-4	2020-02-21 09:36:57	2020-02-21 09:37:22
Yes	It is a stupid idea. Especially in Science. All branches of Science are so different from each other that limiting them at L1 will do nothing but hamper students who continue to take it in L2 and L3. We already struggle to get through the curriculum in L1 in order to set them up for Senior Science subjects and limiting it further only punishes able students who are our future doctors, scientists, engineers etc. Private schools will scrap L1 NCEA completely, do their own programme such as offer IB or similar so those students won't suffer at all. State school students will be disadvantaged and the disparity gap between the haves and the have nots will only widen.	Strongly disagree	Private schools will scrap L1 NCEA completely, do their own programme such as offer IB or similar so those students won't suffer at all. State school students will be disadvantaged and the disparity gap between the haves and the have nots will only widen. Limiting the Science Curriculum at L1 (School leavers) means that you will have a portion of school leavers every year, leaving school without a broad base of scientific knowledge, who will struggle to make fact based decisions and who will in effect be scientifically illiterate.	Why on earth are we keeping ALL the Technology subjects but condensing 4 highly different and specialised bodies of Science knowledge into one and limiting the assessment opportunities?	How about instead of blaming secondary schooling for poor achievement rates, you invest more money into Primary education, change the qualifications for Primary teaching (to include specialist Science) and improve their Professional Development? Why must secondary schools be blamed for poor achievement, when we have students starting Yr 9 who still can't read and solve simple maths problems? How are secondary schools supposed to condense 7 years of pre secondary education + 5 years of post secondary education into 5 years and still have students achieving? It's an impossible task.	Yes			2020-02-21 09:37:26	ANON-YFPW-R9PS-M	2020-02-21 09:37:26	2020-02-21 09:37:38
Yes		Agree			Yes, Financial Literacy	No			2020-02-21 09:39:12	ANON-YFPW-R9PB-5	2020-02-21 09:39:12	2020-02-21 09:39:20
Yes		Strongly agree				No			2020-02-21 09:36:53	ANON-YFPW-R9N3-J	2020-02-21 09:34:41	2020-02-21 09:39:35
Yes		Agree				No			2020-02-21 09:41:57	ANON-YFPW-R9P9-T	2020-02-21 09:41:57	2020-02-21 09:42:21
No	Not until this release	Strongly disagree	As a HOD Health and PE, we have strong L1 PE and a strong L1 Health programme. Separate is better	Level 1 optional may be fine but I would not support the removal of a level 1 qualification. I am also a Year 11 dean, and by having this formal qualification it does a few things; 1. provides a practice before the more serious Level 2 and 3 exams, and the learning of NCEA systems beforehand. 2. gives a level of qualification for those that can't make level 2 (e.g. special needs, students who are just wanting to leave school for various reasons etc) 3. a confidence building block for Level 2		No	Aware of it but not familiar		2020-02-21 09:42:18	ANON-YFPW-R9PJ-B	2020-02-21 09:42:18	2020-02-21 09:42:29
No		Strongly disagree				No			2020-02-21 09:42:17	ANON-YFPW-R9PG-8	2020-02-21 09:42:17	2020-02-21 09:42:34
Yes		Strongly disagree	I am a science teacher. As it stands I am teaching level 2 chemistry students who lack basic chemical understanding and am having to go back to year 10 syllabus at the start of each unit. The proposed changes are not going to improve this situation in my opinion.			No			2020-02-21 09:46:24	ANON-YFPW-R9PQ-J	2020-02-21 09:46:24	2020-02-21 09:46:32
Yes		Agree		I agree in principle to the proposed change of a combined science at Level 1 - what concerns me is that it appears possible to omit physics and chemistry from a teaching program when using the new proposed standards .	I am interested to see what the new standards will look like in senior science - the newly proposed Level 1 science standards appear to be written from a social sciences perspective. Will there be a Level 2 & 3 science course ?	Yes	Yes but teachers need more support to be able to do this. The inclusion of mautauranga maori in the newly proposed science standards requires PD and support for most teachers this information is not easily accessible and will provide a significant challenge in the teaching of science at level 1.	Provide support mautauranga maori can not be looked up in a book or online it requires collaboration of teachers with their community and the resources (langata whenua) therein - how is this going to be achieved? This needs to be facilitated , supported and funded.	2020-02-21 09:47:07	ANON-YFPW-R9PE-6	2020-02-21 09:47:07	2020-02-21 09:47:19
Yes		Strongly agree				No			2020-02-21 09:47:24	ANON-YFPW-R9PS-P	2020-02-21 09:47:24	2020-02-21 09:47:50
Yes		Agree			Philosophy	No			2020-02-21 09:52:44	ANON-YFPW-R9P7-R	2020-02-21 09:52:44	2020-02-21 09:52:54
No	Not until I read this. I understood it was becoming optional. I think if you want to be more foundational you need to include some financial literacy, lifeskills,	Undecided	It does not seem foundational but still has a very academic focus. What is happening about a vocational qualification? Where are hospitality, travel and tourism, retail etc?			No			2020-02-21 09:52:57	ANON-YFPW-R9PF-7	2020-02-21 09:52:57	2020-02-21 09:53:06
No	No I was not aware that broad education was defined as "eradication of Sciences"	Strongly disagree	Science standards only allow for a "technical science course" bereft of content and no pathway for academic students.	As Deputy Principal of a High School we will be investigating Cambridge and IB as alternatives to NCEA. I can only imagine how delirious their sales teams are as they will have plenty of traffic coming their way. Removal of Level 1 Science standards in this way is not acceptable to students, parents, staff or any industry dependent on informed Science students.	I think the Ministry should spend time fixing the Science disaster they have just created before they consider further destruction.	No			2020-02-21 09:55:28	ANON-YFPW-R9PZ-U	2020-02-21 09:55:28	2020-02-21 09:55:38

Yes		Disagree		I do not agree with the merging of Health and Physical education. It is teaching our students that these are the same/similar which is not the case. This would therefore make it harder for students to specialize in Health or PE in level 2/3 because they are unaware of the difference.		No				2020-02-21 09:55:27	ANON-YFPW-R9P1-J	2020-02-21 09:55:27	2020-02-21 09:55:39
No	What an awful idea. Languages and commerce subjects and science subjects are all different, so why collapse commerce and science!	Strongly disagree	If you do this you are deliberately destroying Commerce and Science in NZ	Why is accounting no longer an option to learn.		No				2020-02-21 09:56:03	ANON-YFPW-R9PH-9	2020-02-21 09:56:03	2020-02-21 09:56:18
No	This is definitely something that should have been told to schools before this list came out. From what you have stated above students will basically be doing year 10 again and then the step up to year 12 will be even more difficult for them.	Strongly disagree	I think you would be making a huge mistake amalgamating several of these subjects into one. These subjects need subject specialists to teach them, in some cases they aren't even remotely the same or require the same skill set.	Classical Studies is one of the most multi-disciplinary subjects out there. By only having it as a possible context in history you are ignoring all the other aspects of classics that are not ancient history such as philosophy, language, literature, art history. You are ignoring the fact that they paved the way for the world we live in today!		No				2020-02-21 09:56:17	ANON-YFPW-R9PB-3	2020-02-21 09:56:17	2020-02-21 09:56:31
Yes		Strongly disagree	The huge irony and short-sightedness of leaving out Media Studies in a world where nearly all our content is mediated is incomprehensible. Media Studies could strongly make the case to be THE only compulsory subject in our schools.	I am guessing that by leaving out Media Studies the assumption is media related topics can be covered under the broader Social Studies. Leaving s a Social Studies media/unit aside to cover the level of critical awareness needed to navigate our world of digital manipulation, social media, fake news, mis-representation, hyper-reality, gaming, etc is totally insufficient. If you fear the impact technology is having on our young people, then omitting a subject that deals directly in these things will come at an even greater societal cost. Where else do you investigate the representation of women in music videos? get to understand the media organisations track, target and sell audiences? or how Hollywood film manipulate reality? Media Studies is one of the few subjects already aligned to the new digital curriculum. In the production standards students are already tasked with computational thinking and it helps to build such approaches as early as possible, as well as giving students practice and exposure to the media technologies (such as advanced editing software) as early as possible.	Theology. We living in an increasing diverse world/country. We need to build empathy and understanding, especially around religious tolerance.	No				2020-02-21 09:56:38	ANON-YFPW-R9PM-E	2020-02-21 09:56:38	2020-02-21 09:56:50
Yes	However, the broadness of the Level 1 foundation standards - particularly in Science will prevent subjects from covering their subject based curriculum and the preparation of students for Level 2.	Strongly disagree	I strongly disagree with nature of the Level 1 subject changes. With the influence of the media on young adolescents there is a strong argument to retain Level 1 Media Studies as a way to guide student understanding around media literacy.	Level 1 Media Studies should be retained. With the influence of the media on young adolescents there is a strong argument to retain Level 1 Media Studies as a way to guide student understanding around media literacy. Level 1 English is not the place for media literacy.	Retain what is currently available.	Yes				2020-02-21 09:58:07	ANON-YFPW-R9PD-5	2020-02-21 09:58:07	2020-02-21 09:58:41
Yes	Yes, from initial press releases. But feel quite blindsided by how this is actually being rolled out.	Undecided		Given the current climate of media disinformation and the growing demand for media, I would think that critical thinking and media literacy would be an area of the curriculum we would try to grow.	Many schools are beginning to offer both Music and Music Technology as separate courses. This does require there to be enough standards to justify the division of the courses but this suits student and market needs.	No				2020-02-21 09:59:25	ANON-YFPW-R9PA-2	2020-02-21 09:59:25	2020-02-21 09:59:40

Yes		Strongly agree	Students are making decisions to specialize too early. This can be to the detriment of being well prepared should they change direction at a later stage. I feel it is also important that students gain a broader education before they are able to leave school at 16 rather than a narrower specialization as: 1. this will enable them to make better informed decisions across a range of areas in their everyday lives. 2. They are keeping their options open for longer before they need to decide on the subjects in which they will specialize.	Strongly agree that Māori Performing Arts is included as a subject with the other more traditional Arts. Although it has been available as Unit Standards, this subject has not had a "level playing field". This paves the way for a University Entrance Māori Performing Arts alongside the Ngā Toi subjects offered in te Reo Māori. Strongly agree that Agricultural and Horticultural Sciences is retained as a separate subject. We have far too few students studying in this area and yet the primary industries make a major component of our GDP. Agree that the other sciences are combined into Science because, although specializing in year 11 leads to being better prepared for those subjects in year 12 and 13, the students are narrowing their options too early and unable to gain a broader education. All students would be entering year 12 and 13 with the same general science background and so teachers can adjust their programs for year 12 and 13 accordingly to account for prior knowledge. Agree with the changes to Health and Physical Education, History, Commerce and Social Studies for the same reasons as Science.	No				2020-02-21 09:59:31	ANON-YFPW-R9PN-F	2020-02-21 09:59:31	2020-02-21 09:59:54
Yes		Agree		I believe taking away the option to study art history a shame; I have seen some schools that offer it under English credits, which I believe was a good alternative.	I believe something digital needs to be offered at all schools for visual arts level 1, as a better gateway for students looking to study photography and design.	No			2020-02-21 09:59:52	ANON-YFPW-R9PK-C	2020-02-21 09:59:52	2020-02-21 10:00:07
Yes		Strongly disagree		Level 1-3 for Digital Tech have already gone through changes and new standards have been produced so I do not feel that another change will be helping us as teachers to teach the courses nor our students to gain better understanding of the fundamental concepts in this subject area if the those proposed changes are vague and open to interpretation. Also, building resources to support the changes is a big ask for the Teachers given that we have over the past 3 years developed resources for the current standards for the subject.	Provide more resources and exemplars for the current level 2 and 3 standards in Digital Tech	No			2020-02-21 09:59:25	ANON-YFPW-R9PX-S	2020-02-21 09:59:25	2020-02-21 10:00:09
No	I do think it is a good idea not to specialise too early and think it is good students may experience a wider range of content up in to year 11. However I am concerned that this may limit the range of assessments to choose from, especially for our lower level students.	Agree		At the moment we are able to build internal only programs such as 'skills science' for students who work better in such classes. We are able to take internal assessments from the range of Sciences to make such programs. How would we be able to create such programs so all students can succeed at level 1 under the new model?		No			2020-02-21 10:01:54	ANON-YFPW-R9PW-R	2020-02-21 10:01:54	2020-02-21 10:02:03
Yes	The theory is fine, but already I'm not sure that is happening if you are eliminating Art History and -- especially -- Latin, and placing Classical Studies as a subcategory of History. If anything Latin should be available at Yr 11 to give that broad background. Later students can choose to follow Latin or not.	Strongly disagree	You say one criterion is: How the subject supports the credibility of NCEA as a qualification overall among stakeholders, including its credibility as an internationally recognised qualification. But then you get rid of Latin, Art History and consign Classics to a lower level. I feel like NZ is jumping on the STEM bandwagon, throwing out the classical foundation. This STEM thing is a fad. Throwing out the liberal arts/classics will not raise the credibility of NCEA internationally. Quite the opposite. NZ should be in the forefront of restoring the liberal arts -- not eliminating.	See comment above. First, keep Latin. At all costs. It will return. Second, if you are going to put Art History and Classics as part of a broader subject of History, then great care has to go into resources and Teacher continuing education in order to show the great importance of these two subjects. In your footnote 1 above should eliminate the words "only" and "to a low degree"; the footnote should rather say how such disciplines should be the foundation of history.	Art History, Classics and Latin should all be fortified at Levels 2, 3, and scholarship. I really think an attitude change must happen at Ncea.	No			2020-02-21 10:01:47	ANON-YFPW-R9PR-K	2020-02-21 10:01:47	2020-02-21 10:02:10
No	Despite being a secondary teacher a lot of this is news to me	Undecided	Sad to see some subject specialisation lost at level 1. Media Studies in particular!	Media Studies is bursting at the seams at our college from Y9 through to Y13 with a clear pathway of learning. Proposed Social Studies standards will need to have the flexibility to work in a Media Studies context.		No			2020-02-21 10:03:50	ANON-YFPW-R9PT-N	2020-02-21 10:03:50	2020-02-21 10:03:57
Yes		Strongly agree				Yes	Only a general understanding	n/a	2020-02-21 10:04:38	ANON-YFPW-R9P3-M	2020-02-21 10:04:38	2020-02-21 10:04:58
No		Undecided				No			2020-02-21 10:10:07	ANON-YFPW-R9PU-P	2020-02-21 10:10:07	2020-02-21 10:10:23
Yes		Agree	It is important that the key learning objectives of the current subjects are retained and not lost in the combination		Legal studies	Yes		E pai ana, e mihi ana	2020-02-21 10:10:02	ANON-YFPW-R9P2-K	2020-02-21 10:10:02	2020-02-21 10:10:32
No		Strongly disagree	This is a terrible idea	Combining subjects together to become one is very dumb, students will not gain the benefits of knowing about specific subjects before progressing to the next level.	Classics needs to be taught by itself	No			2020-02-21 10:11:33	ANON-YFPW-R9SY-Y	2020-02-21 10:11:33	2020-02-21 10:11:41
Yes		Agree				No			2020-02-21 10:11:47	ANON-YFPW-R9SV-V	2020-02-21 10:11:47	2020-02-21 10:12:03
No		Strongly disagree				No			2020-02-21 10:12:45	ANON-YFPW-R9SC-9	2020-02-21 10:12:45	2020-02-21 10:12:51
Yes		Undecided				No			2020-02-21 10:14:36	ANON-YFPW-R9SS-S	2020-02-21 10:14:36	2020-02-21 10:15:01
Yes		Undecided				No			2020-02-21 10:15:22	ANON-YFPW-R9SE-X	2020-02-21 10:15:22	2020-02-21 10:15:29

Yes		Strongly disagree	This is too much of a narrowing / 'dumbing down' of the curriculum. I am a Science teacher, but more specifically a Biology Teacher. Losing the different disciplines within Science means that so much content will be lost, and the opportunity of choice / developing specific courses/ tailoring to students needs & interests is gone. Science should not be an all encompassing term - there are 4 distinct areas of Science which we currently have but will now lose. The students already find the jump from Level 1 content to Level 2 content a large jump - and many struggle with this. Taking away the specific content, and doing broad 'science' will make Level 2 even more inaccessible to many. Level 2 would then need to be 'dumbed down' to help with this, which in turn would then affect Level 3. Universities already say that NCEA does not provide enough academic knowledge to prepare students for tertiary study in science disciplines. This will only get worse if this proposal comes in. We already struggle with a shortage of teachers in these disciplines. Many will leave as they will be disenchanted with how their passions and being made bland and fluffy. This is a bad move.	As per my answer for Q2. Do not get rid of separate science disciplines. This will take away the in-depth content knowledge that is needed for further study.		No			2020-02-21 10:15:23	ANON-YFPW-R959-Y	2020-02-21 10:15:23	2020-02-21 10:15:35
Yes		Strongly agree		No, agree with subjects that have been excluded and/or groups e.g. social studies	NO	No			2020-02-21 10:16:12	ANON-YFPW-R959-D	2020-02-21 10:16:12	2020-02-21 10:16:27
No		Agree				Yes	No		2020-02-21 10:16:45	ANON-YFPW-R959-Q	2020-02-21 10:16:45	2020-02-21 10:16:51
Yes		Strongly disagree	I strongly disagree with the Ministry's proposed subjects as it absolutely stuffs up all of the other subjects such as classics, art history, media studies. Putting teachers jobs in jeopardy as they trained and have a degree specialized in those subjects.	Absolutely shit what you're doing	Stop messing with the subjects, it would be easier if you say diled them down but not merging subjects: 9/10?	Yes	Because it's taught everywhere. As much as it's nice to learn about New Zealand history in the subject history, history means the general history of the world, conflicts that happened elsewhere than just New Zealand! I took history to learn about a vast range of warfare however it is restricted down to the few un settlements that happened here in New Zealand.		2020-02-21 10:16:42	ANON-YFPW-R959-G	2020-02-21 10:16:42	2020-02-21 10:16:54
Yes		Agree				No			2020-02-21 10:19:10	ANON-YFPW-R959-B	2020-02-21 10:19:10	2020-02-21 10:19:20
No	I was not made aware I'm a level 3 student in 2020 and found that specialised subjects in level one were fundamental to my knowledge in level 2&3	Disagree	I believe that combining and getting rid of subjects will not benefit those who want to do classical studies, art history and Latin, I believe Maori performing arts will benefit and create a subject for the indigenous people of New Zealand and those who wanna celebrate Maori culture	I believe all the new subjects will benefit culture, schools and students, and getting rid of subjects seen as smaller will not benefit those who want to go into those subjects, it's diminishing success in history, business and science some students only want to take one and will found others non-beneficial, making success limited and putting stress on students who don't succeed as others in certain areas of an "umbrella" subject	All specialist subjects should stay separate, this is limiting the knowledge our country has, also not giving students and people of New Zealand the opportunity to bring their knowledge overseas and thrive overseas	No			2020-02-21 10:19:59	ANON-YFPW-R955-U	2020-02-21 10:19:59	2020-02-21 10:20:09
Yes	I have been very interested in this as I have seen some subjects become default to just become credit catchers rather than a body of learning.	Strongly agree	I am a music teacher in a high school. I really like the curriculum for senior students. Many students take music as a subject they love and want to do more of, but not necessarily become a professional musician. They are many positive outcomes of learning a musical instrument to help with brain development, fine motor skills and personal development/ confidence.	Music should continue as a practical subject, giving performance opportunities to students to encourage confidence in front of others and their overall personal development		Yes			2020-02-21 10:20:44	ANON-YFPW-R959-P	2020-02-21 10:20:44	2020-02-21 10:21:23

No	But I would like to be made aware. Unless you are getting rid of Classics. Which in that case you can burn in hell.	Strongly disagree	Classics rules! You can't get rid of it, it's one of the best subjects. Also, one of the reasons people like splitting into specific subjects instead of umbrella subjects is that is what they are interested in. They don't care about learning other things that hold no interest to them. It's a terrible idea that you have not thought through, just to let you know.	Don't group the subjects together, they are their own subjects. You cannot label them under one group. That's discrimination to the teachers who put work into learning that subject.	Don't get rid of Classics!	No	Is it about Classics? I was told I don't understand this because we are not a Te Reo Maori school	If you get rid of classics, we will have a problem. I will tell my parents not to vote for you and I won't vote for you when I am old enough. Do not cause this problem between us. I thought our relationship meant more than that to you guys. I care about classics more than I care about breathing. DO NOT TAKE THAT FROM ME!!!	2020-02-21 10:21:38	ANON-YFPW-R957-W	2020-02-21 10:21:38	2020-02-21 10:21:59
No	I don't see how removing subjects level 1 makes this 'broad'.	Strongly disagree	Combining the vast topics from all the Sciences into just 4 under the single topic of Science is the opposite of broad. Dumping or giving little support to psychology at L1 is also the opposite of their stated intentions.	Keep Psychology as a separate subject, as it is an area of growing importance and leads to a huge variety of careers. Split the Sciences back up to provide a wider range of contexts for learning	Human biology	No			2020-02-21 10:22:07	ANON-YFPW-R95F-C	2020-02-21 10:22:07	2020-02-21 10:22:19
Yes		Disagree	Very concerned about the loss of Accounting and Economics at level 1	Would like to see Accounting and Economics retained individually at level 1	fine	No			2020-02-21 10:22:49	ANON-YFPW-R951-Q	2020-02-21 10:22:49	2020-02-21 10:23:05
No	As a teacher very little was shared. As a head of Department, I had no idea.	Undecided	At this stage, not too much will change but to say that 5 different topics in science are to be covered by just 3 is a little advantageous			Yes			2020-02-21 10:23:43	ANON-YFPW-R95Z-2	2020-02-21 10:23:43	2020-02-21 10:24:01
No	As a teacher of Economics, it sounds like I would be teaching Spanish, Chinese, and Te Reo all together in one class. Seriously, who's idea is this.	Strongly disagree	With this proposal, we are preparing our Tamariki to fail more in school. They are already confused with the ncea system and this is further confusing them. Subjects need to be as it is at present why is there a need to have it combined. Not every student is good at everything and that is the reason why schools provide options. Through my observations for example students who turn to do well in Economics not necessarily do well in Accounting as they are totally different subjects. One has been content-based and theory the other being numbers.			No			2020-02-21 10:25:43	ANON-YFPW-R95H-E	2020-02-21 10:25:43	2020-02-21 10:26:03
No		Strongly disagree	I do not agree with how this new proposed scheme makes level 1 much too broad. I was lucky to have the option to at least branch out and specialize in the social sciences when I did level 1, and I was quite upset that I could not specialize in science until level 2 (in my specific school). I think the earlier students can specialize, the better as it gives them a much more accurate choice for them to do what they actually want to do. If these broad "umbrella subjects" are introduced, I feel it would deter people from many subjects as they would end up doing many subjects they didn't want to do. Say if I wanted to do social studies, I would not take it as it would mean I would have to do media studies.	I do not agree with getting rid of latin, art history and classics. This shows no respect towards many teachers, as well as cutting down the choice that makes high school so special.	more health-based science around the human anatomy as well as maybe nursing and communication skills, as well as a life-skills subject which teaches people how to pay their taxes, bills and how to be a functioning member of society	No	I feel it would be much better if the maori language and culture was integrated into all subjects, as it is an extremely important part of us as NZ that no one knows about		2020-02-21 10:25:59	ANON-YFPW-R95B-8	2020-02-21 10:25:59	2020-02-21 10:26:06
Yes		Disagree	The abolishment of physics, chem and biology, coupled with the vague nature of the proposed level 1 science standard, will leave students woefully unprepared for the level 2 specialist science subjects. There is already a big jump from level 1 to level 2. This jump will be magnified and lead to poorer achievement outcomes.	Need to include biology, physics and chemistry to ensure a solid foundation for progression to level 2 and 3	No	No			2020-02-21 10:26:11	ANON-YFPW-R95M-K	2020-02-21 10:26:11	2020-02-21 10:26:24
No		Agree				No			2020-02-21 10:26:22	ANON-YFPW-R95D-A	2020-02-21 10:26:22	2020-02-21 10:26:35
Yes		Undecided				No			2020-02-21 10:26:36	ANON-YFPW-R95A-7	2020-02-21 10:26:36	2020-02-21 10:26:45
Yes	Aware with no consultation, yet again changes are forced on Teachers with almost no input from them.	Strongly disagree	By limiting options at level 1 you are directly forcing students down certain pathways, which seems to be politically motivated. For example combining Economics, Accounting and Business studies into commerce, but adding Maori Performing Arts and keeping R.E in a secular country?	The whole approach to this seems to be driven by people who are not working at the coal face in Education, it seems to think that students are not learning currently and are not progressing, where as a Teacher of Economics for almost 20 years I can tell you with absolute certainty that Accounting and economics as separate subject allows students a lot more option later in their careers After seeing the proposed list yesterday, I am seriously considering a profession other than teaching, and I know a lot of my colleagues will be thinking the same. Yet again the ministry is creating a huge amount of work for teachers with actual data to backup the reason for the changes.	Please actually ask the teachers what they think for once	Yes			2020-02-21 10:26:24	ANON-YFPW-R95X-X	2020-02-21 10:26:24	2020-02-21 10:26:56
Yes		Undecided				No			2020-02-21 10:27:02	ANON-YFPW-R95N-M	2020-02-21 10:27:02	2020-02-21 10:27:15
Yes		Undecided		Removal or 'inclusion within an umbrella subject' of Art History, Classical Studies, and Latin is disappointing. Given the Treaty of Waitangi's partnership ethos, it doesn't seem equitable that subjects which support the identity of one of the Treaty partners is sidelined or disappeared. This does leave the way open to a feeling that one heritage/taonga has less value than the other, and can be removed without consideration of the effect on the mana of the individuals who identify with that heritage.		Yes	As a member of Ngati Pakeha, I am reluctant to comment as I do not have confidence that I can speak to what is important for nga tangata whenua.		2020-02-21 10:28:16	ANON-YFPW-R95K-H	2020-02-21 10:28:16	2020-02-21 10:28:24

No		Strongly disagree	Economics and Accounting should not be combined. Its like Latin and Japanese teaching together	no	No				2020-02-21 10:31:25	ANON-YFPW-R956-V	2020-02-21 10:31:25	2020-02-21 10:31:58
Yes		Agree			Yes				2020-02-21 10:32:08	ANON-YFPW-R958-R	2020-02-21 10:32:08	2020-02-21 10:32:21
Yes	This was much needed - students specialize far too young in NZ and lack basic understanding.	Undecided	Still feel that with most students only covering 5/6 subjects it is possible to still specialize too much. You could still complete 3 subjects in technology / arts/ social sciences/ languages. Would have preferred to see a limit of ONE subject per the 8 essential learning areas of the curriculum or allow combination courses so students could pick standards across the learning areas to keep it broad.	Am in favour of the proposal to start some subjects such as classics and psychology and media at Level 2. The choice at present is daunting to students so any that remove them is a step in the right direction. In some ways I feel that the cutting back of subjects is not as much as could have been. As prior would favour students doing ONE subject per learning area while also being able to pick standards appropriate to them within it. This would keep education more broad and provide students with the foundation on which to choose suitable courses for the future. Few students at L1 choose appropriate subjects but are driven more by peers / what they know or the teachers involved rather than what suits them.	No - some subjects should be left to the tertiary level only. There is a feeling that you have to do say psychology at school to do this at University if offered which is incorrect. Hence would cull a few here too.	No			2020-02-21 10:32:13	ANON-YFPW-R958-W	2020-02-21 10:32:13	2020-02-21 10:32:42
Yes		Strongly agree		No I think it is a good idea to have a broad curriculum at Level one so that students can gain skills that they can later focus at a more specialised area.	No	No			2020-02-21 10:32:20	ANON-YFPW-R957-T	2020-02-21 10:32:20	2020-02-21 10:32:54
Yes		Agree			No				2020-02-21 10:32:43	ANON-YFPW-R959-S	2020-02-21 10:32:43	2020-02-21 10:33:00
Yes		Strongly disagree	<p>Firstly, the incorporation of biology, chemistry, physics and earth and space science removes ALL formal assessment of any content in these areas from NCEA Level 1, as the Level 1 science standards which have been promulgated assess only Nature of Science. This means that students are only assessed on ONE of the FIVE strands of science in the NZ curriculum. Students will be COMPLETELY unprepared for the specialist nature of NCEA Level 2 sciences.</p> <p>The other changes (such as combining media studies with social studies, or classics with history) also mean that large areas of the curriculum are being chopped out of any kind of assessment, and students are not being prepared for future studies.</p> <p>These changes also reduce student agency and choice over what is studied, and reduce the ability of schools to create varied and interesting courses that are tailored to their local curriculum and student need.</p>	<p>The removal of Level 1 Chemistry, biology, physics and earth and space science is a major blow for science education in New Zealand. The proposed new Level 1 Science standards are very general and require very little science understanding. I strongly suggest that these subjects are retained at NCEA Level 1, as it is essential that students understand the key concepts associated with these areas of science, as well as understanding the nature of science.</p> <p>The jump between the expectations at NCEA Level 1 and NCEA Level 2 in the sciences is already very large, and the proposed changes is going to make the difference even more extreme.</p> <p>The rationale is to provide a clear pathway, but this change will do the opposite. The proposed Level 1 science standards are purely contextual and based on nature of science, and these do not continue to Levels 2 or 3, so it is difficult to see how this provides a pathway to the specialist, knowledge based subjects (chemistry, physics, biology, ESS) at Levels 2 and 3.</p>	<p>Yes. I would also like to see Level 2 and 3 science available for those students who do NOT want to specialise into one (or more) of the specialist science subjects. This would also provide a pathway for students going from Level 1 science up.</p>	No			2020-02-21 10:33:35	ANON-YFPW-R952-R	2020-02-21 10:33:35	2020-02-21 10:33:49
Yes		Disagree	Intelligent hard working students deserve the challenge of subject specific content, which is inherently more rigorous than generic broad subject knowledge. I do think that the dissolution of Media Studies, Art History, and Classical Studies at Level 1 might be a mistake because it fails to recognize that these content areas are fundamentally different from History and Social Studies generally. The same with the sciences, by compiling them at level 1 you deprive students of more subject specific knowledge. This feels like a dumbing down of the curriculum. Making things easier is not the best way to raise the relevance and value of the level 1 qualification.	Media studies is not part of social sciences in terms of its subject content. In most schools it is aligned with English. The practical film making element and the close examination of media in the modern world are elements that are not captured in any other subject area. Media studies provides a pathway for students who find the rigors of an English classroom increasingly overwhelming into the senior years. Media studies also allows a practical form of student expression that is not replicated in the generalist Social Sciences classroom. Media studies therefore should not be erased.	No				2020-02-21 10:33:58	ANON-YFPW-R954-T	2020-02-21 10:32:19	2020-02-21 10:34:04
Yes		Agree	<p>Agree with general direction.</p> <p>Good to include Maori Performing Arts.</p>	<p>In general I agree with the direction.</p> <p>I really would like to have seen Media Studies included under English to give a wider base to that learning area (and this would potentially improve the current draft Achievement Standards in this area which I think are poor).</p> <p>I'm not sure why as most learning areas are going 'broad' (Science, SOS, Commerce) the specialisation for technology remains. I would just have one technology subject like with Science. If the standards were well written students could cover more than one of the technology disciplines but they would still be general technology standards.</p>	No				2020-02-21 10:34:08	ANON-YFPW-R959-U	2020-02-21 10:34:08	2020-02-21 10:34:14
Yes		Agree	I support the inclusion of Maori Performing Arts at level one.		No				2020-02-21 10:34:17	ANON-YFPW-R939-W	2020-02-21 10:34:17	2020-02-21 10:34:29

No	I was not aware until the government announced it, although I knew that changes were being made.	Disagree	I do not agree with this proposal of making grouping other subjects together to make an "umbrella subject". Having umbrella subjects when they were once subjects on their own, overshadows the smaller subject so they are forgotten (classics merges into history). I do not agree with cutting out Latin, as when a language is cut out, it removes learning about the culture of the language (and leads to people being less educated about other parts of the world, hence xenophobia in extreme cases).	Keep specialised subjects by themselves at level 1, 2 and 3. Students (and schools) should have a choice in choosing the subjects they are allowed to take. I do agree with making level 1 optional (or even compulsory but less credits = less stress)	Health Science without P.E Real life courses (e.g. practical skills, how to change a tire, how to budget).	No			2020-02-21 10:34:33	ANON-YFPW-R93V-T	2020-02-21 10:34:33	2020-02-21 10:35:02
Yes		Disagree				Yes			2020-02-21 10:34:48	ANON-YFPW-R93C-7	2020-02-21 10:34:48	2020-02-21 10:35:14
Yes		Agree				No			2020-02-21 10:35:23	ANON-YFPW-R939-W	2020-02-21 10:35:23	2020-02-21 10:35:31
Yes		Agree		nil	no	No			2020-02-21 10:35:20	ANON-YFPW-R938-W	2020-02-21 10:35:20	2020-02-21 10:35:40
Yes		Agree				Yes			2020-02-21 10:36:14	ANON-YFPW-R93J-E	2020-02-21 10:36:14	2020-02-21 10:36:23
Yes		Agree				No			2020-02-21 10:36:19	ANON-YFPW-R93Q-N	2020-02-21 10:36:19	2020-02-21 10:36:35
No		Strongly disagree	Psychology is one of the fastest growing subjects in the country. In my school we have grown from 9 classes in 2019 to 14 classes in 2020- every single one of those classes is full, and we have waiting lists of students for Level 1 and Level 2. It now has UE approval and combining it with Media Studies will decimate our subject area. There is one class of Media Studies at Level 1 at my school compared with 4 Level 1 Psychology classes. If you want a broader focus for Level 1- allow each subject to have less credits and then get them to take more subjects (so at my school they do 5 Level 1 subjects so they can get their 80 credits). Instead of combining subjects - allow students to take 8 or 9 subjects. Psychology (and adolescent mental health) is so important in today's society, and an understanding of human behaviour can be applied to so many different careers.	Don't get rid of Latin. Psychology and Media Studies and Social Sciences are too different to be combined- keep them separate.	Scholarship Psychology	No			2020-02-21 10:36:29	ANON-YFPW-R93E-9	2020-02-21 10:36:29	2020-02-21 10:36:45
No	I have seen limited release of information unless hunted down or links shared through subject associations.	Agree	Agree in majority. Although I think no media studies and only as a context for social studies does not work. Very different subjects. Surely it fits more as an English based area.	It's great to see Nga Toi Maori Performing Arts - but what is the crossover here between Dance, Drama and Maori.	No	No			2020-02-21 10:39:05	ANON-YFPW-R935-S	2020-02-21 10:39:05	2020-02-21 10:39:20
Yes	A great idea, students need to keep their options open.	Strongly disagree	Home Economics changing to Food Science changes the whole subject focus to make it less applicable. It also does not relate to the Health and Physical Education curriculum at all, because the focus of HPE is on well-being in a holistic sense.	I do not think that Home Economics should change to Food Science. Nutrition and well-being are crucially important for our students and our society as a whole. The name "Food Science" indicates that none of the socioecological aspects of food choice will be addressed. This would change the whole focus of our subject area for the worse. Our society has many health and social problems that are linked to food choice and consumption and education for our young people is power for future change.	Retain Home Economics.	No			2020-02-21 10:39:08	ANON-YFPW-R93P-M	2020-02-21 10:39:08	2020-02-21 10:39:40
No		Undecided				No			2020-02-21 10:40:43	ANON-YFPW-R937-U	2020-02-21 10:40:43	2020-02-21 10:40:56
No	Subjects at level 2 and 3 would provide less specialisation than they currently do as they would have to cover what was left out in level 1.	Strongly disagree	Subjects such as Art history and Classics will be ignored. This will further decrease the number of already decreasing numbers of teachers as people will leave the profession while the population is continuing to grow which eventually will lead to larger classes with less teachers and teachers aren't perfect so people will fall behind, lowering students academic abilities. Having boarder subjects will limit people and dumb down the content. The stress levels of students in level 1 will be decrease, but, this will increase the amount of stress on students in level 2, far surpassing the current stress levels of students in level 1 and level 2 is also important as it is what universities look at whilst level 1 is a practise year as level 1 results are mostly not used for academic purposes and it is okay to have some failures. Then if further dumbing down of subjects in level 2 occurs the academic standard will decrease continually adding stress to later academic years and decrease the numbers of people attending university.	Don't merge or remove subjects from the current NCEA subject list as you will limit opportunities, if there is a lack of interest in some places, leave it to the schools so they can decide whether or not to offer it based on numbers.		No			2020-02-21 10:42:09	ANON-YFPW-R93F-A	2020-02-21 10:42:09	2020-02-21 10:42:22
Yes		Agree				No			2020-02-21 10:42:22	ANON-YFPW-R931-N	2020-02-21 10:42:22	2020-02-21 10:42:48

Yes		Agree	My only reservation is that gifted learners might not be challenged.	My child didn't do Media Studies at school (it wasn't offered) but I see it as a place where internet safety and the level of trust and reliability of information on the internet could be studied.	More fairness in learning for kids at scholarship level. Most of the kids who win scholarships in taught subjects all come from the same schools - either large schools that have the size to offer special classes or private schools that have the money to offer special classes. Kids that win in the creative subjects come from a wide range of school where ability rather than teaching is more important. A whole lot of talent is missing out on good teaching and academic reward because not all schools can afford to have scholarship level classes in school time especially smaller schools and girls school which are less likely to be streamed	No			2020-02-21 10:44:00	ANON-YFPW-R93Z-X	2020-02-21 10:44:00	2020-02-21 10:44:13
Yes		Agree		no	Politics and Law	No			2020-02-21 10:45:48	ANON-YFPW-R93B-6	2020-02-21 10:45:48	2020-02-21 10:46:00
Yes		Strongly disagree	As a Home Economics teacher, I feel very uncomfortable with the subject change to food science. Home Economics and Processing Technologies have very different focuses and pathways into future education. They also represent the diversity of the two curriculum areas with Home Economics focusing on food, nutrition, and society (health and PE) and Technology focusing on manufacture and the technology process. I am concerned that this combination will cause students to miss out on valuable learning across both areas. If the name and connotations is the concern, maybe changing to something such as food studies would be more appropriate?	I would like to see the retention of Home Economics and Processing Technologies as different subjects. As stated above, they both have very different focuses and I am very concerned about the combination to Food Science not representing the curriculum learning that is occurring in both of these areas currently. As a teacher, I see the value in both of these subjects existing across the two curriculum areas.	If Food Science stays, could the split back to the two different areas occur at L2 and L3?	No			2020-02-21 10:46:36	ANON-YFPW-R93M-H	2020-02-21 10:46:36	2020-02-21 10:46:52
Yes		Agree	With a changing world, we need to be able to provide opportunity to meet that world, The Maori economy is a point of example, Te Reo Maori and Maori Performing Arts with be crucial to the Maori Cultural Tourism industry.	I like the idea of starting with a broad focus, then looking at specialising at levels 2 and 3.	Business studies?	Yes		Not really but endorse the fact that the Maori economy will have an impact in the future and this must be taken into consideration (eg Maori Business and Innovation).	2020-02-21 10:46:34	ANON-YFPW-R93H-C	2020-02-21 10:45:45	2020-02-21 10:46:52
No		Agree	I agree with the consolidation of subjects like the sciences. I do think Latin should be available in case someone wanted to take it, unless this is an option at level 2. But I do agree with the overall idea of having a substantial general education at level 1 to then branch off later.		I can't think of any specifically, but aligning with what a popular industry or career paths such as nursing etc.	No			2020-02-21 10:49:40	ANON-YFPW-R93D-8	2020-02-21 10:49:40	2020-02-21 10:49:47
Yes	But not aware of the radical changes that you have just smashed over our heads in abolishing certain subjects at Level 1	Strongly disagree	You are abolishing three subjects (Economics, Accounting, Business) and forcing them into one 'uber-subject' of Commerce (and you are doing the same things to the Sciences.) This is idiotic - what are these subjects supposed to now do, pick a third of their learning and cram it together into one new Frankenstein monster. Students in these subjects at Level 1 will now, optimistically, learn only a third of what they were learning and then come to Level 2 without the needed knowledge. Before we can then teach them what they were learning at Level 2 we will have to teach them what they would have learnt at Level 1 with flow-on effects for Levels 2 and 3 and a much poorer education for students in these subjects.	DO NOT crush Economics, Accounting and Business Studies into one 'Commerce' subject and do not crush Biology, Physics and Chemistry into 'Science' It is crazy, the content in these subjects is NOT THE SAME. Imagine saying that you are now going to teach Maori, French and Chinese as one subject called Language - how many of your students do you think will actually learn any of the languages!		Yes			2020-02-21 10:52:34	ANON-YFPW-R93A-5	2020-02-21 10:52:34	2020-02-21 10:53:02
Yes	This was not as well posted to parents and the public as it should have been	Strongly disagree	The axing of classical subjects like Latin and Art History is political and does not take a not account the desire many young people have to learn deeply about the wider world and the past. It smacks of ignorance, intolerance and small mindedness. Why shouldn't our young people learn about the beauty of European Art and know how to figure out a word from its Latin root?	As above. I am not adverse to subjects like Maori, for those who want to take them. I value inclusivity! What I object to is the axing of wonderful subjects like Classical Studies, Latin and Art History - they are part of the heritage of many New Zealanders, too. Just because numbers taking a subject may be dwindling, don't cut these subjects to save money. Some of our brightest and best students take and enjoy them.	I think a creative writing subject would be great - in addition to English.	No		This is an odd question and politically loaded. I am aware of the NZ curriculum contents in English.	2020-02-21 10:52:11	ANON-YFPW-R93X-V	2020-02-21 10:52:11	2020-02-21 10:53:03

Yes		Strongly disagree	I strongly disagree with the removal of any subject from Level 1. As a Latin teacher specifically, I strongly disagree with the removal of Latin, when all the other languages are being kept, including smaller languages such as German and Korean. One of the stated goals of the NCEA changes is to 'ensure every student gets fair and equal access to the full range of possible quality pathways through NCEA and beyond'. Removing subjects does not give students this full range. After reading the associated cabinet documents on the changes, the fact that they state that Latin is the only other subject unlikely to even be included at Levels 2 and 3 would seem to indicate Latin is being targeted for removal. Students should have the ability to be assessed and gain qualifications in the full range of possible pathways through NCEA.	After reading the set of criteria applied holistically by the Ministry to come up with the provisional subject list, it would seem that all of them could include Latin and the other smaller subjects, with the possible exception of Number 5 (Demand for a subject and the sector's capability to deliver the subject). As there are numerous qualified teachers around the country already teaching the subject, there is definitely the capability to deliver the subject, so it comes down to 'demand for a subject'. Whilst Latin is indeed a smaller subject than some of the other languages, students deserve to right to pursue subjects about which they are passionate - this includes smaller subjects. If a school wishes to offer a smaller subject, they should be able to. If the issue is financial, in terms of NZQA spending money on smaller subjects, then there are various ways to mitigate this in order to allow subjects to continue to exist. One way is to make Latin an 'internal only' subject - After the new standards are written by the SEG, all standards could be carried out and marked by Latin teachers, and moderated by Latin teachers at other schools (an e-mail network of Latin teachers could be set up to facilitate this - I know that Latin teachers are passionate and will be motivated to make this happen for it to allow the subject to continue to exist). The traditionally	Yes - Keep Latin as a subject in NCEA Levels 2 and 3. As written above, I strongly urge NZQA to keep Latin as a subject at NCEA Level 1. However, if Latin is ultimately removed at Level 1, then at the very least, it should be kept at Levels 2 and 3, in order to fulfil the goal of allowing specialisation at Levels 2 and 3. I know that Latin teachers will work with NZQA, even if it means more work for the teachers themselves, to allow Latin to continue as a subject.	No				2020-02-21 10:55:52	ANON-YFPW-R93N-J	2020-02-21 10:53:51	2020-02-21 10:55:57
Yes	The new Level 1 should be based around Project Based Learning, reducing the silo effect of teaching/learning explicit subjects.	Agree				Yes				2020-02-21 10:57:01	ANON-YFPW-R936-T	2020-02-21 10:57:01	2020-02-21 10:57:07
Yes	Agree with more broad level 1 Hope more specialised levels 2 & 3 would not see students disallowed by schools to pick up subjects in levels 2 & 3 that they had not done at level 1. That does not advantage anybody!	Agree	I think Food Science should be moved solely into the Technology and not partially in HPE and partially in Technology which it seems to be now and is slightly confusing (much like this comment, sorry)	Food Science only in Technology learning area. Seems to be how most schools address it as a subject	Outdoor Education	No				2020-02-21 11:00:24	ANON-YFPW-R93R-P	2020-02-21 11:00:24	2020-02-21 11:00:40
Yes	I was aware, however I do not agree with this change. I think that years 9 and 10 are supposed to be to prepare students to be able to achieve well in level 1 and beyond, so the change for more generalised subjects is only detrimental for those who are prepared and want to start specialise, and focus on the subjects that they are interested in. I also think that the generalisation is especially detrimental to those who want to take sciences and business subjects, as these subjects are necessary for university qualifications and understanding in levels two and three, which will simply not happen in accordance with these changes.	Strongly disagree	I think that these changes are detrimental to the smaller, more niche subjects, as they are very important for those individuals who do take them. Taking these subjects - that by the way have been fought tooth and nail to be able to be taught - is going to hugely affect these students, and thereby affecting their potential university and then career options by taking these smaller subjects away and combining the bigger subjects.	Firstly, the sciences SHOULD NOT be combined. Years 9 and 10 have general science, and it might be a good idea to include a general science course as well as the specialised subjects. However, taking away the ability that students have to choose the subjects they take by decreasing the options is upsetting to students. It is also detrimental in the sense that it takes away the amount of each subject that can be taught, as in a general science far less of each would be able to be taught due to time constraints, and then when students do go in to specialised sciences, over the course of level two and level three, they are able to learn and understand less because the level one basics for that specific subjects have simply not been taught. This is also detrimental for those who want to study these subjects at university, as they don't have as thorough a foundation as they could if they had been able to study it at all three NCEA levels. The same ideas could be applied to the business subjects and the social sciences.		No				2020-02-21 11:01:01	ANON-YFPW-R93W-U	2020-02-21 11:01:01	2020-02-21 11:01:10
Yes		Agree	I think using Level 1 as a broader foundational base for specialisation at level 2 and 3 is a good idea. I teach Maths and Science and we, like many schools, teach level 1 science as a rotation with 1 term each of chem, bio and physics.			No				2020-02-21 11:01:32	ANON-YFPW-R934-R	2020-02-21 11:01:32	2020-02-21 11:01:38
Yes		Agree				No				2020-02-21 11:02:55	ANON-YFPW-R93T-R	2020-02-21 11:02:55	2020-02-21 11:03:09
Yes	I support this decision to help address the need to Scientific literacy to be embedded in a wider range of our community. This allows for a more integrated learning experience as well, therefore, supports community-based projects better.	Strongly agree		No	No	No	Not strongly. I would like to be able to utilise this more in my own teaching.	No		2020-02-21 11:04:28	ANON-YFPW-R932-P	2020-02-21 11:04:28	2020-02-21 11:04:39
Yes	I don't agree to this.	Strongly disagree	Art History and Home Economics should be kept the same, commerce should still include accounting.	Art History and Home Economics should be kept the same, commerce should still include accounting.	I think Chinese culture is getting more important so would like to suggest include that, learning Mandarin is different from learning Chinese culture, simply learning Mandarin itself won't help understand the Chinese culture and won't help work or do business in Chinese market in the future. Mandarin language is just a tool, but Chinese culture is about how to use the tool.	Yes		No		2020-02-21 11:04:13	ANON-YFPW-R933-Q	2020-02-21 11:04:13	2020-02-21 11:04:41

Yes	This intended change will have a negative effect on student engagement in science. It will lower their base knowledge and reduce their confidence in their ability to understand science concepts resulting in fewer students going on to higher levels of education in the Sciences. Our focus should be on developing students with thinking and problem-solving skills involving STEM activities. With the outcome of having innovative young people who can develop new technologies to solve the problems of the past and our future.	Strongly disagree	We are already seeing lower literacy skills and numeracy skills across the country in our young people. Now the proposal is to do the same to science. The impact of these proposed changes will not be seen for a number of years, at which point, it will be too late to fix. Our reputation for quality education will be destroyed and we will have a community and workforce what lacks fundamental knowledge, thinking skills and problem-solving skills.	At Level 1 Science should be split into separate subjects. Geology, Chemistry, Physics, Horticulture, Biology, Human Biology etc and life skills science. This then caters for all students needs and opens up career opportunities for students.		No			2020-02-21 11:06:45	ANON-YFPW-R93U-S	2020-02-21 11:06:45	2020-02-21 11:07:06
Yes		Strongly agree				No			2020-02-21 11:06:59	ANON-YFPW-R9DY-E	2020-02-21 11:06:59	2020-02-21 11:07:06
Yes		Disagree	The idea that lumping things like Psychology and Media Studies into a broader strand seems naive. The same applies for Classics and History They are vaguely related, but vastly different in regards to the actual content knowledge and skills required within them	I can understand catering to certain subjects within a broader spectrum at Level 1. However, you are assuming that a History teacher CAN teach Classics. And that a Social Studies teacher CAN teach Media and Psych. You are going to either be driving people out of jobs, creating stress to learn massive news pieces of the curriculum. Or force schools to almost run courses with 3 different teachers, taking a chunk each. You want to encourage people into this job, not create weird new hurdles within subjects	You need to keep Classics, Art History, heck even Latin. The ability to learn and critique ideas is just as important as content. I am a digital tech teacher, and have been told my almost all graduates, the ability to think is so much more important that the small amount of content they comparatively learnt at high school	No			2020-02-21 11:08:31	ANON-YFPW-R9DV-B	2020-02-21 11:08:31	2020-02-21 11:08:40
No	Little to no communication to schools and teachers, this questionnaire is almost impossible to find on the NZQA website	Agree	My only concern is Media studies, as this is so different in approach than socialstudies	Media Studies this should be independent at level 1. Psychology should not be done at level 1 - so I agree with including it in social studies	How does performing arts technology fit into this?	No			2020-02-21 11:09:22	ANON-YFPW-R9DC-R	2020-02-21 11:09:22	2020-02-21 11:09:30
Yes	I was aware of the changes, but was not aware of the extent of the changes and do not believe they would achieve the proposed aim.	Strongly disagree	As a student who is doing Level 3 NCEA, I believe these changes would negatively affect students preparedness for both later in NCEA and further education. The solution for ensuring an increase in student retention would not be to make the qualifications easier but to make sure necessary support is available for students to complete these. I also believe that the choice to generalise certain areas like science, business and social sciences would greatly reduce the number of students who specialise in these areas which contribute greatly to the New Zealand economy. NCEA Level 1 is important in preparing students for NCEA Levels 2 and 3, the jump from level 1 to level 2 is challenging for some students, by taking away level 1 as preparation it would be even more challenging. Furthermore, Year 9 and 10 are supposed to help prepare students for Level 1. I believe these changes would overall negatively affect the education of New Zealanders and decrease chances of New Zealanders making it on a world stage.	I strongly disagree with the choices to generalise the subjects of science, social sciences, business. I think this is detrimental to the education of students who enjoy these subjects. The subjects that are being merged are very different and should not be merged. Although not popular in some schools, Latin is a big part of some schools around New Zealand who have fought to keep Latin in NCEA. In Level 1 I feel like these changes would not be positive and would negatively affect the retention of students, and the interest as they cannot specialise in subjects they like as well as not putting in place robust pathways to tertiary. Tertiary institutes already feel as though NCEA does not sufficiently prepare students for tertiary education, by softening the learning students in NZ will be further behind other students of the world and unprepared for university. Keep these subjects in their specialisations and offer umbrella subjects as well. These changes I feel will also contribute to teacher shortages, more teachers are being driven away from the professions, by removing these more specialised subjects even more teachers will be driven from teaching. I suggest that subject specialisations are kept to ensure students are prepared for tertiary and enjoy the subjects they take leading to higher student retention.		No			2020-02-21 11:12:48	ANON-YFPW-R9D8-D	2020-02-21 11:12:48	2020-02-21 11:12:55
No	I just read about it in the NZ Herald 21/02/2020.	Agree	It's good because young students are not fully aware at Year 11 of what subjects might interest them. If they get pigeon-holed too early they might miss out on interesting/beneficial opportunities.	Media Studies is not just Social Studies. Some of the current Media Studies achievement standards could be made to fit into English, Design & Visual Communication, or Digital Technologies.		No			2020-02-21 11:12:37	ANON-YFPW-R9DS-8	2020-02-21 11:12:37	2020-02-21 11:12:56
Yes		Agree		Where are all the generic technology standards going? With Food technology it has been great using them over the years and to move to just home economics and processing that is a big change.	A generic technology standard within the food science/technology program.	Yes			2020-02-21 11:13:27	ANON-YFPW-R9D9-E	2020-02-21 11:13:27	2020-02-21 11:13:46
Yes		Agree				No			2020-02-21 11:14:55	ANON-YFPW-R9DG-V	2020-02-21 11:14:55	2020-02-21 11:15:08
Yes		Agree			I am keen to see the current separate Visual Arts subject disciplines maintained (Painting, Photography, Sculpture, Printmaking, Design) and the Possible inclusion of Moving Image as a similar stand alone discipline.	No			2020-02-21 11:15:16	ANON-YFPW-R9DJ-Y	2020-02-21 11:15:16	2020-02-21 11:15:43
Yes		Agree				No			2020-02-21 11:19:11	ANON-YFPW-R9DE-T	2020-02-21 11:19:11	2020-02-21 11:19:24

Yes	Vaguely. Didn't know any details until recently.	Undecided	I think it makes sense to some degree but as a Media Studies teacher, I am gravely concerned about the implications of including Media Studies under a generic Social Studies umbrella at Level 1.	I think it would be extremely dangerous to remove Media Studies from the list at Level 1. The work we do is hugely important, especially in a world full of fake news. Media Studies encourages students to develop their critical thinking and other skills that are extremely valuable in the modern workforce, and not just in the media industry itself. While placing it within a Social Studies banner might theoretically sound practical, the issue I have is that often, the teaching approach in Media Studies is utterly different to the traditional Social Studies approach. At my school, Media Studies is its own department, and I would have no interest in it being absorbed into the Social Studies department. It would be absolutely detrimental to the subject in the school and to my own teaching practice. For some students, Media Studies provides an opportunity for them to explore their interests and develop their creative ideas in a way that is simply not offered in a traditional Social Studies setting.		No				2020-02-21 11:22:57	ANON-YFPW-R9D5-A	2020-02-21 11:22:57	2020-02-21 11:23:09
No		Strongly disagree	See comments below	Why, when commerce has the highest level of entries in tertiary study, would you combine three of the top 13 NCEA externally entered subjects into one and then cut out Accounting as it is too practical. Students need to know this information and the merging of these subjects could jeopardise numbers of all subjects in the senior school, in particular Accounting. There is still a large number of Accountants required and although the role is adapting from the traditional sense it is still a fundamental requirement. Also where are the Agribusiness and Financial Literacy classes? The government wants financial literacy for students, Accounting already does this but you are now cutting it out. Why are dance and drama still two separate subjects? There is no academic pressure in these classes its all performance based why not merge them into Performing Arts? These decisions do not make a lot of sense.	No	No				2020-02-21 11:23:12	ANON-YFPW-R9DP-5	2020-02-21 11:23:12	2020-02-21 11:23:21
Yes		Disagree	the combining of economics and accounting into commerce will have issues as they are two very different subjects and level 2 will need to be looked at to see how the lack of exposure at level 1 will cause. There will need to be changes made. Putting these two subjects together would be like putting spanish and french together - the same but different.	putting economics and accounting together will see a watering down of content in an area where people are already saying we need more understanding of. The content of both are very different		No				2020-02-21 11:24:08	ANON-YFPW-R9D7-C	2020-02-21 11:24:08	2020-02-21 11:24:23
Yes		Agree				No				2020-02-21 11:25:25	ANON-YFPW-R9DF-U	2020-02-21 11:25:25	2020-02-21 11:25:40
Yes		Agree			Mathematics for small businesses and personal finance is a critical component missing - the Financial Literacy standards are woefully inadequate and the current Mathematics/Business Studies/Accounting standards do not offer scope for these essential skills.	No				2020-02-21 11:26:09	ANON-YFPW-R9D1-6	2020-02-21 11:26:09	2020-02-21 11:26:25
Yes		Undecided				No				2020-02-21 11:27:00	ANON-YFPW-R9DF-F	2020-02-21 11:27:00	2020-02-21 11:27:10
Yes	I only heard about the changes through Facebook. Then investigated the level 1 numbers and details myself.	Disagree	I don't agree with commerce all being put under the one banner. I also think that having all of the sciences together might be a bit of a stretch, but some of them could go together. The rest of the changes I think would work.	Lumping all of the commerce papers together won't help with student engagement in each of the topics, some students prefer accounting but dislike economics, and many prefer economics to accounting. The demand for economics as a subject is ranked 6th out of the options, and has 4 times the demand than, say Te reo Maori. While accounting and business studies rank 9th and 13th out of 36 subjects at level 1.	No, I think that the subjects cover the variety of academia that should be taught to teenagers.	No				2020-02-21 11:27:10	ANON-YFPW-R9DH-W	2020-02-21 11:27:10	2020-02-21 11:28:04

No	I am a PhD student who also tutors university papers (stage one and two), and as someone who has experienced teaching university students/spends the majority of weekdays in an academic setting, it is concerning that these changes have not been made more publicly visible.	Disagree	<p>The removal of Latin; Classical Studies; and Art History will be detrimental to students who intend to pursue subjects such as Classics; Art History; Museum and Cultural Studies; Ancient History; and History when it comes to tertiary study - particularly at post-graduate study where language requirements are involved. These subjects are already affected by funding cuts, hindering the student engagement and the number of enrollments in these subjects.</p> <p>The introduction of Māori Performing Arts is great, but must be taught in a way that is wholly inclusive and indicates possible career paths for this subject. Having attended a largely Pākeha high school myself, in my experience there seemed little incentive to take a subject such as Te Reo (or Māori Performing Arts if it had been on offer) and I would have felt out of place doing so. Since attending university, my perspective has changed dramatically and I am about to partake in a 4th semester of Te Reo at AUT as part of my journey in learning more about Māori culture as a Pākeha immigrant.</p> <p>Bundling up the sciences into one, general 'Science' is possibly a mistake. The Sciences are not taught in this way at a tertiary level, therefore teachers at high school will not have the specific knowledge required to teach all three branches at a level required for</p>	By removing subjects such as Classical Studies; Art History; and Latin from the NCEA Level 1 syllabus, the government sends out the message that these subjects are irrelevant. What if students do not excel at STEM subjects, but thrive when it comes to the Arts? What kind of message is this sending them - that they must persist in subject areas that they are more likely to struggle in, leading to loss of self-confidence?	A subject that I would like to see included in the NCEA Level 1 syllabus, which is present in secondary schools elsewhere in the world, is Politics/Civics. Indeed, this is compulsory in many countries. This teaches students about how the system of government works, the basics of political ideologies, the fundamental policies of each political party, and most importantly the significance of voting once they are able.	No			2020-02-21 11:28:33	ANON-YFPW-R9DB-Q	2020-02-21 11:28:33	2020-02-21 11:28:40
No	Accounting, Economics and Business Studies (Entrepreneurship) are separate subjects and should be kept as such.	Disagree	Accounting and Economics and Business Studies should be kept separate and distinct - they should have their own curriculum area ie "FINANCIAL CAPABILITY"	IT IS ESSENTIAL THAT STUDENTS CONTINUE TO BE ABLE TO SPECIALIZE IN EITHER ACCOUNTING OR ECONOMICS OR ENTREPRENEURSHIP (BUSINESS STUDIES) - we are a global economy where knowledge and skills in the 3 separate areas are recognized - NCEA NZQA should do this to.		Yes			2020-02-21 11:28:48	ANON-YFPW-R9DM-2	2020-02-21 11:28:48	2020-02-21 11:29:06
No		Disagree		<p>I selected my high school based solely on the fact that Art History was available early on. However, many of my friends only discovered art history when it was first available to them as NCEA students, and it became the most important subject for them too. We were taught by Nicky Green, an acclaimed author, and Lily Laita, an acclaimed Māori and Samoan Artist. As I was able to take Art History over multiple years, I was able to earn a NCEA scholarship in Art History in year 13. I went on to study Art History at University, from where I was able to work on a television series helping small museums tell the stories of their artefacts. I then worked at Auckland Museum, caring for the Māori cloak collection for two years. I am now doing my PhD in Art History and tutoring undergraduate students in Art History, teaching them about crime in the art world.</p> <p>Firstly, I am highly supportive of the addition of Māori performing arts into the curriculum, this is a fantastic move to support an important art form which is undervalued in the mainstream.</p> <p>Secondly, I am of course very upset and concerned about the removal of Art History from the curriculum. Art History is the most formative and</p>	Sculpture as an Art subject. This would allow Māori carving to be taught in high schools, an art form as important as performing arts.	Yes			2020-02-21 11:29:43	ANON-YFPW-R9DQ-6	2020-02-21 11:18:47	2020-02-21 11:29:52
Yes		Agree			Legal Studies	No			2020-02-21 11:30:49	ANON-YFPW-R9DD-5	2020-02-21 11:30:49	2020-02-21 11:31:01
No		Strongly disagree	The proposed changes to NCEA L1 Science does not support the Science Curriculum and will impede student's understanding of Science in general. The standards proposed will also impact student achievement negatively and will broaden the gap between Māori/Pacifika and Pākeha student achievement. Project-based assessment is ideal for high performing students who already have specialist knowledge in a subject area, which does not align with the level Year 11 (NCEA L1) students are at.	Do not make changes to L1 Science. It is essential that Physics, Chemistry, Biology remain as subjects within the Science umbrella and that there are specific standards which assess those specific branches of Science as they currently do in order to enable students to develop the base understanding/knowledge for future learning. Project-based learning should ONLY happen after students obtain sufficient base understanding of the Sciences. Failure to do this will result in misunderstanding of Science concepts and ideas and further misinformation in our society around Science.		Yes			2020-02-21 11:32:30	ANON-YFPW-R9DD-D	2020-02-21 11:32:30	2020-02-21 11:32:46
No		Strongly disagree		Commerce - keep accounting separate	no	No			2020-02-21 11:32:46	ANON-YFPW-R9DA-P	2020-02-21 11:32:46	2020-02-21 11:33:06
Yes	I dont agree with combining Economics/ Accounting and Business Studies as they are very complex areas that many students struggle with to understand the basics.	Strongly disagree	Once again change for change sake. Lets just work on refining on what we have now.			No			2020-02-21 11:35:40	ANON-YFPW-R9DN-3	2020-02-21 11:35:40	2020-02-21 11:35:52

No	I was not	Strongly disagree	I supported you for a moment, I don't like NCEA in general so getting rid of level 1 seemed like a blessing for future generations. However, after a lengthy discussion with our Classics teacher I have revoked my support. You are hating on teachers who specialise in a subject and are potentially putting them out of employment just for some silly reason to fix something that isn't even broken yet	Do not change. Subjects are good as they are, NOBODY HAS ANY PROBLEMS. If you ask students, they will not complain and ask you to change all the subjects. We are happy. You are making a problem out of nothing and it is unnecessary.	I reckon you should add subjects such as life skills (car maintenance, managing student loans etc). Don't mess up already acceptable subjects, instead add some worthwhile subjects to the curriculum.	No	I am not sorry	I can't say I do. Thank you for reading this :)	2020-02-21 11:36:18	ANON-YFPW-R9DK-Z	2020-02-21 11:36:18	2020-02-21 11:36:33
Yes		Strongly disagree	In particular, the removal of specialist subjects in the sciences. Schools should still have the option to offer content-based science standards that prepare students for Level 2 study and beyond. The proposed standards read like social sciences, and the skills (since no content is specified) could easily be covered in social studies). The high level of literacy required for the proposed standards will lead to inequity and drive down science achievement across the country (as will the lack of explicit content).	I had been hoping that the specialist science subjects would remain, with their associated external and internal standards, to enable schools to design courses that were appropriate to their schools, students and communities. While "credit counting" is not to be encouraged, a greater range of standards would enable students to play to their strengths. The proposed suite of standards effectively becomes the basis of all courses as the number is so limited. Schools presently offering specialist science subject will be unable to continue to offer NCEA and will look at CIE or IB.	The current L2 and L3 subjects in science are sufficient and necessary.	No			2020-02-21 11:36:59	ANON-YFPW-R93K-F	2020-02-21 10:55:25	2020-02-21 11:37:06
Yes		Agree				Yes			2020-02-21 11:39:19	ANON-YFPW-R9D6-B	2020-02-21 11:39:19	2020-02-21 11:39:36
Yes		Agree			Would like to see Media Studies become a stand-alone subject in Level 2 and 3, and also consider Legal Studies, Pacific Studies and Financial Literacy as well.	No			2020-02-21 11:41:48	ANON-YFPW-R9DW-C	2020-02-21 11:41:48	2020-02-21 11:42:03
Yes		Undecided			Textiles as a separate subject to Fashion	No			2020-02-21 11:41:53	ANON-YFPW-R9D4-9	2020-02-21 11:41:53	2020-02-21 11:42:16
Yes		Strongly agree	This is still a broad list of subjects that all students can get a variety of experiences	If the subject list could be refined further eg technology		No			2020-02-21 11:43:50	ANON-YFPW-R9DT-9	2020-02-21 11:43:50	2020-02-21 11:44:11
Yes		Strongly agree		Do not have specialised 'Sciences' at Level 1. I support the proposed change to 'Science'.		Yes			2020-02-21 11:44:30	ANON-YFPW-R9D3-8	2020-02-21 11:44:30	2020-02-21 11:44:40
No	NO! This was not made clear in the change package. It's not in itself a bad idea to reduce the choice at level 1, devil is in the detail.	Undecided	Mixed bag - see below	1. In order to understand Art you need to know something of its history. Why not rename Visual Art 'Art' and make sure it includes a decent Art history component as well? 2. Removing Latin at Level 1 will further reduce uptake - it's a vicious cycle. Why not leave it in so those who want to, can study it at level 1? Greek already doesn't exist at NCEA. 3. The changes proposed to Science are the MOST WORRYING. If students will have only four Achievement Standards to choose from to cover all of science at Level 1 the coverage of each subject will be too light. Why not adopt the British model and retain Biology, Physics and Chemistry as separate subjects but also offer a combined Science option for the less academic students? Also, if you need to reduce the offer at level 1, is Agri and Hort Science really necessary - surely these students could do the combined Science described above? 5. Don't call it Commerce, instead Business Economics. Always lead with the more aspirational title - our job is to hold students to HIGH aspirations, not meet them where they are. 6. Four (or three) technology subjects seems like a lot at this stage.		Yes			2020-02-21 11:45:41	ANON-YFPW-R9DU-A	2020-02-21 11:45:41	2020-02-21 11:45:49
No	I was aware that NCEA Level 1 was being reviewed but not with the intent to generalise and reduce subject selection. One of the advantages of the NCEA structure is that it provides a diverse and reasonably flexible approach to subject selection, standard selection within subject area and the mix of internal and external assessment, all of which help cater for varying student strengths and weaknesses and interests. Increasing generalisation (in particular with Economics, Accounting and Business) will dilute the base technical skills which are taught at level 1 which provide foundation knowledge for future studies, especially Economics and Accounting. In Economics there is a strong link between the Level 1 course and the Level 3 course.	Strongly disagree	Combining Economics, Accounting and Business into one blended course is akin to combining French, German and Mandarin. An Accounting Teacher may not be a subject expert in Economics and an Economics Teacher may not be a subject expert in Accounting. As a teacher who is trained in both Economics and Accounting and having worked with many teachers asked to teach one of these subjects in which they do not have the core discipline knowledge - combining these subjects will do a disservice to all of the Accounting / Economics and Businesses Studies subjects and ultimately to the students.	As above I believe that Economics, Accounting and Business should be kept as separate subjects. Possibly NCEA could offer a combined course in addition to the 3 separate specialisations to enable wider subject endorsement - this would allow students the choice to generalise or specialise - as some at age 15 will know where their academic strengths lie whilst others may not yet be determined.	Tourism should be offered within the NCEA Framework given its importance to the NZ Economy.	No			2020-02-21 11:45:25	ANON-YFPW-R9D2-7	2020-02-21 11:45:25	2020-02-21 11:45:54

No	You say that the changes are based on what the people want, but I suspect this is not true. What you are doing by getting rid of key subjects like Classics is pandering to the radical left who despise subjects that encourage independent thought and value the individual. No doubt, under the guise of "History", the achievement standards will aim to simply indoctrinate our young people to view history through a Marxist lens, where history is presented through an oversimplified narrative of oppressor and oppressed.	Strongly disagree	I find the suggested changes appalling. Classics and History are two very independent subjects. Classics encompasses the study of philosophy, literature, art (and more) from the ancient world and by studying it, people learn how to think for themselves as individuals and take personal responsibility for their own lives and not as a victim of some oppressed group.	You should keep Classical Studies and Art History at Level 1 because they contain the origins of Western culture and are critical in supporting individuality (which is under threat). In studying Classics, students learn to think for themselves by exploring a range of philosophies and texts that place value on a person's independence. I suspect that this is the real reason Classics is being abolished at Level 1. In classical myth, we find the blueprint of our collective unconscious, which through exploring, the individual can come to draw upon in order to add meaning to their lives. Additionally, our political and legal systems are derived from the Greco-Roman model and so in studying Classics, our young people learn about why Western society operates the way that it does and how it has BENEFITED mankind.	No			2020-02-21 11:46:10	ANON-YFPW-R9RY-V	2020-02-21 11:46:10	2020-02-21 11:46:44
Yes		Agree			Yes			2020-02-21 11:47:24	ANON-YFPW-R9RV-S	2020-02-21 11:47:24	2020-02-21 11:47:36
Yes		Agree			No			2020-02-21 11:48:31	ANON-YFPW-R9RC-6	2020-02-21 11:48:31	2020-02-21 11:48:40
No	This was brought to my attention by one of the Accounting teacher.	Strongly disagree	I believe that specialization starts at Level 1 where students will have the opportunities to master the application of the basics taught in Years 9 and 10. The decision for their pathways may be confirmed at Year 12 but at least they are already exposed to each specialized field of study in Year 11.	Commerce Commerce subjects (Accounting/ Economics/ Business Studies) should NOT be combined in Year 11. Rationale: i) Basics for these subjects are different in context and required different skills level. These basics are currently combined in Year 9 and 10. The application of these basics into the real world is done at Year 11. This is when students are being introduced to processing information and making decisions ii) Start specializing in Year 12 is too late as students need to confirm their pathway choices as early as possible, latest at Year 11.	No	No		2020-02-21 11:50:12	ANON-YFPW-R9R8-U	2020-02-21 11:50:12	2020-02-21 11:50:38
No		Agree			No			2020-02-21 11:48:53	ANON-YFPW-R9RS-P	2020-02-21 11:48:53	2020-02-21 11:54:10
Yes		Disagree	I like the mathematics curriculum now. Also removing psychology, media studies, etc seems like a mistake		No			2020-02-21 11:55:02	ANON-YFPW-R9R9-V	2020-02-21 11:55:02	2020-02-21 11:55:11
Yes		Strongly agree			No			2020-02-21 11:58:00	ANON-YFPW-R9RG-A	2020-02-21 11:58:00	2020-02-21 11:58:18
Yes	My HUGE concern is that subjects will become less specialised as a result. Much of the teaching I do at Level 1 is scaffolding for 2 and 3. Without it the students will not reach tertiary level. I think what you are suggesting would work for Year 10. I think standards will really fall if you water down Year 11. It will put more pressure on staff and students at year 12 and 13.	Undecided	I do not know how you will put my subject - Music which has three strands - Performance, Composition and theory into 4 assessments. I do not know how it will support Level 2 and 3. I do not know if standards will slip as a result How will effect schools where year 10 are accelerated and can currently do some standards? How will it work in schools where we have to teach multi levels? How will they get scaffolded?	Again generalising subjects where a HUGE amount of prior knowledge is required eg Science - how are you going to make sure students have the level required for tertiary? How can real scaffolding take place when subjects are watered down? In essence as a student you could get through 11 years of schooling without having a real subject specialist teaching you. How can a student get a real feel for a subject without being taught it? How will the changes support our excellent students? How will fewer standards support the lesser able students?	Yes	I do not see how your proposed changes are in alignment with the Curriculum as it stands Whilst there are four learning strands in my subject: PK Developing Practical Knowledge in Music DI Developing Ideas in Music CI Communicating and interpreting in Music UC Understanding Music in Context I do not know		2020-02-21 11:59:30	ANON-YFPW-R9RJ-D	2020-02-21 11:59:30	2020-02-21 11:59:43
Yes		Strongly disagree	Commerce completely ridiculous as for science	Accounting should not be downgraded to a little presence. Have you had a look at the number of students taking it?????????	No	Yes		2020-02-21 12:00:28	ANON-YFPW-R9RQ-M	2020-02-21 12:00:28	2020-02-21 12:00:39
Yes	A great initiative t keep level 1 optional.RAS also focussing on tikanga Maori is fantastic	Strongly agree	More transparent for parents and importantly to give clarity as a teacher to whanau on their child's learning and achievement.	Support kaupapa for tikanga Maori being incorporated as a non Maori. It is long overdue	Yes	relevant to my workplace and planning as an HOD	Great to see the progress in Religious Studies and the feedback is overall positive.	2020-02-21 12:03:19	ANON-YFPW-R9RP-K	2020-02-21 12:03:19	2020-02-21 12:03:36

Yes	But I defined broad foundational understanding differently. Nature of science core ideas - yes absolutely- but also some key content ideas such as balance and equilibrium (bio: ecology and our interdependence, chem: particles and reactions, physics: forces and stability, energy conservation. Such as interrelationships between structure and function (bio: adaptations and niche, chem periodic table, chemical properties & atomic structures, physics: how something's built and how it works, surface area and lung/intestine absorption; such as cycling: water cycle, carbon cycle, nitrogen cycle, law of conservation of energy cycles, homeostasis cycles, redox reactions, etc	Disagree		If we could select one of these standards or two of these standards to include along side the other strands , as is outlined by the nz curriculum that would be okay. But this can't be the entire programme. Less able students do need some science knowledge To function in the world beyond just the social scientific stuff. The proposed standards are a recipe for inequality to further proliferate. So disappointed.	Carry heat, pressure and atmospheric science into the physics domain or allow us to include ess standards in our physics and chem courses towards a single subject for UE	No			2020-02-21 12:03:14	ANON-YFPW-R9R5-R	2020-02-21 12:03:14	2020-02-21 12:03:36
Yes	In the Science subject area I think it is vitally important to allow schools the flexibility to design the Level 1 Science course that best suits their students, this often requires parallel courses to be run - some more focused on Internal standards and general science, while other students prefer a focus on preparing well for the specialist senior subjects of Chemistry, Physics and Biology - hence this course should have more academic rigor available by sitting focused Externals.	Strongly disagree	Throwing away the work of specialized Chemistry, Physics and Biology teachers and assessment providers is a mistake. This would lead to an inevitable lack of flexibility for schools to design parallel Level 1 Science courses that best suit their entire cohort abilities, cultural backgrounds, future course preparedness and learning styles/desires.	In the Science subject area I think it is vitally important to allow schools the flexibility to design the Level 1 Science course that best suits their students, this often requires parallel courses to be run - some more focused on Internal standards and general science, while other students prefer a focus on preparing well for the specialist senior subjects of Chemistry, Physics and Biology - hence this course should have more academic rigor available by sitting focused Externals.	No	Yes		No.	2020-02-21 12:03:49	ANON-YFPW-R9R7-T	2020-02-21 12:03:49	2020-02-21 12:04:04
Yes		Agree		Concerns over Food Science being under the PE/Health curriculum. Strongly suggest that this should be Nutrition in this area (if included at all) and that Food Science remains under the Technology curriculum area. Agree that Materials Technology could be a subject area but schools should be able to separate into Soft and Resistant courses as these appeal to different students and require different specialist skills from teachers. Concerns however that standards would be the same in both Soft and Resistant courses meaning that students cannot successfully complete both courses. We do have a number of students that do both - having to choose would create a male - female divide. Not sure about Media being lost as a separate subject as it is extremely popular as a stand alone course	More combined/ x-curricular options such as - Spatial / Interior design - using DVC, textile and resistant materials Textile Science - textiles and chemistry Robotics - digital, electronics, materials technology With students able to get endorsements (and UE recognition) for the course	No			2020-02-21 12:05:26	ANON-YFPW-R9RF-9	2020-02-21 12:05:26	2020-02-21 12:05:40
No	I thought they were talking about removing it or making it more cross-curricular project based?	Undecided		Media Studies worked really well in cross curricular projects with other subjects. the influence of Media on society is an extremely important topic. If it is simply integrated it may be overlooked.		No		I know of it but do not know it in detail	2020-02-21 12:06:01	ANON-YFPW-R9R1-M	2020-02-21 12:06:01	2020-02-21 12:06:26
Yes		Strongly disagree		Why would the Sciences be narrowed down to one subject whereas other areas are not. Physics is to Biology as French is to Spanish. This in no way prepares students for Level 2, it goes against ALL valid research. Schools will be creating their own programmes to pick up from the lack of strength in the NCEA system.	I would rather the ministry stop making poor decisions with subjects.	Yes			2020-02-21 12:06:26	ANON-YFPW-R9RZ-W	2020-02-21 12:06:26	2020-02-21 12:06:35
Yes	I think this is a great idea, especially if there can be less focus on assessment and credit counting - and more time to focus on authentic learning.	Agree			At all level of NCEA Technology, there needs to be a focus accommodating all learning styles: Comprehensive written modelling reports for example are clunky and inaccessible for so many of our kids - especially in low decile schools where English may not be the language spoken at home. These type assessments unfairly penalise kids who see the technology subject as an opportunity to succeed in a more practical way within the education system. Accepting a range of formats for assessment may be a start down this track .	No			2020-02-21 12:06:52	ANON-YFPW-R9RH-B	2020-02-21 12:06:52	2020-02-21 12:07:10
Yes	Level 1 Science still needs to be broken up into the specialist understanding as the jump in knowledge would make a lot of learners fall behind compared to studying overseas. This would be detrimental to the ability of New Zealanders moving forwards	Agree				Yes			2020-02-21 12:09:28	ANON-YFPW-R9RB-5	2020-02-21 12:09:28	2020-02-21 12:09:36

Yes		Strongly disagree	I think the decisions to incorporate media studies and psychology into social studies along with art history and classics studies into history creates classes with far to broad of a mandate to cover in a year - even if just giving an overview of each of these subjects. Essentially removing media studies as a year 11 course removes an entire, incredibly valuable curriculum (including in depth film analysis and production lessons, which will there will not be room for in a crowded social studies curriculum) which is then built upon in levels 2 and 3. There is not enough time within levels 2 and 3 alone for all of this content to be taught and thus for a knowledge of media studies to be gained from high school. The same could also be said for classical studies. I do however support the merging of the sciences as unlike subjects such as media studies and social studies which are not always inherently linked, the sciences are intrinsic to one another thus a broad understanding of all of them is needed before specialising in one. In summary, I support combining subjects when at a low level, an understanding of one is intrinsic to an understanding of another (e.g chemistry and biology) however not when it leads to the elimination of an entire specialisation that does not require the subject it is combined with for a sound understanding. - Donald Mayo, Third Year Medical Student, Dux of Western Springs College 2017.	I think the decisions to incorporate media studies and psychology into social studies along with art history and classics studies into history creates classes with far to broad of a mandate to cover in a year - even if just giving an overview of each of these subjects. Essentially removing media studies as a year 11 course removes an entire, incredibly valuable curriculum (including in depth film analysis and production lessons, which will there will not be room for in a crowded social studies curriculum) which is then built upon in levels 2 and 3. There is not enough time within levels 2 and 3 alone for all of this content to be taught and thus for a knowledge of media studies to be gained from high school. The same could also be said for classical studies. I do however support the merging of the sciences as unlike subjects such as media studies and social studies which are not always inherently linked, the sciences are intrinsic to one another thus a broad understanding of all of them is needed before specialising in one. In summary, I support combining subjects when at a low level, an understanding of one is intrinsic to an understanding of another (e.g chemistry and biology) however not when it leads to the elimination of an entire specialisation that does not require the subject it is combined with for a sound understanding. - Donald Mayo, Third Year	No.	No			2020-02-21 12:09:39	ANON-YFPW-R9RM-G	2020-02-21 12:09:39	2020-02-21 12:09:58
Yes	Concern about projects for credits when students can be shifted schools often throughout the year. How does part work on different projects get transferred ?	Undecided				No			2020-02-21 12:09:54	ANON-YFPW-R9RX-U	2020-02-21 12:09:54	2020-02-21 12:10:04
Yes		Disagree		There could possibly be generic language standards for students who study other languages like Latin. Also will first language students still be sitting the same assessments as second language students? It is discouraging for learners to be competing with fluent native speakers	English as a subject is now too broad. Possibly literature and general options could be created	No			2020-02-21 12:11:33	ANON-YFPW-R9RN-H	2020-02-21 12:11:33	2020-02-21 12:11:40
Yes	As an HOD Music, I feel that the current setup already offers a safely generic course at Level 1 while there is scope for specialisation built in for Levels 2 and 3. I say keep the Music status quo.	Agree		Music is my specialised area. I recommend we keep everything as is. Also we need to bring back the excellent aural unit standards that were wrongly dis-continued ie Level 1 18816 and Level 2 18818. These standards assessed aural skills in the truer sense by allowing students to playback short rhythmic and melodic excerpts using voice or an instrument. The standards provided an excellent basis for a year long aural teaching program in preparation for the aural external exams ie 91093 and 91275.	I also teach electronics and electrical technologies and would like to see new standards introduced in these areas more suitable for secondary schools in preparation for apprenticeship training	No			2020-02-21 12:12:20	ANON-YFPW-R9RK-E	2020-02-21 12:12:20	2020-02-21 12:12:38
No		Agree		Economics continues to be included in the commerce subject area. I feel this somewhat limits the scope of the subject. It's natural home is in the humanities, and yet it is so separated from these subjects now, that it is thought of as commerce. I realise this is also the case in tertiary study, but it is concerning to see a review of NCEA continue down this path. Economics should be about sustainability and productivity, not about money.		No			2020-02-21 12:12:57	ANON-YFPW-R9RE-S	2020-02-21 12:12:57	2020-02-21 12:13:06
No	I have been made aware by colleagues but there has been no teacher consultation in my area within the last year (when I started teaching in New Zealand).	Strongly disagree	I agree that it is important to keep pathways open to students, but this should be through the transferability of skills rather than skewing students future perception of a course content, and giving unspecialised teachers the role or providing what will end up to be a watered down (at best) example of a subject. This structure also canonises those subjects that the Ministry deem of a higher status than providing students with the ability to make their own informed choices supported by the school.	Classics is not the same as history and many of the skills are different. Students take classics and history with very different expectations and interests. Media studies is a subject that needs time to be fully utilised. It should be taught by a specialist you can not expect social studies teacher to hold that level of knowledge or time within their curriculum. Psychology again is very specialised subject that requires a psychology teacher due to the subject specific requirements and content.		Yes			2020-02-21 12:14:24	ANON-YFPW-R9RW-T	2020-02-21 12:14:24	2020-02-21 12:14:30
Yes		Agree			Philosophy. Rationale: This subject, above all others, teaches students about thinking and learning.	No	I can't even find it published in English.		2020-02-21 12:15:11	ANON-YFPW-R9R4-Q	2020-02-21 12:15:11	2020-02-21 12:15:23

No	I did not know the change was to remove subjects and absorb them into others. You cannot combine business studies, commerce and accounting into one subject or art history and classics into history. These are completely different subjects and any accounting teacher, art history teacher or classics teacher could tell you that.	Undecided	The question is confusing and does not make sense.	Classics is not simply a history subject. Neither is art history. To have this view is to have an overly simplistic and superficial view of the subjects. Classics teachers have not been consulted in a meaningful way. Classics includes several different features that may share aspects of History, but also English, Psychology, Sociology, Art, Maths, Media Studies, Commerce, Language, Technology, and Science. While Classics incorporates a small history component, it also includes mythical traditions in literature and art, religious beliefs and practices, and the discussion of social customs, ideals, and behaviours. Not to mention the evolution of Maths, Science and Technology, the relationship between socio-political precedents, economic systems or the literary and stylistic development of art and architecture. Within this are specific Greek and Roman concepts which do not easily transition to the standard history concepts of cause and effect and perspective.	No.	No	Once again the Ministry is dictating that people should have knowledge of things that they have received very little information or professional development for.		2020-02-21 12:16:29	ANON-YFPW-R9RT-Q	2020-02-21 12:16:29	2020-02-21 12:16:38
Yes	aware and generally supportive.	Agree	We are already looking at cross subject curriculum in the Social Sciences at Level 1 based on student feedback and personal experience. I would like to suggest that the new Commerce curriculum becomes a stand alone curriculum area rather than as an adjunct to Social Sciences.	formally aligning media studies within the Social Science curriculum is important rather than it being a choice of schools who often fit it within an English course.		Yes			2020-02-21 12:17:32	ANON-YFPW-R9R2-N	2020-02-21 12:17:32	2020-02-21 12:17:58
Yes		Undecided	For the Technology learning area, I'm not sure what his means "integrated through new Technology subjects". The devil will be in the detail. What will the implications of this on teacher up skilling, workload, staffing, recruitment etc ?		ITO (unit std) based standards should be integrated fully into NCEA at levels 2 & 3 at an equivalent status with Achievement stds. That means the ability for learning to be recognised at Merit & Exc. I'm hopeful that the proposed Vocational Entrance certificate will address this serious historical anomaly.	Yes			2020-02-21 12:18:09	ANON-YFPW-R9RU-R	2020-02-21 12:18:09	2020-02-21 12:18:57
Yes		Strongly disagree	It would be better to allow assessments/subjects to exist and get more schools to create courses rather than subjects at Level 1, if you want to create a broader knowledge base. Currently, most schools still offer subjects rather than courses. That is what is narrowing the curriculum. You could even perhaps look at more generic type assessments e.g. research assessment - so the teacher could chose the context. Currently almost every subject has a research standard - so rather than limit the subjects, maybe limit the types of assessments we offer. Give students/teachers any context to teach but give them a range of generic assessments to hang that learning off. If you came up with a range of 10-15 assessment types (e.g. research, portfolio, oral presentation etc.) then any subject/context could be used.	Absolutely DO NOT limit students in the subjects they do. Work with schools on how to create courses if you want "broad learning". What does it matter if only 4 schools offer Latin? If that is an interest to the student then shouldn't they come first? Where is your student centred learning in this?	No	No			2020-02-21 12:21:39	ANON-YFPW-R9GV-H	2020-02-21 12:21:39	2020-02-21 12:21:52
No		Strongly disagree	Further dilution and "dumbing down" of subjects is not needed.			No			2020-02-21 12:22:02	ANON-YFPW-R9GV-E	2020-02-21 12:22:02	2020-02-21 12:22:17
Yes	In general terms this had been signaled although earlier timelines around when information was going to be made available have become very tight. I am also not aware how involved various subject associations have been and what information has been provided to them as there is a level of surprise evident in responses. There continues to be a pattern of major announcements and info releases coming through the news media and then through official channels. There was no mention of this in the 17th Feb Bulletin	Agree	The inclusion of MPA is fantastic, the collapsing of some areas is interesting but I do support the pushing back of specialisation to L2 and L3			No			2020-02-21 12:24:00	ANON-YFPW-R9GC-U	2020-02-21 12:24:00	2020-02-21 12:24:11
Yes	Good.	Strongly agree				No			2020-02-21 12:26:18	ANON-YFPW-R9GS-B	2020-02-21 12:26:18	2020-02-21 12:26:24

Yes		Disagree	Science has been streamlined completely into 4 standards and the implications this will have on our future tamariki will be significant. It will not be robust enough to prepare our learners for the future world of science and technology (NCEA Level 2 onwards).	I'm interested to know the reasoning behind science having the most major change among all subjects. It is undermined heavily right now. Science is a way of looking at the world, which is integral to our modern society. "The problem in society is not kids not knowing science. The problem is adults not knowing science. They outnumber kids 5 to 1, they wield power, they write legislation. When you have scientifically illiterate adults you have undermined the very fabric of what makes a nation wealthy and strong" - Neil DeGrasse Tyson. It's great that Hort/Agriculture is still made available because it has major positive implications on our future economy, however the vision we should have around the sciences for this country should be broadened.		No			2020-02-21 12:26:16	ANON-YFPW-R9R3-P	2020-02-21 12:17:13	2020-02-21 12:26:26
No		Disagree		It would be great to see Biology, Chemistry, Environmental Studies and Physics available at Level 1.		No			2020-02-21 12:26:43	ANON-YFPW-R9G8-G	2020-02-21 12:26:43	2020-02-21 12:26:57
No		Disagree	It seems mostly to be echoing the older subject arrangements of 10-20 years ago which does raise the question of what motivated the initial changes to make sure that we are setting ourselves up to have to then have to repeat this process again in the not too distant future. Some of the changes do not seem to align with the subjects as they are now which makes me think that either the wrong people have been involved in the process thus far or you are considering redesigning entire subjects. If subjects are being redesigned this needs to be mentioned at this stage so that we can give accurate and appropriate feedback.	Media Studies is a subject that should be more widely taught not have a reduced representation. This subject has been incorrectly aligned with Social Studies when it is more closely related to Technologies and English. In a society saturated with modern media it is imperative that students are taught how to navigate this world as both consumers and creators. This subject teaches the introductory trade skills for those entering entertainment and media fields and the language and communication skills used by storytellers, journalists, advertisers and politicians. By removing the ability for junior students to gain the foundation knowledge in this subject we reduce their ability to go as deep in their studies as senior students. I am aware that many people currently teaching this subject (at all levels!) are not experts in the field or even experienced at all and have come from other disciplines so despite the best intentions do not have the same regards for this subject as is necessary to understand the true value and importance of Media Studies in our current society. Knowing this I would hope that any consultations would acknowledge this and make sure to get a fair and genuine representation of views and opinions from appropriate sources		No			2020-02-21 12:29:33	ANON-YFPW-R9G9-H	2020-02-21 12:29:33	2020-02-21 12:30:00
Yes	This is very important.	Strongly agree		I agree with the Sciences being placed together. It is also very good to see History and Geography being offered at Level 1 - this allows students to have a new subject line at level one and both these subjects cater to a differentiated learning of our students. It is sad for accounting, however we have already started to remove accounting from our learning programme and we offer a combined business studies and economics class.		No			2020-02-21 12:34:35	ANON-YFPW-R9GG-Y	2020-02-21 12:34:35	2020-02-21 12:34:40
No	I was aware that NCEA level 1 was to be reviewed and that sitting level 1 could be optional. I was not aware of the plan to create a broad foundational education that had a strong cultural emphasis.	Undecided	There should be a separate Digital Arts Course at year 11- that can cover photography, design and moving image. Many departments already offer digital Arts at year 10 and currently offer separate programmes at year 11 in Digital art andin Visual art - but students cannot take both as they are assessed against the same standards (which currently don't easily accommodate the digital fields of art). Digital Technologies and DVC do not have the same issue as they each have different standards. Students having to choose between focussing on Digital Art or Visual Arts at year 11 means that learning pathways to either the level 2 vis arts fields (painting, printmaking, sculpture) or the digital art fields (Photography and Design) can be disrupted and students arrive in level 2 courses with significant deficits in their learning.	As above.	Moving Image ART	Yes	Familiar.		2020-02-21 12:35:43	ANON-YFPW-R9GJ-2	2020-02-21 12:35:43	2020-02-21 12:36:12
Yes		Agree				No			2020-02-21 12:37:20	ANON-YFPW-R9G5-D	2020-02-21 12:37:20	2020-02-21 12:37:26
Yes		Agree		L1 Dance and L1 Drama - these performing arts subjects could be taught from L2. Unlike L1 Music these performing arts subjects would not need much theories to be taught at L1. NCEA English offers Film studies and plays. Critiques or analysis - these skills which are currently examined by the external exam can be taught under English.		No			2020-02-21 12:37:10	ANON-YFPW-R9GE-W	2020-02-21 12:37:10	2020-02-21 12:37:41

Yes		Strongly disagree	By taking away Classical Studies, Art History, and Latin, students will be unable to study ancient Western civilisation, and it will mean that less students will want to take it in Year 11 as it won't count towards any credits. For that reason, this change could condemn many students, especially the Latin students, to be unable to pursue their passions.	Classical Studies, Art History, and Latin should be included at Level 1, as they are subjects about ancient history, as opposed to the History course which is merely a course delving into 19th-20th century history. It would halt student's passions for these subjects, and these subjects help enhance the learning of other subjects. Classical Studies brings greater depth to political science and sociology, as it shows the rise and fall of many ancient civilisations, as well as how they were run and bolstered. Without it, New Zealand students risk losing their links to the past, and it would be incredibly shortsighted to focus students' history learning on the 19th and 20th centuries. Art History helps young artists learn about composition, media, and technique, helping them to flesh out their artwork as well as understand their forebearers in art. To eliminate this could cause young artists' skills to become lessened, and it could hinder the growth of art in New Zealand. Latin is a language which links closely to English, as well as to Classical Studies, History, and other languages. As Latin is a subject which demands prerequisites from prior years, taking it away from	None.	No		No.	2020-02-21 12:37:46	ANON-YFPW-R9GP-8	2020-02-21 12:37:46	2020-02-21 12:37:54
No		Strongly agree				No			2020-02-21 12:38:30	ANON-YFPW-R9G7-F	2020-02-21 12:38:30	2020-02-21 12:38:44
No		Strongly disagree	I am concerned that students with a strong interest in the subjects being dropped will lose the opportunity to study them in more depth and be placed at a competitive disadvantage. The teacher shortage is already causing a loss of depth in student learning as many classes are taught (or should I say babysat?) by teachers from another subject area with the assistance of inadequate educational software. Pushing for a broader curriculum may exacerbate or conceal this problem. I wonder whether these changes may have been influenced by the availability of teachers for certain subjects? These changes "might" result in a more broad education for the individual but will result in a more narrow education for the community as a whole. A broad general knowledge only natural for a curious person in the information age. To teach students to be life long learners, we need to show them how to learn in depth.	New Zealand students who pursue a career in art are already at an international disadvantage to those who grew up visiting the best museums in the world. Removing art history from the curriculum will result in a loss of knowledge as content is squeezed into level 2 and 3. Schools should be able to choose between offering general science or specialization at level 1.		No			2020-02-21 12:40:22	ANON-YFPW-R9G1-9	2020-02-21 12:40:22	2020-02-21 12:40:32
No	I feel you are actually doing the opposite by removing subjects. I can see a lot of History teachers not including classics in their programmes.	Strongly disagree	As above - you are losing variety. The smaller subjects will either be lost or elements of the subjects they are being incorporated into will be lost. I also fear for the state of science in NZ. While most schools do a year 11 general science programme there are also many who ran an additional programme to get students more science in Year 11. This is important for their success in future years. This will now be lost.	Don't do it. Keep all the current subjects in tact. allow schools to meet the needs of their students best by doing this.	nil	No			2020-02-21 12:42:13	ANON-YFPW-R9GZ-J	2020-02-21 12:42:13	2020-02-21 12:42:23
No	A broader curriculum at L1 is likely to disadvantage many students who have a clear focus and wish to pursue a clear progression. It is a case of one size fits all and a general dumbing down of what is currently offered.	Strongly disagree	The proposed L1 Commerce will not provide the students with the foundations on knowledge to pursue diversity into the various subject specialisms in Years 12 & 13 and as a result the students will lack the knowledge and understanding to be able to cope with the content at L2 & 3. Given the NZ curriculum advocates commerce as a key component necessary for New Zealand's economic prosperity and entrepreneurship is key to that it is short sighted to reduce this element of the curriculum and therefore the potential take up in Years 12 & 13.			Yes		See above comments	2020-02-21 12:43:01	ANON-YFPW-R9GH-Z	2020-02-21 12:43:01	2020-02-21 12:43:16

Yes		Strongly disagree	Merging all the Science subjects into one is not a positive step, and it is a poor preparation for study in Level 2 and 3.	All Sciences cannot be merged into a single subject. That would be poor preparation for Levels 2 and 3. Given that most Science departments are mostly Biology teachers, it is inevitable that Chemistry and Physics will lose out when the suggested changes are actually applied in the classroom.		No	I don't think that this is the most important part of the NCEA Review. Te Reo is exclusively used by very few, if any, science students at NCEA in my school, and many others like it.		2020-02-21 13:01:32	ANON-YFPW-R9GK-3	2020-02-21 13:01:32	2020-02-21 13:01:41
No	I was not aware of this shift in NCEA design and feel like this has been poorly communicated to the teaching world before announcement publicly.	Undecided	I think the shift to combined Science is a hard decision to make and realise that it will have some severe implications for schools and their staffing. We are meant to be specialised teachers for a reason, too.	I like the addition of Maori Performing Arts but I hope that this does not discourage Maori and Pasifika learners away from our Drama and Dance courses that co-exist as this (to me) seems like it is against what we are trying to do in a holistic, inclusive classroom.	Performing Arts Technology as it's own specialist subject - i.e. lighting, sound design, set design, etc.	Yes	I am familiar with the English translation but not the te reo Maori because I cannot speak the language? But I AM familiar with the NZ curriculum		2020-02-21 13:01:39	ANON-YFPW-R9GG-E	2020-02-21 13:01:39	2020-02-21 13:02:17
Yes		Undecided	Geography, history and social studies should be joined if the various areas of Science are able to be joined then social studies which encompasses history, geography etc., can also be joined. If level 1 is supposed to be broad then this is an area of consolidation.	Social studies contains elements of history and geography and, as such, there is no real need for separate history and geography subjects. Science can drop from 5 large subject areas down to one, social studies can do the same.		No			2020-02-21 13:05:43	ANON-YFPW-R9GR-A	2020-02-21 13:05:43	2020-02-21 13:05:59
No		Strongly disagree	No balance	Commerce are hugely disadvantaged here. To combine Accounting, Economics and business is not doing the learning area justice. Too different. And what about financial literacy??	Financial Literacy	No			2020-02-21 13:06:47	ANON-YFPW-R9GW-F	2020-02-21 13:06:47	2020-02-21 13:06:51
Yes		Agree				No			2020-02-21 13:08:36	ANON-YFPW-R9G4-C	2020-02-21 13:08:36	2020-02-21 13:08:46
No		Strongly disagree	More 'dumbing down' in the science area. I am so pleased that I left the state system!			No			2020-02-21 13:09:44	ANON-YFPW-R9GU-D	2020-02-21 13:09:44	2020-02-21 13:09:58
Yes	Aware but in the dark as to what that might mean. I was expecting no particular subject specialisation at all in Level 1, instead focus on skills and key competencies in any context.	Disagree	If subjects are to be aligned with the NZC then all Learning Areas would be equally represented and schools would be able to decide how to deliver each area. There should be no determination that some learning areas asked to make decisions about what to drop and what to include and others aren't. Assuming that Economics and Accounting can be an either/or choice is not reasonable, when Drama and Dance are not being asked to do this - for example, I do not understand the logic - particularly when I assume, we are being asked to stick to 2 internal and 2 external standards.	As stated, it would be more equitable to organise Level1 into Learning Areas and allow schools to decide the split of subjects within them, if broad, foundational education is required would students not be better off testing the water in Level 1 of new subjects and experiences with learning, rather than more of the same (Maths, English, Arts, ...) Social Sciences appears to be making a greater sacrifice in coverage of subjects and in terms of citizenship, global and social awareness, it is an extremely important area of study - particularly in our town.	No	No			2020-02-21 13:09:39	ANON-YFPW-R9G2-A	2020-02-21 13:09:39	2020-02-21 13:10:02
No		Strongly disagree	I am vehemently opposed.	As an English and Media Studies teacher, I am aware of the critical nature of media literacy in today's media-saturated environment. I believe it should be going in the other direction: Media Studies should be made compulsory at a general level, not subsumed as a 'possible context'. Media Studies is listed under Social Sciences in the NZ Curriculum but, in reality, it is always part of the English department. Media Studies subjects at university are counted towards English degrees, not Social Studies. Therefore, making these changes means you will be asking Media Studies teachers to retrain for the Social Studies department, and vice versa, which will be a massive disincentive for teachers to remain in the workforce. How can we, as a society, expect to combat the spread of fake news and dangerous misinformation (see: anti-vaxxers, the horrifying rise of white supremacy) if we are not equipping our young people the skills they need to filter and critically analyse the media they are being bombarded with from the moment they wake up to the moment they fall asleep? As a government, don't you want well-informed, media-savvy citizens to populate and stabilise a fair and		No			2020-02-21 13:10:58	ANON-YFPW-R9TY-X	2020-02-21 13:10:58	2020-02-21 13:11:11

Yes		Strongly disagree	there needs to be more than just science and ag/hort at Level 1 STEM is vital to the future of the planet you MUST include biology, chemistry, physics and earth science as subjects at Level 1	there needs to be more than just science and ag/hort at Level 1 STEM is vital to the future of the planet you MUST include biology, chemistry, physics and earth science as subjects at Level 1 if possible include more science subject options rather than less	you MUST retain separate science subjects at Level 2 and 3	No			2020-02-21 13:12:13	ANON-YFPW-R9TV-U	2020-02-21 13:12:13	2020-02-21 13:12:41
Yes		Strongly disagree	Extremely concerned that Accounting, Economics and Business Studies will be merged into Commerce.	Accounting, Economics and Business Studies are courses in their own right. They should not be merged.	Accounting Economics Business Studies	No			2020-02-21 13:13:04	ANON-YFPW-R9TS-R	2020-02-21 13:13:04	2020-02-21 13:13:20
No	I was initially apprehensive that the change to support a broad, more foundational Level 1 NCEA may mean some discipline areas eg Arts were crowded out or that some curriculum subjects could be dropped eg Dance. I am relieved and pleased that all Arts subjects are retained at Level 1 with Maori Performing Arts added. I understand some subjects may be disappointed eg sciences, art history, media studies. The proposed list seems to offer more balance between discipline areas in terms of number of options available to students in each discipline area. For example, 5 Arts subjects, 5 Technology subjects, 5 Social Sciences. The exceptions are Languages (10 subjects), Health and PE (2), Maths (1). The number of options available to students in each discipline area has flow-on effects for timetabling. A large number of subject options in one discipline area requires more teaching and learning hours in the school timetable. This can have the consequence of crowding out subjects in another discipline area within a school's timetable. This occurs when students select multiple subjects in one discipline area eg Business Studies,	Agree	As above.	As above.	It is of utmost importance that curriculum subjects are all retained all NCEA levels.	No			2020-02-21 13:14:31	ANON-YFPW-R9T9-X	2020-02-21 13:14:31	2020-02-21 13:14:46
Yes		Strongly agree	As a teacher of Accounting over many years, it has frustrated me that I have had to teach outdated material at Level 1 that is no longer relevant to the personal, or business world. Level 2 and 3 are much more useful courses.	For Accounting at Level 2 and 3, some Achievement Standards are particularly useful. The more recently added AS 91481 is very valuable, as are the older ASs on Accounts Receivable and Inventory management. The nature of the elements (in 2.1 and 3.1) are also essential for an understanding of Accounting reporting. Once a clear grasp of these topics is evident, journal entries become much easier to understand. I remember a teacher back in the early 80s who said and believed that journals can be taught without the use of Debit or Credit, closing journal entries or ledgers. I continue to be inclined to agree with him. With greater usage of computers, this becomes even more meaningful.	AS 3.5 is actually an ideal AS to be carried out as an internal. Possibly the writing could improve if this was the case. This type of approach (case studies where accounting knowledge is applied to justify a decision) is similar to the case study approach taken by the more modern courses at University (such as Waikato).	No			2020-02-21 13:16:06	ANON-YFPW-R9TG-C	2020-02-21 13:16:06	2020-02-21 13:16:20
No		Disagree	Students can still change subjects at level 2 and 3 but removing subject support at level 1 will reduce the base knowledge some students have for university and will also mean level 2 and 3 cannot be as in depth as the basics will now need to be covered at level 2 instead of level 1.			No			2020-02-21 13:16:39	ANON-YFPW-R9TI-F	2020-02-21 13:16:39	2020-02-21 13:16:46
Yes		Agree				No			2020-02-21 13:17:00	ANON-YFPW-R9TQ-P	2020-02-21 13:17:00	2020-02-21 13:17:11
Yes	Collapsing the subjects will mean students will be less prepared for their chosen level 2 specialisations. I question the validity of this approach, students who want to study history may have no interest in classical studies for example.	Strongly disagree	What evidence is this sweeping decision being based on? Level 2 is already specialised, what does more specialised even mean? This further reduces student choice. Universities are already talking about changing an undergrad to a 4 year course to allow for a built in bridging year.	Improve the flow through of the subjects as they stand, currently the jump between level 1 and level 2 is challenging enough without further dilution. The fundamentals of each subject should be more clearly defined and taught in years 9 and 10 leading into level 1. Students should be prepared to move into a particular pathway by this time rather than delaying for another entire year.	Considering we already have a teacher shortage this seems like a redundant question.	Yes			2020-02-21 13:18:18	ANON-YFPW-R9TE-A	2020-02-21 13:18:18	2020-02-21 13:18:28
Yes		Undecided	difficult to determine agreement until the actual content and standards are made available. erring on the disagree side of the question at this stage in science it has been good to allow students to retain a science by having them able to specialise in a preferred option and general science was still possible for those wanting that option	Why so many languages? These are generally poorly subscribed to within schools.		No	some but not enough to be confident		2020-02-21 13:19:27	ANON-YFPW-R9TN-N	2020-02-21 13:19:27	2020-02-21 13:19:42
Yes		Agree	Pathways for those with special needs is not yet clear so await that before being more positive.	No	No	No			2020-02-21 13:23:46	ANON-YFPW-R9TF-B	2020-02-21 13:23:46	2020-02-21 13:24:22

No		Agree		Art History is a surprising subject for review. Forms foundation for directions in Art and inspiration.		Yes		STEM subjects in particular should be taught in a way that kura kids are not disadvantaged when transitioning over to mainstream etc in preparation for tertiary study. They must be fully prepared for integration into the global science communities. This makes instruction in the reo a noble pursuit, but not productive or economic.	2020-02-21 13:23:45	ANON-YFPW-R977-V	2020-02-21 13:23:45	2020-02-21 13:24:31
No		Agree		Unsure how Health and PE can combine at Level 1 when they are very very different subjects and standards.		No			2020-02-21 13:26:09	ANON-YFPW-R971-P	2020-02-21 13:26:09	2020-02-21 13:26:16
Yes		Agree		what is the rationale Behind introducing Food Science and including in with Home Economics as opposed to Sciences or both?	no	Yes			2020-02-21 13:29:20	ANON-YFPW-R972-Y	2020-02-21 13:29:20	2020-02-21 13:29:33
Yes	disagree with the whole idea. More effort needs to be on the 3 Rs, NOT PC stuff Te Reo is a language which is not essential for NZ to trade. If people want to learn it, make it co curricular. Science needs to be developed, we are falling behind other countries because of the dumbing down by people who don't teach and have no interest in NZ moving forward. We used to be leaders in agriculture and forestry, but now we are behind the 8 ball. The 'experts in school education might want to find out universities and research establishments want. What chance do we have if we have non-science people in charge of our borders if we have diseases like Coronavirus? Do people want doctors who speak fluent Maori, or someone who knows their way around the body. GET REAL you people	Strongly disagree	need more specialist understanding rather than merging. NOT social studies, but separate to history [especially NZ, and include Treaty issues], and Geography (including geology .. for mining). Teach physics, chemistry, biology, human biology, astronomy, earth science	done above	done above	No	do not find this important as leading forwards, where NZers can become world leaders [no chance of a Rutherford with the present way NCEA people run things since it first started they've not got it right]		2020-02-21 13:29:26	ANON-YFPW-R978-D	2020-02-21 13:29:26	2020-02-21 13:29:47
No		Agree	I think science should definitely be offered as a whole rather than splitting into the different subject matters in level 1.	-	no	No			2020-02-21 13:32:14	ANON-YFPW-R978-7	2020-02-21 13:32:14	2020-02-21 13:32:21
No		Strongly disagree		I think that Psychology is very important and should be included. The skills learnt in psychology are not included / found in social studies achievement standards. I think the skills are far more important and foundational than any skills taught in social studies (having taught using both of these subjects' achievement standards). Therefore I disagree with psychology not being included on the L1 subjects' list and Social studies being on the list instead. Psychology cannot be subsumed under social studies; it needs to be on the list in its own right.	Philosophy. We have been trying to make the case for Philosophy for the past 12 years. The NZ Association of Philosophy Teachers' has made a strong case for philosophy having its own achievement standards. I strongly believe this should be the case at L2 & 3. Philosophy includes non-partisan values education (ethics), and critical thinking (logic) both of which the NZ Curriculum is sorely lacking in. These two areas are not covered anywhere else in the NZ Curriculum. Religious Studies does include ethics but it is partisan/denominational not secular. Students therefore have no place to learn about ethics in the NZ Curriculum that is not from a religious standpoint. Similarly, the skills learnt in Logic (part of Philosophy) such as how to create a strong argument, how to avoid fallacies and common mistakes in argumentation are not covered anywhere else. These two things provide a strong case for Philosophy to be included at L2 & 3.	No			2020-02-21 13:32:19	ANON-YFPW-R978-J	2020-02-21 13:32:19	2020-02-21 13:32:54
Yes		Agree		no	no	No			2020-02-21 13:33:27	ANON-YFPW-R978-9	2020-02-21 13:33:27	2020-02-21 13:33:33
No		Strongly agree			Travel and Tourism	No			2020-02-21 13:34:30	ANON-YFPW-R978-W	2020-02-21 13:34:30	2020-02-21 13:34:39
No		Undecided				Yes			2020-02-21 13:36:36	ANON-YFPW-R978-A-6	2020-02-21 13:36:36	2020-02-21 13:36:46

Yes		Strongly disagree	Combined Health and Physical Education occur in schools up until NCEA Level 1. During this time students are exposed to a broad, more foundational education within this subject area. Historically, Level 1 has been the first opportunity to split these subjects. Students with a passion in Health, but who are not keen on physical activity will be put off taking the proposed combined Health and PE subject. Equally, students with a passion in movement, that have participated in a combined Health/PE program for many years, wont be able to take a subject at Level 1 where they can start to develop a broad foundation of Physical Education knowledge. I believe that there is a real risk that students who would usually take either Level 1 Health or Level 1 Physical Education will end up taking neither. That will hen have a significant flow on effect to Level 2 and Level 3	Combined Health and Physical Education occur in schools up until NCEA Level 1. During this time students are exposed to a broad, more foundational education within this subject area. Historically, Level 1 has been the first opportunity to split these subjects. Students with a passion in Health, but who are not keen on physical activity will be put off taking the proposed combined Health and PE subject. Equally, students with a passion in movement, that have participated in a combined Health/PE program for many years, wont be able to take a subject at Level 1 where they can start to develop a broad foundation of Physical Education knowledge. I believe that there is a real risk that students who would usually take either Level 1 Health or Level 1 Physical Education will end up taking neither. That will hen have a significant flow on effect to Level 2 and Level 3		No				2020-02-21 13:38:22	ANON-YFPW-R9TN-K	2020-02-21 13:38:22	2020-02-21 13:38:53
No		Strongly disagree	Commerce Subjects - the step up from level 1 to 2 is already difficult for students, the proposed structure, without exposure to key concepts at level 1, will make it very difficult for students to gain high levels of achievement.	Leave Commerce subjects separate - Accounting, Economics, Business Studies. They are much more popular than other subjects that are staying separate.		No				2020-02-21 13:39:10	ANON-YFPW-R9TE-U	2020-02-21 13:39:10	2020-02-21 13:39:23
No	I was aware that there would be changes to Level 1, but the intended changes above were not communicated.	Undecided	Agree with some, disagree with others. Combining History and Classics is not a good idea - they do not share enough similarities to be delivered well when combined. Also Media Studies would be better to be absorbed into English than Social Studies. The collapse of the Sciences into a general Science is a good idea, although it does limit that ability for students to specialise at an earlier point in time.	Art History should be either merged with History or Art - to remove it completely is short-sighted.	Develop Tourism as an achievement standard subject - we need highly skilled workers in the industry and the current provision of Tourism does not build that capacity in students as the work is done through unit standards.	No				2020-02-21 13:39:50	ANON-YFPW-R9TR-Q	2020-02-21 13:39:50	2020-02-21 13:40:00
Yes		Undecided		Classics is incredibly important in bi-cultural NZ; we need to understand BOTH parts of what is means to be a NZer. The western system we are based on is created from Ancient Greece and Rome- how can expect our students to fully understand how 'westernised' we are and therefore understand why we need to celebrate and put deliberate focus on our Maori culture with out this wider context?		Yes				2020-02-21 13:38:31	ANON-YFPW-R9TK-G	2020-02-21 13:38:31	2020-02-21 13:40:28
No		Strongly disagree		Need to keep Economics, Accounting and Business Studies!	No	Yes		No		2020-02-21 13:45:06	ANON-YFPW-R9TW-V	2020-02-21 13:45:06	2020-02-21 13:45:22
Yes		Strongly agree		I feel that keeping specialisation in Science until L2 will help us to cover a broader variety of work at level 1 and allow for more time to work though the NoS ideas.		No	I am not as familiar with it as I would like to be or probably should be.			2020-02-21 13:45:27	ANON-YFPW-R9TA-S	2020-02-21 13:45:27	2020-02-21 13:45:35
Yes		Agree				No				2020-02-21 13:52:20	ANON-YFPW-R9T3-R	2020-02-21 13:52:20	2020-02-21 13:52:31
Yes	broad education lacks specific learning outcomes	Strongly disagree	needs clear learning objectives that can be objectively compared across schools			No				2020-02-21 13:52:39	ANON-YFPW-R9T2-Q	2020-02-21 13:52:39	2020-02-21 13:52:51
No	Not really. A lot of information has been communicated since this review into NCEA began and it's difficult to keep track of it all. Please remember we are all busy with our first and most important focus... teaching and learning.	Disagree	As a Home Economics teacher, I feel disempowered and overlooked. With who has the MOE consulted to come to the conclusion that both Home Economics and Food Technology are to become Food Science? This only raises more questions than offers answers. I know that experts in our association and teachers in our learning area are highly concerned with such a significant change to the foundations behind our subject area without consultation. Perhaps there was a need to update the traditional 'Home Economics' but where in Food Science is there a clear understanding of nutrition and the value of how our homes and families and communities influence our food choices and eating patterns? Not a week goes by without the reference in the news to the societal impacts of growing obesity statistics in New Zealand or the issues connected to food security in this country. I have identified this area as 'disagree' rather than 'strongly disagree' because I would really like our learning area to be taken more seriously by the tertiary institutions moving to making it a recommended subject for health related (particularly nutrition related) courses and perhaps this is a small step towards this? It's very difficult to tell because the information provided at this stage is very much lacking.	Why the combining of Food Technology and Home Economics? How is this going to work within the Technology and Health and PE curriculum areas? Don't combine Food Technology and Home Economics. Don't use Food Science but consider 'Food and Nutrition Studies' of 'Food, Nutrition and Health' and consider combining Health standards in with Foods rather than Health combining with PE. Many of my students are very interested in Health (beyond the specific nutrition aspects discussed in Home Ec) but aren't interested in the physical education aspects of PE. Why can't these 3 areas be more interchangeable which increases flexibility rather than limits it.		No				2020-02-21 13:56:02	ANON-YFPW-R9TU-T	2020-02-21 13:56:02	2020-02-21 13:56:15

Yes		Strongly disagree	The jump in requirement between level 1 Sciences and Level 2 is already very significant, and the proposed Science standards will only make this worse as there is an extraordinary lack of content in the new standards. We will leave students totally unprepared for the rigours of the Sciences beyond Level 1	You must reintroduce scientific rigor to Level 1 Sciences - there must be a focus on content as this is required for anybody wishing to study further in the sciences. Currently NZ has a shortage of engineers, doctors etc, and by removing the majority of the scientific knowledge from L1, we make the road to filling these shortages that much harder	No	No			2020-02-21 13:56:06	ANON-YFPW-R99Y-3	2020-02-21 13:56:06	2020-02-21 13:56:15
Yes		Agree	I'm pleased to see that science will once again be one subject. It will mean students will have access to subjects in other curriculum areas which will broaden their education. Currently, some students are specialising too early and this can cause problems for them at L3.	It's disappointing that Media Studies will be within Social Studies. The production aspect is really enjoyed by students and may disappear. What will be the status of existing unit standards especially those used in Transition to Work/Lifeskills type programmes? This whole area appears to be missing from this particular model. Latin - while I accept it's probably had its day and is taught in quite elitist schools and may be difficult to staff, there is a huge amount of value learning it in terms of vocabulary development, grammatical knowledge etc.	Consider how to integrate Transition to Work type standards into a "subject". A cross-curricula English for Academic Purposes subject especially at L3. The proposed English course emphasises language and literature, different skills to developing reading, writing and research skills for tertiary study. Students could take both Englishes, just as they take more than one science subject. It would assist both native speakers and ESOL students to be successful at tertiary level. Perhaps this should be the requirement for UE??	No			2020-02-21 13:57:57	ANON-YFPW-R9TS-T	2020-02-21 13:19:20	2020-02-21 13:58:15
Yes		Strongly disagree	In section one, you have described that the proposals would "promote greater specialisations." However, by combining the Health and Physical Education programme it is in fact, reducing the specialisation within the subject area. Health and Physical Education are quite different subjects, and it is a great shame that the ministry has not been able to educate themselves around the difference between the two and see that they are each specialisation subjects themselves.	Health and Physical Education should NOT be combined. - The concepts and ideas within the health programme are vastly different to the PE programme. Different types of learning and themes are present. Combining them does not do the health and physical education curriculum area justice. Nor does it allow students to choose a subject in which they may be more interested in over the other.	Psychology as a subject that any learning area (not just Social Sciences as this is restrictive). Latin to still be allowed.	No			2020-02-21 14:00:11	ANON-YFPW-R99V-Z	2020-02-21 14:00:11	2020-02-21 14:00:31
No		Undecided	Will have to see changes to assessments	Seems like academic subjects were excluded - Latin would be important if you want to study in other countries Can't Drama be included in English? They do film studies already and can study a drama as one of their other text types Dance should not be an NCEA subject - well covered outside school through other agencies; NCEA Dance is nothing that would lead to any career in dancing as it is not as recognized as the existing Ballet and Dance exams, that are offered outside school Religious Education should be part of Social Studies, can easily be covered under the umbrella of Social Studies; should there even be room for such special character schools in NZ?	Latin should at least be included in Classical Studies Level 2 and 3	No			2020-02-21 14:00:58	ANON-YFPW-R99C-D	2020-02-21 14:00:58	2020-02-21 14:01:12
Yes		Strongly disagree	I teach level 2 Chemistry. Level 2 grades are often the ones tertiary institutions use to select their scholarships and students for halls from. Level 2 Chemistry is a challenging and academic course, a broad-based science program the previous year for students would cause undue stress and angst for the students. It is far better for student well-being for a course to build on itself year on year.	Level 1 Chemistry in its current form is a fantastic course which prepares the students extremely well for the rigors of level 2 chemistry, it is especially helpful for the students looking to gain excellence in level 2.		No			2020-02-21 14:03:43	ANON-YFPW-R998-2	2020-02-21 14:03:43	2020-02-21 14:03:56
No	Specific concerns around Commerce becoming too general and moving away from supporting the needs of our academic students. There is a need for all students to understand financial literacy, so to move away from budgeting units offered in Accounting is short-sighted	Agree	On the whole, it makes sense. The value of NCEA is very watered down, is a credit counting game that allows students to pass, resubmit, re-assess and resubmit an assessment. No wonder Europe laughs at our education system. Therefore changes are necessary. That said, academic subjects must remain academic. Pushing the middle (the majority) and top-performing students should be seen as a priority for our future output.	Commerce to include Accounting elements or accounting to be separate. Media and Social Studies link is great. Maori should be incorporated into History Classical Studies should be in History	none	No			2020-02-21 14:04:49	ANON-YFPW-R999-3	2020-02-21 14:04:49	2020-02-21 14:05:12
Yes		Disagree	NZ desperately needs to encourage technical scientific understanding and rolling the individual specialities into one undermines this process	As above, science should be left as individual specialities to encourage those that want to dive into science to do so. It also enables courses to be made to cater to the variety of akonga	Physics, Chemistry, Biology must remain. Electronics would be great too	No	But I plan to be		2020-02-21 14:05:58	ANON-YFPW-R99G-H	2020-02-21 14:05:58	2020-02-21 14:06:17

Yes		Undecided	I am a Commerce teacher, specialising in Economics but also can teach Business and Accounting. I have concerns over the combination of all 3 in level 1, specifically that one subject will suffer in terms of less teaching. I think all are valuable however Economics and Accounting do tend to be more content specific, we would lose the quality and depth of learning by combining them. Yes they could be picked up at level 2 (Accounting & Economics) but for Accounting specifically I believe it can be difficult for a lot of students due to the number of concepts required to master. I think I would like to see more on what you intend to do with level 2 subjects. I like the idea of teaching less but am concerned over teaching subjects too briefly.			No			2020-02-21 14:06:53	ANON-YFPW-R99J-M	2020-02-21 14:06:53	2020-02-21 14:07:05
Yes		Agree		No. Seems like a good balance to me.	No		No		2020-02-21 14:08:01	ANON-YFPW-R99Q-U	2020-02-21 14:08:01	2020-02-21 14:08:30
No		Strongly disagree	The removal of Latin, and the watering down of Classical Studies, is misguided. On a personal level, they were not just the most interesting subjects I studied at school, but I also draw on the skills I learned in those subjects every day (I am a lawyer, and learning Latin taught me how to write in English). My interest in the subjects continue today. Furthermore, it is astounding that the removal of Classical Studies would even be contemplated in our contemporary political climate. The threat of populism, and its eventual success (by way of tyranny), was the theme of a couple of hundred years of Roman history. We are living in a time when populism is again on the rise, and if we cannot learn from the past, are doomed to repeat it.	There is no rational reason to remove Latin and Classical Studies from the national syllabus of any country that considers itself civilised. Those subjects are the very basis of Western civilisation, and were the only subjects considered worthy of being taught for centuries. While there may be a cultural cringe that a small country at the bottom of the Pacific may still have any links to Europe, it is part of our country's history. It is not like the subjects are compulsory, so leave them for those that wish to have a broad and historically comprehensive education. There is no reason to barbarically strike them from the syllabus completely.	A general civics course should be mandatory. The type of course that teaches students how to function in society, and which covers basic legal obligations, monetary concepts, government structure, differing ethical theories etc.	No	do you not mean "Question 5"?		2020-02-21 14:10:04	ANON-YFPW-R99S-Y	2020-02-21 14:10:04	2020-02-21 14:10:16
Yes	...but the rationale for change is still very unclear to me. Y9 and 10 currently offer that "foundational education" and year 11 was working very well as is. I am not sure why we need to change it. If we keep dumbing down our expectations to meet the needs of the "at risk learners", we risk making our NCEA end qualification less acceptable globally. Any student that applies them self to some extent, can pass level 1. To fail means there are normally social or developmental issues that come with the student.	Strongly disagree	Commerce is hit too hard, given each subjects recent (and historical) successes as an NCEA stand alone subject. When we look at current Level 1 numbers of students sitting NCEA externals, Economics has 16,818 (6th biggest), Accounting 10,501 (9th) and Business Studies 5,900. Each subject should exist alone, and has served students well up until now. If any of the 3 should be merged it should be Business Studies...added to Economics. Financial Literacy should be a strand in the National Curriculum, we should not be taking it away. If there is one thing that the community want taught in schools, it is financial literacy, and Economics and Accounting provide this in their own different way.	Accounting at Level 1 is a very popular course at our school (3+ classes each year) with many students going on to study it at a higher level (tertiary) and interested in it as a career pathway. This interest starts at Level 1 where they pick up the basics and have success, then level 2 adds to this with more depth. These two courses work well, and have slowly adapted to reflect the changing role of accountants. (financial advisors)	no.	No			2020-02-21 14:10:03	ANON-YFPW-R99F-F	2020-02-21 14:10:03	2020-02-21 14:10:29
Yes	Have followed the RAS development.	Strongly agree	I am really pleased to see Science as an over arching subject instead of specialist sciences at Level 1. Level 2 and 3 would supply ample time for specialism in the separate sciences. Good to see the Nature of Science being adhered to.	Happy with what is produced.		Yes	God to see its involvement in the new subjects.		2020-02-21 14:10:16	ANON-YFPW-R99P-T	2020-02-21 14:10:16	2020-02-21 14:10:47
Yes		Agree				No			2020-02-21 14:11:00	ANON-YFPW-R99F-G	2020-02-21 14:11:00	2020-02-21 14:11:10
No		Strongly disagree		I dont think merging the broader subjects into 1 eg classical study's and history together for level 1 will be a good idea. When I was at school having the options in 5th form was awesome as I could start specializing early on. I feel starting later would put you behind in your education	No just leave it as is.	Yes	I dont some of them really need there own separate subject where your pushing 4 subject together to make science. Some things are more useful for our future than others.		2020-02-21 14:11:00	ANON-YFPW-R991-U	2020-02-21 14:11:00	2020-02-21 14:11:16
Yes		Strongly disagree	Science, Social Science and Commerce will find it hard to prepare students for their respective specialities in Y112 & Y13	No	No	No	No		2020-02-21 14:10:49	ANON-YFPW-R997-1	2020-02-21 14:10:49	2020-02-21 14:11:19
No		Agree				No			2020-02-21 14:11:25	ANON-YFPW-R99Z-4	2020-02-21 14:11:25	2020-02-21 14:11:44
Yes		Disagree	Home Economics is not a Science. We teach Hauora - Health & Well being. The umbrella of Food 'Science' does not give students the correct background they need to lead into Level 2 & 3. We look at Social aspects and impacts - how does this fit into Science? If it is just a word - choose another one!	Generally ok.		No			2020-02-21 14:16:23	ANON-YFPW-R99M-Q	2020-02-21 14:16:23	2020-02-21 14:16:40
Yes		Strongly disagree	Merging Economics, Business Studies, Accounting into "Commerce" would not be feasible.	Merging Economics, Business Studies, Accounting into "Commerce" would not be feasible.	No	Yes			2020-02-21 14:21:05	ANON-YFPW-R99X-2	2020-02-21 14:21:05	2020-02-21 14:21:13
Yes	This has been referred to throughout specialised subject groups on social media and the news. However, I have found the communication from the Ministry and NZQA has been confusing with supporting documentation difficult to find.	Undecided	I have some concerns within my subject area (Science) that any proposed changes will make the transition to senior specialist subjects, and onward to specialised university study more difficult for our students.	Although I understand the rationale behind removing the Level 1 specialist subjects I have concerns that the generic science course may not adequately cater to the requirements of the learner.	I would like to see the Ministry work with subject specialists to develop a generic science course at levels 2 and 3 in addition to the specialist subjects.	No	Although I am aware of its existence my skills in Te Reo are not sufficient for familiarity.	N/A	2020-02-21 14:21:04	ANON-YFPW-R99D-E	2020-02-21 14:21:04	2020-02-21 14:21:22

Yes		Disagree	I feel that combining all science subjects into a single topic is reductive and possibly will not allow students to try out more advanced science topics at L1. Often in science the really exciting stuff comes as you begin to specialize - by getting rid of that at L1, you may turn students off of science. I also disagree with change Home Economics to Food Science - surely there is more to Home Economics than just Food Science?		Yes				2020-02-21 14:22:35	ANON-YFPW-R99A-B	2020-02-21 14:22:35	2020-02-21 14:22:53
Yes		Strongly agree			No				2020-02-21 14:23:39	ANON-YFPW-R99N-R	2020-02-21 14:23:39	2020-02-21 14:23:46
No		Strongly disagree		Subjects that have relevance and transferable concepts and skills to today's world such as ICT, Media Studies, Commerce and Geography should be given priority. Subjects such as Classical Studies, Languages are a waste of time and resources.		Yes	You cannot force anyone to learn anything by making it compulsory. If there is no intrinsic value for the student in learning Te Reo, then the teacher will merely be talking at a disinterested and unmotivated learner. There will be very little increase in the number of students who choose to take Te Reo beyond their compulsory year.	Struggling to understand its relevance beyond preservation of a language. NZ History is important however, and far more important than the current contexts that are being taught in schools but that is the only benefit I can see.	2020-02-21 14:27:48	ANON-YFPW-R996-Z	2020-02-21 14:27:48	2020-02-21 14:28:03
Yes		Agree	Geography as a subject MUST be on the list.	It is good to see Geography on the list. It is a subject that cannot be left off as it provides foundation spatial understanding of Te Ao and how people interact with it. Understanding geography as the basis on which our history is shaped, and how our commerce, social and political constructs change and how our physical and social environment lead to sustainable lives is highly important.	Geography must continue to be offered at levels 2 and 3.	No	NA	NA	2020-02-21 14:29:56	ANON-YFPW-R99W-1	2020-02-21 14:29:56	2020-02-21 14:30:13
Yes	eminently sensible - NCEA Level 1 has long been an outdated hoop to jump through. Streamlining should offer tastes for specialisation, nothing more.	Undecided	There are still too many almost specialist parts. It would have been more sensible to encourage integration so that students had to draw on wide disciplinary knowledge. This current arrangement doesn't appear to necessarily encourage this	I can't see fabric technology anywhere- is that subsumed in 'materials' technology or 'design'? Other kinds of technologies appear to be visible but not that one. Please note: fabric is not my subject area, so it is not a comment about 'my subject'.		No			2020-02-21 14:33:00	ANON-YFPW-R994-X	2020-02-21 14:33:00	2020-02-21 14:33:16
Yes		Undecided	If level 1 is a general education and an exit qualification, why does the MOE not publish a graduate profile so teachers of the remaining subjects are clear about this. Will financial literacy be compulsory so school leavers have skills that are needed for all people in the real world? I would have liked to see health education as a separate subject?.	Food science is also a health/ social science and currently is considered such. I hope when it is in the technology domain, that learning at level 1 will encompass humans relationship with food (plants and animals etc) and how it is so important for mental, physical and social wellbeing! Outdoor education could have also been very worthwhile at level 1 and encompass whakapapa and te ao Maori concepts.	Education for Sustainability Outdoor education	No			2020-02-21 14:33:11	ANON-YFPW-R99K-N	2020-02-21 14:27:25	2020-02-21 14:33:28
Yes		Undecided		Not convinced that Latin should be removed. It is a basis for understanding the root of the English language and our political and legal systems. Amalgamation with classic possible (which will now be History)?	NZ History	No			2020-02-21 14:34:04	ANON-YFPW-R99T-X	2020-02-21 14:34:04	2020-02-21 14:34:11
Yes		Undecided	There are some subject areas that are going to be very difficult to merge given current staffing in schools.	Social Sciences will struggle to reach any depth with the inclusion of so many different discrete subjects.	Media Studies.	Yes			2020-02-21 14:34:45	ANON-YFPW-R992-V	2020-02-21 14:34:45	2020-02-21 14:35:09
Yes	I do have some concerns that with going very broad and generic there is the danger that the content will be lost which means that the foundation of the specifics, and jargon, and basic underlying principles will be lacking when students enter L2 and 3. This, in turn, will mean that L2 and 3 has to be very specialised as first foundation must be covered and teachers will only do the foundation that applies to that specific topic. I would like to offer some suggestions as requested but those would be subject-specific ie L1 science has limited opportunity to teach forces, electricity, plant, animal and human biology, reactions, food science, space	Agree		A change I would like to suggest is the ability for credits to be attained from a standard more than once provided the content is very different eg done in a Physics context (force and motion) and then done in a Chemistry context (acid and bases reaction rates). This would allow schools to provide wider yet more subject-specific based teaching and learning programmes.		No			2020-02-21 14:35:06	ANON-YFPW-R998-C	2020-02-21 14:15:04	2020-02-21 14:35:17
Yes		Agree				No			2020-02-21 14:35:18	ANON-YFPW-R99U-Y	2020-02-21 14:35:18	2020-02-21 14:35:26

No		Strongly disagree							2020-02-21 14:35:23	ANON-YFPW-R9UY-Y	2020-02-21 14:35:23	2020-02-21 14:35:37
Yes		Strongly agree	Level one should be a foundational year, and should offer a broad curriculum which is accessible to all students in New Zealand. What I am concerned about is that tertiary providers drive what students do at secondary college, particularly students who are going to university. This influences what subjects students choose at levels 2 and 3, but often level 1. In terms of a local curriculum, the only concern I have is that it depends on the people involved in making that curriculum in terms of the options available. It does allow for greater flexibility and creativity, but in some communities I would hate to see that local curriculum set with low expectations in mind due to judgments and perspectives about the community.	Media studies should be included as it is quite a different skill set and is a growth area in terms of industry.		No			2020-02-21 14:35:30	ANON-YFPW-R9UC-9	2020-02-21 14:35:30	2020-02-21 14:35:38
Yes	However in a culturally responsive world, students would have ACCESS to choice and voice. Narrowing and therefore limiting choice, makes ZERO sense. I am strongly OPPOSED to this suggestion, in particular in relation to the Commerce Proposal.	Strongly disagree		In particular in relation to the COMMERCE proposal: Accounting, Economics and Business are very individual and differing subjects. The skills and knowledge in each of these areas are very different. The skills taught at Level 1 underpin the foundation of success in Level 2 and Level 3. As a pathway into future success in Level 3 and Scholarship Accounting and Economics, students require knowledge that is embedded during teaching during Level 1. There is a clear future career pathway in all of these areas and they are INDIVIDUAL at University. Nationally student numbers in Accounting and Business at Level 1 are increasing (or being maintained). Students financial capabilities are a concern nationwide, and this proposal limits students access to varied pathways where this is a predominant idea. It appears that Commerce subjects, and Accounting in particular, will be a step behind with respect to learning as it is not able to be accessed at Level 1, or will need to be condensed significantly to fit in the other subject's ideas (trying to cover the key foundation ideas of 3 subjects in one is just not feasible)	See previous comments. I believe Accounting, Economics and Business should be kept separate.	Yes			2020-02-21 14:35:29	ANON-YFPW-R9UV-V	2020-02-21 14:35:29	2020-02-21 14:35:38
No		Strongly agree		Removing all actual science from the science curriculum will likely have short and long term impacts on students' employment options and the New Zealand economy. Lowering the bar to improve attainment might be politically expedient but it does not serve our children well.		Yes			2020-02-21 14:29:50	ANON-YFPW-R99R-V	2020-02-21 14:29:50	2020-02-21 14:38:35
Yes		Undecided		Very supportive of Foods (Home Economics) being kept in, although do not believe re-naming it 'Food Science' is useful. Very supportive of Foods (Home Economics) being retained under Health and Physical Education as the importance of food for individuals, groups, communities and society can not be underestimated and is, undoubtedly, inherently a part of our health and wellbeing. Am concerned that adding 'science' to the subject name will deter a good number of students from opting into this. Am also concerned that the implication may be a lesser focus on the nutrition, food safety and wellbeing (personal, interpersonal and societal), and more focus on the science (food chemistry) aspects which are more a component of Food Technology. Strongly believe that emphasis is not helpful for the future wellbeing of our students - see the obesity, diabetes and other diet related health issues statistics.	Optimistic that Foods (Home Economics) will be retained as a specialist subject, due to the nature of this subject in the context of personal, interpersonal and societal wellbeing and preventative health !!!	No			2020-02-21 14:40:46	ANON-YFPW-R993-W	2020-02-21 14:34:30	2020-02-21 14:41:02
No	I am now though, and shocked and extremely concerned.	Strongly disagree	There should be specialised Sciences and much more freedom to create/tailor courses for particular classes/students. This is currently the best thing about NCEA compared to other qualifications and you are planning on removing it? Crazy!!! It will drive schools into other qualifications or avoiding it altogether (maybe that is what MoE are after?)	Students are able to specialise, and should be able to specialise at level 1, and to remove that opportunity will be 'dumbing down' the subject and qualification, whilst at the same time asking for ridiculously high standards in literacy. Biology, Physics, Earth Sci and Chemistry should be included if not available amongst the Science standards. If they are to be removed, then there must be the current options available instead (ie Mechanics, Acids/Bases, Genetic Variation).		No			2020-02-21 14:40:57	ANON-YFPW-R9US-5	2020-02-21 14:40:57	2020-02-21 14:41:14

Yes		Strongly disagree	I am a teacher of physical education and also a teacher of health. Although many may see the two as complimenting each other and I too can see the similarities there is a distinct difference and focus for each in their own right. They each have their own pathways and these are quite diverse. Each has their own distinct group of students that subscribe to the subjects too. If we combine we would be losing the identity of each subject and creating a somewhat murky pathway for students wishing to embark on a pathway in physical education or health.	as above.		No			2020-02-21 14:41:35	ANON-YFPW-R9U8-X	2020-02-21 14:41:35	2020-02-21 14:42:04
No		Undecided		Combining four quite different areas of science into a single category is too broad to be very useful at the next level. You only allow three external exams per subject - biology, chemistry, physics, and earth and space science (let alone general Science) - this does not lend itself to three externals.	No	No			2020-02-21 14:42:23	ANON-YFPW-R9U9-Y	2020-02-21 14:42:23	2020-02-21 14:42:45
No		Strongly disagree		Art History, Classical Studies, Media and Psychology are all subjects in their own right. They are all important in offering students a range of subjects choices and by not offering them you are creating a hierarchy of subjects and you are making students specialise earlier on because the range of subjects offered with be reduced.	With the significant increase of students with learning needs who are not able to reach the academic requirements of Level 2 and 3, there needs to be more practical and vocational subjects for those students as well as the continuation of a broad range of academic subjects so that the needs of ALL students are met. It is not the job of NZQA or the Ministry of Education to decide what subjects students should be taking, it must remain the choice of the student.	No			2020-02-21 14:42:34	ANON-YFPW-R9UG-D	2020-02-21 14:42:34	2020-02-21 14:42:48
No	I have two younger sisters currently in the NCEA system, and I have just gotten out of it and into university study, and I had no idea.	Strongly disagree	This is the complete opposite direction of where I, and many of the people I know, feel that the curriculum needs to go. Most of these proposed merges make no sense, and are cramming more workloads onto teachers and students to learn even more in a shorter period of time. Things like media studies and psychology, both of which I have continued on into a university level, are completely different subjects, and classics and history are both covering completely different time periods. The main complaint we had as teachers and students was that there was way too much to learn in the time frame leading up to the exam, and these changes will make it even worse. Not to mention, it will be pushing some teachers out of subject areas and jobs, which is again, the opposite of what we need. Many students, myself included, love a wide variety of subjects to choose from, so that we can be passionate about what subjects we are learning and choosing to learn, and then will do our best in. Combining all the sciences also seems like such a headache. Career paths don't need all of the sciences at once. Many only need one or two, and combining them all just makes this more difficult for everybody.	As stated above, I do not believe any of these subjects should be merged, as all of them are completely different, require different skills and learning, and require different teachers.	I would absolutely love philosophy and psychology to be included at an NCEA level. I believe there needs to be more subjects to choose from, not less, if we want to get the best out of our students and prepare them for the world and the future workforce.	No	I have never heard of this.		2020-02-21 14:44:25	ANON-YFPW-R9UG-G	2020-02-21 14:44:25	2020-02-21 14:44:36
No	This is not going to help, just a complete dumbing down of the subjects.	Strongly disagree	Who did you ask? No one came to our school.	Scrap whole idea of commerce amalgamation, absolute bullshit.		Yes	Maori perspectives don't have to be put into everything we do. Stop being so PC and bending over backwards to these people. Maori commerce touched on in junior school.		2020-02-21 14:46:55	ANON-YFPW-R9UC-Q	2020-02-21 14:46:55	2020-02-21 14:47:29
Yes		Strongly disagree	The changes do not appear to support the value of science or to promote it as a core subject - which is what it should be and is in other parts of the world. The step up from Yr 11 to Yr 12 is already difficult and often too difficult for some students. This is putting many students off from studying science at L2 and L3, particularly our Māori and Pasifika cohorts. The transition from L1 to L2 should be made easier not more difficult to avoid limiting students that already feel disadvantaged.			No			2020-02-21 14:51:51	ANON-YFPW-R9US-U	2020-02-21 14:51:51	2020-02-21 14:52:01

No	I am a Level 3 student who is unhappy about the change as it was told to me from my teachers.	Strongly disagree	I believe that the decision is unwise and not beneficial to the students. Specialisation is a way of life, and will be how our life will run once we make it to University.	Every year since year 9 I have taken Classical Studies, and I feel that if I did not have my learning in the previous years I would not have enough knowledge to understand classics. It is a class that has its own terminology and way of thinking, very different to History. To place it crassly and bluntly, its a stupid idea to place them together. Don't punish the academic and specialised kids by taking this away from them. You're affecting jobs, education and an entire system, not for the greater good. Ask the teachers is my suggestion. They're the hands on the ground who teach these subjects, who nurture these students, and are the ones who see the real persons scores at the end of the day, and what that means for them. Talk to all of them, not just the few. Not just the HOD's or the senior leaders. Talk to the teachers who classes you are removing. The social scientists, the classics teachers, the history teachers, the accounting teachers. Their specialisation is their career, and taking that away at level one can cost them work at year 9, 10 and 11. They are not trained to teach the other class you've lumped them in with, and if they had wanted to, they would have been doing so already.	Psychology	No			2020-02-21 14:52:34	ANON-YFPW-R9UP-P	2020-02-21 14:52:34	2020-02-21 14:52:43
No	I was well aware of the intention to reduce the number of standards, introduce literacy and numeracy modules, rebalance the spread of internals and externals and redefine how an external is assessed. It was entirely unclear as to whether the subject areas as they exist would carry on as separate entities with their own batch of 20 credits, or if they were to be merged under a single heading. I am confused as to why the feedback for the level 1 science standards was opened before this list was published. I suspect that most of the feedback given is probably invalid as people were not told that the 4 standards on offer essentially represented the entirety of the science curriculum at level 6.	Strongly disagree	I support the overall intention of the alignment of NCEA level 1. I can see large inconsistencies within the number of subjects that exist for each curriculum area. For example, if there is only 1 standard that is devoted to investigating in science (where the methods used vary wildly depending on the physics/biology/chemistry/ESS contexts involved), then why isn't there only one standard that is dedicated to creating your own piece for the Arts? There isn't because the skills involved in composing music are separate from the skill involved in painting. Students who have an interest in music and painting should be able to do a full course in both and get a full course load of credits. Students who are interested in biology and physics should be able to do a full course in both and get a full course load of credits. The panel/person who made the decision to boil the entirety of science down to 4 standards may have made a mistake that will have long running consequences. It is already clear that the STEM field underlies the major growth areas of the world economy (energy, climate change solutions and food supply for example). I can't agree to changes to an	Some statements above are relevant to this, but I don't believe that package of 4 standards for science are sufficient. At the same time I don't believe that having 20 credits for each of the 5 existing subject areas would be the correct option either. I note that "Social science," "history" and "geography" will continue to exist as separate subjects even though geography and history are subsets of social science so it is clear that distinct bundles of 20 credits are still permitted in certain areas. Could there be a 20 credit bundle that is related to investigating in science and then another 20 credit bundle that is related to communicating in science? Or another 20 credit bundle that relates natural phenomena to technology and/or issues? There are plenty of alternatives that still fit with the vision, values and key competencies of the curriculum but offer school and students more than what this does.	I think that the existing range of subjects is already quite comprehensive.	No			2020-02-21 14:52:54	ANON-YFPW-R9U7-W	2020-02-21 14:52:54	2020-02-21 14:53:03
No		Strongly disagree				No			2020-02-21 14:54:37	ANON-YFPW-R9U1-Q	2020-02-21 14:54:37	2020-02-21 14:54:47
Yes	Missing out on Latin is a major mistake.	Strongly disagree	Dropping Latin is a poor solution.	Latin has been a foundational aspect of western civilization for centuries. It also leads to a better understanding of all Romance languages as well as the wider heritage of the west. It makes no difference if you want to avoid the history of the past, you can't take Latin out of any truly excellent curriculum and be able to compete with any of the top Western Countries. We harp on about PISA and then look to move our curriculum away from the aspects that give it broad strength.		No			2020-02-21 14:54:37	ANON-YFPW-R9UF-C	2020-02-21 14:54:37	2020-02-21 14:54:50
No	I did not think that science would be so general, with little specific content. With no separate biology, chemistry and physics content at level one, this will dumb down students approaching level two science specialist subjects	Disagree	I think standards should be offered in Physics, chemistry and biology at Level one so that schools could choose a more academic level one science programme which would give students a better idea of the mathematical problem solving needed in senior science subjects, rather than just written assignments which describe the subject instead of 'doing' the subject.	As above. I would like to see specific physics, chemistry and biology content in level one. I would like to see this assessed with external problems in an exam situation, rather than an extended research project as proposed.	No	No			2020-02-21 14:54:51	ANON-YFPW-R9UZ-Z	2020-02-21 14:54:51	2020-02-21 14:55:15
No		Strongly disagree	I feel having one subject as commerce will not provide the students enough useful information and pathways	I think Economics, Business and Accounting should stay as separate classes. There is ample subject information for students to have these three options. They would miss out on important learning.		No			2020-02-21 14:55:31	ANON-YFPW-R9UB-B	2020-02-21 14:51:42	2020-02-21 14:55:35

No	Not foundational education it is restrictions on education.	Strongly disagree	Why change something that has been in place for the past years, teachers such as history might not have the expertise in classical studies so why would you put a teacher who knows nothing about it to teach it when there are specific teachers who have their degree or a university certificate of the specified subject??? It is the same thing with Science, Earth and space science, biology, physics, and chemistry are all different subject completely different from one another again with teachers who specifically go to university to get a chemist degree a physics degree they don't have an integrated science degree??? do they??? However, if they do why not make that the course at uni? This also makes it unfair on students if this is for UE level courses in college what is gonna happen when everything is combined and in year 12/13 it splits back up again... it will make it more confusing as opposed to what the usual is now, with subjects being separate early on when we still will have two years to make sure we get everything we need for university entrance, I can't think of anything good that is coming out of this.	KEEP THE SUBJECT SEPARATE. So children and young adults ready to go to university have a better understanding earlier on.	No			2020-02-21 14:58:52	ANON-YFPW-R9UH-E	2020-02-21 14:58:52	2020-02-21 14:59:01
No	IT IS BLOODY STUPID	Strongly disagree	This is just breaking a broken system, as a student I cannot possibly support these changes as they limit my learning.	Classics and history should not be combined. Just as the sciences should not be combined. Classics and history are from entirely different time points, and have vastly different views and assessments, I have been taking classics since year 9, and the year nine classes are always full in our school. Universities do not require English, they require an English rich subject for that I have chosen classics. Not English because English is not a subject I am particularly good at. So why may I take English but not classics, how about people can chose their English rich subject so they can get a decent grade and be better prepared for uni. As for combining subjects, are you nuts? the sciences are so incredibly diverse and people need to specialize on the subjects they need. I need nothing to do with physics and it requires so much work to learn, why should I be forced to learn physics when I don't need it, that time I could be using to learn Biology that will prepare me for a bio rich course I plan on taking at uni. and vice versa.	No			2020-02-21 15:00:08	ANON-YFPW-R9UB-8	2020-02-21 15:00:08	2020-02-21 15:00:27
Yes		Strongly disagree	We have the following concerns: Accounting, Economics and Business are very individual and differing subjects. The skills and knowledge in each of these areas are very different. The skills taught at Level 1 underpin the foundation of success in Level 2 and Level 3. As a pathway into future success in Level 3 and Scholarship Accounting and Economics, students require knowledge that is embedded during teaching during Level 1. There is a clear future career pathway in all of these areas and they are INDIVIDUAL at University. Nationally student numbers in Accounting and Business at Level 1 are increasing (or being maintained). Students financial capabilities are a concern nationwide, and this proposal limits students access to varied pathways where this is a predominant idea. It appears that Commerce subjects, and Accounting		Yes			2020-02-21 15:01:10	ANON-YFPW-R9UM-K	2020-02-21 15:01:10	2020-02-21 15:01:17
Yes		Undecided	We need to see how you plan to combine the courses.		No			2020-02-21 15:02:17	ANON-YFPW-R9UX-X	2020-02-21 15:02:17	2020-02-21 15:02:33
No		Agree	Sad to see Art History go entirely. Fold it into History.	Inclusion of Maori Performing Arts is excellent, given the mana this instils in our rangatahi. Kia ora.	Retain Art History and Latin at these levels.	No		2020-02-21 15:02:17	ANON-YFPW-R9UD-A	2020-02-21 15:02:17	2020-02-21 15:02:42
No		Strongly agree			No			2020-02-21 15:03:06	ANON-YFPW-R9UA-7	2020-02-21 15:03:06	2020-02-21 15:03:11

Yes	I was not happy to see the broad general level one science. More specific content in Physics, Chemistry and Biology needs to be included for preparation to level two.	Disagree	Standards in specialist science subjects should be available for schools which want to offer a more academic programme. These should have specific content and be assessed in a problem solving exam, rather than the proposed written research assessments. Students need to be prepared for the mathematical problem solving needed in levels 2 and 3 Physics and Chemistry. A research assignment describes the content, but does not demonstrate a students problem solving ability.	Yes, as above I would like to see specific science content included in the standards	No	No	No	2020-02-21 15:03:43	ANON-YFPW-R9UN-M	2020-02-21 15:03:43	2020-02-21 15:04:14
No		Strongly disagree	The non-inclusion of Latin and Classical Studies seems to be based on a misunderstanding of their importance as a foundation for understanding the European roots of New Zealand society, as well as their importance as subjects that foster cultural awareness of difference in many senses, and the skill of literacy - this particularly applies to Latin. The fact that no other language than Latin is to be eliminated suggests a bias toward the spoken languages, which does not appreciate the importance of written language, with its emphasis on grammar and structure.	Please see above. The argument could be developed at length.	Yes		No.	2020-02-21 15:04:25	ANON-YFPW-R9UK-H	2020-02-21 15:04:25	2020-02-21 15:04:57
Yes		Disagree	A stated criterion was the demand for the subject (number 6). Economics was the sixth most popular subject according to external exam entries out of 36 and Accounting was 9th. It makes no sense to combine these.	The "Commerce" option of combining Economics, Business Studies and Accounting weakens the opportunities for students to improve their financial literacy which is a widely acknowledged need in our communities. I would have expected Dance, Drama and Maori Performing Arts would be a better option for combining subjects. These subjects could be integrated through a range of performance opportunities. It seems there is little regard for the future needs of our economy.	No			2020-02-21 15:04:41	ANON-YFPW-R9U6-V	2020-02-21 15:04:41	2020-02-21 15:05:05
Yes	Understandable objective. However, NCEA was also designed to allow flexibility and choice, which in some cases is being removed. For example, Science rather than Physics/Chemistry/Biology. These subjects should be able to be offered if numbers permit in the school, and if they do not meet a threshold then Science is the default. I personally knew at the end of Year 10 that I did not want to study biology or chemistry, and topped my results in Year 11 in physics because its what I was interested in.	Strongly disagree	No to the amalgamation of commerce subjects. Accounting attracts quite different students to economics and Business Studies, as are Business Studies students to economics students. I do agree with other subject areas however, except I am unsure where specialisation will develop from Level 1 Māori Performing Arts unless a Level 2 course is proposed.	Science rather than Physics/Chemistry/Biology. These subjects should be able to be offered if numbers permit in the school, and if they do not meet a threshold then Science is the default. I personally knew at the end of Year 10 that I did not want to study biology or chemistry, and topped my results in Year 11 in physics because its what I was interested in. This seems counterproductive to a national STEM building education programme. Commerce - while an amalgamation of these courses is possible and in fact does happen in some schools, I strongly suggest accounting is a key year 11 subject that builds into Yr12, particularly for less able students. More able students can join in year 12. The proposal by the group will disadvantage some students therefore. The mix of standards - if the three subjects each had 4 standards, then the school (like science suggested above) could specialise OR combine. I do like the idea of a Commerce Level 1 endorsement etc, across all or some of the subjects.	Yes. The Business Studies, economics and accounting subjects need to be reviewed again. For example, an economics history course at Level 2 or 3 on NZ would be great. A management and leadership course for Business Studies as well, and possibly a better exporter focussed standard. Plus some standards are just not practical today eg marketing Level 1 Business Studies.	No	Can not understand the working groups across these subjects. With an extensive background in business, a former Commerce teacher/HOD, an eLearning specialist, and mentor to many students, I have some concerns at the amalgamation of Commerce. Year 11 in economics, Business Studies and accounting are actually fun, broad based "basics", and build towards level 2. They add to students knowledge without restricting entry to most if they come in directly to level 2.	2020-02-21 15:07:20	ANON-YFPW-R9UR-R	2020-02-21 15:07:20	2020-02-21 15:07:30
Yes		Strongly disagree		Economics Accounting and Business Studies are completely different and distinct subjects with little or no relationship to each other. They are and should remain stand alone subjects. What experts came up with this idea.	No			2020-02-21 15:09:18	ANON-YFPW-R9UW-W	2020-02-21 15:09:18	2020-02-21 15:09:34

Yes		Strongly disagree		<p>I have a vested interest in the Commerce area and strongly disagree with the proposal to reduce Accounting, Economics and Business Studies to one Commerce subject.</p> <p>One of the supposed selling points of NCEA was that it would enable schools to tailor courses with achievement standards that met the needs of their students and community. Cutting out complete subjects such as Accounting, Economics, Business Studies, Physics, Biology etc and replacing these with one hybrid Commerce or Science is a step backwards towards a 'one size fits all' approach in education.</p> <p>Forcing Accounting teachers to teach Economics and or Business Studies may well be demotivating for them (I speak from experience) and the learning experience of the students will suffer.</p>		Yes			2020-02-21 15:13:57	ANON-YFPW-R9U4-T	2020-02-21 15:13:57	2020-02-21 15:14:14
No	Although I had heard this, the implementation of this phrase is very different to what I understood when I heard it.	Strongly disagree	<p>The CTV building collapsed in Christchurch as the designer and site foreman were not properly trained in Science.</p> <p>The removal of separate level 1 sciences makes this review "not fit for purpose".</p> <p>Our students will be unable to make the transition to level 2 without further watering down these levels. Students who study engineering will miss basic content knowledge that is essential to perform in that profession.</p>	<p>Science has been utterly removed from the list!</p> <p>Although there is a draft matrix out, the 4 standards that have been proposed have all drawn upon the Nature of Science part of the NZC. This means that there is no measurement through assessment of what science is taught or learnt at this level.</p> <p>This is setting up the sector for a catastrophic failure of science education when students try to transition to Level 2 without any structured knowledge base provided at level 1.</p> <p>Level 1 Physics, Chemistry, Biology need to be supported at the bare minimum and need a strong content base. A Level 1 Science package that includes the science components of the NZC needs to be put forward as well (the current proposal covers 6 bullet points of science in an entire year, which is insufficient).</p>	<p>You cannot build a building without considering it in its entirety first. You must figure out what you want at the top of the building before creating the foundation.</p> <p>This process has begun creating a foundation, which cannot support level 2 sciences of Physics, Chemistry and Biology as they currently exist. The jump from year 10 content knowledge to level 2 requirements is too great.</p> <p>The entire process needs to figure out what is required at levels 3 and 2, then work backwards to support those end outcomes in the level 1 programme.</p> <p>Consider what is required by level 3, then work backwards to 2, then you know what constraints are on the level 1 courses.</p>	No			2020-02-21 15:14:14	ANON-YFPW-R9U4-T	2020-02-21 15:14:14	2020-02-21 15:14:23
No		Agree		<p>I appreciate Maori Performing Arts but worry about Classical Studies being subsumed by History. It is similar but in many ways it is categorically different (esp. regarding its Art History & philosophical elements). Just because it happened in the past doesn't make it history.</p>	Maori Art.	No			2020-02-21 15:16:37	ANON-YFPW-R9U3-S	2020-02-21 15:16:37	2020-02-21 15:16:58
No	The "greater specialisation" at level two and three, can only occur effectively, at least in Mathematics and Science, where sufficient necessary background teaching has previously occurred. If this is not done satisfactorily for the specialised material, it will need to be retaught with the necessary rigour to enable the new material to be effectively taught. Thus it will slow down the specialised material and limit the scope of the final qualifications. Provided that this allows our students to continue with their qualifications to seek further international and industry specific outcomes (the medical field, the engineering or architectural field or the aerospace industry), this would not be a problem. Otherwise it may limit the options available to New Zealand students.	Disagree	<p>It seems that some subject constructs proposed are arbitrary (Psychology and Media Studies subsumed under social studies, yet excluding History and Geography and keeping them as separate subjects, when they are part of the junior social science curriculum) or disingenuous (keeping Maori performing arts separate from Dance or Drama, while dropping Art History but retaining Visual Art) Similarly each branch of technology is retained, when there continues to be difficulty in employing and retaining effective technology teachers across the country.</p>	see above	<p>This would depend entirely on the specialist subject groups ability to foretell future developments over at least the next twenty years, as this is the time frame that would produce student graduate bedded into the new proposals, and suitable for the changed environment.</p> <p>Twenty years ago smart phones were a rumour and self driving vehicles unimaginable outside of cartoons.</p> <p>It is not really possible for school based teachers to come to grips with these possibilities, (eg on line marketing and sales such as Ali Express), but rather to be able to provide a suitable foundation on which any future developments can flourish.</p>	No			2020-02-21 15:16:56	ANON-YFPW-R9U2-R	2020-02-21 15:16:56	2020-02-21 15:17:14
Yes		Agree				No			2020-02-21 15:25:12	ANON-YFPW-R9UU-U	2020-02-21 15:25:12	2020-02-21 15:25:30
Yes	Attended Auckland workshop last year and applied for RAS SEG.	Strongly agree	<p>Maths and Stats should be relatively straight-forward as we combine existing standards into larger ones. It is a core important subject that is compulsory to Year 11 so should be tackled first.</p>			No	I cannot read Te Reo unfortunately, but fully agree with its existence and continuation.		2020-02-21 15:27:38	ANON-YFPW-R9SV-W	2020-02-21 15:27:38	2020-02-21 15:27:56
No		Strongly agree				No			2020-02-21 15:29:28	ANON-YFPW-R9SV-T	2020-02-21 15:29:28	2020-02-21 15:29:37
No		Disagree	<p>I support some and disagree strongly with others.</p>	<p>Extremely good to see Māori Performing Arts, I think that speaks to the value of te ao Māori.</p> <p>Also in favour of the merging of science and business subjects.</p> <p>NOT in favour of losing Latin - those students who want to specialise in Classics later on will lose a valuable skill that would aid them in that specialisation. Latin is an important language in many contexts, and adds value to the curriculum offerings.</p>		No			2020-02-21 15:29:59	ANON-YFPW-R9SC-7	2020-02-21 15:29:59	2020-02-21 15:30:10

Yes		Disagree	If you are making Science a broad and without scientific rigour, why are the social sciences left separate. Students will not have the same skills leaving Level 1 so they will not be able to reach the same standard at the end of Level 2	In Year 11, many students wish to have some academic rigour and endless written reports and investigations little variation in the assessment styles. For example all the Science ones are going to be assessed in the same manner.	Yes!!!!!! Sciences need to be split. Need commerce subjects Need both Maths and stats standards so those not needing Algebra to continue on their careers, can access some useful maths, like networking and linear programming.	No			2020-02-21 15:34:25	ANON-YFPW-R95S-Q	2020-02-21 15:34:25	2020-02-21 15:34:48
Yes		Strongly agree				No			2020-02-21 15:35:52	ANON-YFPW-R95S-V	2020-02-21 15:35:52	2020-02-21 15:36:02
No	Not until I received the email from dancenet that directed me to this survey.	Agree	Still doesn't feel like an integrated curriculum if you're still talking about subjects.	Performing Arts Technologies has been missed - this is a direct link into industry which should also be explored/maintained. Even though few students take it, they are needed and useful for 'extra-curricular' projects such as school productions.	Not sure, as I'm thinking about the subjects that are usually now covered in trades - changing a tyre; first aid; etc. Will they still be there?	Yes		Not totally sure why Maori Performing Arts is in the arts curriculum? Also, what about the traditional arts - carving, weaving, medicine?	2020-02-21 15:37:30	ANON-YFPW-R95S-W	2020-02-21 15:37:30	2020-02-21 15:37:40
No	I wasn't even entirely aware that NCEA Level 1 was optional. In saying that, it looks like most subjects are going to be merged together instead of specialized fields. It almost looks like you're stating that you'll do something - but are in fact doing the complete opposite (looking at the table).	Undecided	My concern is how are you going to support teachers who are needing to undergo these changes e.g. merge curriculum content etc.	On the grassroots level, a lot of students can be seen abusing 'technology' in the classroom e.g. playing games instead of working online. How are we going to help teachers to keep on top of this while at the same time working through the curriculum. BYOD is good - but I can't be expected to know how to run every different system on a laptop that is brought to school. How are you going to support us in our individual curriculum branch roles if technology must be incorporated more - I use quietlet, kahoots, OneNote, teams etc. - but these problems of self management are already so prominent?	What about linguistics? Computer programming etc.? Key competency classes?	No	No, and I cannot speak Te Reo Maori. I welcome and celebrate it in my classroom. But you're going to need it to be included in our Professional Development slots for me to take the time to learn it thank you. I already work between 40 and 60 hours a week, and was sitting at 64 hours regularly in my first year. Support me better to be the teacher you need me to become instead		2020-02-21 15:37:53	ANON-YFPW-R95G-B	2020-02-21 15:37:53	2020-02-21 15:37:58
Yes		Agree		I am a science teacher and I am unsure about the loss of the specific subjects in Y11. We could create a wide range of courses based on student needs with what we had in Level 1, but now with the lack of diversity we will only have 4 (or 8 if using Ag/Hort) to prepare a science class.		No			2020-02-21 15:43:03	ANON-YFPW-R95J-E	2020-02-21 15:43:03	2020-02-21 15:43:11
Yes		Strongly disagree				Yes			2020-02-21 15:47:07	ANON-YFPW-R95Q-N	2020-02-21 15:47:07	2020-02-21 15:47:16
Yes		Agree				No			2020-02-21 15:47:09	ANON-YFPW-R95E-9	2020-02-21 15:47:09	2020-02-21 15:47:20
No		Disagree		No	No	No			2020-02-21 15:47:21	ANON-YFPW-R95S-5	2020-02-21 15:47:21	2020-02-21 15:47:32
Yes	I believe the intended change was necessary. How are we going to keep our young people motivated if the system doesn't set a clear pathway for them to strive towards.	Strongly agree	We need to look and nurture our young people's skills and give them guidance and direction. We are seeing too many youngsters fall into the hands of gangs and getting into trouble with Police, when at the same time we have a job and labor shortage. The Ministry's proposal is a great step forward in the right direction. However, I would suggest that this isn't a one time fix. It will require constant monitoring and tinkering with the system incrementally to achieve the desired results. And in my view, the results should not be based purely on if a student passes or not, but what kind of society do we want for our country moving forward.	No, I think the proposed subject changes are fine as long as the Ministry keeps monitoring the process.	Personally, I think this should be up to the government to create projections of the future employment and skill sets required during their time in office regardless of the party in power. Asking me what I think is really irrelevant. Asking me what skills we would require 10-20 or even thirty years from now I could not tell you. However, if we have the data of what is required to achieve certain national goals, then it would be prudent to start to align our education system to up skill our people now in order to accomplish these national goals what ever they maybe. It creates a society that is engaging, gives a person something to work towards and ensures that there is a future for that person if they work hard at the same time.	No	Sorry, I have not looked at this yet. However, I will look into it.		2020-02-21 15:50:55	ANON-YFPW-R95P-M	2020-02-21 15:50:55	2020-02-21 15:51:24
Yes		Disagree	The sciences are successful at level 1 and allow general science and specialist sciences to be introduced. How can this be a bad thing? Technology subjects are very distinct from one another and schools well set up to deliver a wide variety should not be disadvantaged.	Keep science specialist and technology specialist. Reasons are described above.	No	Yes	No		2020-02-21 15:52:01	ANON-YFPW-R95T-U	2020-02-21 15:52:01	2020-02-21 15:52:09
No	Changes that have been mooted appear to be a one size fits all approach and will not support the intended outcome stated above. A very narrow range of assessment options for students and they will be under extreme pressure and stress from report style assessment. Authenticity of student work will be an issue as will the increase in teacher work load. The changes will not support STEM careers or any career that needs a foundation in science.	Disagree	I don't see how the proposed changes support the NZC	To support those students who aspire to be doctors, engineers, scientistscience content needs to be taught by specialists teachers . Biology, chemistry and physics should be included as separate subjects.	No. But please do not go down the same road as you propose for the L1 sciences. What a disaster that would be.	No			2020-02-21 15:57:30	ANON-YFPW-R95F-A	2020-02-21 15:57:30	2020-02-21 15:58:01

Yes		Agree								2020-02-21 16:02:38	ANON-YFPW-R951-N	2020-02-21 16:02:38	2020-02-21 16:02:58
Yes		Agree	Should provide greater integration of what were more insular topics especially in a Science (my teaching area).	None	No	No				2020-02-21 16:04:16	ANON-YFPW-R95Z-X	2020-02-21 16:04:16	2020-02-21 16:04:34
Yes	Mainly through emails and regional discussions	Agree	Should allow for greater integration of what have been some what insular subject areas, especially in Science (my teaching area).	No	No	No				2020-02-21 16:06:34	ANON-YFPW-R95H-C	2020-02-21 16:06:34	2020-02-21 16:06:38
Yes	vaguely aware	Undecided	I dont really see the difference in my area (Technology)	I thought there was going to be more of a push for integrating subjects into cross-curricular projects.		No				2020-02-21 16:07:06	ANON-YFPW-R95B-6	2020-02-21 16:07:06	2020-02-21 16:07:14
No		Strongly disagree	I disagree to the dropping of accounting at level one, the level provides a huge base knowledge to go on to level 2 accounting. There is already a big enough jump in understanding required from level 1 to 2. This would considerably decrease students taking accounting at level 2 and 3	Carrying on from above dropping accounting from level 1 but keeping dance drama and music separate I find an unusual choice. I would suggest to combine business and economics and keep accounting separate with a stronger compulsory link to computer technology. Or split business in half and have accounting in business and economics in business.		No				2020-02-21 16:08:02	ANON-YFPW-R95M-H	2020-02-21 16:08:02	2020-02-21 16:08:18
No	I knew there were changes under way but I didn't know anything specific	Agree	I only agree so far as the sciences are taught with more depth in level 2 and 3 assuming that students will have the opportunity choose those subjects as 'options'. I wonder how teachers will squeeze enough of each learning area within the sciences to pique interest in students who might be more inclined to take the sciences route in level 2 and 3.	Its good to condense and simplify the subjects available as long as level 1 doesn't become an obsolete year where student feel they can still kick back and take it easy. I worry that students won't be engaged enough in their subjects because too much is being taught at a rapid pace. students might either become bored and switch off or unable to keep up with the fast pace.	Marketing and communications. Environmental sustainability. Entrepreneurship.	No				2020-02-21 16:09:24	ANON-YFPW-R95Z-8	2020-02-21 16:09:24	2020-02-21 16:09:47
Yes	Although the timing mid Dec - as school was finishing and directly before Xmas was not a time for discussing this with our community. And not a priority for start of year discussions.	Strongly disagree	As a member of the HPE community I object to the way HPE has been dealt to in this given the extensive MoE focus and investment on wellbeing in schools this would seem to be a backwards move. The alignment of Home Ec with Food Science in technology does not reflect the conceptual underpinnings of this subject. In consideration of other learning area decisions, why would there not be a single standard for languages (with only te reo Maori separate) or at most a clumping of regional languages - this suggests a Level 1 students could do a L1 course comprised only of 6 languages.	The grouping of H&PE into a 'general' subject is highly problematic given the unique contexts for HED and PE and requires extensive explanations which will be provided through other channels.	None at this time - just don't erode what we have got.	Yes		'De-colonise' the 'knowledge' in TMOA - ie don't make it simply a curriculum of westernised academic knowledge translated into and taught through the medium of TRM. Develop the curriculum (do they even need to be learning areas - is this how Maori organise indigenous knowledge?) purely from a Maori world view. If that happens to include established academic/disciplined knowledge then the decision to do that comes not from trying to copy or parallel the English medium curriculum, but that the knowledge is deemed fit for purpose and complements or adds to indigenous knowledge in useful ways.		2020-02-21 16:10:07	ANON-YFPW-R95X-V	2020-02-21 16:10:07	2020-02-21 16:10:17
No		Disagree				No				2020-02-21 16:21:10	ANON-YFPW-R95N-J	2020-02-21 16:21:10	2020-02-21 16:21:25
Yes	I knew about the intended change. However, I was not aware of the subjects that were to be grouped together	Disagree	I do not believe that Health and Physical Education should be combined as this will result in the lack of identity in both subjects and also the important learning that happens in both. When we look at the wellbeing of the student, these two subjects are on the forefront of ensuring this can take place. Here, students are given the foundations needed for lifelong wellbeing.	The separation of Health and Physical Education into their own subject areas. Both essential to the overall wellbeing of students in today's society. In a society where diminishing wellbeing is a major issue. Surely if we are not focusing so much on specialised subject knowledge, we should be focusing on developing the personal skills that will allow a foundation for the students to further develop	Separate Physical Education and Outdoor Education	No				2020-02-21 16:24:32	ANON-YFPW-R95K-F	2020-02-21 16:24:32	2020-02-21 16:24:48
No	Not for PE and Health - just learnt of this yesterday (20/2). Would have been more beneficial to know of this prior to 12 months before proposed changes.	Strongly disagree	For our subject areas of PE and Health - I find it concerning that prospective students who may be considering PE at Level 1 may be put off by the idea of having to look at health topics and concepts - it's the physical nature of the subject that attracts them to it (it would be vice versa for students who would choose Health - they may like the idea of health but hate the idea of PE) •We teach some great concepts that really enrich students understanding - collapsing PE and Health into one subject would considerably dilute our ability to do so.	PE and Health must be kept separate subjects. I believe it will kill student numbers selecting this subject in schools.		Yes				2020-02-21 16:28:28	ANON-YFPW-R95E-T	2020-02-21 16:28:28	2020-02-21 16:28:40
No		Agree			Materials technology -inclusion of more making standards across all levels.	No	Although I have been made aware of it.			2020-02-21 16:29:19	ANON-YFPW-R95R-P	2020-02-21 16:29:19	2020-02-21 16:29:53
Yes	But not that Accounting, Economics and Business Studies will disappear and will be combined in some unknown way into "Commerce" ?	Strongly disagree	Accounting, Economics, Business Studies are very different and require very different skills and knowledge to teach. The type of students choosing the different subjects are also different. Business Studies cater for those who prefer to learn in a different way and combining it will put these students off.	See above. Keep the subjects separate.	No	Yes		No		2020-02-21 16:30:09	ANON-YFPW-R95W-U	2020-02-21 16:30:09	2020-02-21 16:30:45

Yes		Undecided		Very important to retain technologies		Yes			2020-02-21 16:34:35	ANON-YFPW-R954-R	2020-02-21 16:34:35	2020-02-21 16:34:43
No		Strongly agree				No			2020-02-21 16:37:32	ANON-YFPW-R95T-R	2020-02-21 16:37:32	2020-02-21 16:37:51
No		Undecided		To leave art history as a subject on its own and to leave the sciences as separate subjects.	Art history as its own subject.	No			2020-02-21 16:46:37	ANON-YFPW-R95U-S	2020-02-21 16:46:37	2020-02-21 16:46:53
Yes	I was aware of impending changes to NCEA, but not specifically about a change in approach. i.e. separating out Level 1 (foundational education) versus Level 2/3 with greater specialisation.	Undecided		We have lost cohesion in Maths. Students know little bits of lots, and not very well either. We need all students in Level 1 to do the SAME foundational maths, including algebra. They need to know that a baseline level of competency is needed to progress in Maths. This will only materialise if we lift the quality of Maths teaching in the primary and intermediate sectors. To see the downhill slide in maths proficiency over the last 20 years has been disheartening to say the least. Primary students need to be effectively trained in the basics so that they don't come into high school with huge gaps. I agree with Hattie - the Numeracy Project was a disaster in many respects.	We need to reduce the fragmentation in Maths. We need to revert to specialising into Stats and Calculus only in Level 3 if we really want to raise student performance. You know things are not ideal when students studying overseas (I know this personally) realise that they need bridging courses in Pure Maths to qualify to get into courses because NCEA is not enough. More Pure Maths will enhance problem solving.	No	I know of it, but not specifically the content itself.	You mean Question 5?	2020-02-21 16:53:18	ANON-YFPW-R98V-Y	2020-02-21 16:53:18	2020-02-21 16:53:43
No		Strongly disagree	I understand the idea around broad foundation but combining subjects like pe and health and sciences means that students will get maybe a broad but very weak knowledge base leading to less subject specific knowledge needed for level 2. It will weaken subjects due to having to exclude significant concepts and discussions due to time restraints.	Keep pe and health separate as students that take these courses are very different and don't often take both subjects at level one, or at least in my experience there are very few student crossover. Biggest fear with joining subjects will be that health will be relegated to the bottom of the pile and we as a subject have worked hard for many years to be taken as a credible and worthwhile subject. This will set our subject backwards once again.		Yes			2020-02-21 17:00:12	ANON-YFPW-R98C-C	2020-02-21 17:00:12	2020-02-21 17:00:19
Yes		Disagree		I think this new curriculum doesn't give students the best possibility to find and invest in their future path. I was always loved science and am studying it now at university and with this proposed change I wouldn't have been able to get a strong foundation in it by doing more science in level one. The same could be said for my friends who now have a career in television and media because they were able to discover their love for this subject from high school. While they may be able to study these in yr 12 and 13 less schools have the resources to have specialist teachers in these areas if they can only teach two year levels, so the learning opportunities are diminished. Additionally most students stick with very similar subjects throughout their years at school so might not branch of into more niche areas if they don't have the chance in the lower pressure environment of level 1 NCEA. The current maths and English guidelines ensure that enough breadth is covered so all students have the foundational skills they need to succeed without restricting their opportunities.		Yes		I think expanding Maori subject choice is important, but adding extra subjects might not be the way to do it as schools might just decide not to pick these up. Instead incorporate these into the current subjects available. For instance put Maori performing arts into drama and music. Also with these change resourcing schools and teachers to be able to properly teach this material is of utmost importance and the adding of new subject's/papers will do nothing if resourcing is not considered.	2020-02-21 17:01:56	ANON-YFPW-R98S-V	2020-02-21 17:01:55	2020-02-21 17:02:04
Yes		Strongly disagree	I strongly disagree with the combination of economics, accounting and business studies as one subject. These are very different subjects that appeal to different students. This will turn students away from these important subjects. It will also mean retraining or upskilling of commerce teachers who usually specialise in one of the three subject areas,			No			2020-02-21 17:10:39	ANON-YFPW-R988-1	2020-02-21 17:10:39	2020-02-21 17:10:49

Yes	Yes, but this is very much open to interpretation and its successful implementation depends on how the revised subject list is to actually be delivered.	Strongly disagree	I agree with the broad structure (left hand column) of learning areas proposed by the Ministry. However, I do not understand the Ministry's rationale for, within those areas, making available a huge range of Languages and Arts subjects, whilst minimising the range of Commerce subjects. The business world is here to stay, is not a dying language (yes, it is akin to a language), is not a 'trend' that will go away in time but is actually what our whole economy is built around. Commerce subjects are practical and relevant in and of themselves, and as soon as you minimise this you are doing exactly the opposite of what is intended in this whole review: you are forcing students to narrow their learning base AWAY from Commerce.	Commerce subjects should not be shrunk into one combination subject. The idea that this will 'suffice' as pre-training for NCEA Level 2 specialist subjects is, frankly, preposterous. Accounting, Business Studies, and Economics are three very different subjects, each teaching relevant and useful skills for not only students looking to be involved in the Commerce industry (which involves a huge range of careers, from small business ownership to financial advice to government policy to marketing to product design/innovation, to name a few) but also life (budgeting, insurance, price negotiation, consumer rights, impacts of government policies, values and decision-making, taxes, again to name but a few). As a Commerce teacher I am appalled that, for example, Dance and Drama are to be retained as subjects in their own right whilst Accounting and Economics are to be condensed into one catch-all. The rather specific language and thinking styles required of Commerce subjects is being downplayed far too much in this model. The inevitable fallout will be that students will quickly discover the content catch-up needed for success in any Year 12 Commerce subject is huge - and will opt into less stressful options, thus leading to the demise of Commerce subjects in secondary	No			2020-02-21 17:11:59	ANON-YFPW-R989-2	2020-02-21 17:11:59	2020-02-21 17:12:15
Yes		Agree		Philosophy! As the world continues to trend toward the secular, we need an emphasis on how to contextualise what we learn in history, science, english, etc. and examine the big questions in life that have perplexed humanity since we gained the cognitive ability to ask them. Critical thinking and logic are also integral skills to build in this age of information that we live in.	No			2020-02-21 17:16:00	ANON-YFPW-R98G-G	2020-02-21 17:16:00	2020-02-21 17:16:16
Yes		Strongly agree			No			2020-02-21 17:20:00	ANON-YFPW-R98I-K	2020-02-21 17:20:00	2020-02-21 17:20:12
No		Strongly disagree			No			2020-02-21 17:20:53	ANON-YFPW-R98Q-T	2020-02-21 17:20:53	2020-02-21 17:21:09
Yes		Agree			No			2020-02-21 17:23:11	ANON-YFPW-R98E-E	2020-02-21 17:23:11	2020-02-21 17:23:22
No		Disagree		Some subjects I agree with and keeping them broad will hopefully assist students who are cut out of pathways to retain breadth. Fundamentally I disagree with merging of Physical Education and Health and the pathways through to tertiary as well as allied health services. The health and well being industries will continue to grow in demand and the topics covered in both areas are fundamentally different. The merging would affect the experiences in both areas.	No	A little but not enough to be an expert in providing well constructed commentary		2020-02-21 17:25:16	ANON-YFPW-R98P-5	2020-02-21 17:25:16	2020-02-21 17:25:33
No		Strongly disagree	Why is Psychology being merged with Media Studies? How are they similar? Psychology is one of the biggest and fastest growing subjects at university, and now that students are able to gain UE from it, it will become bigger in schools as well. Our school has it at all levels, including Level 3 this year. It has two full classes, whereas the other social sciences only have one class each.	Classical studies should still continue to be a subject at Level 1. It is a very popular subject, and it is very interesting for students who take it. Particularly those who have a passion for it. It can be a great way for kids to have success, especially those who are not that interested in other subjects. It is a multidisciplinary subject, which offers brilliant opportunities to engage in critical thinking across all levels.	No			2020-02-21 17:25:38	ANON-YFPW-R987-Z	2020-02-21 17:25:38	2020-02-21 17:25:46
Yes	Aware but I had no idea what was being planned. This is a train wreck in the making.	Strongly disagree	MoE keep getting rid of the good bits and trying to appeal to a small group of people. The proposed L1 program looks like a laugh but sadly people are serious. I note with interest that all of the top performing schools are not part of the various working groups. Surely they have some gems worth rolling out? The issues in education will not stop until you address the front end of the pipeline (preschool and earlier). Warm, dry fed children in a happy environment being read to and interacted with - that will lead to a measureable change. This is all tinkering with the deskchairs on a sinking ship. All of these changes will result in us drifting still further behind to other countries.	Specific subjects should be offered at L1 (eg bio, chem and physics) with a well defined program of learning objectives (best practise all over the world). This helps scaffold students into the more demanding programs in L2 and L3. How many at the MoE have been in a classroom for extended periods feeling the day to day issues teachers have? My feeling is zero. Yes they have been in a classroom; have friends who are teachers; were once a teacher and so can claim to know what its all about but how many are at the coalface dealing with the horrific things teacher deal with? I bet their PD involved a flight somewhere to a "thought provoking" conference. This is all ideology with little appreciation for models that work based on real data.	No			2020-02-21 17:26:10	ANON-YFPW-R98F-F	2020-02-21 17:26:10	2020-02-21 17:26:16

No	I am a science teacher. It works on content. You build students' skills in a certain context. Having a broad, more foundational education will mean students will not have the large amount of content required to succeed at Level 2 and 3 and further in University after that. Also, this change is too local. We need to prepare students to be able to compete in a world which is increasingly becoming a global village.	Strongly disagree	As above, plus if it is quite subjective and subject teachers have a huge amount of responsibility to develop the curriculum which is not always possible given the time constraints.	Science. It should be kept as it is, otherwise it will be a disaster.		No			2020-02-21 17:27:19	ANON-YFPW-R98H-H	2020-02-21 17:27:19	2020-02-21 17:27:29
Yes		Strongly disagree	As a teacher of Business Studies and Media Studies I am strongly against the potential outcome of these two subjects. I question my ability of teaching a skills based, thorough programme in Business with additional pressures to add concepts that include economics and accounting. This restricts my teaching pedagogy and freedoms as teacher when I teach Business in a social context - and how our societal issues effect business. In Media Studies I feel similar. Though I completely see the cross over and ability to teach Media Studies as part of a social studies subject, the reality is that a lot of current teachers of social studies may fail to include teachings of media studies to the depth and ability that the subject deserves. It is a fundamental stand alone subject at Year 11 that would get lost within a social studies course.			No			2020-02-21 17:28:10	ANON-YFPW-R98B-B	2020-02-21 17:28:10	2020-02-21 17:28:16
No	While I was keeping up to date with the review I didn't have a clue that this broader approach was happening - I do like it though	Strongly agree	I think it's great to get rid of Latin at Level 1 - it is not needed and also makes staffing really hard So good to have Maori performing arts - how will we find teachers when it is hard to already staff te reo Maori teachers Commerce - broad is good Social studies - broad is good Geography And history by itself - great! Science combined - again great	As above	Integrated studies - changes for courses to combine more than one subject Your taking away the flexible nature of the NZC and creating more subject silos	No			2020-02-21 17:28:55	ANON-YFPW-R98M-P	2020-02-21 17:28:55	2020-02-21 17:29:11
Yes		Disagree		MOE is punishing commerce ...	no	No	i can only read it in English. PD in Maori would be good		2020-02-21 17:29:30	ANON-YFPW-R98D-D	2020-02-21 17:29:30	2020-02-21 17:29:58
No	I think this is a good idea but I wasn't aware it was happening. I think that in terms of a he correspondence school and learning at NCEA level one that the subjects don't go deep enough and give a good grounding in order to be able to specialise at the next two levels. I know of correspondence students that have completed half the course load for a subject. This doesn't get students ready for the high workload at a university or polytechnic level which is what we are supposed to be being prepared for.	Strongly agree	Could we have a much more in-depth Te Reo course that goes deeper and further into the topics and encourages a lot of writing, reading and speaking. Currently the course is very light but expects a level of sentence writing that is not supported by the beginner Te Reo coursework	As mentioned above I feel that all the subjects need to be more in-depth when offered by correspondence due to the fact that there is little face to face contact with teachers nor much in the way of note taking. The courses are at a level that does not support students to be capable of taking on university level training in subjects. At university you are expected to write large documents of work with reference to current theory and literature yet at ncea level one most students can get a decent grade from writing less than one hundred words. The work load is also too easy through correspondence. We are told that a course module should take roughly 12 hours a week yet I had completed a quarter of the entire course in two weeks and came out of the process with little in-depth understanding of the subject being taught. We should be encouraging students to do more in a particular subject in a year if we want more students to be able to remain at a post high school level. The current drop out rate for most courses is 25 to 50 percent and for medicine and law is closer to 75 percent as they don't have the grounding needed to truly understand the subject.	Not that I can think of at the moment unless they would consider offering something like a highly focused pre med, pre law, pre commerce etc stream for students who know what they want to be with a range of subjects in the stream that would then support the student to be ready and able to grasp the concepts discussed at university level.	No			2020-02-21 17:30:23	ANON-YFPW-R98X-1	2020-02-21 17:30:23	2020-02-21 17:30:36
No		Strongly disagree	Certain areas I disagree with strongly, especially the Sciences.	The NCEA Level 1 Science proposed change is aimed at lower end students, even though I believe it will be even worse for them. There is no academic rigor for our higher end students. There is NO real Science explicit content/ knowledge anywhere to be seen that is necessary to move into Level 2 and 3 Sciences..		No			2020-02-21 17:30:45	ANON-YFPW-R98A-A	2020-02-21 17:30:45	2020-02-21 17:30:52

No	Was not aware the subjects were to change	Strongly disagree	I teach Business Studies, Economics and Accounting at Levels 1, 2 & 3. I do not support the proposed change to Level 1 Commerce as it would make the jump into Level 2 for all students too challenging and difficult.	See above - I do not support the proposed change into "Level 1 Commerce" as it would make the jump into Level 2 for all students too challenging and difficult. Do not change Level 1 'Commerce' subjects.	Leave the Business Studies Levels alone.	No				2020-02-21 17:31:08	ANON-YFPW-R98N-Q	2020-02-21 17:31:08	2020-02-21 17:31:16
Yes		Agree		I like the broad aspect of the subjects at this level. I do not think students need to specialise too early. Even specialisation at level 2 is early. Students need maturity to think about the direction that they want to take after school. I feel that specialisation can take place at university level or training be given on employment.	No	No				2020-02-21 17:48:14	ANON-YFPW-R98K-M	2020-02-21 17:48:14	2020-02-21 17:48:29
No	I was unaware until this announcement	Agree	I understand the logic behind the changes to Level 1 and I think some schools offer far too much choice in some ways which divert students from attaining their key skills needed to meet Level 2 Prerequisites			No				2020-02-21 17:48:29	ANON-YFPW-R986-Y	2020-02-21 17:48:29	2020-02-21 17:48:41
Yes		Strongly disagree				Yes	Maybe why is it that different?	Err was that question 5.		2020-02-21 17:50:56	ANON-YFPW-R98R-U	2020-02-21 17:49:24	2020-02-21 17:51:09
Yes	There has been adequate information provided to practitioners.	Strongly agree	Any initiative to raise the ability go students to read and write fluently is to be applauded. It is a travesty that standards have dropped to such an extent that students entering Year 9 and illiterate.	So pleased that English will regain the profile it deserves.	No	Yes		N/A		2020-02-21 17:52:06	ANON-YFPW-R98W-Z	2020-02-21 17:52:06	2020-02-21 17:52:18
Yes		Undecided		Media Studies needs to be recognised as its own specialised subject. Consider this; would a reliever be able to teach a week's worth of Media Studies class compared to a Science or Math class where they have the aid of a text book. Try getting a reliever to teach editing/production or how to use media techniques to tell stories. It makes no sense for Media Studies to be absorbed under social science. It should either be on its own, part of English or the Tech department (who also should be specialised subjects too)	Media Studies - come and visit Western Springs College! We have a large Media Studies department. What you see will surprise you	Yes				2020-02-21 17:55:22	ANON-YFPW-R984-W	2020-02-21 17:55:22	2020-02-21 17:55:33
Yes		Strongly disagree	Absorbing so many subjects together and getting rid of subjects entirely (especially Latin) is ridiculous at level 1.	To exclude Latin from level 1 NCEA is completely ridiculous. No one begins taking a language at Level 2 - by eliminating the option of Latin at level 1 you are getting rid of the first entry into the language.		No				2020-02-21 17:55:26	ANON-YFPW-R98T-W	2020-02-21 17:55:26	2020-02-21 17:55:37
No		Agree		I take classical studies but I wouldn't take the course if it was paired with history.	I would like to see more work done around the teaching and assessments of digital technology subjects. The programming standards do not provide room for creativity and the externals are very difficult and aren't sat during exam times.	No				2020-02-21 17:55:58	ANON-YFPW-R983-V	2020-02-21 17:55:57	2020-02-21 17:56:08
Yes		Strongly agree		NO	Keep the difference between Maths-Statistics and Maths-calculus in Y12 and Y13 as available subjects.	No		NA		2020-02-21 17:55:59	ANON-YFPW-R982-U	2020-02-21 17:55:59	2020-02-21 17:56:37
No		Undecided	As a maths teacher just reading mathematics and statistics without knowing which strands will be included is not helpful.			Yes				2020-02-21 18:10:12	ANON-YFPW-R98U-X	2020-02-21 18:10:12	2020-02-21 18:10:23
No		Disagree	It rather looks like you are cutting subjects out rather than giving students a general foundation: Accounting for example is now out - because for some reason someone has decided that business studies and eco are more important? Who decided that? Were there accounting teachers on that panel? Also, I am quite confused as to how business studies and economics are to be integrated. Again - who is on that panel? My guess is that it is going to depend on the strength of character of those on the committee. As an Economics teacher I surely hope that there is a strong Economics advocate there. Otherwise we will all be doing business studies.	I suspect that someone has decided that "commerce" is all one big idea - economics, accounting and business studies are VASTLY different from each other (I teach all 3). The same with Science I imagine. Someone has decided to cut down. In our school, students are quite capable of managing the needs of the 3 different Commerce subjects. I don't see why we are "combining" subjects together. Having eg an Economics background doesn't really help students with Accounting and I suspect this will be the same for many of the combined subjects. So why not just offer it as it is.	Yes. Philosophy. It is very sad that NZ doesn't allow students to do philosophy at NCEA level.	No			2020-02-21 18:11:05	ANON-YFPW-R98Y-F	2020-02-21 18:11:04	2020-02-21 18:11:12	
Yes		Strongly agree				No				2020-02-21 18:17:33	ANON-YFPW-R98E-5	2020-02-21 18:17:33	2020-02-21 18:17:45
Yes		Agree			no	Yes				2020-02-21 18:21:31	ANON-YFPW-R98E-E	2020-02-21 18:21:31	2020-02-21 18:21:43

Yes		Disagree	- I feel that some of the subjects being removed are more beneficial than some of those being added - I feel that some subjects being merged with others isn't always helpful and is often reductive and when needed it should only be done with subjects that have similar content	- Merging the commerce subjects leads to severe degradation in the teaching of accounting - Art History and Regular History being merged may not be beneficial for people who don't do both - PE and Health are different enough that they should be separate subjects - The decision to remove Latin is beneficial in my opinion, it is not a widely spoken language anymore and hasn't been for a long time - Religious Education could be properly covered within social studies - Media Studies shouldn't be merged with Social Studies as the content is fairly different - Merging the Sciences at level 1 would be a positive change as it allows people to keep their options open - I feel that Māori Performing Arts is less beneficial than some of the subjects it would take away resources from, however, it would be good to implement in some way	Engineering	No			2020-02-21 18:23:19	ANON-YFPW-R9E9-F	2020-02-21 18:23:19	2020-02-21 18:23:36
Yes		Strongly agree				No			2020-02-21 18:24:34	ANON-YFPW-R9E9-W	2020-02-21 18:24:34	2020-02-21 18:24:45
Yes		Strongly disagree	As a classical studies teacher who has a history degree and previously taught history, I strongly disagree with the two subjects being merged. Classical studies is a more broad and diverse knowledge and range of skills required that will not be covered under history and especially as a minor part of the course. I have 3 year 11 classics classes in my department (more than geography which remains a single subject) in a school for 1400 students and for those students, they would be denied their choice of subject and consequently may not take classics in following years.	No do not remove classical studies as a separate subject! See above for why.		No			2020-02-21 18:28:10	ANON-YFPW-R9E1-Z	2020-02-21 18:28:10	2020-02-21 18:28:23
Yes		Disagree	Separate science and technology subjects should remain.	As above. Adding Maori dance as a separate subject...seriously?!	Personal financial management should be included in a mandatory subject called preparation for work and preparation for life. Include citizenship and personal responsibility.	No			2020-02-21 18:28:52	ANON-YFPW-R9EQ-7	2020-02-21 18:28:52	2020-02-21 18:29:05
Yes		Strongly disagree	You are removing subjects that I have started university to teach and made them less accessible to be part of my future career	Classics has a huge impact on the modern world and the modern is the way it is because of classics. It should remain separate from history as they both use different styles of formal essay and teach different ideas about the world as a whole. The two also have a large difference in the way students interact with sources to learn through different contexts.		Yes			2020-02-21 18:34:51	ANON-YFPW-R9EE-U	2020-02-21 18:34:51	2020-02-21 18:34:57
Yes	Just wondering where ESOL standards would sit. Or are they no longer?	Agree	Still wondering about ESOL standards. Within English?	ESOL? OR will they be rolled into the new literacy standards?	Would philosophy fit into the social sciences?	No			2020-02-21 18:36:40	ANON-YFPW-R9E5-B	2020-02-21 18:36:40	2020-02-21 18:36:48
No		Strongly disagree		Stop screwing with the system		Yes			2020-02-21 18:43:32	ANON-YFPW-R9EP-6	2020-02-21 18:43:32	2020-02-21 18:43:44
Yes		Strongly agree		No change recommended	No	Yes	Keep them coming. More if possible.		2020-02-21 18:57:37	ANON-YFPW-R9EF-V	2020-02-21 18:57:37	2020-02-21 18:57:52
Yes		Strongly disagree				Yes			2020-02-21 19:00:51	ANON-YFPW-R9E1-G	2020-02-21 19:00:51	2020-02-21 19:00:55
No		Strongly disagree				Yes			2020-02-21 19:01:27	ANON-YFPW-R9E1-T	2020-02-21 19:01:27	2020-02-21 19:01:34
No		Agree		Media studies is a separate and much needed subject in our modern lives. I feel it will get lost in social studies and doesn't have a place there. It could sit with drama/ tech/ English if anything. But should be offered separately.	Drama technologies should be brought back into the NCEA fold and given proper support along with event management courses which would sit well in the new vocational pathway.	No			2020-02-21 19:03:03	ANON-YFPW-R9EH-X	2020-02-21 19:03:03	2020-02-21 19:03:20
No		Disagree	Why would you merge Media Studies and Psychology?	Classics and History should not be one subject!	Create a mandatory Civics class!	No			2020-02-21 19:04:31	ANON-YFPW-R9EB-R	2020-02-21 19:04:31	2020-02-21 19:04:41
Yes		Strongly agree				No			2020-02-21 19:05:32	ANON-YFPW-R9EM-3	2020-02-21 19:05:32	2020-02-21 19:06:00
Yes		Disagree	I like the addition of new subjects, but I am concerned that removal/merging of other subjects will limit opportunities for students to follow their passions and find areas where they can succeed.	I am most concerned about Media Studies, Art History, and Latin. I understand that not everyone may wish to take these subjects, but I think History and Social Studies are already so broad that Art History and Media studies won't get much attention. It also seems a shame to remove Latin as an option for those who want to take it. What harm is there in leaving it in?		No			2020-02-21 19:11:59	ANON-YFPW-R9ED-T	2020-02-21 19:11:59	2020-02-21 19:12:08
No		Undecided		No		No			2020-02-21 19:15:24	ANON-YFPW-R9EJ-E	2020-02-21 19:15:24	2020-02-21 19:15:30
No	Isn't it already broad based at Level 1 now? So why the changes?	Undecided		There's already a big jump from Level 1 to Level 2, won't this "change" make things worse?		No			2020-02-21 19:24:01	ANON-YFPW-R9EA-Q	2020-02-21 19:24:01	2020-02-21 19:24:11
No		Agree				Yes			2020-02-21 19:31:44	ANON-YFPW-R9EN-4	2020-02-21 19:31:44	2020-02-21 19:31:56

No	WHY KEEP CHANGING THINGS? You do not seem to have any deep understanding of what is actually going on in individual secondary schools and this is worrying. I do not want my students to become 'test dummies' for your ideas, like those in the past who suffered the most when 'tomorrow's schools' and NCEA first came out. PLEASE STOP TRYING TO FIX THINGS THAT ARE NOT BROKEN!!! The current level 1 standards in Science are perfect for my students - perhaps other teachers / schools are not utilising them in a way that leads to future vocational pathways??	Strongly disagree	As i stated above.	As i have stated above.	No. Please stop trying to mess with a system that is working for the students of our kura.	Yes		SCIENCE!!!	2020-02-21 19:42:22	ANON-YFPW-R9E6-C	2020-02-21 19:42:22	2020-02-21 19:43:03
Yes	Not sure the "categories" defined are consistently suited. Psychology & media studies branded alongside religious studies?	Disagree		Media studies should come into the pool under English or the Arts.	Seriously look at the size of subject standards & how these impact upon other subjects. A student taking; media, English, classics, history & psychology has far more to absorb in comparison to those who study the sciences & or maths. The weight of the assessments in terms of literacy & quantity of required demonstration is vast in comparison.	No	Overseas teachers get little to no support in this area. An online course isn't helpful. Dedicated term long sessions should be provided.		2020-02-21 19:43:48	ANON-YFPW-R9E8-8	2020-02-21 19:43:48	2020-02-21 19:43:57
No		Disagree		Media Studies at level one has been removed from the list. Media literacy is a huge influence on how our young people navigate the information and world around them. Removing Media at level one will lower the chances of growth within the subject throughout level 2 & 3 and dissolve the subject all together	Ancient History such as Greek, Roman and Egyptian	Yes			2020-02-21 19:50:04	ANON-YFPW-R9E2-8	2020-02-21 19:50:04	2020-02-21 19:50:19
Yes		Disagree	I think it's too narrow. Splitting subjects, maybe not as much as they currently are, but to a degree helps more direct pathways towards university/tech etc			No			2020-02-21 19:49:57	ANON-YFPW-R9E3-9	2020-02-21 19:49:57	2020-02-21 19:50:58
No		Agree				No			2020-02-21 19:51:33	ANON-YFPW-R9E9-B	2020-02-21 19:51:33	2020-02-21 19:51:46
No		Agree				No			2020-02-21 19:56:54	ANON-YFPW-R9CY-D	2020-02-21 19:56:54	2020-02-21 19:57:05
Yes	Generally in favour of the concept	Strongly disagree	Classical Studies is not History. Art History is not History. They are both completely separate subjects and it seems that those who have made these suggestions actually don't know anything about either subject.	Classical Studies, Latin, and Art History are all subjects which, while no doubt low in uptake across the country, are still important subjects in their own right. It is extremely important for subject specialists to have the freedom to be able to create opportunities in these fields to support later specialisation. Simply saying that they can inform contexts at a low level in History is completely ridiculous - especially as we're now being mandated to include more NZ History. How does "teach Classics contexts?" and "teach Art History contexts?" match up with "teach more NZ History" ???	Not for the students. I'd like the Ministry staff to perhaps gain an understanding of the importance of a varied and lively Arts / Humanities curriculum, however.	No	I don't teach in te reo.	no	2020-02-21 20:23:09	ANON-YFPW-R9C5-7	2020-02-21 20:23:09	2020-02-21 20:23:24
No		Disagree	I understand the need for a broad education at NCEA level one, but I worry that these changes - particularly combining media studies into social sciences will decrease our media literacy amongst students, especially if they are not being taught by a specialist media studies teacher. As someone with a communications background, we can see that media literacy needs to begin early in order to be fully developed - similar to learning languages, the younger people are exposed to such topics, the easier it is to grasp. This could be true across the board, and by potentially not exposing them to materials that are going to give a deeper understanding of a given topic, we are hindering the students later learning.	Yeah - don't do it. Anecdotally, as someone able to take media studies and history in level one and then specialise further into classics at level two I was able to hone my interests. I doubt I would have taken any Social Studies classes through NCEA level if Geography was a required part of the curriculum for example. Giving the students the choice to take a generalised paper for NCEA level one compounded with various different things, OR specialising if they are already aware of what they want to do. These students are 15-16 years of age, and treating them as if they are incapable of making decisions is only going to remove them from schooling altogether.	Not as of yet.	No			2020-02-21 20:26:07	ANON-YFPW-R9C8-C	2020-02-21 20:26:07	2020-02-21 20:26:20
Yes		Agree		The only query I have is why media studies is grouped with social studies and not with English. I understand that the critical thinking around bias in the media fits well with social studies, however, I feel that there are also a number of areas in media studies that fit with English. For example, currently part of the media studies curriculum is centred around how visual and written texts are put together for a particular purpose, and to me, this more closely aligns with the English curriculum. I think the fact that across the country there are a number of schools using media studies standards in their English programmes is testament to this.		Yes			2020-02-21 20:32:19	ANON-YFPW-R9C9-D	2020-02-21 20:32:19	2020-02-21 20:32:39

No	Only just read it yesterday	Disagree	HPE I agree but not psychology - that is it's own subject and needs to be separate	Psychology needs more attention. More young people want to study the brain and people, not other science or social studies concepts. HPE is ok merged at level 1, but needs to include anatomy, interpersonal skills, sexuality, leadership and an outdoor ed type assessment.	Psychology - see above, needs to allow for students to focus solely on the brain and human behaviour	Yes		No, just feel like at level 1 it disappears out the window for most	2020-02-21 20:34:52	ANON-YFPW-R9CG-U	2020-02-21 20:34:52	2020-02-21 20:35:02
Yes	But not happy that it is taking subjects out.	Strongly disagree	Don't like the leaving out of subjects	Why is Accounting left out at Level 1. The demand for jobs with Accounting is increasing and we are closing the door for our students. Students struggle at Uni if they start with Accounting then. Why not include an Accounting with Financial Intelligence. People are struggling financially because they have no knowledge of that. Bring back Accounting into the mix.	Yes, Accounting	No		Needs to include Accounting at Level 1, 2 and 3. Bring in more cloud services, like XERO, so students can leave school with the knowledge and ability to do the Accounting work.	2020-02-21 20:35:59	ANON-YFPW-R9CI-X	2020-02-21 20:35:59	2020-02-21 20:36:40
Yes		Disagree		I don't believe health and physical education should be one. They are incredibly important to a students well-being and I think you would be stepping back rather than forward moving it to one subject.		Yes			2020-02-21 20:38:56	ANON-YFPW-R9CQ-5	2020-02-21 20:38:56	2020-02-21 20:39:17
Yes		Strongly disagree		I don't believe health and physical education should become one subject as it is too important for students well-being to try and merge all the learning into a small amount of learning time. Students will miss important information for their future. I think we would be moving backwards rather than forward if we moved it to one subject		No			2020-02-21 20:41:50	ANON-YFPW-R9CE-5	2020-02-21 20:41:50	2020-02-21 20:42:13
Yes		Strongly disagree	There will be no clear subject progressions. Yes we over assess and there is credit counting, but dont just get rid of our subjects!!	Media studies must stay! It's an important subject. We have brought in digital technologies curriculum and yet you want to get rid of media studies where they learn and perfect many of these skills. Media studies offered students transferable skills, but we need to be able to teach it. This is a specialized subject.		No			2020-02-21 20:44:29	ANON-YFPW-R9CP-4	2020-02-21 20:44:29	2020-02-21 20:44:58
Yes		Strongly agree		Learning support options and pathways to ncea		No			2020-02-21 20:47:20	ANON-YFPW-R9C7-B	2020-02-21 20:47:20	2020-02-21 20:47:32
Yes	English Language (English as a second language) is not part of the list of languages. Recognition as a learning area more than a means to an end - a consideration? See the Learning Languages List.	Agree		See 1 above.	EAP	No			2020-02-21 20:43:35	ANON-YFPW-R9C5-9	2020-02-21 20:43:35	2020-02-21 20:47:35
Yes		Undecided	Not sure if broad or not. If no Latin, then how have Latin at level 2 or 3. Would need to be more basic Latin.			No			2020-02-21 20:48:15	ANON-YFPW-R9CF-T	2020-02-21 20:48:15	2020-02-21 20:48:30
Yes		Strongly disagree	I think that taking away the option for Year 11 students to choose the subjects they are passionate about like Media Studies and Classics would impact on their ability to excel in years 12 and 13 and scholarship. Students benefit from develop a strong foundation of specialist skills and knowledge. These subjects develop their critical thinking and literacy skills in a context that is relevant to their interests in a way that generic social studies would not provide for all students.	Keeping Media Studies at Year 11. The subject is different from other social science subjects as it also includes technical production of film and other media which requires specialist teachers and equipment.		Yes			2020-02-21 20:51:57	ANON-YFPW-R9CL-5	2020-02-21 20:51:57	2020-02-21 20:52:26
No		Disagree	Too narrow - will reduce student option choices.			No			2020-02-21 21:10:57	ANON-YFPW-R9CE-Z	2020-02-21 21:10:57	2020-02-21 21:11:09
Yes		Strongly disagree	So far as schools and their communities want to provide, for instance, physics or Latin, it is difficult to understand the objection to providing those. NCEA is or is at risk of becoming the inferior/inadequate qualification as it is: incentivising more capable students to take the IB or Cambridge exams will further drive that trend and further undermine marginalised students who cannot easily access these alternatives.	No good reason to omit physics/chemistry/biology/Latin and loss for good students without access to alternatives.	No. Schools already struggle to resource subjects that they teach.	No			2020-02-21 21:12:58	ANON-YFPW-R9CH-V	2020-02-21 21:12:58	2020-02-21 21:13:06
No		Strongly disagree	Combining Accounting, Economics and Business Studies into one single subject is not a good idea - they need to be kept separate.	Combining Accounting, Economics and Business Studies into one single subject is not a good idea - they need to be kept separate.		No			2020-02-21 21:16:44	ANON-YFPW-R9CB-P	2020-02-21 21:16:44	2020-02-21 21:16:56
No		Disagree	Concerned by the PE and Health combining to one course/subject Concerned about the Sciences becoming just science - 5 subjects and the course content fitted into one course will surely lower the depth of knowledge that can be taught?	I am very concerned about PE and Health going from separate subjects to becoming the same subject. Although there are overlaps they are quite distinctly different with PE being more science based and if a student wants to go on to university to take a sports science degree they need this whereas Health is a critical thinking subject that focuses on societal issues and implications. They require different skills Not all health students are into PE and vice versa so combining you take away those options for those students that are more interested in just one of the subjects. Will Science then become more diluted if you have to teach		No			2020-02-21 21:22:49	ANON-YFPW-R9CM-1	2020-02-21 21:22:49	2020-02-21 21:23:14

Yes		Disagree	I disagree with the loss of 'generic' Technology.	The loss of 'generic' Technology standards ignores the central thread that ties all the specialist areas together, and is not reflective of industry practices. I believe this change will lead to far greater silos in Technology, which we have been trying to break free from for years as we want to encourage cross specialist projects. 'Food Science' is technological knowledge, as technological knowledge is used to develop products in this case food products. The Food area needs the biggest up date to align it with Technology, as Home Economics is reminiscent of being a house wife, running a household. It is far removed from today's society.	Generic Technology. It is interesting that this decision to drop it was made before the subject expert groups had been put out for expressions of interest, as there was no group for generic Technology.	No	is there a translated version ?		2020-02-21 21:26:26	ANON-YFPW-R9CD-R	2020-02-21 21:26:26	2020-02-21 21:26:41
No		Disagree		I would like to advocate for Latin to be retained as a subject in NCEA level 1. I believe that the inclusion of Latin as a subject at this level fulfills the requirement stipulated above for "rich" learning. It also helps NCEA to provide a "broad foundation" at level 1 by expanding the range of subjects available. Latin as a language has led on to several modern languages of today and the grammar skills, techniques and knowledge gained through learning this language assist with all other languages. Offering subjects which are less directly related to subsequent jobs enhances critical and creative thinking which are important attributes of success. I would be sad to see Latin no longer available both as a subject in its own right and for what it represents as something a bit different and thought provoking.	No	No			2020-02-21 21:29:34	ANON-YFPW-R9CX-C	2020-02-21 21:29:34	2020-02-21 21:29:49
Yes		Agree				Yes			2020-02-21 21:30:47	ANON-YFPW-R9CA-N	2020-02-21 21:30:47	2020-02-21 21:30:53
No	Vague noises made about changes but not really covered	Strongly disagree	Leave well enough. It works currently.	See above. Workloads are already immense without adding changes to the mix.	No	Yes	Yes		2020-02-21 21:39:10	ANON-YFPW-R9CK-Y	2020-02-21 21:39:10	2020-02-21 21:39:23
No	I thought curriculum areas were going to offer less standards....	Agree		It seems odd that the arts and most of the social sciences have kept their specialisations but science hasn't. I can't see any reason why you wouldn't keep the separate sciences or why you wouldn't provide a broad social studies curriculum at level one like the science.		No			2020-02-21 07:42:45	ANON-YFPW-R9F7-E	2020-02-21 07:42:45	2020-02-21 21:48:57
Yes	Media Studies is often misunderstood. As a subject, it explores a wide variety of content and approaches to learning and skills - from Representation in the media to fullscale short film production. By removing ALL standards from level one, the potential to lose the growing validity of the subject in a landscape where most learners are digital natives - is problematic. For example, why keep religious studies, and discard Media standards such as 1.11 that teach valuable lessons around passive consumption of digital media?	Disagree	I agree there should be less assessment in level one. But provide fewer standards for level one Media standards that operate as 'bridging' standards for level 2 and above. The subject is only gaining more popularity in European classrooms, and yet this proposal seems to discard its potential as a genuine 21st Century subject geared towards digital natives.	See above.		Yes	No		2020-02-21 22:01:01	ANON-YFPW-R9CG-A	2020-02-21 22:01:01	2020-02-21 22:01:13
Yes		Strongly disagree	NCEA level 1 is already too easy to achieve in and if anything needs to be made harder - it should be challenging and not set up for everyone to pass if they turn up. It makes our education system a joke. It is not just the subject changes eg. Science but the achievement standards that will go with it to increase literacy. You are losing the value of learning. You have Years 9 and 10 to act as foundation years - there is already a big gap between Level one and two and this will increase it.	The gap will be increased in the Sciences - the achievement standards look vague and allow to the work to be done by the school, which lacks consistency across the board. Either maintain the Chem/Bio/Physics/Earth Science additional options or at least keep the external achievement standards as optional for schools. Physical Education and Health merging is also inappropriate - they are both contrasting subjects and I can see the merge being put in place in levels 2 and 3. Our school runs Health as a separate unit with Physical Education being an option subject.	No				2020-02-21 22:02:21	ANON-YFPW-R9CR-6	2020-02-21 22:02:21	2020-02-21 22:02:48
No		Disagree	I disagree with the removal of Latin, Classics and Art History at NCEA Level 1 (and the incorporation of Classics and Art History into History). I did Classics and Art History, as well as History, at NCEA Level 1 (also 2 and 3) and think they gave me a good foundation for future study and work. I think their removal would disadvantage students who wish to focus on academic subjects and their incorporation into history would reduce what can be learnt in that subject. I took Latin prior to NCEA and think it is very valuable for literacy. I think removing it from Level 1 will disincentivise it at Levels 2 and 3. I would recommend retaining all three.	As mentioned, I disagree with the removal of Latin, Classics and Art History at NCEA Level 1 (and the incorporation of Classics and Art History into History). I did Classics and Art History, as well as History, at NCEA Level 1 (also 2 and 3) and think they gave me a good foundation for future study and work. I think their removal would disadvantage students who wish to focus on academic subjects and their incorporation into history would reduce what can be learnt in that subject. I took Latin prior to NCEA and think it is very valuable for literacy. I think removing it from Level 1 will disincentivise it at Levels 2 and 3. I would recommend retaining all three.	No.	No			2020-02-21 22:10:04	ANON-YFPW-R9CW-B	2020-02-21 22:10:04	2020-02-21 22:10:25

No		Strongly disagree	Practical life skills such as financial literacy are completely overlooked in favour of non-practical, non-academic and recreational subjects such as drama and dance. Each of the independent Commerce subjects lead to an actual pathway to employment in NZ and abroad. Students will emerge from their secondary education with absolutely no comprehension or understanding of money.	As above. Subjects such as dance, drama, visual art and languages provide very limited opportunity for employment and teach no real-life skills. This curriculum should be of key focus in Early Childhood and Primary education - not in Secondary on the cusp of sending young people out into the real world. Employers are already widely complaining of a new generation of students with poor work ethic. Making our curriculum even more "airy fairy" will serve only to further escalate this issue. The three Commerce subjects are vastly different to each other. The concepts and skills included in these independent subjects are highly contextual with strong relevance to the world we live in.	-	No	How are these skills to help people get and sustain a job in the future? Sure, appreciation and understanding is critical to the future of a harmonious NZ but not something that should be included in our curriculum.	No.	2020-02-21 22:20:34	ANON-YFPW-R9C4-8	2020-02-21 22:20:34	2020-02-21 22:20:41
No		Strongly agree	I think it is an amazing idea to combine alike subjects as broader options. As a student who was very interested in Commerce, at Level 1 I had to sacrifice a favourite subject for my passions. There are compulsory subjects to take, so other options are limited. By giving students the chance to take all-encompassing courses, you are also diversifying their potential career paths. Thank you. From a teen who the system failed, who is glad someone is finally getting it right.	Although I am sad to see Economics get bundled in with other Commerce subjects, I am ecstatic to see changes being made to help the future students. I am also proud to see Maori Performing Arts added. I always thought the Kapa Haka kids deserved more for their mana.	Maori history. Geology. Journalism! I wish I had the chance to take this at school, or at least spend some time on it in English. A lot of my friends are the same too.	No			2020-02-21 22:23:30	ANON-YFPW-R9CT-8	2020-02-21 22:23:30	2020-02-21 22:23:50
Yes		Agree			More options under digital technology	Yes			2020-02-21 22:27:45	ANON-YFPW-R9C3-7	2020-02-21 22:27:45	2020-02-21 22:28:28
Yes		Strongly disagree	Absorbing Media into Social Studies is an incredibly misguided choice. Those subjects are extremely different and each valuable in their own right. To combine them is a mistake. Likewise with classical studies and history. The cancellation of art history is frankly ridiculous. More than ever, our tamariki need critical thinking - a skill that is best taught with close visual analysis. Additionally, when taught by a strong teacher, this subject has an incredible capacity to make visible discussions around the mistreatment of minority groups. Art history allows one to visualise issues of race, sexism and ableism (and so many more) which can be hard to grasp when abstract thinking is yet to fully develop.	See above regarding art history and media studies.		Yes			2020-02-21 22:47:30	ANON-YFPW-R9JV-H	2020-02-21 22:47:30	2020-02-21 22:47:40
Yes		Strongly disagree		Not sure how a generalised Science course in Level 1 is going to prepare students for the specialised courses in Yr 12 & 13. That step up is the biggest one in senior school and is difficult as it is. I believe the current changes will make this even more difficult. I'm not holding my breath that the resources that will be provided by the ministry that will allow courses to be easily taught (a) and (b) will even come close to preparing students for the specialised Science courses in Level 2 & 3.	No - we are struggling to find teachers for the existing courses.	No			2020-02-21 22:50:10	ANON-YFPW-R9C2-6	2020-02-21 22:43:03	2020-02-21 22:50:19
Yes		Undecided				Yes			2020-02-21 22:54:38	ANON-YFPW-R9J8-K	2020-02-21 22:54:38	2020-02-21 22:54:49
Yes		Strongly disagree	All of these subjects shouldn't be moulded into one, there would be so much to learn within the year and they would basically have more subjects.			No			2020-02-21 22:55:21	ANON-YFPW-R9J9-M	2020-02-21 22:55:21	2020-02-21 22:55:27
No		Strongly disagree				No			2020-02-21 23:09:07	ANON-YFPW-R9JG-2	2020-02-21 23:09:07	2020-02-21 23:09:18
No		Strongly disagree		As a current university student intending to teach economics on completion of my degree I am troubled by this proposed merger. Although I have developed foundational accounting and other business skills I personally feel inadequate in my capacity to present this information to the level that students deserve. Whilst there are of course advantages in merging subjects to provide a broad understanding, the disadvantage, even at NCEA level one, is that the education that students receive from teachers is potentially not as optimal as it would be if they were taught by a specialist teacher.		No			2020-02-22 00:05:37	ANON-YFPW-R9JU-5	2020-02-22 00:05:37	2020-02-22 00:05:51

No		Disagree		I disagree with Latin being removed at Level 1. It is an excellent language and should be available for students. It has been hugely beneficial for me in my life and career. I also don't understand how that would operate at future levels, one can't study Spanish at Level 1 and then specialise into Latin at Level 2. Equally it's unfair for students who intend to study Latin all the way through to not be able to obtain Level 1 credits for it. Also not a huge fan of folding classical studies into history.		Yes				2020-02-22 03:09:52	ANON-YFPW-R9J5-G	2020-02-22 03:09:52	2020-02-22 03:10:12
No		Disagree				No				2020-02-22 05:34:30	ANON-YFPW-R9JP-B	2020-02-22 05:34:30	2020-02-22 05:34:54
No	I have since seen the science stds and to be honest, if these are implemented I will move my children to a CIE school. Not sure what the intention is. My two questions I want an answer to are: "what will success look like?" "How will you measure it?" I was brought up in the School C era and I can't understand why there are no longer any learning objectives. Everyone on the same page and everyone clear what needs to be taught/learnt.	Strongly disagree	Based on what I have seen, where is the clear link to content knowledge? I can imagine many schools with limited resources and inexperienced teachers (forced to teach subjects that are not their specialty) will be at a disadvantage. If the MoE hadn't opened up the can of worms all those years ago to allow so much choice there would be no need to go down this current track. I can imagine lots of teachers using the same exemplars. So a country of group think.	Stick to the basics - (reading, writing, maths, science and a few others) and support with well defined learning outcomes. Don't be scared of external exams (its the first time kids really treat their results seriously). Year 10 is a nothing year to many students and now yr 11 will be the same.	Show us what you have first and put a bit of flesh on the bones.	No				2020-02-22 06:42:19	ANON-YFPW-R9J7-J	2020-02-22 06:42:19	2020-02-22 06:42:26
Yes		Agree		Na	Please do t forget the Arts with History and Classical Studies. These subjects teach invaluable research, comprehension and writing skills and the important skill of how to form a logical position and formulate that position in to a cohesive written argument...alongside teaching us about ourselves.	No		Na		2020-02-22 06:57:57	ANON-YFPW-R9JF-1	2020-02-22 06:57:57	2020-02-22 06:58:13
Yes		Strongly agree		Consider combining dance and drama or eliminating dance as it is typically taught outside of school for those interested.		No				2020-02-22 07:05:55	ANON-YFPW-R9JL-C	2020-02-22 07:05:55	2020-02-22 07:06:11
Yes		Disagree	Year 10 is the foundational year for NCEA. By delaying specificity in subject, you will make it harder for students to determine career paths or areas of further study as they will have less experience in the subject and less understanding of what is involved.	Good understanding of these subjects in preparation for university is critical and the loss of one years study will impact on the outcomes we see coming out of tertiary study in to the workforce.	NZ politics to help students become politically literate and understand the country they live in, the laws in place and determine how they want to shape the future through their democratic right to vote. Small business management would be useful to prepare students who may leave school to start a business.	No		No		2020-02-22 07:25:30	ANON-YFPW-R9JZ-N	2020-02-22 07:25:30	2020-02-22 07:25:45
Yes		Agree				No				2020-02-22 07:38:39	ANON-YFPW-R9JH-3	2020-02-22 07:38:39	2020-02-22 07:38:57
Yes		Strongly disagree	Health and pe are 2 subjects		Outdoor education should be a separate subject	Yes				2020-02-22 07:54:56	ANON-YFPW-R9JB-W	2020-02-22 07:54:56	2020-02-22 07:55:07
No		Strongly disagree	Ummmmmm... Why do we need to make Level One more "generalized?" I am sick of how NCEA is being dumbed down. Some of us actually study and want a challenge, and through specialization we can achieve this much, much earlier due to the increased level of detail. For example, as an Excellence student, I took Biology at Level One. Obviously, once this gets merged into Science, there is NO WAY a student would be taught to the level of detail I was. It's well known that NZ performs very poorly internationally. Hmm, I wonder why. Other qualifications, namely Cambridge, are extremely specialized right from IGCSE (equivalent to ncea level one.) Maybe to perform at a similar standard to these countries, we need to take a leaf out of their book. No, we don't need to make level one more generalized. All you are doing is making it easier for the lazy people who can't be bothered to open a book. Isn't generalization and a broad curriculum what Year 9&10 and the whole of primary school is about? And Māori performing arts to replace Latin.. I'm speechless. We Don't come to school for that. Māori performing arts is an after school activity.	Keep all current subjects. See reasons above.		No				2020-02-22 07:56:06	ANON-YFPW-R9JM-8	2020-02-22 07:56:06	2020-02-22 07:56:17
Yes		Agree		While broader, the teacher themselves are likely to remain with their status quo of programmes of learning...there is a significant different between psychology and social studies, so I suggest free PLD to up skill staff in those areas of change	Psychology and connection to sport/wellbeing Electronics Sustainably and ethics	No				2020-02-22 07:59:05	ANON-YFPW-R9JD-Y	2020-02-22 07:59:05	2020-02-22 07:59:20

Yes		Strongly disagree		Getting rid of a lot of science standards that are widely used to set up students for specialized subjects the following year is not in the best interest of the students.		Yes			2020-02-22 08:01:41	ANON-YFPW-R9JX-K	2020-02-22 08:01:41	2020-02-22 08:01:49
Yes		Agree				No			2020-02-22 08:18:42	ANON-YFPW-R9JA-V	2020-02-22 08:18:42	2020-02-22 08:18:52
Yes		Undecided	I would like to see the Standard/Unit Standard content before commenting here.	I would like to see Mathematics and Statistics separated into two subjects, i.e. Mathematics as one course and Statistics as another course. At levels 1, 2 and 3 there is enough current material available to run two courses.	Financial Literacy	No			2020-02-22 08:31:35	ANON-YFPW-R9JN-9	2020-02-22 08:30:05	2020-02-22 08:31:44
Yes		Strongly disagree		Keep Classics, Art History and Latin! It's completely unfair on children who love history to remove these subjects, and is indicative of the continued devaluation of the arts. Subjects like Art History, Classics and Latin teach essay writing skills, critical thinking, forming arguments, vocabulary and language skills, as well as giving students the opportunity to student culture and languages that have shaped the world today. MoE claims that these subjects can be taught through History, but what about New Zealand History? There's simply not enough space and time in the History curriculum to teach NZ history, classical history and art history. All of these histories are too important to be lumped together and given a quick once over. It's essential that students have access to New Zealand History, and proposal to teach classical studies and latin within History will negatively impact this.		No			2020-02-22 08:51:49	ANON-YFPW-R9JK-6	2020-02-22 08:51:49	2020-02-22 08:51:57
Yes		Disagree	Home Ec and Food Tech should not be changed food science. The above terms allow us to be student led. We use current food concerns/ topics that the learners are interested in to guide our learning. I feel if you change this to Food Science we will be more restricted and will lose passion from our learner. You should consider asking a survey asking students about this.		Other than Food Tec/ Home Ec and I instead of Food science. Consider a Level 2/3 Nutrition course. As a Dietician turned teacher myself, I see so many learners wanting this option as a pathway. When teaching food tech we can add this to the learning, but we can not go into depth Because of time and the restriction of the current assessments.	Yes			2020-02-22 08:52:31	ANON-YFPW-R9JG-H	2020-02-22 08:52:31	2020-02-22 08:52:47
Yes		Strongly disagree	I have concerns around the changes to food related subject areas.	I question the decision to create Food Science as a subject without the inclusion of nutrition and hauora. The government wants to address equity and the health of future generations so why get rid of the one subject (Home Economics) which enables understanding around how to address them?	Environmental Studies Home Economics Food Science and Nutrition	No			2020-02-22 09:04:48	ANON-YFPW-R9JH-D	2020-02-22 09:04:48	2020-02-22 09:05:05
Yes		Undecided				No			2020-02-22 09:05:07	ANON-YFPW-R9JW-J	2020-02-22 09:05:07	2020-02-22 09:05:33
No		Strongly disagree		Media studies has nothing to do with social science, media studies is about how the media affects the world and how we understand different types of media. Whereas social studies is more history which is the past and learning about current events		Yes			2020-02-22 09:13:39	ANON-YFPW-R9J4-F	2020-02-22 09:13:39	2020-02-22 09:13:51
No		Agree				No			2020-02-22 09:17:51	ANON-YFPW-R9JT-F	2020-02-22 09:17:51	2020-02-22 09:18:01
Yes	This has always been the case year 7-10 offer classes that are merged and collaborative, where as NCEA is more specialised; still offering a diverse range of lessons and skills within individual subject classes.	Strongly disagree	While I agree that the subjects are foundational in NCEA level 1, if subject are merged then the curriculum will not be showing the full scope of an area to student who may then be pushed out of industries because of the overlooked issue of brushing too quickly over a subject.	I disagree with the merging of media studies into the social studies class. Without a dedicated class for media studies and the practical and theoretical focus on the media industry, especially the a digital age we live in, I feel as though students wouldn't be given a fair chance in learning the media industry. While many social/political, historical and even psychological issues are risen in a media studies classroom I cannot say the same for the classes being merged with it. Obviously this is only my opinion but having gone through high school with no clue of what to do because some classes have too many options, adding more options for pathways aimed at 15-16 year olds is confusing. High school is about choosing subjects you enjoy and wish to excel in. Not about choosing an entire chunk of a sector and making these life decisions and aspirations even harder to realise.	Having done tertiary study in photography and film, I would like to see a more hands on approach in learning technical skills, perhaps having experts come in as a sort of master class or lecture, similar to university. This would coax the student into having a better understanding of life after high school.	No			2020-02-22 09:26:56	ANON-YFPW-R9J3-E	2020-02-22 09:26:56	2020-02-22 09:27:04
No	Can not see why Home Economics would go under science. Much better fit under Health and Physical Education. More than Science of food	Strongly disagree	Home Economics more than science. Where does family and community aspect fit into this mix Health and Physical Education picks up the health aspect	Home Economics vital to teaching of nutrition and family studies. Only have to look at the child obesity and other health related issues to see this. Putting under Science takes away opportunity to teach these basic skills and educate the population to make changes. Life skills taught in Home Economics not picked up in this either		Yes			2020-02-22 09:28:21	ANON-YFPW-R9J3-D	2020-02-22 09:28:21	2020-02-22 09:28:37
Yes		Strongly agree				No			2020-02-22 09:40:59	ANON-YFPW-R9JU-G	2020-02-22 09:40:59	2020-02-22 09:41:15

No		Strongly disagree	I strongly disagree with the proposed changes to NCEA level one specifically within the social sciences area.	Grouping media studies into social studies is wrong. Media studies should be a subject in its own right. Media studies is an ever growing subject and will have a significant impact on future learning, an ever growing learning experience. Psychology and media studies are not the same thing and should not be grouped together into social studies.	Media studies should be further developed into its own rightful subject. I feel very strongly about this and in high school learnt the most from media studies.	No				2020-02-22 09:45:43	ANON-YFPW-R9XY-2	2020-02-22 09:45:43	2020-02-22 09:46:05
Yes		Disagree		While some areas being combined are understandable, the decisions made could have a potential adverse effect on teacher careers. Further, by removing Media Studies at Level 1, it further disincentivises studying the subject. At a time when media literacy and critical thinking is at a premium, removing the subject at that level seems not only counter-intuitive, but actively destructive towards the Humanities, and appears to run counter to the rationale offered.	No. Quite frankly, after the hatchet job delivered to subjects at Level 1, I am terrified of what would be done at Levels 2 and 3.	No				2020-02-22 09:50:38	ANON-YFPW-R9XY-Y	2020-02-22 09:50:38	2020-02-22 09:50:50
No	Was aware of changes happening within schools to allow more depth of learning within level 1, eg not doing level 1 or removing some assessment... Not these changes	Strongly disagree	I feel these changes do not fit with points 2, 3 and 4 of the criteria! This change for us at our school will not allow for rich learning for all our learners in health and pe. We have students who know that they want to follow one of these curriculum areas, not both. Merged standards will exclude those for example who do not want to learn from the pe standards or pursue thus pathway. Schools can already choose to focus on standards from each area within one course if they so choose, this is a better option. Schools can make changes to their programmes of learning and design of level 1, as my school has, will allow for the criteria you mention above. This is going backwards for the health and pe curriculum. Which area will be given more value and presence in the standards and who will decide this, considering the changes that have already been suggested have been done without some well informed leaders of the health curriculum. I am passionate about both PE and Health, this is not going to support these 2 areas			No				2020-02-22 09:59:35	ANON-YFPW-R9XC-C	2020-02-22 09:59:35	2020-02-22 09:59:47
Yes	I think it's absolutely outrageously. It takes away pathways for students who know what they want to do, leaving them with a whole year of foundational learning, additionally for those who don't yet know and are trying new things to find what they want to do with life... they can't! I cannot fathom the logic of combining classes like psychology, social and media studies which have so little to do with each other. Science of all places needs to have all the space it can get because the students of today need to be learning to fix the cock up of the world that we have made. Please, don't do this! It will negatively effect both students AND TEACHERS who are already on the edge of a chasm of a collapsing profession.	Strongly disagree	Re previous comment			No				2020-02-22 10:00:59	ANON-YFPW-R9XC-V	2020-02-22 10:00:59	2020-02-22 10:01:12
No		Disagree	I think Latin should remain as one of the languages. It is useful for Law and Science as it forms the basis of much terminology in these two fields. It also exercises the brain considerably.			No				2020-02-22 10:02:56	ANON-YFPW-R9X8-1	2020-02-22 10:02:56	2020-02-22 10:03:19
No	I had been under the impression that science subject specialists (and others) were working on L1 Bio Chem Physics within this review. Now I find the 4 Science standards are going to be the only ones, apart from Ag/Hort. This will mean our lower ability learners will be disadvantaged as will our higher ability learners. We are a small country school and will need a lot of support to find a way to make this work for our cohorts and our teachers.	Strongly disagree	Science should remain as discreet subjects as it is currently to enable teachers to construct courses that make sense for their students. Only 4 standards to cover the myriad of knowledge under the Science umbrella is absurd.	Science should remain as discreet subjects as it is currently to enable teachers to construct courses that make sense for their students. Only 4 standards to cover the myriad of knowledge under the Science umbrella is absurd.	Science should remain as discreet subjects as it is currently to enable teachers to construct courses that make sense for their students.	Yes				2020-02-22 10:07:00	ANON-YFPW-R9X9-2	2020-02-22 10:07:00	2020-02-22 10:07:09

No		Disagree	You shouldn't be rolling subjects into broader categories for all topics. While this probably works for things like science (this was how it was when I was in high school and it meant you got a taste of each before deciding what you might want to specialise in) I think in arts subjects there is simply too much to cover when you are already looking at say, history, how will art history or classics be included on top of everything else? It's too broad and means student will have less options, schools will probably stop offering many choices and kids will just not learn about these things at all. Arts are important, don't cut them!!	Please stop cutting arts options/rolling them in together!! People need the arts to help them understand other people, cultures, and history and it's impacts on us today. Rolling them all into one broad subject guarantees that a lot of schools won't cover them and kids will miss out. Also if these changes are adopted by governments universities will follow suit. I work for Otago uni which has recently slashed its arts offerings with no art history at all any more which is a great loss. We should be pushing kids to learn these topics from a young age. not taking away all their options! Also media studies psychology and social studies are all totally different areas that should not be grouped together at all. These changes really affect what is seen as important areas to study and honestly the arts are just so important and they are constantly underfunded and these attitudes lead to people thinking they aren't important when they definitely are. Encourage kids to learn about the arts and different aspects of it by giving them options!		No			2020-02-22 10:22:30	ANON-YFPW-R9XG-G	2020-02-22 10:22:30	2020-02-22 10:22:45
No		Undecided		I can't see how psychology fits with media studies, these are really different learning functions so this is confusing around how a curriculum would be taught and to cater to different types of students that would potentially have interest areas in each. I'm unsure how combining all the sciences will be able to fit in enough learning of each area before going into Level 2 specialization. I feel this might set kids up for failure in Level 2. If you want to consolidate it might be better to consolidate two subjects into two science areas rather than all four. Economics and accounting are really different subjects and to hear there will be not much accounting learning. I think accounting and business studies could be combined but economics should be a subject on its own	Investment fundamentals, how to provide or start to provide for their futures and deal with money. Technical drawing should be taught earlier, architecture studies in Level 1/2	No			2020-02-22 10:30:09	ANON-YFPW-R9XJ-K	2020-02-22 10:30:09	2020-02-22 10:30:24
No		Agree				No			2020-02-22 10:35:46	ANON-YFPW-R9XQ-T	2020-02-22 10:35:46	2020-02-22 10:35:57
No	I knew changes were happening but the key focus seemed to be to enable more external assessments.	Undecided				No			2020-02-22 10:46:25	ANON-YFPW-R9XS-X	2020-02-22 10:46:25	2020-02-22 10:46:31
Yes		Undecided				Yes			2020-02-22 10:54:41	ANON-YFPW-R9XP-S	2020-02-22 10:54:41	2020-02-22 10:54:51
Yes		Strongly agree				Yes	No		2020-02-22 11:01:26	ANON-YFPW-R9X7-Z	2020-02-22 11:01:26	2020-02-22 11:01:45
No	These changes should be publicised more and I suggest making all students who have studied NCEA before aware of the changes to receive feedback from those who may not have pursued a career in Teaching.	Disagree	I did not take the majority of subjects that are now being combined however, the changes in a certain subject area is deeply concerning to me and the future of our political systemf.	I strongly disagree on combining Economics, Business and Accounting as Economics is the theoretical study of managing resources within any type of society. Even though they are closely related in our current western socio-economic political environment, it is NOT the same as Finance and therefore, if this combination is adopted, students must be taught an unbiased viewpoint of ALL Economic Models. It should NOT be called Commerce and instead should remain as Economics as the umbrella term that links into current financial decision making. Additionally, the subject matter of Political Theory should also be introduced in order to provide an unbiased understanding of the range of political models which may use certain economic models e.g. Capitalism, Communism (theory vs. current attempts), Socialism and others	It would be better to have Economics, Geography and History combined into Social Science and Commerce, Business and Accounting combined into Finance. These should all be closely interlinked. Students can then choose, what subject matter within Finance and Social Science to specialise in Lvl 2 and 3.	No			2020-02-22 11:10:04	ANON-YFPW-R9XF-F	2020-02-22 11:10:04	2020-02-22 11:10:45
Yes	But it still isn't improving Māori student's achievement as it is still English and mainstream system based.	Undecided	I don't think anything the MOE is doing is really in the interest of the tangata whenua of this country as they are just taken gestures resembling being treaty partners.	Māori have their own government system and protocols as per the true intention of TOW per rangatira perception.	All the Tikanga, Māori, Performance, Rangara, etc Māori based subjects.	Yes	I prefer to use this as it is more relevant for Aotearoa and Māori mana whenua and tāngata whenua as per the true intention of T.O.W	Let specialist teachers like those at Waikato revamp this document.	2020-02-22 11:18:53	ANON-YFPW-R9XZ-3	2020-02-22 11:18:53	2020-02-22 11:19:13
Yes		Strongly agree	I like the broader context of subjects. E.g. Science. At the moment we Level 1 students taking Physics and Biochemistry to allow them to study Physics, Chemistry and Biology at Level 2. This limits their learning at Level 1 because they are forced to specialise early which means access to other subjects is limited.	I like the the exclusion of more specialised subjects. E.g. Science instead of specialist science subjects, Commerce instead of specialised commerce subjects and the same with social studies. Broader educational experiences which can only help a more holistic approach to education.		No			2020-02-22 11:22:35	ANON-YFPW-R9XH-H	2020-02-22 11:22:35	2020-02-22 11:22:58

Yes	I agree with this approach, but I feel it would be better to spread NCEA level 1 across years 10 and 11 to provide some meaningful assessment to year 10.	Agree	I fully agree with a generalized approach to level one, where strong emphasis on key ideas within the subject area can be explored	Outdoor education is taught as a year 11 subject in almost 50 secondary schools, but is not recognized in the NZC. I would like it recognized as a component of Health and PE alongside Home Economics.	Outdoor education, or outdoor and environmental education/ studies	Yes				2020-02-22 11:23:04	ANON-YFPW-R9XB-B	2020-02-22 11:23:04	2020-02-22 11:23:27
Yes No		Agree Disagree	I feel that some of these subjects are important to keep in their own right. A subject like classical studies could allow a student to achieve literacy credits even if they do not love English and do not do that well in that subject. I struggle to believe that students can pick up accounting at level 2 and still be as successful without the level 1 foundation skills.			No No				2020-02-22 11:28:52 2020-02-22 11:30:57	ANON-YFPW-R9XM-P ANON-YFPW-R9XD-D	2020-02-22 11:28:52 2020-02-22 11:30:57	2020-02-22 11:29:07 2020-02-22 11:31:03
No	I don't think specialisation is necessarily a good thing in high school education, in case students don't know what areas they want to focus on yet	Strongly disagree	Making a subject like science more general doesn't seem like a good idea when there is a "general science" subject option (or there should be). For languages, why is Latin being taken out of level 1 but left in at level 2 and 3? Seems a little counter-intuitive for subjects that need assessment of some kind.	Making a subject like science more general doesn't seem like a good idea when there is a "general science" subject option (or there should be). For languages, why is Latin being taken out of level 1 but left in at level 2 and 3? Seems a little counter-intuitive for subjects that need assessment of some kind.		No	I agree that it should be included but I think how it should be included needs to be looked at in more depth to ensure it's actually useful and valuable to students			2020-02-22 11:33:15	ANON-YFPW-R9XC-1	2020-02-22 11:33:15	2020-02-22 11:33:19
Yes No	I was not aware that these changes would strip students and teachers of their choice to diversify. These changes seem more about taking away choice and adding value to the 'perceived' subject for an unknown desire.	Strongly agree Strongly disagree	These changes are clearly aimed at creating a narrative that the government wants to display rather than a discussion about the well-being of students. I feel that education should have less of a political agenda, and should be more about developing future functioning members of society.	The killing of the arts is a major issue for me. Grouping all business, economics and commerce together for one really does nothing for the specialisation of any of these (I have discussed with my friends that are in these fields, and they say the earlier you can specialise the better). The killing of Classical Studies and Latin will lose key critical thinking that does not happen in History (my University History courses were nothing like the Classics paper I did, so I am not sure how these fit together?).	I think schools should be driving this, rather than the Ministry. It is clear the Ministry does not consult the schools over what is important and what works. A one-size-fits-all system is not right for New Zealand, even though we are constantly trying to say that this is not what we are doing; evidence suggests otherwise.	No No	I do not speak Te Reo.			2020-02-22 11:37:45 2020-02-22 11:47:00	ANON-YFPW-R9XA-A ANON-YFPW-R9XN-Q	2020-02-22 11:37:45 2020-02-22 11:47:00	2020-02-22 11:38:43 2020-02-22 11:47:31
Yes	I am a teacher, so I had knowledge that Level 1 was up for review. What I did not know was the criteria and requirements of how each subject was measured, and therefore why certain subjects won out against others. Was it numbers? Theories? Evidence?	Strongly disagree	As a Classical Studies teacher, my numbers have only been growing each year. So much so, that level 1 was in discussion for this year and the future. To be lumped together with History is a catastrophe as the discipline is completely different, and apart from the discussion of 'the past', the two fields do not actually have much in common. Furthermore, social media is very strongly against the removal of Latin and Classical Studies, so I would be very curious to know where your evidence has come from for these subjects to go? Looking at the subjects that are on offer, it does seem to me that easy points/credits are of more worth than challenging students. But, I am sure you have done your own research on the detriment of creating a class of people that cannot comprehend the world around them.	As above, there should have been diversification of subjects, not lumping unnatural ones together so to create a facade of assisting students. Students, by and large, love the ability to choose subjects; this gives the pride, purpose, and direction. So again, I have to ask, where do your considerations come from? What data has been used to indicate the importance of one subject over another? I also must ask, how does Māori Performing Arts work in terms of increasing literacy and Classical Studies subtract from it? I really need that part explained to me.	I would actually suggest for you to push Latin, ancient Greek, and even old English into schools (old English as a branch of English Literature). If you want an increase in literature, using languages that have given most and contributed to the English language would be key. The same can be argued for Te Reo; including a pathway for Tahitian and Cook Island Māori will give you a desired effect for increasing Te Reo literacy... but I do believe you know that, right? So, that is why I cannot see the merit in killing literacy based subject in favour of subjects to do with culture UNLESS you plan to add these (so Latin and ancient Greek being given the same merit through English, or specialist subjects like Classical Studies which is a discipline that includes language, literature, philosophy, art and architecture, and so much more).	No	This is not my field of expertise.			2020-02-22 12:02:43	ANON-YFPW-R9XK-M	2020-02-22 12:02:43	2020-02-22 12:02:52
No		Undecided	more information needed		Physical education and health should be separate courses, someone wanting to get into jobs within the health sector may not be interested in the sports that are offered in High School. The sciences should remain as separate.	No				2020-02-22 12:08:12	ANON-YFPW-R9XG-Y	2020-02-22 12:08:12	2020-02-22 12:08:23

No	As a retired teacher, I don't always keep abreast of new developments in secondary education.	Strongly disagree	There seems to be an undue emphasis on subjects of dubious intellectual and long-term value such as Dance and Performing Arts. As a former teacher of English, Latin, and Classical Studies I am disturbed by the thought of the thorough watering down of Classical Studies which will be received if amalgamated with History. Much of Classical Studies concerns art and literature rather than history anyway. It seems that the pakeha are abandoning their own whakapapa which includes the beginnings of Western Society, philosophy (Socrates) and satire (Aristophanes) among many other topics. Having taught CS for several years, I know that this subject doesn't only appeal to Caucasian students; in fact some of my most enthusiastic students were Pacific Islanders.	For me, the most disturbing aspect of these proposed curriculum changes concerns the discarding of Latin. I think this is a grave mistake. Why is this language so popular in American high schools? Because so much of English is actually derived from Latin (60% actually) which means that a knowledge of Latin helps you understand the difference in spelling and meaning between words like 'complement' and 'compliment'. A study of Latin gives students an excellent grounding in language learning - not only are the Romance languages derived from Latin but the Germanic/Scandinavian languages have an elaborate case system that is more easily mastered with a little knowledge of Latin. The grammar of English is so badly taught by English teachers today in this country that our pupils could do with at least a smattering of Latin grammar to give them a map and a pathway towards understanding their own language. The stated aim of your changes is a 'broad and foundational' education. Latin gives students a 'broad and foundational' approach to languages and language learning. Suggested change to your proposals: there may be scope for a subject called 'Language Studies' which might aim to give students an insight into the differences between Latin and an Asian language like Mandarin or a	Question: is Latin to be discarded completely or can students pick it up at Level 2? my feeling is that the MOE is finally attempting to rid themselves of a language the value of which is unfortunately only appreciated by those who have studied it.	No			2020-02-22 12:26:36	ANON-YFPW-R9XR-U	2020-02-22 12:12:10	2020-02-22 12:26:54
Yes		Strongly disagree	Teaches will have to be jack of all trades master of none, the topics will be covered with such little depth, eg rolling all the sciences into one that they may as well not be covered. In no way will this prepare students for the rigours and depth of level 2.	The blade the choice to more open the options. Most young people know whether they have an interest in a particular science, or not, by leave one, and often do not want to cover all the sciences. Putting them all together makes it harder for those with a specific goal in mind, eg budding engineering students don't need biology.	Understanding the political system, connection between govt and the community etc.	No			2020-02-22 12:32:35	ANON-YFPW-R9XW-Z	2020-02-22 12:32:35	2020-02-22 12:32:49
No		Agree				No			2020-02-22 12:33:28	ANON-YFPW-R9X4-W	2020-02-22 12:33:28	2020-02-22 12:33:36
No	But believe the move is in the right direction. There is far too much specialisation that already occurs in L1 now.	Strongly agree		A good range is included and some offer more a 'taster' for the subjects in L2 and 3 instead of being quite specific. Should appeal to students.	A Law / Legal Studies Achievement Standard based course at 2 and 3 as an option.	Yes		Again, placing more emphasis on these areas can only be a move in the right direction to create pathways for our Maori students and apply the principles of the Treaty in schools.	2020-02-22 12:54:07	ANON-YFPW-R9X3-V	2020-02-22 12:54:07	2020-02-22 12:54:26
Yes	But the proposed changes do not meet the goal of these changes ie the changes propose will not ensure "every student gets fair and equal access to the full range of possible quality pathways through NCEA and beyond."	Disagree	Why have 3 completely different subjects - eco, acc, bus become combined as one subject COMMERCE but other subjects not combined eg Geo and History are separate and not HUMANITIES or dance and drama are not combined as ARTS This proposal does not fit the criteria for the provisional subject list in particular criteria 3,4, and 5 Eco, Bus, Acc all have coherent and robust pathways into NCEA Level 2 and further study or training. Eco, Bus, Acc contribute to supporting schools to create well designed and coherent local curricula, which support pathways for individual learners. Eco, Bus Acc are highly demanded subjects and the sector does have the capability to deliver the individual subject. Student numbers in NZ for each of these individual subjects are higher than many other subjects which are proposed to be stand alone subjects.	Where is Financial Capabilities? - read the NZ Curriculum for reasons why this should be included as a subject Three large subjects (based on no. of students currently and historically taking these subjects) being combined into one does not seem equitable when compared with other subjects that are individual subjects. eg Geo and History are separate and not HUMANITIES or dance and drama are not combined as ARTS Eco, Bus, Acc all have coherent and robust pathways into NCEA Level 2 and further study or training. (meets criteria - criteria 3 not met Eco, Bus, Acc contribute to supporting schools to create well designed and coherent local curricula, which support pathways for individual learners. - criteria 4 not met Eco, Bus Acc are highly demanded subjects and the sector does have the capability to deliver the individual subject - criteria 5. Student numbers in NZ for each of these individual subjects are higher than many other subjects which are proposed to be stand alone subjects.	Financial Capabilities Do not combine eco, bus, acc at Levels 2 or 3	No			2020-02-22 12:56:29	ANON-YFPW-R9X2-U	2020-02-22 12:56:29	2020-02-22 12:56:42
Yes		Agree		I am a little worried to see Home Economics possibly going to Food Science. Currently, the home economics curriculum includes the fabric/clothing curriculum as well. Food science sounds like this will not still include the clothing component???	See above	No			2020-02-22 12:56:38	ANON-YFPW-R9XU-X	2020-02-22 12:56:38	2020-02-22 12:56:50

Yes		Agree		I am wondering what Food Science would 'look like'. Currently we offer Home Economics underpinned by the Health and PE curriculum and Technology focused standards from the Technology curriculum. Are students still going to be offered both pathways for assessment or are they going to integrate both curricula? The Health and PE and Technology curricula are quite different pathways. If students need to do a combination of both at Level 3 does this give them enough knowledge for Level 2?		No			2020-02-22 13:02:53	ANON-YFPW-R9BY-C	2020-02-22 13:02:53	2020-02-22 13:03:05
No		Disagree	Do not agree with combining Health and Physical Education	As above		No			2020-02-22 13:05:10	ANON-YFPW-R9BV-9	2020-02-22 13:05:10	2020-02-22 13:05:22
Yes		Strongly agree				No			2020-02-22 13:11:06	ANON-YFPW-R9BS-6	2020-02-22 13:11:06	2020-02-22 13:11:14
Yes	I had a vague idea that this was the intent?	Agree	I think this proposal works well. Streamlining these subjects into general subjects under one main title would work well for students as well as for parents to understand. I am in favour of this proposal. I would like to see the technology proposals and hope these would be more specialised similar to the Arts.	Although the proposed dropping of Latin needs to be reviewed. This is a language that underpins most modern languages. It is a living language (although small). I would hope to see this maintained at level 2 and 3.	Technology subjects need to be added.	No	I will need to know more about this aspect. Very keen to.	I would like to see Maori as a general subject be incorporated into English the Arts and Sciences as a general subject of study.	2020-02-22 13:11:35	ANON-YFPW-R9B8-B	2020-02-22 13:11:35	2020-02-22 13:11:49
No		Undecided	With the proposal to combine Economics, Accounting and Business Studies at Level 1. 1. Careful consideration will need to be made to the Level 2 courses to make up for essential necessary learning now foregone in Level 1. And the same for level 3 to make up for missed content in Level 2 (replaced by level one work). 2. For smaller schools it will give students to "get a taste" of all 3 subjects than if they had to specialise in one or two subjects from level one, But all three subjects will probably not be available as a pathway at level 2. 3. Some teachers are not qualified in all 3 subject areas, so combining into one will result in some teachers teaching outside their specialist teaching subjects.	There should be inclusion of Financial Capabilities as a subject area rather than just left in "Core Generic" domain. Essential learning and skills required by all people (but easier to learn as students). Some schools already offer challenging, informative and meaningful learning experiences in this area with full year courses at Levels 1,2 and 3. All levels offer graded Unit Standards at Achieved, Merit and Excellence levels. Financial Capabilities is a far more useful and meaningful Subject than many on the proposed list! Should be included on the list definitely!	As above There should be inclusion of Financial Capabilities as a subject area rather than just left in "Core Generic" domain. Essential learning and skills required by all people (but easier to learn as students). Some schools already offer challenging, informative and meaningful learning experiences in this area with full year courses at Levels 1,2 and 3. All levels offer graded Unit Standards at Achieved, Merit and Excellence levels. Financial Capabilities is a far more useful and meaningful Subject than many on the proposed list! Should be included on the list definitely!	No			2020-02-22 13:13:35	ANON-YFPW-R9BC-P	2020-02-22 13:09:11	2020-02-22 13:13:49
No	No idea subjects would be collapsed to single general subject eg eco, Accounting, bus studies to Commerce	Disagree	Disagree collapsing of subjects	Do not like Collapsing of eco, acc and bus st into Commerce		No			2020-02-22 13:21:10	ANON-YFPW-R9B9-C	2020-02-22 13:21:10	2020-02-22 13:21:29
No	If I didn't belong to a subject association who drew my attention to this - I would not have known.	Agree		Media Studies should be included. This will not be well served by Social Studies and in fact will get lost under that umbrella. Creative subjects need those early years to bed in the kinds of skill level required so that students can go on to create innovative work in the senior levels.	The Arts are pivotal to learning and developing the key competencies. It is my hope that MoE will continue to demonstrate value of the Arts by developing all 4 Arts disciplines into Level 2/3	No			2020-02-22 13:23:55	ANON-YFPW-R9BG-T	2020-02-22 13:23:55	2020-02-22 13:24:09
Yes		Strongly agree	NCEA must be streamlined to reduce the workload for both teachers and students.	Keep the status quo for Level 1 Accounting, Economics and Business Studies. Each subject is very specialised and students need a solid foundation from Level 1 in order to succeed at Levels 2 and 3. The numbers for these subjects are large and continue to increase or stabilise each year, reducing the subject to just "Commerce" would impact on teacher and department numbers, resulting in teacher layoffs. There are many other reasons as I am sure other business teachers will state on this questionnaire. Please do not merge the subject.	Financial Literacy. This needs to include budgeting, insurance, kiwisaver, savings, debt reduction, home ownership etc.	No			2020-02-22 13:36:44	ANON-YFPW-R9BJ-W	2020-02-22 13:36:44	2020-02-22 13:36:53
Yes		Disagree	I believe that by bringing individual subjects into more overall categories e.g. Science and commerce will make the stress of choosing subjects in L2 and L3 even harder. On average you take 6 subjects in L1, 6 in L2 and 5 in L3. The proposed idea is that in L1 you would now be learning 3 sciences and 3 commerce subjects, 2 history subjects and 3 social studies subjects, for example. In year 12 it makes it harder to choose what specialised subjects to choose as by exploring more opportunities in L1 you might not know what you want to do in L2.	Lots of the subjects that would now be brought under overall titles e.g. Psychology, media studies and business studies are not always not at schools. So teachers would have to learn about these subjects to then teach them in class with the internals based on the above subjects in the new overall subjects. However i really like the name food science rather than home ec.		No			2020-02-22 13:37:29	ANON-YFPW-R9BQ-4	2020-02-22 13:37:29	2020-02-22 13:37:44
No		Undecided	As a Psychology teacher, I am concerned about the move from being a stand alone subject to being merged with social studies.	I feel that psychology at level 1 would be completely lost in the social studies context and it provides a good foundation for level 2 and 3 psychology.	No	No			2020-02-22 13:37:43	ANON-YFPW-R9BE-R	2020-02-22 13:37:43	2020-02-22 13:37:52

Yes		Agree	I have reservations about Food Science and Processing Technology being combined. They have previously been each very different from the other - one nutrition centred, the other process and development focused. At this point the combining of the two doesn't not make sense. It would be helpful to know what the proposed content for this subjects is. While the name Food Science might be considered to have more kudos than the age old 'Home Economics'; it does not imply nutrition, and this is of concern. Processing technologies is great for developing an inquiring mind and the ability to make informed decisions, and shape future entrepreneurs - for a few - where as Home Economics / Food Science is the source of sound nutritional knowledge and understanding needed by every one. Or is Food Science not going to include nutrition?	As above; nutritional knowledge is extremely important in an age of increasing obesity - and the proposal (minus detail) suggests that processing will be at the forefront and nutrition will sit as an 'add on'. This does not make sense. Do the decision makers understand each of these subjects within their current learning areas? Possibly not? The new Food Science must not erase the strong nutrition focus which is currently Home Economics.	I would hope that Home Economics or Food Science will continue to be in the curriculum. Which ever genre they take, such subjects provide excellent vocational pathways to university and other nutrition based tertiary programs.	No			2020-02-22 13:39:18	ANON-YFPW-R9B5-8	2020-02-22 13:39:18	2020-02-22 13:39:31
Yes	I agree with this - there has been too much content missed at level 1 under the current system which starts to restrict students options at later levels.	Strongly agree			Financial literacy - this is often taught in an ad hoc way over a number of different curriculum areas. I believe these are important life skills and would fit well at Level 2 as a stand alone subject.	No			2020-02-22 14:07:17	ANON-YFPW-R9B7-A	2020-02-22 14:07:17	2020-02-22 14:07:39
Yes		Strongly disagree	This is the trashing of what is actually a fairly clear system. I am not the only person who will see this this way.	I have taught overseas and here in New Zealand (I am tertiary) and the awareness in the students fostered by the Latin, Classics, and Art History (the latter two especially) has led to students who were able to build of a foundation to understand key issues in both politics, western culture and art. We should preserve this. The students have a levels of mental agility that have been honed by their earlier experiences.	no.	Yes			2020-02-22 14:15:53	ANON-YFPW-R9B5-F	2020-02-22 14:15:53	2020-02-22 14:16:06
No		Strongly disagree	Classical Studies is a subject in it's own right, and should not be lumped in with History! The content and concepts vary hugely.	Latin should stay. It is an important language that students should have access to!	Ancient History. It does not fit with either Classics or History, and is a subject that I believe would get great uptake from students.	No			2020-02-22 14:16:02	ANON-YFPW-R9B1-4	2020-02-22 14:16:02	2020-02-22 14:16:37
Yes		Strongly disagree	I believe that Level 1 individual sciences prepare the proper background for learners required for specialisation at Levels 2 & 3			No			2020-02-22 14:28:56	ANON-YFPW-R9B2-D	2020-02-22 14:28:56	2020-02-22 14:29:09
No	I expected the MoE to have developed a better understanding of the current system and applied a sensible and fair approach to the review. I am struggling to understand how we can deliver a world class curriculum for our akonga with the new suggestions for science.	Strongly disagree	Removing Standards in science reduces the range and breadth of assessment opportunities and narrows the curriculum. There has been limited research and consultation prior to making the changes to NCEA. Consultation with many of our akonga with a wide range of learning needs categorically stated that they valued the range of assessments NCEA gave but wanted to reduce the workload in subjects. Teachers also wanted reduced workload. The change does it address this.	Separate biology, chemistry, physics and ESS standards which offer a broad, robust range of assessment opportunities. This also includes the ability to sit an external standard which tests knowledge. Testing content helps to develop cognitive as well as meta cognitive capabilities as part of a rich range of assessment standards. The RAS is very disappointing.	Separate sciences and ESS.	Yes			2020-02-22 14:40:39	ANON-YFPW-R9B8-U	2020-02-22 14:40:39	2020-02-22 14:40:59
Yes	And totally agree that a broad foundation is a good start for students at 15yrs old.	Strongly agree	I'm happy to see some innovative thinking	As a Social Scientist my belief is that Classics and Psychology are difficult and should be specialised at an older age level. Commerce needs improvement in teaching. Making it broader at Y11 is a good start to improvement.	Why is it necessary to have so many? University is where learners can expand into various specialist subjects. Schools should be working towards expanding critical thinking skills. As a Social Scientist those subjects with a huge critical thinking set, ie, History, Social Studies and Geography are enough to maintain student interest in the Humanities. The subject list at the top look full enough. Perhaps some time for personalised or project based learning would allow for students to specialise.	Yes	But not hugely familiar enough to comment.		2020-02-22 14:46:32	ANON-YFPW-R9B8-M-2	2020-02-22 14:41:59	2020-02-22 14:46:36

Yes		Strongly disagree	As an HOD of science and senior chemistry teacher I am of the opinion that there is nothing wrong with the current structure and content of the standards available. How individual schools and teachers approach the way they package and teach the content is probably the biggest issue. The loss of formal external exams at level 1 will have serious consequences for senior sciences. The ministry is making huge assumptions that teachers are not contextualising their curriculum content into "real world" contexts. Portfolios will just allow teachers with limited skills and understanding in certain areas to avoid teaching essential skills and content. Another factor I don't think has been considered is the impact these changes will have on the resources level 1 science currently has access to. The online and print resources that have been developed over the years have finally reach a quality that supports teaching and learning to a very high level. All these companies will have to start from scratch during which time teachers will have limited resources to support the new standards. These changes are going to have huge impacts on teacher and HOD work load. Overall I obviously support the ministry wanting to tackle issues around numeracy, literacy and individual achievement levels as well the focus on the nature of science but the issue is not with the standards, it is with certain schools inability to effectively deliver the			Yes				2020-02-22 14:59:31	ANON-YFPW-R9BB-N	2020-02-22 14:41:10	2020-02-22 14:59:43
No		Agree		As long as they dont disappear its fine. For example, if Classical studies was actively included in each year 11 history course then students may choose it in year 12 or 13.		No				2020-02-22 15:06:29	ANON-YFPW-R9BD-Q	2020-02-22 15:06:29	2020-02-22 15:06:37
Yes		Strongly disagree	Making Classical Studies part of the History syllabus will weaken the subject and is one step away from what has happened to Latin.	See above		No				2020-02-22 15:20:33	ANON-YFPW-R9BX-B	2020-02-22 15:20:33	2020-02-22 15:20:41
Yes		Agree		I believe that having Biology in level 1 should be an option for those who find the natural world studies more intuitive than chemistry and Science. I believe that having Art history should be mandatory as part of the visual arts subject - from experience I believe that the students would benefit from a more thorough understanding of art, through a deeper understanding of previous artists works.		No				2020-02-22 15:28:03	ANON-YFPW-R9BA-M	2020-02-22 15:28:03	2020-02-22 15:28:16
No		Strongly agree	We shouldnt have level 1 anyway. This is adding fodder to teachers who previously would not have wanted to ditch level 1 to get rid of it. I fully support getting rid of level 1 so very pleased with this move	Politics and legal studies achievement standards	Politics and legal studies achievement standards	No				2020-02-22 15:29:17	ANON-YFPW-R9BN-1	2020-02-22 15:29:17	2020-02-22 15:29:26
Yes	And I think what has happened to Science at level 1 is appalling. Level 2 and 3 cannot be specialist without some segway into them; different schools in different areas will have different emphasis and it would also depend so much on the teacher interests/specialism. Some broad balanced Science course with some well defined CONTENT is essential exposure for students not carrying on with Science as well as for those who do. Report writing on concepts that are above that curriculum level of understanding (e.g. potential dangers of 5G) will not help our students to become Scientifically literate. And the loss of ability to make a decent course drawing from Science and individual Science standards will make us less able to meet the needs of OUR students.	Undecided	Silly question - hence my undecided answer as unwilling to strongly agree and give weight to the stats. Yes, strongly agree they should be aligned with the NZC but they should not be twisted to just reflect certain cherry picked aspects of it. Surely a broader and possibly shallower treatment of NZC level 6 in Science is better than focusing on fake news and Social Science and local solutions to global issues in terms of setting up our students to be more Scientifically literate i.e. KNOW some stuff so they can think critically about it, as well as better preparing the large number of students who carry on with L2 and L3 Sciences.	I am horrified at what you have done to Science at level 1. Why does Ag Hort survive? I am not surprised you have dropped the separate Sciences but am appalled at the manipulation of numbers to back this up! So many of us have courses that use Science and Chemistry and Physics standards - with the CONTENT and SKILLS we feel are essential for well rounded individuals as well as for an introduction to Level 2 and 3. We design courses to meet the needs of our students. It's almost like 'you' are trying to destroy STEM and future Scientists and Doctors etc in NZ. Why are history and geography separate? Why not make them part of "Social Studies". They are as similar or dissimilar as Chemistry and Biology.	I want to know your plans for Level 2 and 3 in the individual Science subjects. It's all back to front. Sort out L3 and work backwards - then we will know what we need at Level 1. I would like to see a Level 2 Science course that was not just Earth and Space Science; One that would meet the needs of Level 2 Science Students wanting to study Science but not as specialised as the individual Sciences.	No	And, this is going to sound racist anyway and you will ignore it I am sure, BUT we are a multicultural country. While happy to incorporate as much language and Māori content by use of examples (as I would examples from China or Germany as appropriate), I am concerned that, especially in Science, the curriculum has been 'reimagined' to fit the view of some on the	I think you might mean question 5.....	2020-02-22 15:35:46	ANON-YFPW-R9BK-X	2020-02-22 15:35:46	2020-02-22 15:35:56	
Yes	Information gleaned through the media. IE radio	Strongly disagree	You are penalizing students who have a strength and passion for subjects that you are removing.	Media studies, needs to be included. Students are constantly analysing their world through a range of media platforms, arm them with the tools to understand and interpret how the world is being portrayed to them. It is unbelievable in this day and age you are considering removing this subject.	Media studies	No				2020-02-22 15:48:53	ANON-YFPW-R9B6-9	2020-02-22 15:48:15	2020-02-22 15:49:05
Yes		Strongly disagree				No				2020-02-22 15:49:27	ANON-YFPW-R9BR-5	2020-02-22 15:49:27	2020-02-22 15:49:36

Yes		Undecided	Technology is still an idea looking for a reality. What does "Food Science" really mean? Is it a science? then put it under Science. Is it technology? then put it under Technology. Whatever happened to fabric and fashion design? Terrific future pathways if these are taught with flair and imagination.	Partly covered above. I would have thought that Maori Performing Arts would either be covered in the Te Reo teaching, or could/should be covered in Dance and/or Drama. I foresee issues with finding enough trained, qualified and registered teachers for this area. Why do we still persist with Religious studies as a separate subject? Comparative religion fits perfectly into a Social Studies framework. Too easy for this subject to become a platform for proselytizing, which is not what state education is about. Latin is presumably going because of numbers? It is valuable and challenging for a minority - can we really not afford it?	Make sure Art History, Classical Studies and Media Studies are included. They are very rewarding for a great number of students. Tourism/hospitality, if it's not already there.	No				2020-02-22 16:08:28	ANON-YFPW-R9BW-A	2020-02-22 16:08:28	2020-02-22 16:09:07
Yes		Strongly disagree	Science becoming a single subject is worrisome. My personal experience is that students do better at years 12 and 13 in specific science subjects (Biology, Chemistry, Physics, Planet Earth and Beyond) when taught by specialist teachers at year 11. The skills required to do well in Biology are very different to the ones you would need to do well in Physics. Physics teachers don't necessarily understand or teach Biology content well and vice versa. The end result is less quality teaching and learning for the students.	Science becoming a single subject is worrisome. My personal experience is that students do better at years 12 and 13 in specific science subjects (Biology, Chemistry, Physics, Planet Earth and Beyond) when taught by specialist teachers at year 11. The skills required to do well in Biology are very different to the ones you would need to do well in Physics. Physics teachers don't necessarily understand or teach Biology content well and vice versa. The end result is less quality teaching and learning for the students. It is also important to note the gap of knowledge and skill is significant between year 11 and year 12 in all science subjects. This would only worsen the situation in my opinion. I strongly believe the science subjects should remain split at year 11.	No	No				2020-02-22 16:16:30	ANON-YFPW-R9B4-7	2020-02-22 16:16:30	2020-02-22 16:16:43
Yes	It will only be supporting a broad foundation Education if level 1 students do more than they do at the moment. In the UK they used to do 10 to 12 subjects at this level over two years, year 10 and 11 then specialise at yr 12 and 13. To give a broad base to education all students should do a wider range 1 from each learning area.	Agree	I believe that Performing Arts could have been combined Drama, Dance, Event and entertainment technology, and Maori Performing Arts could be combined with Student able to choose one or two specialties. Level 1 to 3 Event and Entertainment Technology (Set design costume makeup lighting etc) should never have been split from NZQA to Skills Active all foundation subjects to level 3 in high schools should stay with the same provider. External providers can take over from level 4 or offer specialist introductory complementary courses.	Event and Entertainment technology should be included in Performing Arts see above	Philosophy should be added as a discrete subject with Religious Education level 2 and 3 it is very important to Gifted and Talented courses.	No				2020-02-22 16:18:35	ANON-YFPW-R9BT-7	2020-02-22 16:18:35	2020-02-22 16:19:04
Yes	Yes however I disagree with this for all students. Some advanced students are ready for much more than a foundation level course at this level. Offering something for all learners should be a priority or clever kids will leave for schools that offer another course.	Strongly disagree	Why are some subjects kept and others amalgamated? Latin is important for students going on in medical fields, those with a love of language and words. Why is this option removed however Tongan kept? How do you justify this? Why keep dance and pe? Isn't dance just a part of pe? If you can keep these as two subjects, why would you even consider removing physics, biology and chemistry. History, geography and social studies kept as single subjects. This is so inconsistent!	Please see above. I am incensed however that the flexibility of NCEA to choose standards that suit students is removed. As an employer, I also want to know there is consistency between students so if they have competed a standard, I know what content they have covered. These new standards seem to do away with content. That is of concern to me. Also a lack of exam means that all grades are not necessarily equitable.		No				2020-02-22 16:27:55	ANON-YFPW-R9B3-6	2020-02-22 16:27:55	2020-02-22 16:28:06
Yes		Agree		As a recently retired Visual Art teacher with 41 years behind me, I am concerned at the mathematics continued inclusion of statistics. Traditionally Mathematics departments and teachers are strong and passionate (as they should be) about their subject area, but as a teacher of Design and Sculpture at higher level, I always found that students ability to derive their basic solutions to problems in logistics or construction, to be markedly simplistic, weak and often non-existent. Consequently my wish would remove statistics at level 1 to allow focus on purely practical and "daily" used understandings. There is in my experience a great need for knowledge of simple maths processes, and statistics is a narrowing that could be left as L2.	In most schools of the past, technical (physical) processes were seen as a "given", and students participating were given an awareness of the practical world they live in. As an educator since the 70's I have seen a reversal in students' abilities to deal with the practical world in which they live. Recognition is given here to the financial restraints that schools deal with and therefore practical activities and materials are at a premium. In todays schools I hear constantly of students worry that they cannot "do anything for themselves". This is a general area - specialisation in "plumbing" or "construction" is not necessarily the aim, but there is a vast number of students who feel bereft of those skills that "grandpa" had, and quietly wish that they could get them at school, but realise that its just not out there.	Yes				2020-02-22 16:27:59	ANON-YFPW-R9B2-5	2020-02-22 16:27:59	2020-02-22 16:28:17

No		Strongly disagree	I feel like subjects for example Media studies is so core in a students education. It subjects like these that allow students to get a deeper understanding And love of media and creating their own view of media rather than taking it for what it is. If these changes were to happen students would slowly not care and crucial subjects like these would die out. Students need more choice rather than demanded subjects. They should be able to choose their education based on their strengths and likes other wise they will struggle as developing students. Every child is different. every child is unique. Every child deserves to learn what they want to learn. Choice is key to a deeper education.		Yes			2020-02-22 16:29:49	ANON-YFPW-R9BU-8	2020-02-22 16:29:49	2020-02-22 16:30:02
No		Disagree			No			2020-02-22 16:33:43	ANON-YFPW-RB6Y-9	2020-02-22 16:33:43	2020-02-22 16:33:53
No		Agree		Why is Religious Studies included? Has no basis in fact and has no place being taught as part of the school curriculum. Parents and churches can teach this if they choose	Personal financial management	No		2020-02-22 16:33:52	ANON-YFPW-RB6V-6	2020-02-22 16:33:52	2020-02-22 16:34:03
No		Strongly agree			No			2020-02-22 16:36:21	ANON-YFPW-RB6C-K	2020-02-22 16:36:21	2020-02-22 16:36:35
No	Some of the subject changes are very out of the blue - Science is often run as general Science at L1 despite the specialisation of assessments, but combining Health and PE is a terrible idea	Strongly disagree	Health and PE should not be together. They appeal to very different kids for very different reasons. I worry that the need to keep practical front and centre as it should be to meet the needs of PE students we will be doing a disservice to the types of students who have a passion for Health and wellbeing and greatly benefit from this knowledge, but have bad experiences/health/injuries that prevent them from enjoying physical activity. I know many of our LGBTQI+ kids find Health incredibly important and the learning there suits their wellbeing needs. They would disengage from the learning and honestly very few would select the subject if there was a practical element (look at the Out on the Field data - these types of kids are not yet feeling safe in PE classes and this is not going to help with that). It is going to marginalise Health if we are not combining performing arts or materials technologies then why health and PE? Different skills, different skill sets, different career paths, different learners, different skills needed in the teachers - this doesn't make sense.	Food Science? Is this going to have links to the Science, Technology or HPE curriculum? It seems odd to remove it from the AD' s it builds itself on? At a time where diabetes, obesity and food excess are major issues we are moving AWAY from teaching about food in relation to it's impact on Hauora? We are ignoring the links between creation, supply and consumption of food within socio-ecological perspectives? This seems incredibly counterintuitive. Shouldn't we be increasing the focus on wellbeing through strengthening Health education and Home Economics instead of hiding them in other more overpowering subjects to get lost along the way?		Yes	Only in passing, haven't sat down to read it in a few years	2020-02-22 16:39:58	ANON-YFPW-RB6S-3	2020-02-22 16:39:58	2020-02-22 16:40:14
No		Strongly disagree	This does not address the original concerns of over assessment. Now we have different ones. Teacher anxiety in my subject has not been alleviated but has, in fact been worsened.	Food Science does not reflect the learning needs of my students at level 1. We are not following a Technology programme but a programme based on the Health and PE curriculum pathway. This is not supporting Home Economics. We have underpinning concepts of Wellbeing, Social Justice, Socio cultural and Socio economics. None of which are traditional 'science'. I am hoping level 2 will still be Home Economics and not Technology. Food Studies may be a better name and a wide range of approaches to meet the needs of our learners.		No	Only have a little understanding.	2020-02-22 16:46:57	ANON-YFPW-RB68-8	2020-02-22 16:46:57	2020-02-22 16:47:23
Yes		Strongly disagree		The disintegration of Art History, Classics and Media Studies, I strongly disagree with. Particularly Media Studies: we have a diverse and rapidly growing film industry in New Zealand, which creates an excellent future job market in this field? Why would we get rid of a subject key to an expanding industry? I took both Art History and History in school through to year 13 level and learnt dramatically different material in each, and while I enjoyed both, the crossover between Art History and philosophy is something that I've found really useful in later life both in university study and in general for having a well rounded perspective of the world. I would have been devastated if the two subjects had merged when I was at school because I loved both of them and they seemed to have very little in common aside from both being essay based? Pythagorus also came up with his theory in the past, does this mean Maths should be covered in History exclusively now?		No		2020-02-22 16:49:26	ANON-YFPW-RB69-9	2020-02-22 16:49:26	2020-02-22 16:49:41
Yes		Undecided				No		2020-02-22 16:59:08	ANON-YFPW-RB6G-Q	2020-02-22 16:59:08	2020-02-22 16:59:25

Yes	I was aware that there was a review but not necessarily the detail of the review.	Strongly disagree	As a Latin and Classics student I am concerned that the Ministry does not appear to value the Humanities as much as STEM.	As a student who has just completed L1 Latin, it has been good to have my study over the past 4 years assessed externally. This means that I am confident going into L2, and that I have the required level of understanding to start study at L2. Latin has also helped me in so many other subjects, particularly in English and Spanish. My grasp of English grammar has improved enormously. I think it is a huge mistake to deny current Latin students the opportunity to sit the L1 exams. I also believe the Classics should be a separate subject to History. The study of Classics is a different type of History to the normal History curriculum. Classics doesn't just cover factual events. Classics students learn about how our modern world was formed from the ancient world. These simply would not be enough teaching time in a combined L1 History class to cover the detail needed to gain the level of understanding L2	No	Yes			2020-02-22 17:17:04	ANON-YFPW-RB6J-T	2020-02-22 17:17:04	2020-02-22 17:17:53
No		Agree	I think it's great that home economics and processing technology are going to be merged into food science.	No	No	No			2020-02-22 17:21:52	ANON-YFPW-RB6Q-1	2020-02-22 17:21:52	2020-02-22 17:22:16
Yes		Agree			A pathway for students with special needs within the mainstream school setting needs to be thought through. A large number of these students are not able to sit exams hence the need to have assessments in class, possibly through a specialised stream. At present schools are having to purchase this material from companies. Should this not be available from The Ministry, at a cost, then making certain the standard is maintained.	No			2020-02-22 17:36:24	ANON-YFPW-RB6E-N	2020-02-22 17:32:54	2020-02-22 17:36:37
No		Strongly disagree		Keep subjects separate.	Not sure.	No			2020-02-22 18:12:01	ANON-YFPW-RB6S-5	2020-02-22 18:12:01	2020-02-22 18:12:23
Yes		Agree		I really don't understand how media studies fits within the scope of social studies...?! However, I don't imagine the reasoning for dumping it in within another subject is due to very few students taking it as a specific subject at Level 1...e.g. any school I've taught at only offers it from Level 2 or only even Level 3 (same with Art history and Classics) so as long as they are offered as individual subjects at higher levels of NCEA I can't see it having a drastic effect on subjects and teaching roles.	Would you consider moving the taonga pūoro from unit standards to achievement standards?	No			2020-02-22 18:40:35	ANON-YFPW-RB6P-Z	2020-02-22 18:40:35	2020-02-22 18:40:45
No		Undecided		Food Science as a replacement for Home Economics has disregarded the strong health aspect of the Home Economics standards. This is a shame considering societal well-being is largely reflective of how people nourish themselves. Given we are in the midst of an obesity and diabetes epidemic, Food and Nutrition needs to be at the forefront of any food related studies.		No			2020-02-22 18:45:35	ANON-YFPW-RB67-7	2020-02-22 18:45:35	2020-02-22 18:45:57
Yes		Agree		Ok with this at Level 1. Level 2 will need more introductory material that is often done in the specialised sciences at Level one.	All sciences now at level one occur at level.	Yes	Some		2020-02-22 18:48:22	ANON-YFPW-RB6F-P	2020-02-22 18:48:22	2020-02-22 18:48:35
Yes		Strongly agree				Yes			2020-02-22 18:54:12	ANON-YFPW-RB61-1	2020-02-22 18:54:12	2020-02-22 18:54:22
Yes	But not to the extent that Classical studies would be dropped at level one. That is quite mind blowing to me.	Strongly disagree		Eliminating classics at level one is ludicrous. I am a supporter of religious studies but that does not provide the same appeal to all students. Classics as a discipline is multi disciplinary in itself and incorporates art, mythology, history, textual studies- is that not what the changes are aiming for? So why eliminate a subject that does just that. It allows students to connect and compare Maori creation mythology and belief systems to that of Greek and Roman. To cut a subject that demands academia and a high level of critical thinking across a range of aspects is mind blowing and disappointing.	Gender studies.	Yes			2020-02-22 19:02:52	ANON-YFPW-RB6Z-A	2020-02-22 19:02:52	2020-02-22 19:03:30
Yes		Undecided		I would like to see Latin and Psychology available.	Music - needs to be more thorough and go deeper with more composition options.	Yes	No		2020-02-22 19:05:20	ANON-YFPW-RB6H-R	2020-02-22 19:05:20	2020-02-22 19:05:34
No		Strongly disagree	Why no Classics, but the inclusion of Religious Studies? And what is deemed Religion? Will it include Islam, Bhuddism, Hinduism?	As above	Tikanga Maori	Yes			2020-02-22 19:13:26	ANON-YFPW-RB6M-W	2020-02-22 19:13:26	2020-02-22 19:13:34

Yes		Strongly disagree		Science-Doing a closed book NCEA external exam actually builds students' resilience/perseverance/attitude/skills towards revision/exams and gives a good picture of how they would do in level 2 external exams. Furthermore, the external standards (be they from level 1 science and/or level 1 bio/chem/physics) build a strong foundational knowledge without which they would struggle with level 2 specialised subjects. (eg mechanics from sci L1, carbon chem from chem L1 and genetic variation from sci L1 etc builds a strong foundation for level 2 physics, chemistry and bio). Hence these options should be available for schools to combine with the proposed new standards for planning a level 1 science course to cater for different abilities of students.		No			2020-02-22 19:13:26	ANON-YFPW-RB6B-J	2020-02-22 19:13:26	2020-02-22 19:13:35
Yes	I can't think of any subjects which could provide a broader foundation to increasingly specialised knowledge than Latin or Classics, through all levels of NCEA levels, university, and beyond. Without the rich acquaintance with these subjects provided from NCEA Level 1 onward, it is difficult for any student to attain a command of the scientific and legal vocabulary which is vital to serious practitioners in the medical, scientific, technological, juristic, or political fields, or a deep understanding and appreciation for the heritage of Greece and Rome which inform our democratic freedoms and Humanities. For 2000 years, Latin and Classics have constituted a solid core to the education system which continues to provide a basis and wellspring to the Western civilisation which still forms the primary heritage for most of this country's population: the civilisation which has made this Western democracy one of most advanced and prosperous in the world and a primary drawcard for immigrants.	Strongly disagree		We have plenty of gifted people eager to teach and learn Latin and Classics in this country. The relentless creep of mediocrity and mundanisation is the only obstacle which denies them more opportunities. Te Tiriti o Waitangi provides a basis for biculturalism in Aotearoa New Zealand. Why is it that Latin and Classics, indubitable taonga for the Pakeha side of the equation, must be marginalised? The principle of partnership dictates that neither party loses out, which is what would inevitably happen if the intelligent youth of this country were culturally impoverished by a deprivation of the Great Works of Western civilisation at a high level. Only last week I was speaking with a number of young people and older ladies who lamented their denial of opportunity to take Latin at school. When I look at any of the other Western democracies with which Aotearoa customarily ranks itself, I can't envisage another government taking such a seriously philistine step as to abolish school Latin or Classics. These are still highly regarded as foundational academic subjects by the world's top-ranked universities, here and overseas.		Yes			2020-02-22 20:17:19	ANON-YFPW-RB6D-M	2020-02-22 19:50:46	2020-02-22 20:17:38
Yes	It is difficult to understand how changes at level 1 will effect level 2 or 3. A big picture would generate more meaningful understanding and suggestions.	Strongly disagree	Offering less to our students just limits the opportunities to differentiate for our learners. NZ school have such a diverse mixture of learners and needs. Limiting what we offer them seems like it will disadvantage our tamariki.	Health/PE - NZ has serious mental health and physical health issues why would we limit standards offered to students at the risk of potentially limiting the education they get around these vital issues. Sciences - Science is a vital part of any students education and builds future health professionals (and many other professionals) which our country has a massive shortage in. Why would we limit the education that students can get in Science at level one by removing Bio/Chem/Physics/ESS standards. Also by removing these subjects and their standards we are removing opportunities to differentiate their courses and engage students in what ever science is the most relevant to them.	No, but a big picture of all levels would be much more useful than a step by step approach.	No			2020-02-22 20:24:14	ANON-YFPW-RB6X-8	2020-02-22 20:24:14	2020-02-22 20:24:30
Yes		Strongly disagree				No			2020-02-22 20:28:20	ANON-YFPW-RB6A-H	2020-02-22 20:28:20	2020-02-22 20:28:27
Yes		Strongly agree			Classical studies	Yes			2020-02-22 20:31:10	ANON-YFPW-RB6N-X	2020-02-22 20:31:10	2020-02-22 20:31:17
Yes		Undecided				Yes			2020-02-22 21:27:37	ANON-YFPW-RB6E-6	2020-02-22 21:27:37	2020-02-22 21:27:42
Yes		Undecided	Will the broader approach properly prepare students for level 2 specialisation? How do you ensure teacher's do not focus on one area Accounting vs Economics? What are the implications for learning in year 9 and 10?	Wondering how Classics and History will work together-especially for this school's who focus on New Zealand history at level 1-and who have no interest in the classics?	Indigenous Performing Arts.	No			2020-02-22 21:45:50	ANON-YFPW-RB6R-2	2020-02-22 21:45:50	2020-02-22 21:46:02
Yes		Disagree	Where is Home Economics??? We have a massive obesity problem in New Zealand and this subject is helping to address this and we lose it. Really??? What is the government thinking? Home Economics is a world wide term and it is a specialised subject and you are giving it to PE/Health Teachers to teach? I know the government focus has been physical activity of late but this is so narrow minded, where is the Hauora, the 4 dimensions? Does the Maori curriculum teach food as a Science? I doubt it, it is important to nurture and fulfil the mind and spirit. Where does Food History stand? Not as a Science? What will intermediates teach? Food Science?	How dare you change a subject with such amazing life skills that sets students up for life. Where will be the sociology that we teach? In health? Following Otago University when they dropped the Home Science name they are now called Consumer and Applied Sciences would that not be better so we can still teach the Sociology? Why does Food Technology where they design and make food get to stay where Home Ec goes and this is where we teach students what food to cook and why for health and well being.	Bring back Home Economics	Yes			2020-02-22 21:54:56	ANON-YFPW-RB6W-7	2020-02-22 21:54:56	2020-02-22 21:55:05

Yes		Strongly disagree	I teach Classical Studies and the students especially Maori and Asian students particularly relate to the ideas and values of the Classical World. These students quickly grasp and relate to the family and community values that are taught. We compare and contrast to our modern values and they especially feel empowered and upheld and proud of their ancestral customs and values. Students, in general, love the subject and this in turn allows Maori students to feel more appreciated and important as many of values are their values.	Classical Studies is one of the most foundation subjects there is. It allows for awe and wonder, to think critically about the past and the future. Learning about the past is a necessary to predict and plan for the future. If you remove Classical Studies you remove a students ability to hang all their future knowledge. It is like making the run before they had a chance to crawl and explore. Don't do it.		No			2020-02-22 21:56:50	ANON-YFPW-RB64-4	2020-02-22 21:56:50	2020-02-22 21:57:14
Yes	I was only made aware of this change through discussion with personal friends that are currently high school teachers.	Disagree		I believe the Ministry are actually failing to see the relevance of some of the subjects they are proposing to no longer continue within the level one programme. Subjects such as media studies are extremely relevant to this generation of students as we live in a very media dominated society. While I believe it is important to show consideration and understanding toward religion and religious studies, I believe it is more important to offer subjects that are going to benefit the majority and that have the ability to aid them towards either further tertiary education or employment.	Te Waharoa.	Yes			2020-02-22 22:00:33	ANON-YFPW-RB6T-4	2020-02-22 22:00:33	2020-02-22 22:00:49
No		Strongly disagree		Appalling so many omissions and unrealistic combinations		Yes			2020-02-22 22:09:34	ANON-YFPW-RB63-3	2020-02-22 22:09:34	2020-02-22 22:09:52
Yes		Undecided				Yes			2020-02-22 22:23:22	ANON-YFPW-RB62-2	2020-02-22 22:22:01	2020-02-22 22:23:33
No		Disagree		Classical Studies and Art History should be distinct subjects, not combined with History. Classical Studies broadens the minds of young students beyond what we consider "modern history" and reaches back thousands of years to discover the foundations of modern society. It develops fundamental skills, including the ability to analyze art and literature for both meaning and form, to discuss the origins of a democratic society and its relevance today, and to identify repercussions of historic events that have continued into the present. Classical Studies deserves to be a distinct subject in its own right- to combine it with History would not do it justice.		No			2020-02-22 22:27:39	ANON-YFPW-RB6U-5	2020-02-22 22:27:39	2020-02-22 22:27:53
No		Strongly disagree	I am opposed to the idea of melding biology, chemistry, physics, and Earth and Space into Science at level 1. It is already difficult for many students make the step into L2 Physics, Chem, Bio and Earth & Space. The step is huge. With the proposed changes it will make the movement into L2 very difficult.	Although Chemistry, Physics, Biology and Earth and Space are all sciences, they are very different. I believe it would be better to have Level 1 Chem, Physics, Bio and Earth & Space and not have science achievement standards. A school could choose from these standards to form a science class.	no	No			2020-02-22 22:53:04	ANON-YFPW-RBWV-A	2020-02-22 22:53:04	2020-02-22 22:53:20
Yes		Strongly disagree	I have heard nothing about good, strong professional development for teachers to coincide with these changes. Weeks of training will be needed not just a half day of listening to speeches.			Yes			2020-02-22 22:56:14	ANON-YFPW-RBWV-7	2020-02-22 22:56:14	2020-02-22 22:56:39
No		Disagree	Classical studies is distinct from history in that its focus is studying culture, beliefs and ideas. It studies art as art and literature as literature as well as as historical objects. It shouldn't be bundled into history, but should continue to be a separate subject.	Classical studies is distinct from history in that its focus is studying culture, beliefs and ideas. It studies art as art and literature as literature as well as as historical objects. It shouldn't be bundled into history, but should continue to be a separate subject.		No			2020-02-22 23:24:13	ANON-YFPW-RBWC-M	2020-02-22 23:24:13	2020-02-22 23:24:24
No		Strongly disagree	It is a huge mistake to remove latin and classical studies as an option.	I think it would be a huge mistake to remove both Latin and classical studies as option. Classical studies is a widely different discipline from history as it encompasses an entire civilisation which had an enormous impact on the way we think. It's about people, who haven't changed that much, so you cannot teach classics without being forced to reflect on some of the most important issues facing us today. There is a reason it still inspires film makers and authors, because they see there is relevance for a modern audience. Anyone wanting to study history or english, cannot do so by ignoring this subject. Latin is also important for understanding the development of English and other languages mentioned on your list. Those lucky pupils who have the opportunity find real value in even a brief introduction.		No			2020-02-22 23:53:01	ANON-YFPW-RBWS-4	2020-02-22 23:53:01	2020-02-22 23:53:14
Yes		Disagree		As a teacher of English, I believe the proposed removal of Art History and Classical Studies to be short-sighted. Both subjects are academic in the traditional sense, contribute to a greater understanding of English literature texts, and serve to reinforce / enhance writing skills.		No			2020-02-23 00:08:19	ANON-YFPW-RBW8-9	2020-02-23 00:08:19	2020-02-23 00:08:26

No	I just heard about it on National Radio.	Undecided	I am happy about some things but not others.	I have no problem with the science changes. When I was at school in the early eighties there was only general science really although I think if you weren't that academic you could opt for biology. I don't know of anyone who did. I think it is a shame about Latin, classical studies and art history.		Yes	Sort of.			2020-02-23 00:09:01	ANON-YFPW-RBW9-A	2020-02-23 00:09:01	2020-02-23 00:09:10
Yes		Disagree	Removing Latin is a bad mistake. It's foundational for studying/understanding much western language, literature, history, and culture. It also teaches language and grammatical fluency. It is hard to understand why you would consider removing this and art history and keeping eg Tongan or Maori, which obviously have much local significance but less connection to global cultures. Keep both!	See above - you are producing a more narrowly local curriculum than seems ideal by removing subjects that connect to a global heritage of language and culture, including much of New Zealand's inheritance from a Europe. By all means include subjects deriving from indigenous peoples - a good idea- but don't polarise it into a choice to ditch connections to the old world.		No				2020-02-23 01:20:06	ANON-YFPW-RBWG-R	2020-02-23 01:20:06	2020-02-23 01:20:16
No	I am a retired teacher of Music and Latin, who taught in Auckland from 1978 - 1980, before resuming my career in the UK. I would strongly argue the case for keeping Latin in NCEA Level 1, and do not understand how it can fail the criteria. May I refer you to Teaching Classics with Technology, a new book by Steve Hunt, senior lecturer in Classics Education at Cambridge University? For 6 years, I taught Latin to year 7 (11/12 year olds) and upwards in a non-selective state secondary school, and found that this offered a strong lead for many pupils into history, other languages, interest in stories, as well as enjoying the subject for its own rewards.	Disagree		See comment under 1		No				2020-02-23 01:53:38	ANON-YFPW-RBWQ-2	2020-02-23 01:53:38	2020-02-23 01:54:00
No		Strongly disagree		Latin provides good academic grounding in workings of language and is foundation for Western world cultures	Greek Classical studies	No				2020-02-23 06:57:27	ANON-YFPW-RBW5-6	2020-02-23 06:57:27	2020-02-23 06:57:46
Yes		Agree				No				2020-02-23 07:16:48	ANON-YFPW-RBWP-1	2020-02-23 07:16:48	2020-02-23 07:17:01
Yes		Strongly agree				No				2020-02-23 07:43:39	ANON-YFPW-RBW7-8	2020-02-23 07:43:39	2020-02-23 07:43:54
No		Strongly agree	This is a logical step towards reversing our over emphasis on assessment.	Schools use subjects as a means of competition with one another, so a shift towards general breadth across the curriculum at ncea level 1 is a good move.	Outdoor education as a subject would support schools in activating the principles and values of the NZC. The development of a set of achievement standards would also support a shift away from schools who offer highly technical courses that are performance based and show little linking to the NZC. The establishment of this domain would also support the MOE's new direction towards localised curriculum as schools would be able to create a subject where contexts are centred around local environments	No				2020-02-23 07:50:20	ANON-YFPW-RBWF-Q	2020-02-23 07:47:53	2020-02-23 07:50:23
Yes		Strongly agree	I agree strongly with broadening the topics rather than encouraging specialisation at yer 11. It is great to see Maori Performing Arts given greater exposure but this will more than likely resourcing challenges,	I agree with the subject list because this is consistent with the aim of the revamped NCEA level 1 qualification. I think that the NCEA Level 1 qualification is unnecessary but I am interested to see how the qualification develops.	I am anticipating that MPA will be included and resources to level 2 and level 3.	No				2020-02-23 08:18:25	ANON-YFPW-RBW1-2	2020-02-23 08:18:25	2020-02-23 08:18:35
Yes		Disagree	I would want to see Art History included, media studies and a break down in science. There is a need for civics education with an emphasis on democracy, integrity and ethics. This should be at Level 1. It is a subject that is compulsory in some countries including America and has recently been made compulsory in Fiji. NZ is the least country in the world - would be good to keep it that way.	Art history not only builds an appreciation of the arts it gives historical context and insights to other worlds. It fosters creativity. Media studies assists with knowledge, English and critical thinking - media is also rapidly changing g and as such is hugely influencing how we think and how we behave. Look at the effect of media on democracy, extremism, social cohesion. Science, Maths, Engineering and Technology should be a focus and sunsets within them if we are to encourage these much needed skills,	Yes Critical thinking. In our workplace we require people who have critical Thinking skills and who can analyse information for veracity and context. Sadly they come out of University without that and we need to teach them how to think beyond the obvious. We also find they need history to have context. For some students data analysis would be helpful for future careers as well this could be part of a computer science /maths steam. .	Yes	Not overly familiar	There needs to be a historical component here that looks at Maori settlement - te tiriti o waitangi, contemporary claims, and Maori and the economy. If there was more knowledge we might break down the racism in this country.		2020-02-23 08:23:19	ANON-YFPW-RBW2-B	2020-02-23 08:23:18	2020-02-23 08:25:04

Yes		Agree		<p>SCIENCE: Need to make sure that there is a broad range of science at L1 - the L2/L3 content is very specialised and often needs a foundational understanding to ensure success in later years (for example - a L1 programme that focuses on biological sciences would hinder a student who wanted to study L2 Physics/Chemistry) - so standards offered need to provide a broad base.</p> <p>COMMERCE: Disappointed that Accounting has been "downplayed" due to lack of access to practical examples - especially given the lack of financial literacy in NZ at present. Refocus the standards so that basic household finances are more of a focus (borrowing/debt - interest rates, understanding invoices & statements (like bank statements, power bills), Kiwisaver, bank reconciliations, preparing loan applications (need to know what an asset / liability are) etc. would be valuable. Also - basic accounting skills are needed for people who are involved in clubs in roles such as treasurers.</p>	No - but I would like to see a continued ability to access unit standards from industry-based providers as part of the NCEA qualification at all levels as this provides another level of diversity in learning within secondary schools (e.g. the STAR unit standards that can be delivered & assessed for senior students).	No		N/A	2020-02-23 08:33:13	ANON-YFPW-RBWH-S	2020-02-23 08:33:13	2020-02-23 08:33:37
Yes		Strongly agree		Our children need to learn more life skills. Budgeting, taxes, driving/maintaining a car. We are not setting our children up for the basic of life first before we start adding in (quiet often never used) information		Yes			2020-02-23 08:33:44	ANON-YFPW-RBWB-K	2020-02-23 08:33:44	2020-02-23 08:33:56
Yes		Agree	Not sure about the watering down of accounting. The rest look fine. Adjustment of level 2&3 content is expected in some areas.	Health is still important and should be kept. The junior curriculum is now too crowded with the addition of DTE. Students typically have strong opinions on PE by the end of year 9 and making it optional would free up time for other subjects.	Robotics specialization at level 3	No			2020-02-23 08:34:21	ANON-YFPW-RBWM-X	2020-02-23 08:34:21	2020-02-23 08:34:33
Yes		Agree		The introduction of Māori performing arts is a positive and welcome addition. The removal of Classics, Art History and Latin, on the other hand, cuts off knowledge of large parts of history that have equal effect on modern day NZ. Although Classics is the study of historical society, the language, literature and art from the Ancient World is still large enough an area to remain a broad level 1 subject area, which could allow specialisation at higher levels.		No			2020-02-23 09:03:49	ANON-YFPW-RBWD-N	2020-02-23 09:02:52	2020-02-23 09:04:03
Yes	I heard about this through my school and I also attended a NCEA change workshop.	Undecided	While I think it is good to have food under one area of the curriculum, I am confused as to what this will include in terms of topics that will be taught in each standard because we haven't been given this information. It is important for NZ that nutrition (previously taught in a lot of detail under Home Economics) is still as strong, because there are a lot of nutrition concerns within NZ that young adults need to be aware of. We currently teach them tools to make change within themselves, their communities and ultimately NZ society. At the same time I would applaud any changes that will enable teachers to teach food science per se; changes that occur in food during cooking, preservation, the role of additives, gelatinisation, emulsions, etc etc. This has been missing from the curriculum for some time and is important for those students who wish to study food technology/science at university. This is an area where NZ has huge shortages. I am also wondering whether incorporating processing technologies under food science will include cookery skills (the current implement standards) It is important to recognise student cookery skills. Another confusion I have is will there be any standards under materials technology that include food in any shape or form? And where will things like brief development go???	See above.	Nutrition that includes determinants of health, wellbeing, health promotion, attitudes and values as per the New Zealand Curriculum. Food science that includes what happens to food when it is cooked, changes that occur during making of a product etc. Cookery skills.	No			2020-02-23 09:13:12	ANON-YFPW-RBW-X-9	2020-02-23 09:13:12	2020-02-23 09:13:20
Yes		Agree				No			2020-02-23 09:18:19	ANON-YFPW-RBWA-J	2020-02-23 09:18:19	2020-02-23 09:18:28
No	It had started off like this but then the headmasters of a number of more traditional schools got together and there seemed to be a big swing toward a more knowledge based approach and then when these intended changes were presented there had been a big swing back toward what was originally planned.	Strongly disagree	These changes will increase inequity and lower the outcomes for students across the board.	L1 Biology, Chemistry and Physics should be included. These are not subjects that students have been low tracked into to credit farm. The aim of stopping some students of low prior attainment being given lower expectations and credit farming from 'easier' credits has been solved by having lower credits overall. A general L1 biology standard for example would also improve the Science standards by adding content knowledge to stand along side the nature of science standards as a signal that both are important.		No			2020-02-23 09:20:24	ANON-YFPW-RBWN-Y	2020-02-23 09:20:24	2020-02-23 09:20:32

Yes		Strongly disagree	There are several subjects which are proposed to be no longer assessed but which form the foundation for higher learning at Level 2 & 3. For example in the commerce area. I am concerned that there seems to be inequity in subject rationalization with some learning areas still retaining a full range of subjects, while others seem to be severely reduced. I cannot understand why in the Science area that Agriculture and Horticulture would still operate, but all Sciences will be lumped together. What is rationale behind retaining religious studies when other Social sciences are also together? Very little rationalization seems to have happened in the Technology area			No			2020-02-23 09:41:23	ANON-YFPW-RBWK-V	2020-02-23 09:40:00	2020-02-23 09:41:34
Yes		Disagree	I disagree I with some of the changes. I also don't think the changes strengthen preparation for university, which is a major concern of mine. If anything they make students less prepared.	My main concern is the reduction in the science curriculum. If schools go that route, make the inclusion of all 4 subjects compulsory but don't lump them all together. Also, why ditch Latin?	I would like Algebra included as a separate subject along with calculus and statistics.	No			2020-02-23 09:51:51	ANON-YFPW-RBW6-7	2020-02-23 09:51:51	2020-02-23 09:52:07
Yes		Undecided	I need more information to make an informed choice or to be able to respond to this question in an intelligent way.		Schools should have the freedom to create their own subjects that are put together from approved standards. This allows schools to specialise their subjects, learning and assessment to suit the needs and opportunities that exist in their communities.	No			2020-02-23 09:52:57	ANON-YFPW-RBWR-3	2020-02-23 09:52:57	2020-02-23 09:53:16
Yes		Strongly disagree	Needs to go further: fragmenting of "Food" into Home Ec., Food Science and, I presume, Hospitality/Cookery standards administered by Service IQ is unproductive means that there is respectively: -Food issues explored in Home Ec but little actual cookery -Food functionality explored in Food Science/Technology but limited range of cookery -Hospitality/Cookery plenty of cookery, some thinking around science but little around NZ Food issues. Not sure of title but should roll Level 1 into one Food subject concentrating at least 50% on cookery and remaining time dedicated to Nutrition issues and functionality/production.	Hospitality/Cookery standards administered by Service IQ, ITD are not mentioned-I sincerely hope they are not being axed. The fact that Food Science is included in the Health and Technology learning area is a sign of fragmentation.		No			2020-02-23 09:53:35	ANON-YFPW-RBWW-8	2020-02-23 09:53:35	2020-02-23 09:53:49
No		Strongly disagree		Keeping PE and Health as there own separate subjects and not combining them		Yes			2020-02-23 10:02:38	ANON-YFPW-RBW4-5	2020-02-23 10:02:38	2020-02-23 10:03:00
Yes	Your table does not show how the increased specialisation will work as only describes the current model for specialist subjects and the new L1 subjects. With the monumental changes you are suggesting for L1, will all the current L2/3 courses still exist?	Strongly disagree	There is a complete lack of understanding about the nuances of different subjects. It is clear that MoE understand that all languages require different skills and knowledge. However there is a complete lack of understanding that the knowledge and skills required for Biology is very different to those for Physics - it seems that someone has seen "science" and has lumped them all together. This also applies to subjects like Media, where specific production skills are developed over a 3 year course. I'm quite sure it applies in other subject domains too.	There is a complete lack of understanding about the nuances of different subjects. It is clear that MoE understand that all languages require different skills and knowledge. However there is a complete lack of understanding that the knowledge and skills required for Biology is very different to those for Physics - it seems that someone has seen "science" and has lumped them all together. This also applies to subjects like Media, where specific production skills are developed over a 3 year course. I'm quite sure it applies in other subject domains too. For example, the proposals suggest that L1 Korean will neatly fold into L2/3 Korean - makes sense. But then L1 Science (which is a broad skills based course) will fold into L2/3 Biology, Chemistry, Earth and Space, Education for Sustainability AND Physics with all their specific skills and content is a nonsense. There is no parity between the offerings here.	The danger of introducing more at L2/3 is being underestimated. Already traditional subjects are being squeezed and the basic skills and understanding that these develop are being sidelined. There seems to be an idea that students can just "pick up" subjects with no prior learning at a relatively sophisticated level. Also, not sure if anyone has noticed, but there is a teacher shortage in many areas. Adding more areas is going to increase pressure on the profession, may require teachers to increase the breadth of their subject knowledge, which takes time, which increases pressure etc.	Yes	A joy of the NZC is the flexibility of offerings. The proposed changes to L1 will reduce the opportunities for schools (and so students) to study a broad range of subjects and assess them in a flexible way best suited to their learning needs.		2020-02-23 10:16:54	ANON-YFPW-RBWT-5	2020-02-23 10:16:54	2020-02-23 10:17:19

Yes	I support the principle of this change and also greatly value the improved rigor in assessments (less internal assessments) and more authenticity in the English language and numeracy credits. As a teacher these changes make sense and make the qualification more valuable.	Undecided	I'm concerned about the combination of Business, Economics and Accounting. I think it's easily possible to even remove Business Studies from level one and just teach it in level 2 & 3. However, I think it's very difficult to combine Accounting and Economics and do both justice. Students will be disadvantaged at level 2 & 3 if this happens. The subjects, while all in a commerce domain, are very different in content, skill and knowledge. It would be advisable to keep them separate. Numbers of students entering these subjects demonstrate that they are highly popular. Universities keep them as three distinct areas of study. Many teachers are unable to teach all three subjects due to the separation given them at university so this could be problematic moving forward. I'm disappointed that a (compulsory?) financial literacy subject is not included in level 1. Will it be put into year 9 or 10 instead? Students greatly need financial literacy to be taught.	As an Economics teacher for 21 years I have seen a huge decrease in the content of the courses in years 11-13. For example, the content taught at level 2 is almost half today what was taught in 1999. The same could be said for level 1 & 3. This is a big concern to me as students are not getting the same breadth of knowledge even within the subjects they select. A quick look at the content examined prior to NCEA being introduced will reveal the gaps. If we combine Accounting, Business and Economics I'm fearful that we will even further compromise the breadth of knowledge learned in these subject areas. It's very difficult to combine Accounting and Economics as they are so different in content and skill. Students will be disadvantaged at level 2 & 3 if this happens. It would be advisable to keep them separate. Numbers of students entering these subjects demonstrate that they are highly popular. Universities keep them as three distinct areas of study. I'm concerned about the combination of Business, Economics and Accounting. I think it's easily possible to even remove Business Studies from level one and just teach it in level 2 &	Financial Literacy maybe? As a compulsory one or two standard course? To prepare students for the wide world of work, credit cards, student loans, debt management , Kiwi saver and basic budgeting.	No			2020-02-23 10:22:14	ANON-YFPW-RBW2-3	2020-02-23 10:22:14	2020-02-23 10:22:31
Yes		Agree				No			2020-02-23 10:23:45	ANON-YFPW-RBWU-6	2020-02-23 10:23:16	2020-02-23 10:23:51
Yes	I do not necessarily agree with it, but was aware	Disagree	Health and Physical Education being combined is difficult. It will be purely dependent on the teacher as to which standards are covered, students may not receive a balance or true representation of both subjects, which creates difficulty in Level 2 and 3. Although broad, this will negatively affect the depth of both subjects delivery.	Need clarity on "food science" and what this entails.		No			2020-02-23 10:32:00	ANON-YFPW-RBZY-D	2020-02-23 10:32:00	2020-02-23 10:32:10
Yes		Agree	I broadly agree although there are some very specific languages and performing arts subjects which don't follow with this model.	I do think science could be split into 2 version? Everyday Science and Deeper Science to allow for general science for 1 course and physics and chemistry focus for another	No	No			2020-02-23 10:36:36	ANON-YFPW-RBZV-A	2020-02-23 10:36:36	2020-02-23 10:36:59
Yes		Strongly disagree			No	No			2020-02-23 10:42:44	ANON-YFPW-RBZC-Q	2020-02-23 10:42:44	2020-02-23 10:42:53
No	I was aware of a review of subjects - not 'a broad, more foundational education at NCEA Level 1'.	Strongly disagree	I am very concerned about the proposal to 'combine' Level 1 Accounting, Business and Economics at Level 1 into a single cell subject entitled 'Commerce' with limited Accounting.	I am very concerned about the proposal to 'combine' Level 1 Accounting, Business and Economics at Level 1 into a single cell subject entitled 'Commerce' with limited Accounting because; Accounting, Economics and Business are very individual and differing subjects. The skills and knowledge in each of these areas are very different. The skills taught at Level 1 underpin the foundation of success in Level 2 and Level 3. There is a clear future career pathway in all of these areas and they are INDIVIDUAL at University. These subjects are very relevant to the real world, with real authentic learning opportunities. These subjects can be accessed by a variety of students which allows choice and voice, by narrowing this area we reduce student access. This is contrary to culturally responsive pedagogy. Finding 'specialists' who can create lessons which engage learners in this area with enough knowledge breadth across three disciplines, could be difficult and therefore limit access to students and compromise authentic learning. The data of student numbers taking these subjects supports the popularity of these subjects individually, as well as student success in these areas. In particular I note, that many subject areas		No			2020-02-23 10:53:45	ANON-YFPW-RBZS-7	2020-02-23 10:51:45	2020-02-23 10:53:55
No		Strongly agree				No			2020-02-23 10:54:16	ANON-YFPW-RBZB-C	2020-02-23 10:54:16	2020-02-23 10:54:26
No	I work as a facilitator and are in contact with teachers on a daily basis plus I read the Education Gazette and media releases, yet I had not heard of this intended change.	Agree	I agree with the exception of science.	Removing Physics, Chemistry and Biology standards at L1 means the needs of students wishing to pursue a career in science will be disadvantaged. This is because the jump from the draft L1 standards to L2 Physics etc is huge. The L1 specialist science subjects bridge this gap for many students. I recommend retaining some L1 Physics, Chemistry and Biology standards.	Not sure.	No			2020-02-23 11:18:50	ANON-YFPW-RBZ9-D	2020-02-23 11:18:50	2020-02-23 11:19:05
Yes		Agree				No			2020-02-23 11:21:56	ANON-YFPW-RBZG-U	2020-02-23 11:21:56	2020-02-23 11:22:18
Yes		Agree		No	No	Yes	No		2020-02-23 11:25:01	ANON-YFPW-RBZJ-X	2020-02-23 11:25:01	2020-02-23 11:25:37

Yes		Undecided	Specifically Commerce -It would really depend on what is offered at Level 2 and 3 as to whether I support the change to Commerce. I can see benefits in a general Commerce course at Level 1 that covers some ECO/BUS/ACC but it needs to be enough of each to ensure students would be able to build on that for level 2. Financial Literacy is important but I believe that is better catered to in the junior school up to year 10.	I would like to think that someone has looked at what is required for University and then mapped it backwards from scholarship down to Level 1 to ensure there are no major "jumps" in knowledge or understanding required. I think this option at this stage will get little support as we do not have the big picture, so it is hard to make a decision on whether to agree or not.		No			2020-02-23 11:32:20	ANON-YFPW-RBZQ-5	2020-02-23 11:32:20	2020-02-23 11:32:29
Yes	support	Strongly agree	the range of specialisation at level one has meant that there are many overlaps that could be managed via the employment of contexts at a local level. Excessive specialisation at this early stage (L1) locks kids in to pathways while still at a very early stage of their understanding of what they might want from education in the long term.		Sustainability Community Service and Engagement	No			2020-02-23 11:54:33	ANON-YFPW-RBZ5-9	2020-02-23 11:54:33	2020-02-23 11:54:45
Yes	Been keeping up to date on the progression and what is happening via MOE website and subject association groups.	Agree	In general I agree with what has been proposed as there is such an extensive and broad subject framework at Level 1 currently and a lot of crossover between subjects within schools and how NCEA L1-3 subjects are devised. The new proposed subject L1 list refines and suggests the more broader and foundation subject aspects with a holistic viewpoint.	I would like to know more what 'Technology - integrated through new Technology subjects' is and have that unpacked to understand what this might be. There is a division with the Construction and Mechanical Technology - now targeted as Materials Technology; as there is two distinct groups within this, the pure makers, and the designers who make. Could there be a Design subject that then those who are design thinkers and undertaking design practice similar to DVC but in a materials way can have an area, as in how you have introduced a new subject in The Arts - Maori Performing Arts, and have not generalised this under Dance or Drama or Music.	With Technology Learning area specifically; I think that Fashion needs to be having a targeted specialist learning area of itself. As currently it is mixed and using some DVC, some Materials, and some Technology, as it has its own specific design thinking, design practice and design making. Similar to what DVC has for Spatial and Product. Some aspects of the Technology subjects have become outdated on the way they are seen and taught within their teaching and learning and have become embedded in a framework that is heavily driven by systems and process (that are often connected with science thinking) has overridden the creative thinking and design practice. Looking at how DVC has maintained and kept being current and the new approach with the Digital Technologies needs to be looked at with how new life can be brought into the other areas of Technology.	No	I acknowledge and respect the diversity of the curriculum and understand and recognise of the unique status of tangata whenua in New Zealand. In my own teaching practice an in the the classroom I acknowledge the histories, heritages, languages and cultures however I do not teach in te reo.		2020-02-23 11:56:56	ANON-YFPW-RBZE-5	2020-02-23 11:50:52	2020-02-23 11:57:23
Yes		Strongly agree				Yes			2020-02-23 11:59:24	ANON-YFPW-RBZF-4	2020-02-23 11:59:24	2020-02-23 11:59:58
Yes	I'll answer "yes" only in a very broad sense. What we don't seem to be informed about is the actual nature of the change. What standards are being replaced or abolished? What is the rationale for moving varying subjects into different curriculum areas? Why are we retaining archaic and inaccurate descriptors for some subject areas ("Home Economics") when the nature of those subjects have changed in the last twenty years to more accurately reflect changing industry and sector needs? How does this apparent amalgamating of subject/curriculum areas promote "specialisation" and why does "specialisation" seem to be the mode d'jour when industries and sectors are calling for cross-trained "all-rounder"-type candidates? How are we catering for non-academic students and vocational training needs at Secondary level?	Disagree	From the limited information we have been presented with, I do not feel that anyone could be adequately informed in order to offer any meaningful feedback. Therefore it is difficult to say whether one supports or does not support the proposed subjects.	My feedback takes the form of questions: 1. Why is Latin being dropped as a language when it is the foundation of legal language in Law and Legal Studies and Horticulture? 2. Changes to English does not seem to be specific enough. Is there a plan to split this huge curriculum area into two separate areas, English Language and English Literature, as per other Anglophone nations? If not, why not? There are reasons supporting such a distinction between Language and Literature that echo the spirit of "specialisation" that I would be happy to discuss with you. 3. Food Science seems to be split between Health & Phys Ed, whereas the (inappropriately named) Home Economics subject is confined solely to Health & Phys Ed. Why is this? The (inappropriately named) Home Economics is a vocational subject: one might expect that, as such, it is more appropriate to have both subjects in both curriculum areas. 4. Why is Art History no longer being included in The Arts? Knowledge of how the presentation of Art has changed/is changing is fundamental in how Art should be read, interpreted and received by the greater audience.	It is impossible to answer this question until NCEA Level 1 has been sorted out properly. Thus far, the information presented is confusing, seems to be incomplete in some areas and, therefore, cannot accurately be used to project pathways for Level 2 and 3.	No	Is this available to everyone (with an English Language translation)? Where could I find it?	See above my concerns as stipulated in Question 4.	2020-02-23 12:18:01	ANON-YFPW-RBZF-B	2020-02-23 12:18:01	2020-02-23 12:18:38
No		Agree	I think it is a good idea to be broad in Level 1	Will the Industry Training courses be still available at Level 1 or only at Level 2	Industry training course separate from Material Technology	No			2020-02-23 12:30:04	ANON-YFPW-RBZF-T	2020-02-23 12:30:04	2020-02-23 12:30:13
No	We were not consulted on dropping the Level 1 Physics, Chemistry, Biology, Earth & Space Science standards.	Strongly disagree	It is important for schools to have choice so, for example, whether they offer the broad Nature of Science standard being proposed, or choose to offer the more specialized Physics, Chemistry, Biology or Earth & Science standards, or to choose whether they offer a blend of these standards, to best suit their akonga. Externally assessed examinations must be retained as an assessment option at Level 1.	Please re-instate the Physics, Chemistry, Biology and Earth & Science standards at Level 1 so that schools can choose what standards best suit the learning needs of their akonga. Externally assessed examinations must be retained as an assessment option at Level 1.	Yes: Physics, Chemistry, Biology, Earth & Space Science at Level 2 and 3. We also need to have these subject-specific standards at Level 1 to help students start building the skills and knowledge that are required at Level 2. Externally assessed examinations must be retained as an assessment option at Level 1, 2 and 3.	No			2020-02-23 12:49:08	ANON-YFPW-RBZH-V	2020-02-23 12:49:08	2020-02-23 12:49:32
Yes		Agree				No			2020-02-23 12:50:00	ANON-YFPW-RBZH-E	2020-02-23 12:48:21	2020-02-23 12:50:05
Yes		Strongly agree				Yes			2020-02-23 13:14:56	ANON-YFPW-RBZH-P	2020-02-23 13:14:56	2020-02-23 13:15:16

No		Strongly disagree	There will be less choice for our diverse learners e.g. Economics, Business Studies and Economics are vastly different subjects in the way they are taught and assessed at Level 1. Grouping them together will mean the content is covered in less depth and the learning will be boarder but more superficial.	There is now less choice for our young entrepreneurs. Combining Accounting, Business and Economics into one subject with minimal emphasis on Finances seems to run counter to what the Ministry is advocating regarding improving Financial Capability. Economics covers Micro at L1 and Macro at Level 2. Students who don't go on to university will miss out on all this valuable knowledge about how the economy works. The practical Business experience is invaluable and should be offered at every level to inspire confident, innovative young business people. Commerce is a very old fashioned term and does not reflect the richness and depth of material covered within this dynamic group of subjects.	I would hope that all existing Level 2 subjects remain	No			2020-02-23 13:23:51	ANON-YFPW-RBZX-C	2020-02-23 13:23:51	2020-02-23 13:24:16
No		Strongly disagree	This is how students build interest - by dipping their toes in the water. Take this away and you remove the willingness of schools, particularly small schools to support subjects such as Latin, Classics, and Art History at levels 2 and 3. In turn this means that students learning needs and interests are not able to be met.	This is how students build interest - by dipping their toes in the water. Take this away and you remove the willingness of schools, particularly small schools to support subjects such as Latin, Classics, and Art History at levels 2 and 3. In turn this means that students learning needs and interests are not able to be met.	Archaeology, Psychology and a division of English into literature and language.	No			2020-02-23 13:37:12	ANON-YFPW-RBZA-N	2020-02-23 13:37:12	2020-02-23 13:37:19
Yes		Strongly disagree	I believe that the skills in the specialised subjects under the Social Sciences banner are as similar as the skills as Biology, Chemistry and Physics in the Science area and so those individual subjects should be retained in the Foundation level. Students want to have the option to do a Science course that is mainly in one branch of science.	Why have some areas been allowed to specialize such as Psychology and Religious Education? These subjects do not even appear in NZC.		Yes			2020-02-23 13:52:16	ANON-YFPW-RBZN-2	2020-02-23 13:52:16	2020-02-23 13:52:24
Yes	Yes, but we had limited detailed information, about what this would look like, and effects of work load. It was great to be given 8 TOD in our last negotiations, we can now see how those 8 days will be filled up, again the MDE has overlooked the workload issue. Schools have to include many other aspects to help create well rounded citizens, wellbeing, a sense of belonging and identity are just a few things aspects that also need to be incorporated into the teaching and learning of our students and staff.	Strongly disagree	Current SEG's do not represent all the learning areas, how would these representives understand the needs,wants and requirements of the learning areas. There should be representatives from all learning areas taking part in this review.	Combing Health and PE is detrimental for both subjects. Whilst there are some students who would enjoy a combination of subjects, most students prefer them to be separate. Students select the subjects based on their own merits, experinences and interests. This move will definitely affect the numbers taking the course. In light of all the mental health issues in our country, one would think that Health would be a stand alone subject. Perhaps with this opportunity of change, this proposal should look to include other AS that deal specifically with the current crisis we have (ie, high suicide rates and other mental health issues. Health can absolutely go with any other subject, PE not so much, so why combine them? It seems like inseatad of broadening the range of subjects students can select from, this proposal limits thier options, expecially when classics and psychology are omitted from the scheme of things.	Essential skills course for Seniors that delves into the social/emotional issues that are currently affecting our youth. This course could be a mix of AS from a variety of subjects, schools could desgin a course that is suited to the needs and demands of their students. Resilience, wellbeing, mental health, relationships, essential skills, global studies.....the list is endless and could be an amazing turning point for students. There are so many social demands put on schools to help fix but schools do not have the time or resources to help implement. For example the ACC Mates and Dates course could be implemented in this space instead of encroaching into timetabled subject area times. This could be an amazing space for development of well rounded students, capble with coping and understanding this ever changing world they live in. This course needs timetabled time to develop confident, resilient individuals who realise their full potential and could be an opportunity to include aspects of Te Marautanga o Aotearoa	Yes		Pleas refer to comments made in question 4.	2020-02-23 14:05:54	ANON-YFPW-RBZX-Y	2020-02-23 14:03:51	2020-02-23 14:06:04
Yes		Disagree	Streamlining Science options from 6 courses to 1 course is very limiting for those who previously took vocational courses like Academy subjects across 2 lines.	Retain the 3 main Sciences - Chemistry, Biology and Physics as alternative options to enable double lines of science to remain in existing successful programmes.	Forensic Science Human Biology	No			2020-02-23 14:14:44	ANON-YFPW-RBZ6-A	2020-02-23 14:14:44	2020-02-23 14:14:54
Yes	However I feel there are some limitations in the subject list published	Disagree	Unfortunately it is clear that the end result will be further dumbing down of the curriculum . While many schools teach only general science at level 1, the opportunity for bright students to take on physics and chemistry and biology at this level must be left in place. The inclusion of Maori dance et cetera will lead to large numbers of students joining the Kapa Haka group but failing to realise that they have cut themselves off from further advanced studies by their choices of an easier option. For students planning to enter a trade,there should be more opportunity to learn basic techniques used in every trade and therefore the widening of this subject should be promoted ---into building, electrical engineering, petrol and diesel engineering The removal of Latin, is understandable, but Latin is a wonderful base for all education in particular for those leading onto linguistic studies, medicine, health and plant science. Schools should be permitted to make their own choices to put students into a course on Latin.	The removal of Latin, is understandable, but Latin is a wonderful base for all education in particular for those leading onto linguistic studies, medicine, health and plant science. Schools should be permitted to make their own choices to put students into a course on Latin. I believe that lumping all the subjects into commerce will prevent students obtaining basic financial literacy and similar skills at this level I am pleased to see the retention of languages as all the subjects listed of considerable value to our range of students and must be kept at all costs	I believe that teaching students more about environmental science at this age would be beneficial. Such things as perma culture could be included in environmental science which should be a possible part of the science curriculum	Yes	I'm familiar with the New Zealand curriculum but not in the Maori language		2020-02-23 14:16:24	ANON-YFPW-RBZR-6	2020-02-23 14:16:24	2020-02-23 14:17:31

Yes	What a joke. This whole review process has been Amateur Hour. It shows so little understanding of what schools do already. This WILL NOT deliver your intended outcomes and the fact that you think this response will lead to a broader education when you are getting rid of most of the standards is farcical. At present schools use the broad range of standards to deliver a broad education which is also responsive to individual student needs in different communities. Many schools do this in a highly successful way includes course of no more than 16-18 credits. There are some schools which aren't using NCEA well and you should be targeting them - not punishing the vast majority of schools which are, in the main, getting it right and thereby punishing the students who will now lose the ability to learn essential life and learning schools by being able to pursue subjects and standards which align with their interests and needs. This is shameful.	Strongly disagree	See above.	If the people making these decisions knew anything about the complexity of the curriculum and how it works, they would know that it is the values and key competencies (the 'front half' of the curriculum) are the essential learning for all akonga in Aotearoa. Ultimately, it is less important what subjects a student takes (the 'back half' of the curriculum) than whether they are getting the key skills, values, competencies and well-being outcomes from the front half. What the learning areas in the back do, along with a breadth of standards, is to give flexibility to communities, schools and teachers to best respond to what individual students need. It matters not whether they learn to others through a general science course or through media studies - what is important is that they learn it. If film making is a passion it's great way to gain the essential learning. By reducing courses and standards you undermine the very best aspects of our education system. Those who are already marginalised will become more so as schools will have no option but to put them through your new cookie-cutter, factory production qualification.	I would like the Ministry to sort its shit out before trashes a system it clearly doesn't understand. Are there areas where improvement is needed? Absolutely. But these responses will not address the problems outlined.	No				2020-02-23 14:22:56	ANON-YFPW-RBZW-8	2020-02-23 14:22:56	2020-02-23 14:23:19
No		Disagree		Economics, accounting and business need to be separate at level 1		No				2020-02-23 14:31:25	ANON-YFPW-RBZ4-8	2020-02-23 14:31:25	2020-02-23 14:31:35
Yes		Undecided				Yes				2020-02-23 14:51:24	ANON-YFPW-RBZT-8	2020-02-23 14:51:24	2020-02-23 14:51:38
No	This was the first I had heard of the changes.	Disagree	I see that Food Technology and Home Economics are affected. As HoF at a school where I have 2 dedicated Food Technology staff and 3 Hospitality Unit Standard teachers doing a fantastic job, we are all mystified as to who was consulted for their opinion, before making such dramatic changes to these subjects. Seems very uninformed by students real needs and experienced teacher input.	Food Technology is a valuable subject within the Technology subject umbrella. The nature of its problem solving and attention to innovation will likely be lost for students simply covering how to prepare food, rather than the why and what could be.	Having been a passionate Technology teacher of both Achievement and Unit Standards for 18 years, a marker, subject writer, moderator and ITE curriculum tutor for Technology, I see real value in keeping the broadest possible range of Technology subjects in secondary schools viable. The main suggestion has to be that Generic standards must, must, must be in the variety needed to ensure that a student studying 2 Technology subjects is not disadvantaged by a lack of standards to sit. Although a standard may be generic, there is clearly enough difference in a courses content to be able to provide a separate stream of learning evidence for the student.	No				2020-02-23 14:53:48	ANON-YFPW-RBZ3-7	2020-02-23 14:53:48	2020-02-23 14:54:24
Yes		Strongly disagree	Health and Physical Education have gone in different directions over the last ten years. By putting them under the same umbrella students will be put off taking the subject as they are often passionate about one subject and not the other. Teachers are also trained to teach the subjects individually by placing them together will do a disservice to the content of each.	As mentioned above, I believe that Health and PE should not be forced as one target subject. The nature of each is different with PE having a mainly Bio-Physical focus and Health a Socio-Cultural focus. If they were taught under the same umbrella less content would be covered making it harder to progress naturally through to Level 2 and 3.		No				2020-02-23 14:55:14	ANON-YFPW-RBZ2-6	2020-02-23 14:55:14	2020-02-23 14:55:27
Yes		Undecided		Important that AgHort stays to assist NZ Primary Industries which are countries significant income stream	MUST have biology, physics and chemistry at level 2 - but not compulsory for everyone. This is to allow the students who go on to tertiary to have sufficient knowledge to make sense of first year tertiary.	No				2020-02-23 15:04:10	ANON-YFPW-RBZU-9	2020-02-23 15:04:10	2020-02-23 15:04:17
Yes		Strongly agree				No				2020-02-23 15:26:34	ANON-YFPW-RBAY-M	2020-02-23 15:26:34	2020-02-23 15:26:45

Yes		Strongly disagree		<p>I believe very strongly that the 3 commerce subjects of Economics, Accounting and Business Studies should remain separate as is the status quo. My reasons are as follows:</p> <p>Accounting, Economics and Business are very individual and differing subjects.</p> <p>The skills and knowledge in each of these areas are very different.</p> <p>The skills taught at Level 1 underpin the foundation of success in Level 2 and Level 3.</p> <p>As a pathway into future success in Level 3 and Scholarship Accounting and Economics, students require knowledge that is embedded during teaching during Level 1.</p> <p>There is a clear future career pathway in all of these areas and they are INDIVIDUAL at University.</p> <p>Nationally student numbers in Accounting and Business at Level 1 are increasing (or being maintained).</p> <p>Students financial capabilities are a concern nationwide, and this proposal limits students</p>		Yes				2020-02-23 15:46:07	ANON-YFPW-RBAV-H	2020-02-23 15:46:07	2020-02-23 15:46:23
Yes		Strongly disagree		streamlining of science subjects will make the step up to level 2 even harder!	no	No				2020-02-23 15:46:30	ANON-YFPW-RBAC-X	2020-02-23 15:46:30	2020-02-23 15:46:38
Yes	I would like to see whatever is offered and assessed at Level 1 to be authentic, have a local context be and cross-curricular. Ensuring that Level 1 content, skills and knowledge provides sufficient breadth of learning to students so that they are not limited to what they can choose as specialisations at Levels 2 and 3.	Disagree	I still see "silos". Literacy and numeracy as well as digital literacy are all essential for life beyond school. However, they should not be taught in isolation as they are not used in isolation beyond school. This is an opportunity to provide perhaps 4 or 5 broad learning areas (eg Arts, Sciences, Commerce, Creative Technologies, Health and PE) that all have a compulsory literacy, numeracy, digital literacy component.	See above. Additionally, I would like to see elements of DVC embedded into all Technology areas rather than as a standalone, preferably a general "technologies learning area". Food Science - At Level 1 this needs to be a foundation for pathways at Levels 2 and 3. If the intention is for food science to cover the development of new food products and biotechnology for example it needs to align more closely with Technology or Science. If the intention is to specialise in Food and Nutrition then perhaps Health & PE is the right learning area.	No.	No	Not really. However, I am sad about this as I would like to know more.			2020-02-23 15:49:09	ANON-YFPW-RBAS-E	2020-02-23 15:49:09	2020-02-23 15:49:26
Yes		Agree		This may not be the appropriate place to comment on this, but I believe all subjects should be able to receive a variety of grades, to acknowledge hard work and success in every subject. - (eg technology subjects should receive grades other than achieved, it may not need to be excellence or merit but it should acknowledge higher success)		No				2020-02-23 15:56:54	ANON-YFPW-RBA8-K	2020-02-23 15:56:54	2020-02-23 15:57:09
No		Undecided		my area of expertise is food technology and hospitality, just wondering where that fits in?	I would like to see the area of food extended to incorporate all subject areas in an applied format and to see it as a UE accredited subject. To just specialise in Technology is too specific for such a wide topic. I also do not understand why practical based subjects should be limited to Unit Standards.	No				2020-02-23 16:01:47	ANON-YFPW-RBA9-M	2020-02-23 16:01:47	2020-02-23 16:02:04
No		Undecided		my area of expertise is food technology and hospitality, just wondering where that fits in?	I would like to see the area of food extended to incorporate all subject areas in an applied format and to see it as a UE accredited subject. To just specialise in Technology is too specific for such a wide topic. I also do not understand why practical based subjects should be limited to Unit Standards.	No				2020-02-23 16:02:32	ANON-YFPW-RBAG-2	2020-02-23 16:02:32	2020-02-23 16:02:42
Yes		Undecided			Photography	No				2020-02-23 16:15:23	ANON-YFPW-RBAJ-5	2020-02-23 16:15:23	2020-02-23 16:15:39
Yes	The changes to Science do not "support a broad, more foundational education" because you are narrowing the options... (so not broad)... and it's not foundational as the lack of specialisation reduces access to L2.	Strongly disagree	Science... the removal of specialisation is a disaster... there needs to be specialisation in L1 to support the transition into Level 2 and beyond... the step up is too great... especially in Chem and Physics. STEM focus comes from the current and projected demand for students to fill STEM careers... we are not meeting demand already... this change will completely undermine work done already.	Recommend keeping the status quo with specialisation i.e. Science, Chem, Physics, Bio and Earth Science (rationale above)	Biotechnology	No	No			2020-02-23 16:39:53	ANON-YFPW-RBAQ-C	2020-02-23 16:39:53	2020-02-23 16:40:06

Yes		Strongly disagree	The merging of Commerce subjects, which had the 6th (Economics), 9th(Accounting) and 13th(Business Studies) highest number of Level 1 students enrolled in both an internal and external standard in 2019, out of a total of 36 subjects seems, illogical and unjustified.	Economics, Accounting and Business Studies are 3 very distinct disciplines, and the acknowledgement that the resulting standards are "likely to have very little Accounting content due to the practical constraints " seems highly unfair to the students who would opt into the course. (There were 10,501 students enrolled in 2019. These courses by definition provide a broad, more foundational education than many of the other learning areas, as they all require learning to be integrated with real-world, economic, business and financial understanding. Merging them, devalues their importance as subjects that enable students to bring meaning and understanding to the economic, business and financial world in which they live. In an education system, we were being encouraged to de-silo our teaching and learning practice by integrating our subjects and providing authentic learning contexts, the merging of three of the best subjects to integrate with any learning area, seems a backward step. My suggestion - Keep Accounting, Economics and Business Studies as three NCEA level 1 subjects, due to the reasons mentioned above.		No				2020-02-23 16:50:32	ANON-YFPW-RBAE-Z	2020-02-23 16:50:32	2020-02-23 16:50:57
Yes		Agree				No				2020-02-23 16:59:22	ANON-YFPW-RBA5-G	2020-02-23 16:59:22	2020-02-23 16:59:33
No		Agree				No				2020-02-23 17:03:29	ANON-YFPW-RBAP-B	2020-02-23 17:03:29	2020-02-23 17:03:37
Yes	I think it is a good idea to be general at Level 1 - there is no real need for any assessment at this level so by staying general allows students to still continue to develop breadth of knowledge. It is good to encourage specialisation from Level 2 as we have a big range of students and being allowed to specialise allows them to study in areas of interest	Strongly agree	It is good to combine Sciences, Commerce and Social Sciences as they have become too specialised too early in many schools - this brings them into line with English and Maths. It is good to see the Technology subjects using current language for the more traditional subjects.	It is a shame to see Latin go - I know it is a very small subject though so probably understandable. Why isn't Agricultural and Horticultural included in Science	The sciences, social sciences and commerce need to split at Level 2 and 3 again. Mathematics needs to split into two specialist subject Mathematics (one subject), Statistics (2nd Subject). It would good to even bring in Calculus as a 3rd subject. English is likely to be able to split into two subjects two (Writing, Creative) and (Reading, Understanding)	No		I think you meant - if you answered Yes to Question 5		2020-02-23 17:04:05	ANON-YFPW-RBA7-J	2020-02-23 17:04:05	2020-02-23 17:04:49
No	I found out about this in the news today.	Agree	I don't think the sciences should be bunched together. I think they are a very important part of the future of NZ there should be 3 categories in Level 1 - Biology, Chemistry and Physics (earth/space science could be part of physics).			No				2020-02-23 17:07:06	ANON-YFPW-RBAF-1	2020-02-23 17:07:06	2020-02-23 17:07:16
Yes		Agree	I wonder if there should be a Literacy subject at Level 1 - separate from English.	Literacy is different to subject English. A student can be a literate text user and participant without needing to demonstrate capacity in the Big Ideas mooted in the English curriculum. Will there still be a non-literature/English subject based pathway for Literacy achievement?		No				2020-02-23 17:10:58	ANON-YFPW-RBA1-C	2020-02-23 17:10:58	2020-02-23 17:11:23
No	I understood the concept but had no idea that you intended to delete subjects and combine some in the way you have recommended.	Strongly disagree	There is no detail about what your recommendations may look like which concerns me enormously. To make such an announcement without that detail is highly inflammatory and misguided, in my opinion. Teachers are now left wondering whether all the work they have done in individual subjects will have any validity in the future. Uncertainty is stressful and the research into facilitating change (and taking people with you) supports that. As a Health teacher, I do not consider that my students would all choose to do PE. Health teachers need to be consulted on such a momentous change.	Health and PE are very different subjects. Take a close look at the standards and explain to me how they are going to fit together, please. Teachers need to be consulted in all areas/ subjects in a meaningful way before any change is considered. Follow your own pedagogy rather than making an announcement with little substance.		Yes	Some only.			2020-02-23 17:12:20	ANON-YFPW-RBAZ-N	2020-02-23 17:12:20	2020-02-23 17:12:46
Yes		Agree		As a teacher of History and Classical Studies I support the proposed integration of History and Classical Studies, as Classical Studies can be accessed as a topic within the broader subject area allowing students to have breadth of coverage at level 1 before specialising.	Classical Studies and History to be offered as separate subjects at level 2 and 3.	No				2020-02-23 17:24:15	ANON-YFPW-RBAH-3	2020-02-23 17:24:15	2020-02-23 17:24:29
Yes	I was partly aware, however not aware it would be so extreme for some subjects. Also, the summary above does not give enough detail.	Disagree	I disagree because as a teacher I do not believe we will get the professional development that we need to deliver this 'new' because model to the best of its ability.	Yes, the suggestion to merge health and physical education. These subjects need to remain separate. Healths focus is extremely different to physical education. They lead to completely different career pathways and attract different students and different teachers. It's unrealistic to merge these subjects without keeping the integrity of subjects.	Outdoor education should be added! Currently it's only offered using the PE standards. However to deliver an excellent outdoor education programme they deserve their own units.	No				2020-02-23 17:27:21	ANON-YFPW-RBAB-W	2020-02-23 17:27:21	2020-02-23 17:27:33
Yes	Isn't media studies more a part of the English curriculum?	Agree	A lot of students take health as an academic subject. Combining it with PE may deter students.			No				2020-02-23 17:29:41	ANON-YFPW-RBAM-8	2020-02-23 17:29:41	2020-02-23 17:29:56

No		Disagree	In this day of manipulation of public thought by the media, Media Studies has never been more relevant. Home economics and Food Science are very different things and the bulk of students would be better served by Home Economics rather than Food Science.	See above. Art History is a huge loss to the 'soul' of Humans as a society.		No				2020-02-23 17:37:08	ANON-YFPW-RBAD-Y	2020-02-23 17:37:08	2020-02-23 17:37:30
No		Strongly disagree	Accounting, Economics and Business are very individual subjects and for all these subjects the content that the students learn at level one underpins the foundation for success in L2 and L3. I feel that this would be a step backwards, having watched the growth of Business Studies through the development of unit standards and achievement standards. Parents support these subjects, especially Business Studies and view this as a 21st C subject that holds real value...to combine these into one subject would condense the learning in these subjects areas and would not be beneficial to the students. It seems strange that many subject areas with less students have been able to maintain their status as individual learning areas eg; Dance and Drama, yet accounting, economics and Business subjects which are such important learning areas have not!! It is not just about the students but our country as well!!	Financial Capabilities		Yes				2020-02-23 17:42:01	ANON-YFPW-RBAK-K	2020-02-23 17:42:01	2020-02-23 17:42:16
Yes		Strongly disagree	I believe that combining subjects such as Health/ Physical Education and Economics/ Accounting/ Business Studies is taking a backwards step. The content covered in these courses currently are wide ranging and not similar. They also attract a different kind of student and with these proposed changes you are limiting the options for our young people.			No				2020-02-23 17:43:51	ANON-YFPW-RBAA-V	2020-02-23 17:43:51	2020-02-23 17:44:01
Yes		Agree				Yes				2020-02-23 17:55:15	ANON-YFPW-RBAN-9	2020-02-23 17:55:15	2020-02-23 17:55:26
Yes		Agree				No				2020-02-23 18:10:38	ANON-YFPW-RBAK-6	2020-02-23 18:10:38	2020-02-23 18:10:54
Yes		Agree	I am a Science teacher. I like the idea of only having Science at Level 1 but I do have some concerns. Under our current matrix of standards, schools have had a lot of flexibility to design very different courses. While this can still be done with the proposed L1 Science standards it does mean that students can only take one Science at L1.		Human Biology	No				2020-02-23 18:14:04	ANON-YFPW-RBA6-H	2020-02-23 18:14:04	2020-02-23 18:14:10
No		Agree	-Makes sense to reduce the number of subjects at level 1 -some of the subjects not included i was surprised were assessed at level 1 previously	I think it is appropriate	No	No				2020-02-23 18:16:11	ANON-YFPW-RBAR-D	2020-02-23 18:16:11	2020-02-23 18:16:16
Yes		Agree		I think that the drama technologies list, currently only unit standards should also be included. They are for the most part (the external is not so good) well tested and I don't see any reason why they shouldn't be for achievement standards. In a lot of city centres working as a tech, or something related is a field students can actually go into, and it would be nice if this acknowledge more. I also think carving needs more recognition as a subject.	I think the drama technologies standards currently available through skills active should be achievement standards. There's only a few (sound at level 3, some of the externals) that would need adjusting. I know the point of the changes is to simplify subjects, not have as many assessments, but this really is a course unto itself with connections to the real world. Again also think Maori carving should get more recognition as a subject.	No				2020-02-23 18:18:07	ANON-YFPW-RBAW-J	2020-02-23 18:18:07	2020-02-23 18:18:16
No		Strongly agree		I adored doing various art and social science subjects in high school especially media studies, classics and art history. I enjoyed them to the extent at which I am currently in my third year of a Bachelor of Arts double majoring in art history and classics. I would be upset to see these subjects removed as I'm sure there are countless students like myself that would extremely benefit from these classes.	Art history, classics and media studies	No		I think its great that we are including more Maori based classes in the curriculum.		2020-02-23 18:24:01	ANON-YFPW-RBA4-F	2020-02-23 18:24:01	2020-02-23 18:24:18
No		Undecided	Why is food science under home ec? Should be under technology			No				2020-02-23 18:39:16	ANON-YFPW-RBAT-F	2020-02-23 18:39:15	2020-02-23 18:39:23
No	Keep subjects separate! Especially in for Health and PE! Some students dont enjoy practicals and Health is more about healthy communities it is not right to force everyone into the same box. There are already too many standards and if you cut some you only make the education system even more stale.	Strongly disagree				Yes				2020-02-23 18:50:01	ANON-YFPW-RBA3-E	2020-02-23 18:50:01	2020-02-23 18:50:17
Yes	Not a good idea at all. It is only going to make it harder for our lower students to be successful.	Strongly disagree		They are too broad. This does not allow students with clear pathways the ability to specialise as they wish to at Level 1. Large standards do not support lower ability students who need things in small chunks. The whole idea is ridiculous and not going to achieve what it needs to.	Not at this point. What we have CURRENTLY fits well. The large range of standards allows for flexible learning programs that meet a variety of students needs.	No				2020-02-23 18:52:05	ANON-YFPW-RBA2-D	2020-02-23 18:52:05	2020-02-23 18:52:15

No		Strongly disagree	As a Hpe head of faculty I cannot understand the logic and reasoning to combine two very specialist course at level 1 namely health and Pe. Although under the same umbrella they each have their own specialist teaching and content knowledge: Health is a vehicle for schools to promote and develop a sound understanding of mental health and how we nzers can see it through a holistic lens. It also promotes inclusion of rangata whenua. Sexuality and gender is also delivered in a safe and culturally responsive way. Pe allows for students to develop physical capabilities while building themselves as leaders, being socially responsible and functioning citizens. Combining the two will have a detrimental effect to all of the above Especially when most junior Pe and health programmes are very limited in terms of contact time unlike other core subjects. Thus the need to keep subjects separate	Health and Pe should remain as a separate subject. This is critical in supporting the mental health of our teens while teaching them strategies to develop positive relationships and be informed of making the correct decisions for their health and wellbeing. If their is no health programme what other avenue is their to support the wellbeing of rangatahi. This is the course that support the understanding of real life situations in order to making health enhancing decisions.	No			2020-02-23 18:54:44	ANON-YFPW-RBAU-G	2020-02-23 18:54:44	2020-02-23 18:54:55
Yes		Undecided			No			2020-02-23 19:04:03	ANON-YFPW-RB2Y-5	2020-02-23 19:04:03	2020-02-23 19:04:09
Yes		Undecided			No			2020-02-23 19:08:18	ANON-YFPW-RB2V-2	2020-02-23 19:08:18	2020-02-23 19:08:31
No		Disagree		The sweeping changes proposed to science and commerce are of concern.	No			2020-02-23 19:17:07	ANON-YFPW-RB2C-F	2020-02-23 19:17:07	2020-02-23 19:17:33
Yes		Agree		The EL standards should be included. They provide vital support fir the many ESOL students in NZ. EAP level 4 standards should be an approved subject.	Yes	EL standards. Some Level 3 should count for literacy and the EAP standards should be an approved subject at level 3.		2020-02-23 19:20:16	ANON-YFPW-RB28-4	2020-02-23 19:20:16	2020-02-23 19:20:25
No		Disagree		The proposed sweeping changes to science and commerce are of concern.	No			2020-02-23 19:19:17	ANON-YFPW-RB25-Y	2020-02-23 19:19:17	2020-02-23 19:20:25
No		Strongly disagree		Condensing Economics, Accounting, and Business Studies into one subject whilst keep stand alone subjects like Dance, Tongan and Religious Studies shows the massive disconnect between the Ministry and what students want/need. The subjects are vastly different and condensing them won't allow the courses to go into the depth required. 70% of our students currently take NCEA Level 1 Economics. They don't want to take Accounting or Business Studies, but you are making that decision for them.	No			2020-02-23 19:42:57	ANON-YFPW-RB29-5	2020-02-23 19:42:57	2020-02-23 19:43:11
No		Agree			No			2020-02-23 19:43:44	ANON-YFPW-RB2G-K	2020-02-23 19:43:44	2020-02-23 19:43:56
No		Strongly disagree		The loss of business subjects is a big concern - business studies when I was at high school catered for less highly achieving students who still wanted to start their own business. Economics taught totally different content to accounting. I don't understand how the same content base can be taught which means that level 2 will have to incorporate level 1 content ie a complete watering down of the commerce pathway. As the most critical aspect of a modern society (ie business) it seems mad that fewer pathways in commerce are being offered rather than more!! Classics is a similar issue - most students I knew who took classics did so to avoid the highly biased and politicised nature of the history subject. Many wanted to learn non-New Zealand centric history - something that clearly won't be taught without classics.	Data analytics - this is a major part of modern business which should be a part of the curriculum - currently it's an ignored pathway which is probably costing NZ millions. World history would also be a useful specialist subject as an aside to New Zealand history - there is a large body of students who would prefer world history to be taught. There is also a significant gap for a written english subject in the mix - with a focus on formal writing not analysis. Could have more of a language focus and discuss proper sentence structure and the emergence of slang as some examples.	No	No I had no idea that there was a separate curriculum for Maori! Seems a bit concerning - would be very interested to know how quality is controlled between the two curriculums and whether they actually match up to each other. Also if new subjects are being offered exclusively in Maori this seems very unfair for non-Maori speakers as they clearly cannot access	2020-02-23 20:07:18	ANON-YFPW-RB2J-P	2020-02-23 20:07:18	2020-02-23 20:07:27
Yes		Undecided	No pathway for EAL students. No EAP standards?		No	EAP standards		2020-02-23 20:13:22	ANON-YFPW-RB2Q-W	2020-02-23 20:13:22	2020-02-23 20:15:16
Yes		Agree			No	At Levels 2 and 3 English needs to be split into two different courses. One course should focus academic and tertiary level BA criteria while another course needs to focus on providing students who are not moving into academia with relevant standards.		2020-02-23 20:17:37	ANON-YFPW-RB2E-H	2020-02-23 20:14:41	2020-02-23 20:17:43

Yes		Disagree	The 4 standards proposed seem heavily based on ideas and evidence. However, with the limited amount of curriculum time pre-level 1 means that the foundations students have to enter these courses is weak. The implication is to develop scientific literacy but the reality and outcome will increase the divide between those that can access Level 2 and those that can't. I teach in an MLE and love it but to take this to the next level learners need content to support their learning. I feel the pressure to get the grades will make these standards hoops and not deep learning.	Why is Agriculture still a separate subject?	Physics coverage needs to be wider. The breadth is limited compared to other countries and reduces learner engagement.	No				2020-02-23 20:22:26	ANON-YFPW-RB25-1	2020-02-23 20:22:26	2020-02-23 20:22:50
Yes		Strongly disagree	I work in the PE/Health area. I can not believe the decision to combine these two subjects into one subject is even an option. The fact that NZ has one of the worst obesity rates and Mental Health issues in the world and now we are expected to teach this together and most likely with no extra hours is absurd. We are already so undervalued in schools as a curriculum area and bringing more theory into a subject already lacking so much of the practical element. I think many of these changes could see even more good teachers leaving the profession because they are undervalued.	I can not understand why PE and Health have to be combined. We fought for so long to make them separate subjects. 2 subjects that are already lacking support and 2 subjects that desperately need to be taught to kids especially at the senior level. Our subject needs more government support especially when research shows active kids learn better in the classroom and being active and looking after your wellbeing releases endorphins, which leads to better mental health. These two subjects need to be kept separate and also need more support. In my opinion, with all the problems we have in this country, level 1 PE and level 1 health should be compulsory for all students.	No	Yes				2020-02-23 20:23:00	ANON-YFPW-RB2P-V	2020-02-23 20:23:00	2020-02-23 20:23:21
Yes		Agree				Yes	Te Matauranga - in general, yes. You might want to fix the typo.			2020-02-23 20:25:10	ANON-YFPW-RB27-3	2020-02-23 20:25:10	2020-02-23 20:25:23
Yes	Yes, but not that broad! Also getting rid of genuine external exams in science in no way prepares students for level 2. One of the big advantages of the current NCEA Level 1 Science matrix is it's flexibility. If you want schools to have to do 50% externals just use the current mix and demand that schools do at least 2 genuine externals.	Strongly disagree	In Science we need the options of specialization in Bio, Chem and Physics. You cannot prepare students adequately for careers in science without a rigorous foundation. It is great to be able to pick standards from different areas to tailor courses to different groups of students with different needs. Have you consulted with the universities? They currently discount all internals for any competitive entry courses. This will apply to the proposed "externals" as well.	Yes, see above. Mainly we need the options of having genuine external examinations in Science, Biology, Chemistry and Physics. I agree with the push to emphasise NOS, a Maori perspective and general problem solving skills. But students need to have training/practice in recall of knowledge in order to succeed in higher education in STEM jobs. You cannot do well in any field .. sport/music etc without lots of practice, and preparing for exams is a great way of training how to think and remember ... not to mention learn attributes of self-discipline/planning and organisation/perseverance.	No	No				2020-02-23 20:31:22	ANON-YFPW-RB21-W	2020-02-23 20:31:22	2020-02-23 20:31:53
No		Undecided		NO		No				2020-02-23 20:40:51	ANON-YFPW-RB2Z-6	2020-02-23 20:40:51	2020-02-23 20:41:14
Yes	I think the broadness of the achievement criteria shouldn't restrict the level of specialisation that is taught or learnt by students. In fact I think the broader the assessments the more authentic assessments can be created by teachers - or negotiated with students.	Undecided	I agree with the cut down of specifics in level one, but I also think there is room to keep assessment open to more options. EG Languages - Why restrict which language we assess against and have standards for only 10 languages. Is it not possible to have a standard that one must meet to get a qualification in any language, not just ones defined by NZQA.	Like my above response. Yes, remove the likes of Art History, but why not retain the possibility of assessing against it by creating English standards that are easy to contextualise. Same goes for the likes of Digital technology. Wouldn't it be wise to have a range of English standards that can be contextualised into the Digital tech program/student project instead of the current literacy heavy digital tech standards which assess a student more on how well they write and minimally on their ability to create using technology. Schools could offer programs with exciting titles or contexts for their students and within this take a standard out of a pool of subject areas. 'Digital technology' at school could then assess against 2 tech standards, 1 English, 1 Math, 1 Visual Art and a Media studies. Teachers can not complain that their 'subject' is missing, they will instead build their 'subject' from the ground up	No	No	No			2020-02-23 20:58:49	ANON-YFPW-RB2H-M	2020-02-23 20:58:49	2020-02-23 20:59:01
No		Strongly agree				No				2020-02-23 21:03:38	ANON-YFPW-RB2B-E	2020-02-23 21:03:38	2020-02-23 21:04:03

Yes		Strongly disagree	Taking away Art History is a travesty, and extremely ignorant of the benefits of this subject in our modern world, as is the combination of Classics into History, which will quickly see the subject lost. The removal of Latin, while one cannot argue the small numbers in that subject, only further removes the choice for students and limits their futures.	The proposed subjects blatantly disrespect and discredit the importance of Arts and Humanities within the education system, a problem I did not think could get worse. While History, Classics and Art History can be vaguely put under the umbrella of Humanities or Liberal Art, however the skills and content differ tremendously. The classes already struggle to fit all they would like to teach into the singular subject, to attempt to force them all together would quickly see massive parts of each ignored (and I can easily see Classics becoming defunct). Again with the combination of Media and Psychology, while there is some cross-over, the subjects should not go together at all.	I would like to NOT see specialist subjects such as those proposed for Level 1. If I were to have this subject guide imposed on me when I was in Year 13, I would have gone from 6 subjects down to 3. One of those subjects would have included a subject I had completely no interest in. These new subjects limit students in specialising, limit them following their passion and will encourage a dislike for school even more as they must take subjects they have no interest in. It is a very poor decision by the government, though they may be to focused on how it will force more students into those "all important, big money" pathways of Science and Math.	No			2020-02-23 21:20:18	ANON-YFPW-RB2M-S	2020-02-23 21:20:18	2020-02-23 21:20:43
Yes		Strongly disagree	The removal of Latin as a Level 1 subject completely and wholly undermines the intention for Level 1 to transition to a more foundational education. Even more fundamental than English, Latin underpins the vast majority of scientific and academic language, and the ability to study it lends utility across the curriculum. From critical analysis of prose English, to study of human musculature in Physical Education, Latin is unquestionable in its contribution to richness of learning. Higher levels of Latin study focuses on high-level critical analysis of text, a skill which is able to be transferred across languages and subjects, however Latin provides the undeniable foundation of these analytical skills. To Latin remove it from the NCEA Level 1 curriculum in its entirety is short-sighted and denies our youth the opportunity to explore and develop these skills and experience the richness of Latin.	The removal of Latin as a Level 1 subject completely and wholly undermines the intention for Level 1 to transition to a more foundational education. Even more fundamental than English, Latin underpins the vast majority of scientific and academic language, and the ability to study it lends utility across the curriculum. From critical analysis of prose English, to study of human musculature in Physical Education, Latin is unquestionable in its contribution to richness of learning. Higher levels of Latin study focuses on high-level critical analysis of text, a skill which is able to be transferred across languages and subjects, however Latin provides the undeniable foundation of these analytical skills. To Latin remove it from the NCEA Level 1 curriculum in its entirety is short-sighted and denies our youth the opportunity to explore and develop these skills and experience the richness of Latin.		No			2020-02-23 21:21:20	ANON-YFPW-RB2D-G	2020-02-23 21:21:20	2020-02-23 21:21:25
Yes		Undecided	I think the sciences should be kept separate because they lead to different pathways..		should specialize in Chemistry and physics more to align with NZ space research and Yacht development industries. Chemistry should be sperate from science and should have pathways like structural, inorganic and organic chemistry. this will allow students to specialize and improve our composite/polymer industries.	No			2020-02-23 21:30:12	ANON-YFPW-RB2X-4	2020-02-23 21:30:12	2020-02-23 21:30:44
Yes		Agree		It is good to see the fragmenting of science wait until level 2. Also pleasing to see health combine with PE.		No			2020-02-23 21:31:47	ANON-YFPW-RB2A-D	2020-02-23 21:31:47	2020-02-23 21:31:58
Yes	I was aware of this intention and I think that it is a good idea. In my school (Botany Downs Secondary College) this is exactly what they are doing, especially the health and pe subject as well as the science subjects are combined, and they spread out to be sperate subjects in level 2 and 3	Strongly agree	I think it is a good thing to combine some of the subjects to be taught as just one subject so that the students can really get a feel for which part of the subject they like the most, which they can then take seperately in level 2 and 3. However, I don't think psychology and media studies should be combined in social studies. These 2 subjects are completely different from each other and they have nothing to do with social studies.			No			2020-02-23 22:05:58	ANON-YFPW-RB2N-T	2020-02-23 22:05:58	2020-02-23 22:06:17
No		Strongly agree				No			2020-02-23 22:08:42	ANON-YFPW-RB2K-Q	2020-02-23 22:08:42	2020-02-23 22:09:22
No		Strongly disagree		Latin needs to remain!		No			2020-02-23 22:33:02	ANON-YFPW-RB2E-2	2020-02-23 22:33:02	2020-02-23 22:33:13
Yes		Disagree	Scrapping Latin and essentially scrapping classical studies is narrow minded, would put our education system behind those found overseas, and will limit the possibility to learn these subjects to those who can afford to study in alternative international programmes (Cambridge and International Baccalaureate). This is hardly a step towards ensuring equal education for all New Zealanders. At the very least, these two subjects could be combined. Also, what's up with squishing media studies and psychology into social studies? You may as well scrap them because I can't see many social studies teachers finding the time or space to add them to their curriculum. Psychology isn't a huge loss at level 1 because even if you don't take it at high school, it's a very popular subject to take in your first year of university and requires no prior experience. However, media studies seems quite valuable in this online era - couldn't some of those standards be added to English? I know at my school media studies was taught by teachers who were mostly (if not always) also English teachers, and they often cross pollinated their courses which was really valuable and relevant.	Why aren't you merging art history with visual art? At my school we did a couple of art history standards as part of the level 1 visual art subject and then were able to make an informed choice about whether art history was a subject we wanted to continue in level 2. At most schools the number of subjects you take gets fewer and fewer until in Levels 2 and 3 you take the 5 or 6 subjects you know you enjoy/are good at/want to pursue after high school. If you narrow the options in level 1, not many people will want to take the gamble of choosing a subject they have no experience of to be one of their few subjects for the year in level 2/3, especially with level 2 and 3 results counting for scholarships and university entrance.	Having available standards for a science extension programme is important: as it stands, at my school at level 1 we all had to take general science which included standards covering physics, biology and chemistry concepts, and then you could choose to take the extension science subject as one of your optional subjects. This course taught several of the physics, chemistry and biology standards that weren't a part of general science (and for which we sat three separate exams at the end of the year). This optional course was an excellent opportunity, especially at an all-girls school, to promote STEM, and many of my old classmates are now studying for engineering and medical degrees that they may not have decided to pursue had they not had so much exposure to the three separate science disciplines at level 1, and subsequently been able to make an informed choice to continue with two or three of those science disciplines in levels 2 and 3. A generic science course at level 1 being the only option will shut doors for people who don't do so well (for example) on the only physics standard offered to them, even if they are interested in science and are capable of achieving what they want to if given the	No			2020-02-23 23:45:22	ANON-YFPW-RB2W-3	2020-02-23 23:45:22	2020-02-23 23:45:28

No		Strongly disagree	Latin is a valuable language and should not be removed. I feel the combination of many of the social sciences may take away from some of the nuance of each subject notably in the combination of commerce and social studies.	Latin is an extraordinarily valuable subject as it tends to teach very technical grammar & syntax rules which often overlooked in favour of textual analysis in English. It provides students a strong foundation for studies in English and many other languages and should not be discontinued. The combination of Accounting, Economics & Business Studies into one subject "commerce" at level 1 seems to paint the field in far too broad of strokes. These subjects have an incredible amount of depth individually and often deal with different areas of business and the economy at large, for example where accounting develops vocational skills economics provides a theoretical backing for microeconomic concepts. To merge them into one subject is misguided as it restricts the teachers ability to provide sufficient depth of analysis in each field where under the status quo students may be able to learn about but the supply and demand side economics of a business and finally how they interact with one another, with the proposed it would be unreasonable to teach all of this whilst also teaching the basis of accountancy and therefore sacrifices must be made for example where students will only see how supply side and consumer economics interact not the incentive structures behind why they exist (which	Philosophy Politics & Civics	No			2020-02-24 00:06:37	ANON-YFPW-RB24-Z	2020-02-24 00:06:37	2020-02-24 00:06:51
No		Strongly disagree				No			2020-02-24 00:45:14	ANON-YFPW-RB24-Z	2020-02-24 00:45:14	2020-02-24 00:45:24
Yes	Yes, but extremely disappointed that the concept of minimising Level One, or removing it altogether has not moved forward. These ideas of emphasising a broad curriculum is putting changes on the table that don't go anywhere near solving the issue of over-assessment which is the fundamental problem with NCEA. No part of this proposal suggests that the MoE has begun to listen to the sector and the growing body of literature around the issues that teachers are facing. Please start listening to Rosemary Hipkins and other NZ scholars on this issue with practical experience in the classroom of using NCEA.	Strongly disagree	The suggestions are absolutely absurd and are a shameful effort on the MoE's part to make meaningful change to NCEA.	I'm particularly disturbed by the proposal for Media Studies. Media has a unique position in the curriculum, not specifically included in the 2007 NZC but widely taught across various levels of Secondary Schools. It sits across Social Sciences, Arts, Technology, economics and English. To push it into a generic Year 11 Social Studies course is to minimise the importance of this learning area, destroy junior media courses, and reduce the number of senior students taking media courses. It has NEVER been more important to have media literate young people in the world to navigate our complex media environment. Media literacy is a fundamental learning area that media studies is designed to address. There is no subject that addresses this explicitly throughout various units and learning areas. Areas like representation, reliability of news sources, investigating media use, and industry and production are so important for young people. As I write I continue to struggle to understand how on earth in 2020 this subject might be under threat. Similar arguments can be made for Classics. Psychology has just finally got their Level One Achievement Standards and now they are gone! What on Earth is MoE thinking?! Achievement Standards should not explicitly tie to courses		No			2020-02-24 01:58:20	ANON-YFPW-RB23-Y	2020-02-24 01:58:20	2020-02-24 01:58:32
Yes		Disagree	I strongly disagree with the decision to exclude Latin from NCEA Level 1. The study of Latin is invaluable to the understanding of linguistic conventions, sentence structure and argumentative writing skills (to name but a few) that are otherwise neglected by English literature such as it is covered by the NCEA curriculum. Cutting Latin from the public education syllabus limits access to these skills to all but the wealthy who can afford to study and sit CIE curriculum at private schools. I have no reservations as to the remaining subjects proposed.	I strongly urge the government to reconsider the exclusion of Latin language study. As the only language from the list that fundamentally shapes the English language, Latin is the only language the study of which can benefit any student continuing to write and argue in English. Proper Latin education supports students' language, problem solving and argumentative writing skills as well as their understanding of and fluency with the English language. Students of Latin will continue to profit disadvantageously from the study thereof, and excluding the language from the public syllabus limits those students to the minority wealthy or privileged enough to attend a school that offers Cambridge International Examinations.	I am concerned that Classical Studies will only continue to the extent that it can be covered by History. History alone cannot cover the wide variety of studies included in Classics, ranging from literature to anthropology. It is an entirely separate set of skills that is required to, and developed in pursuit of reading, understanding and analysing ancient texts written for societies and cultures no longer existent in the world. Again, the fact that CIE continue to support these studies is evidence alone to the wealth of educational benefit to be gained from their pursuance, and cutting them from NCEA allows only the privileged few to continue to learn from them.	No			2020-02-24 02:27:53	ANON-YFPW-RB22-X	2020-02-24 02:27:53	2020-02-24 02:28:17

No		Strongly disagree	The exclusion the single science subjects makes progression to Year 12 very difficult, particularly in light of the proposed year 11 Science course which has very little basic science content. Chemistry is a subject which relies very heavily on a symbolism and vocabulary that must be learned before more advanced concepts are put in place in Year 12.	The Year 1 Chemistry standards are taken to a much greater extent than the standards on dance or drama. It is not very common to take the entire course, but having some of these content based standards available is important because on average one-third of the level 3 exam takers have had one or more level 1 separate science standards.	Level 1 Separate Sciences	Yes		The level 1 science course is preposterous. There is no way that students can learn basic science by being thrown in at the deep end in difficult contexts. You need content knowledge before you can use it in such a sophisticated way. Many university students would struggle with this. We are meant to be encouraging scientific literacy. This will make students think that science is hard.	2020-02-24 04:20:37	ANON-YFPW-RB2U-1	2020-02-24 04:20:37	2020-02-24 04:21:13
Yes		Agree				Yes		Look at the students who struggle in main stream. Make sure the new standards are easy to interpret. Include clarifications as part of information for standard. There should be no surprises when delivering the standard. Have more project based standards. Have flexibility to include the group work.	2020-02-24 06:50:48	ANON-YFPW-RBYV-C	2020-02-24 06:50:48	2020-02-24 06:51:09
Yes		Disagree				Yes			2020-02-24 06:51:43	ANON-YFPW-RBYV-9	2020-02-24 06:51:43	2020-02-24 06:51:58
Yes		Strongly disagree	I am particularly worried about the lack of required content at level 1. It has to be understood that some students will leave high school with only that qualification. Without required content knowledge such as evolution, forces and atomic theory, there is very little that students can do to think critically. Critical thought requires content knowledge first, these should still be a required understanding, to create an acceptable minimum of knowledge if they choose to further progress later in life.	For science at level 2 and 3, subject specialist are largely happy with what is presented at the moment. However, the leap from level to level 2 is already a big jump in all specialist subjects, without required conceptual frameworks from level 1 they jump will be even higher, much higher in fact that it may be difficult to have students get up to an acceptable understanding within a year. Level 1 still needs to have important conceptual knowledge around principles of forces, evolution and atomic theory.		No			2020-02-24 07:05:46	ANON-YFPW-RBYC-P	2020-02-24 07:05:46	2020-02-24 07:05:57
Yes		Agree				No			2020-02-24 07:20:20	ANON-YFPW-RBYS-6	2020-02-24 07:20:20	2020-02-24 07:20:32
No	"more foundational" just sounds an awful lot like "dumbed down"	Agree	Looks OK as a base - not sure what is gained by reducing opportunity to specialise for some students	"new Technology subjects" = WAY too vague	Not new, but update of senior Physics curriculum is about 50 years overdue...	No			2020-02-24 07:29:07	ANON-YFPW-RBYB-B	2020-02-24 07:29:07	2020-02-24 07:29:21
Yes		Undecided		As a classics teacher I'm unsure how being part of history 'to a low degree' will represent all of the different facets of that course which includes art, literature, philosophy and history. There seems to be a prevailing attitude that History and Classics are the same course - an attitude that clearly shows how little people understand what classics actually is. Will the new standards in development for the NCEA overhaul take this into account to ensure classics can be studied at level one so students get the base knowledge and skills they will need in level 2 classics? The same question for art history and media studies being part of social studies.		No			2020-02-24 07:45:25	ANON-YFPW-RBYV-C	2020-02-24 07:45:25	2020-02-24 07:45:34
No		Disagree		looking at proposed assessments for Science it looks like an English paper with a high level (stage one university) of literacy required and really no room for students who might want some concrete examples of science and who are not strong in explaining what happened to encouraging STEM in NZ schools.		No			2020-02-24 07:54:51	ANON-YFPW-RBYG-T	2020-02-24 07:54:51	2020-02-24 07:55:10
Yes	Yes, I was aware of this, however, was not aware that there would be merging of subjects areas that all have very different disciplines.	Strongly disagree	I strongly disagree with the proposed subjects. For example, the merging of Economics, Accounting and Business Studies into "Commerce" diminishes and takes away value from these subject areas. Not to mention specialising in these subjects at Levels Two and Three will now become more difficult for students, as they will have less content knowledge to support their learning at a senior level.	Economics, Business Studies and Accounting are all VERY different disciplines with different subject language. Merging these three subjects into one will discourage students from taking these subjects and kill the subject area. It is unreasonable to assume that because a student takes Economics, they should also take accounting or business studies. Students may have an exclusive preference for one or the other! Diminishing the value of these subjects at NCEA Level One will surely have a flow on effect to these subject areas at the Tertiary Level.	No.	Yes	No.		2020-02-24 07:55:43	ANON-YFPW-RBYJ-W	2020-02-24 07:55:43	2020-02-24 07:55:56

Yes		Undecided		If the intention is to provide a broader course at Level one why is Food becoming a narrower and more specialist course? Food Science is taught at tertiary level and the prerequisites are science and math. Consultation with wider stakeholders (parents/students/industry) would likely indicate the need for a broader approach that covers a range of skills. How would Food Science look in existing classrooms with fairly basic equipment many of which are still set up to deliver an older style food programme? Who will teach food science? It would be a very different course to what is currently available. Many students who currently enjoy the design and practical focus of food programmes would be put off by a science course. It sounds academically elitist. I strongly feel that this is a mistake.		Yes			2020-02-24 07:55:57	ANON-YFPW-RBYQ-4	2020-02-24 07:55:57	2020-02-24 07:56:15
Yes		Strongly disagree	Arts and language retain single subjects, but science does not. Given the government's push on support for STEM subjects this seems to be a ridiculous situation.	The proposed L1 Science Standards give on opportunity for non-science (STEM) specialist, but does not provide a platform for successful learn of the vital keys skills and knowledge involved in advanced science careers.	Must retain academic focussed Biology, Chemistry, Physics and Earth and Space Science.	No			2020-02-24 07:59:18	ANON-YFPW-RBYE-R	2020-02-24 07:59:18	2020-02-24 07:59:31
Yes		Agree	Overall I agree changes are needed to Level 1. I think there are however some misunderstandings about the way in which some standards offer opportunities for learners. For example, the level 1 Art History standards are very useful within the Level 1 Visual Arts Curriculum. It's important that the teams reviewing standards are able to be flexible in their thinking as opposed to siloed.			No			2020-02-24 08:01:05	ANON-YFPW-RBYS-8	2020-02-24 08:01:05	2020-02-24 08:01:13
Yes		Agree				No			2020-02-24 08:05:28	ANON-YFPW-RBYP-3	2020-02-24 08:05:28	2020-02-24 08:05:42
Yes	Good idea.	Strongly agree	Good range. Any compulsory?	No.	Media Studies, Drama	No			2020-02-24 08:05:46	ANON-YFPW-RBY7-A	2020-02-24 08:05:46	2020-02-24 08:05:55
No	The intended change is great and I hope schools do get on board. Links nicely with making Level 1 optional, creating a broad platform for learning rather than a focus on assessing specialised aspects of subjects	Agree				No			2020-02-24 08:05:53	ANON-YFPW-RBYF-5	2020-02-24 08:05:53	2020-02-24 08:06:11
Yes		Agree		if some curriculum areas are merging and there are to be fewer Achievement Standards offered, which old curriculum areas will hold their standards??		No			2020-02-24 08:09:21	ANON-YFPW-RBY1-4	2020-02-24 08:07:20	2020-02-24 08:09:24
Yes		Strongly disagree	Classical Studies should not be taken from Level 1. History teachers will not include it in their programme so it will not occur. Classics is a multi-disciplinary broad-based subject so I cannot understand why it has been removed. The myths and legends, political systems, art works and ideologies form the basis of western culture. Therefore it is inaccurate to say it does not lead to or complement another subject. Also the myths and legends which form a major part of the Level 1 course is a reflection on the important art of storytelling which leads directly to a comparative study with Maori myths.			No			2020-02-24 08:10:23	ANON-YFPW-RBYZ-D	2020-02-24 08:10:23	2020-02-24 08:10:56
No		Disagree		I am tired of being asked to defend the study of Latin and the Classical world. Its value should be obvious to educational experts and consultants in charge of the national curriculum. Nothing could be more "foundational" for an understanding of Western culture, or a healthier contribution to a "broad" understanding of the world. The notion that, because the people involved are long dead and the languages no longer spoken, the subject is therefore irrelevant and of no value is exceedingly shortsighted and mistaken. These subjects, more than many others, encourage students to consider their place in the world and recognise the deep roots that support our present culture. They also expose students to a wide range of disciplines: history, art, literature, language skills, philosophy, architecture, anthropology, early science, and geography. Needless to say, these subjects are supported in NCEA Levels 2 & 3 and at the tertiary level and are deep and varied enough to sustain three years of secondary study. There is also plenty of student demand; although I feel this is slightly beside the point, since it is the job of those setting the curriculum to outline what pursuits may be valuable to a young person's education, not the other way around. If we remove these options young people could come away from their time at school unaware of the fact that the		No			2020-02-24 08:15:08	ANON-YFPW-RBYH-U	2020-02-24 08:15:08	2020-02-24 08:15:37

Yes	I was aware of this but not as proposed with regards Commerce.	Strongly disagree	From a Commerce perspective I believe this a massive step backwards. It is my understanding that you needed to pass 2nd year papers at University to teach a particular subject - this may restrict some teachers. It will also create logistical issues within schools for Commerce teachers. Personally I feel it will detract from becoming either an Accounting, Economics or Business Studies teacher.	When I first heard that things would change I was excited by the thought that Commerce - Accounting/Economics/Business Studies would become a more exciting option with incorporation of financial literacy into the Achievement Standards. That it would be an opportunity to include some more practical information into the relative subjects e.g. taking out a mortgage, Kiwi saver, job scenario's, etc.. The fact the course is being condensed would appear to be the opposite of this.	With all three Commerce subjects they provide a foundation for Levels 2 and 3. With the foundation being diminished it will have implications for Levels 2 and 3.	Yes			2020-02-24 08:22:19	ANON-YFPW-RBYB-N	2020-02-24 08:19:33	2020-02-24 08:22:21
Yes		Agree		The social sciences are hit particularly hard with the disciplines being drawn together, whilst I understand the rationale teachers are currently subject experts in their own disciplines, so asking them to broaden a focus could be difficult. Many history teachers do not have a classics background nor do many accounting teachers have a business studies so the alignment of standards needs to be done carefully and with enough options for teachers to cater to the needs of the Ako and to deliver what they can teach to the highest standards		Yes			2020-02-24 08:38:38	ANON-YFPW-RBYM-Z	2020-02-24 08:38:38	2020-02-24 08:38:58
No		Strongly disagree		Level one commerce will have very limited accounting content due to the practical constraints of the subject and the ability to access the subject directly at Level Two in most settings' We have the following concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accounting, Economics and Business are very individual and differing subjects. The skills and knowledge in each of these areas are very different. The skills taught at Level 1 underpin the foundation of success in Level 2 and Level 3. As a pathway into future success in Level 3 and Scholarship Accounting and Economics, students require knowledge that is embedded during teaching during Level 1. There is a clear future career pathway in all of these areas and they are INDIVIDUAL at University. Nationally student numbers in Accounting and Business at Level 1 are increasing (or being maintained). Students financial capabilities are a concern nationwide, and this proposal limits students access to varied pathways where this is a predominant idea. It appears that Commerce subjects, and Accounting in particular, will be a step behind with respect to learning as it is not able to be accessed at Level 1, or will need to be condensed 		No			2020-02-24 08:44:07	ANON-YFPW-RBYD-Q	2020-02-24 08:44:07	2020-02-24 08:44:24
Yes		Undecided	I can appreciate the drive to deliver a broad curriculum and we certainly need to assess less and teach more. However I am unsure of the make-up of the "Commerce" course.	Hopefully the Commerce course at Year 11 contains sufficient basic Accounting skills. Despite technologies being widely available that do the processing and statements it is still vital for business students to understand how these processes work. A bit like needing to know how to add up in maths even though we have calculators. If they don't have enough Accounting at level 1 it could kill it in Year 12 and 13, which would be a shame as there are still many employment opportunities in finance which utilise these skills.	No	No			2020-02-24 08:47:22	ANON-YFPW-RBYA-M	2020-02-24 08:47:22	2020-02-24 08:47:35
No	No greater exposure than what we currently do. Currently students do get enough exposure to make an informed choice going onto level 2. They do get enough broad exposure Y9&10!!	Strongly disagree	Some of the high numbered subjects entered into L1 are disadvantaged compared to those at the bottom of the list. Clearly not catering for student needs/wants. Check the data for NCEA entries and rethink please	NO good for commerce <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Look at the numbers nationally for Level 1 - clearly favoured by students Students will miss out big time on ENOUGH exposure Different skills are needed for Bus, Econ and Accounting. NOT good to combine. We do that in Year 10 for exposure!! Staff will leave the profession as expertise are not valued at L1 		No			2020-02-24 08:44:07	ANON-YFPW-RBYX-B	2020-02-24 08:44:07	2020-02-24 08:48:42
Yes	However, the foundation education appears to be overly broadband to give enough of content materials in preparation for Level2 and Level 3.	Strongly disagree	Disagree because of 1 above.	Any change should involve more content materials to support studying at Level 2 e.g. 2PHY.	2PHY and 3PHY.	No	No		2020-02-24 08:49:40	ANON-YFPW-RBYN-1	2020-02-24 08:49:40	2020-02-24 08:50:04

Yes		Agree				Yes	It's a waste of time. A politically motivated gesture. It will hamper the education of children, when compared globally. It's a self serving political motivated crutch to buy Maori votes at the cost of the whole nation. Any criticism of it will be declared "racist" so why do I bother?	Don't do it.	2020-02-24 08:52:30	ANON-YFPW-RBYK-X	2020-02-24 08:52:30	2020-02-24 08:52:41
Yes		Agree				No			2020-02-24 08:55:42	ANON-YFPW-RBY6-9	2020-02-24 08:55:42	2020-02-24 08:55:48
Yes		Strongly disagree	Foundation knowledge established at level 1 for level 2 will be lost. Making level 2 and 3 a lot more complex and inaccessible to a large number of learners.	Little to no Accounting being taught at level 1 will hugely impact learner success at level 2 and put a tremendous amount of pressure on them.		Yes		See previous comments.	2020-02-24 08:57:23	ANON-YFPW-RBYR-5	2020-02-24 08:57:23	2020-02-24 08:57:45
No	The idea of reducing Biology, Chemistry, Physics etc into Science, is akin to reducing Spanish, French, Japanese into "Language" or Dance, Visual arts, Drama into "Arts". While these subjects have commonalities, there is a lot of difference too.	Undecided	See above.	I think that it make sense to maintain the Sciences as individual subjects, but along with this goes the idea that it is ok to assess curriculum. What really concerns me is that this appears to be a situation of Assessment driving curriculum, and not the other way around. I think that by reducing the sciences to a single "science" the amount of time delivered to this part of the curriculum will be reduced to be consistent with this, and thus a disparity of time will exist between subjects which are "reduced" vs those that are not.	I think there is room for further specialisation in the Science. Eg Geology, Astronomy, Psychology.	No			2020-02-24 08:59:07	ANON-YFPW-RBYW-A	2020-02-24 08:59:07	2020-02-24 08:59:21
Yes		Disagree		Health and Physical Education should not be combined at level one. The students taking these two subjects can be very different. A large majority of student's in this subject area love one (health or PE) more than the other.		No			2020-02-24 09:01:39	ANON-YFPW-RBY4-7	2020-02-24 09:01:39	2020-02-24 09:01:54
No		Strongly agree		No	No	No			2020-02-24 09:02:11	ANON-YFPW-RBYT-7	2020-02-24 09:02:11	2020-02-24 09:02:32
Yes		Strongly disagree	The fundamentals of Biology, Chemistry and Physics are taught in year 11. One year is challenging enough to teach the fundamentals of level 2 and 3. If this was to go ahead, this would lead to the dumbing down of the level 2 and 3 course prescriptions due to the fundamentals from level 1 not being taught. Assessment of the material is essential for students as it teaches work ethic, persistence, motivation and incentive for students to pay attention and learn. It is the method which is used in teaching to understanding students progress, it is embedded in our national teaching registration standards so it has an important place in our education system. From the experience of the classroom, students will switch off in lessons for information they are not going to be assessed on, no matter how interesting you try and make your lessons. So the concept of teaching topics for the sake of it with out structured follow up assessment will not gain any benefit to both teachers and students. The integrity of Science (biology, chemistry and physics) is being completely compromised and it is embarrassing, demoralizing for both teachers and students.	Don't make the changes. We are dumbing down our nation. It is embarrassing.		No			2020-02-24 09:05:07	ANON-YFPW-RBY3-6	2020-02-24 09:05:07	2020-02-24 09:05:31
Yes		Agree				No			2020-02-24 09:07:51	ANON-YFPW-RBY2-5	2020-02-24 09:07:51	2020-02-24 09:08:01
Yes		Strongly agree				Yes			2020-02-24 09:08:01	ANON-YFPW-RBYU-8	2020-02-24 09:08:01	2020-02-24 09:08:08
Yes		Strongly agree	I think a broad course is far more valuable than forcing students to specialise too early.			No			2020-02-24 09:09:53	ANON-YFPW-RBY1-4	2020-02-24 09:09:53	2020-02-24 09:10:10
Yes		Agree				No			2020-02-24 09:11:53	ANON-YFPW-RBYV-1	2020-02-24 09:11:53	2020-02-24 09:12:20
No		Strongly disagree	Having only very broad Science standards instead of subject-specific standards will narrow our curriculum and make it much more difficult to provide meaningful courses to learners of all abilities.	See answer to point 2.		No			2020-02-24 09:13:55	ANON-YFPW-RBY1C-E	2020-02-24 09:13:55	2020-02-24 09:14:04
Yes		Agree				No			2020-02-24 09:17:15	ANON-YFPW-RBY1X	2020-02-24 09:17:15	2020-02-24 09:17:37

Yes		Strongly disagree	What are they thinking? Media and psychology are in no way whatsoever related to social studies and regarding the other subjects, the schools themselves should be able to decide which specialized subjects they provide according to demand and student population size.	Getting rid of Latin is all round a poor choice in general, no explanation really needed. Combining so many subjects that are barely or not at all related, for example social sciences, is an incredibly poor choice because you're making it even harder for teachers to do their jobs and you're making a job with poor pay and little to no benefits even more unappealing to those considering teaching in the future.	No			2020-02-24 09:17:24	ANON-YFPW-RB1B-3	2020-02-24 09:17:24	2020-02-24 09:17:59
Yes	Yes, I was aware but had no idea it would be such overreaching and massive changes. Perhaps this is NCEA's attempt to get all schools to drop Level 1? I cannot imagine parents of Level 1 students will approve of all Sciences being combined or numeracy subjects in particular.	Strongly disagree	I do not support these changes. These changes to not make NCEA broader and more straight forward, instead they simply allow students less options and make some subjects seem of more value than others. The kind of cutting and 'grouping' that is seen here will only make students see a value system imposed by NCEA. This 'value system' of what subjects are worth doing and which aren't, is not only incorrect but dangerous. In example, Classics and History are not the same. In any sense. In fact they are thousands of years apart in content, and Classics includes art, architecture, language, literary texts and more which History does not include. Sciences all being grouped, with no option for students to get on their pathway, is unfair to students. If a student wants to do, in example, Biology, how now will they prepare for Level 2? Are we going to dumb down Level 2 to make it possible. This can fit any of NCEA's proposed cuts.	Classics is not History. If we look at the recent graduation stats at Auckland, Ancient History/Classics outstrip modern history as a choice by graduates. This means that graduates have chosen to study Ancient History/Classics MORE or instead of History. At a high school level, numbers I am seeing are growing. The reasons for this are likely as follow: 1. Rich learning opportunities. Classics includes ancient languages, and modern, which are of huge relevance to our world. Student must also learn art, architecture, literature (some of the world's oldest texts, such as the Iliad and Odyssey), drama, and more. A Classics student is not like a History student, or any other, as Classics pulls in a far wider array of evidence and themes. A student in Classics can improve their literacy with ancient text studies, or their grasp of the physical world with art and architecture. And so on. 2. Level 1 NCEA Classics is our pathway into Level 2/3 Classics. At my school we have year 8, 10 and 11-13 Classics. The numbers in 11 and 13 are particularly large. This is because students can gain literacy credits in Classics instead of English, and much prefer Classics as a choice. Without Level 1, students are being told that Classics is not of value. That NCEA has no place for it. Or, worse,	No			2020-02-24 09:20:20	ANON-YFPW-RB1G-J	2020-02-24 09:20:20	2020-02-24 09:20:26
Yes		Agree		Yes. For level 1 Commerce it says that Accounting will not be taught. Does this mean that existing Econ and Bus Stud standards will remain? I have taught both and our school currently has good numbers for Bus Studs which is more hands-on and less theoretical than Econ. I can't comment further until it is clearer what the ACH STANDARDS within Commerce look like. Thanks	Yes		no	2020-02-24 09:23:05	ANON-YFPW-RB1J-N	2020-02-24 09:23:05	2020-02-24 09:23:32
Yes	I was aware, but was hopeful that they would still contain clear content guidelines and not just be touche feely stuff with no real science content to help prepare the students for Level 1 or give them basic science understanding for life	Strongly disagree	the scraping of chemistry, physic, biology and earth science has reduced our choice even though you say we didn't use them my school did the 3 science externals and choose internals from the chem and physic standards not the science ones. this is reducing our range of areas we can choose from and takes away our ability to choose what our students are interested in.	If the reduction of content and assessing using portfolios is meant to motivate students it will not, the students I teach will get bored and the boys who struggle to write will just quit therefore many of our potential scientists of the future will be lost. As for thinking we can still teach the content, students are very motivated but credits and if it does not count for credits they will just turn off. I was hopeful in the beginning when I saw that there were still going to be some externals but when they turn out to be portfolios and that they were very wolly I looked at how many years I have left to teach! My biggest concern is that my youngest child will have to go through this system and she is a high level thinker with an engineering mind and struggles with writing, these standards will not interest her or do her justice as they require a higher level of literacy than the current standards do. These standards appear to favour girls that can write and doesn't give students with poor written skills room to excel, at least with the current system students with lower literacy skills can answer shorter questions and show what they can do.	No	No idea as we have not seen this!		2020-02-24 09:23:39	ANON-YFPW-RB1Q-V	2020-02-24 09:23:39	2020-02-24 09:24:18
No		Disagree	Most are fine, but I don't think it makes sense to have 5 fields of science (earth, space, bio, chem, phys) integrated into "Science" while aghort remains separate. This also makes it difficult for teachers to design courses which meet the requirements for UE while contextualising learning for populations of students who would benefit from learning more about agriculture and horticulture.	see #2	No			2020-02-24 09:25:43	ANON-YFPW-RB1E-G	2020-02-24 09:25:43	2020-02-24 09:25:48

Yes		Disagree	I strongly agree with the pedagogy behind the changes, however, not how much some subjects are spread so thinly.	I disagree with Media Studies being put into Social Studies. I think combining two disciplines is fair, but three spreads the key ideas too thin. Especially as Media Studies involves practical skills as well. It is also inequitable that Geography remains singular - especially since studying the environment could be filtered through the entire curriculum. As Geography is studied as a Science at University - perhaps it could be combined here.	- Human resource management to give an academic outlet for students demonstrating work readiness and understanding of the workplace, rather than just the Unit Stds on offer.	No			2020-02-24 09:27:31	ANON-YFPW-RB15-Z	2020-02-24 09:27:30	2020-02-24 09:27:53
Yes		Undecided			This might not be the place, but i am worried about the reducing of standards in Digital Technology and wonder if this requires the subject to be more specialized? At my school we currently teach 2 strands of DT in level 2 and 3 (comp sci, and media), and are thinking about changing this to 3 in the future (adding networking and electronics). A number of students currently take both comp sci and media. I am worried that the reduced number of standards might make it difficult to put together two separate courses.	No			2020-02-24 09:28:43	ANON-YFPW-RB1P-U	2020-02-24 09:28:43	2020-02-24 09:28:54
No		Disagree				No			2020-02-24 09:30:43	ANON-YFPW-RB19-4	2020-02-24 09:18:43	2020-02-24 09:30:53
No		Disagree	It is very disappointing that the only ancient language that has been offered in NZ highschools, Latin, is now being cut. Learning Latin has many educational and cultural benefits. Classics is a popular subject and should be separate from a general history course. I have 4 school aged children and am very sad to hear that they might not have the chance to properly access these subjects in enough depth.	It is very disappointing that the only ancient language that has been offered in NZ highschools, Latin, is now being cut. Learning Latin has many educational and cultural benefits. Classics is a popular subject and should be separate from a general history course.	Ancient Greek.	No			2020-02-24 09:31:13	ANON-YFPW-RB17-2	2020-02-24 09:31:13	2020-02-24 09:31:26
No		Undecided				No			2020-02-24 09:31:44	ANON-YFPW-RB1F-H	2020-02-24 09:31:44	2020-02-24 09:31:50
Yes		Strongly agree				Yes			2020-02-24 09:36:44	ANON-YFPW-RB1Z-5	2020-02-24 09:36:44	2020-02-24 09:36:58
Yes		Strongly agree	I am against the removal of Latin. It is a foundation language.	I am against the removal of Latin. It is a foundation language. If New Zealand decides to remove Latin then that would be in the wrong direction as to what is happening globally. The language is making a comeback and we should not be look inwards but outwards and ensure our children are fit globally and not just New Zealand based/linked languages. Latin provides a deeper understanding and fluency of the romance languages (French, Spanish, Italian etc.). Half of the English vocabulary is made up of Latin words and roots. Latin helps us understand English better.		No			2020-02-24 09:37:16	ANON-YFPW-RB1H-K	2020-02-24 09:37:16	2020-02-24 09:37:58
Yes		Strongly disagree		The inclusion of so many scientific subjects in one section is not a good idea. I do agree that the nature of science and critical thinking around how science is presented in the media is important. However, removing critical learning objectives for each subject is not going to work well. The students need to know the basics of each subject area first in order to understand how each subject area implements the scientific method. It is also important to understand how each subject area understands matter and the world in order to be aware of how each area is often portrayed in the media (e.g. why is the idea that "chemicals are all bad" still presented in the media?) This programme will ask too much of the teachers. It will be too much work to support so many students in designing experiments. I fear that classes will all end up doing the same experiments just so the teacher can manage their workloads. That would be unfair to the teachers, as well as the students. We need to design programmes that allow teachers to support the learning of students easily. I suggest revising this to outline clear learning objectives for each subject area and incorporating the nature of science throughout each subject	Chemistry	No			2020-02-24 09:39:25	ANON-YFPW-RB1B-D	2020-02-24 09:39:25	2020-02-24 09:39:34
Yes	I think its good but it could limit knowledge going into uni. It would be easy to create an option. Get these specialised subjects AND a broader subject. Onehunga High School already does this with a Social Studies option and a Geography option, for example.	Strongly disagree	Again, there should be an option to do both broad and specialised subjects. Media Studies should be Arts, it is far more creative than Social Studies. I just don't see how someone could teach all these options in one subject for one year, so when the options for Level 2 come, a student can make an informed decision.	Media Studies should be completely separate from Social Studies. Sure, part of it is around the impacts of the media on society but it is more creative, involving creating short films, music videos, screenplays etc.	No.	No		N/A	2020-02-24 09:42:03	ANON-YFPW-RB1M-R	2020-02-24 09:42:03	2020-02-24 09:42:27

No		Disagree	I do not support the merging of subjects. Specifically History and Classical studies, and the complete disregard of Latin as a NCEA subject.	Bring Latin back into the curriculum.	Law should be a subject that has achievement standards not Unit standards.	Yes		No.	2020-02-24 09:42:55	ANON-YFPW-RB1D-F	2020-02-24 09:42:55	2020-02-24 09:43:06
No	As usual, change by stealth.	Strongly disagree		Separate sciences ie Physics, chemistry and biology must remain and be taught as distinct disciplines.	Irrelevant question.	Yes	Why is this relevant?	No	2020-02-24 09:44:01	ANON-YFPW-RB1X-3	2020-02-24 09:44:01	2020-02-24 09:44:23
Yes		Undecided		That Home Economics should fall under Technology as, even though there is a relationship around healthy eating. But with the hospitality industry, it should fall more under technology rather than PE	Outdoor Ed	No			2020-02-24 09:44:30	ANON-YFPW-RB1A-C	2020-02-24 09:44:30	2020-02-24 09:44:39
Yes	I'm wondering about the core generics? Where do they fit in?	Agree	Good range of subjects		Psychology, Philosophy, Forensic science	No			2020-02-24 09:59:09	ANON-YFPW-RB1N-S	2020-02-24 09:59:09	2020-02-24 09:59:25
Yes	I support keeping level 1 broad, and I also think Levels 2 and 3 should be broad. Instead of limiting the future choices of kids at uni, they should be supported to have a well-rounded, robust education.	Disagree	I am entirely unhappy about the exclusion of Art History and Latin.	I fail to see the rationale for excluding those Art History while adding Maori Performing Arts. Maori Performing Arts is no more beneficial to students than Art History. Art History is beneficial in helping others learn about the past, what was going on during those time periods, and help humans relate to one another. With the rise of globalism, students should have their views expanded, not narrowed. Latin should absolutely remain part of the curriculum as Latin provides the root words of over half of the modern sciences. Latin is a highly beneficial language. "Latin can prepare you to study 'Latin saturated' professions. Law, medicine, science, music, theology, philosophy, and literature use many Latin words or English words derived from Latin." Not only that, but Latin "French, Spanish, Italian, Romanian and Portuguese are considered the Romance languages and evolved from Latin. 90% of their vocabulary comes from Latin. In addition, the concepts of agreement, inflected nouns, conjugated verbs, and grammatical gender learned in Latin can help you learn non-Latinate languages as well. Home Economics should not be limited to Food.	I would like to see NCEA be broadened where students are provided a much more rounded education than they are now. Why are we asking students to specialize at such a young age?	No			2020-02-24 10:01:14	ANON-YFPW-RB1K-P	2020-02-24 10:01:14	2020-02-24 10:01:26
No		Strongly disagree		I am deeply disappointed that Latin is being removed and Classical Studies is being essentially removed from Level 1. Latin should be kept on these grounds (there are other reasons, but we have been asked to be brief): Category 1: Learning Latin provides a broad basis for vocab use in Romance languages at Level 2 and 3 and for Classical Studies Category 3: Latin is useful for further study in medicine, law, Sciences, and Arts Category 4: Individual learners who excel in languages would benefit from curricula designed for them (people have no problem studying 3 sciences, but balk at 3 languages!) Category 7: Latin is widely regarded as a key indicator of academic excellence internationally and would benefit our students if applying for overseas universities Classical Studies and History and Art History are vastly different subjects. I would recommend keeping Classical Studies as a separate subject at Level 1 in order to prepare students for further study at Level 2 and 3.	NA	No			2020-02-24 10:04:57	ANON-YFPW-RB16-1	2020-02-24 10:04:57	2020-02-24 10:05:14
No		Undecided	The subjects that have been aligned with the NZ curriculum still need to directly lead into NCEA subjects. There still needs to be the foundation learning for level 2 and 3.	I feel that we are watering down subjects so there is a going to be a wide gap between the learning specificity in Level 1 and 2		No			2020-02-24 10:11:02	ANON-YFPW-RB1R-W	2020-02-24 10:11:02	2020-02-24 10:11:17
Yes		Strongly agree		I think the core subjects need to be tighten further as young people often look for the "easy" options and then later regret what they have chosen as it has narrowed what they can do. Some subjects need a strong foundation e.g. maths while study of the others can be commenced quite easily at tertiary level.		No			2020-02-24 10:13:47	ANON-YFPW-RB1W-2	2020-02-24 10:13:47	2020-02-24 10:13:55
No	I didn't know of the cull or putting subjects together. Seems to not have been transparent	Undecided				Yes			2020-02-24 10:14:37	ANON-YFPW-RB14-Y	2020-02-24 10:14:37	2020-02-24 10:14:46
Yes		Agree				No			2020-02-24 10:16:04	ANON-YFPW-RB1T-Y	2020-02-24 10:16:04	2020-02-24 10:16:13
Yes		Agree				Yes			2020-02-24 10:17:25	ANON-YFPW-RB13-X	2020-02-24 10:17:25	2020-02-24 10:17:34

Yes		Strongly disagree	Removing Latin altogether (supposedly on the basis of all criteria) as well as removing Classical Studies from NCEA level 1 is misguided and intellectually dishonest. To me (an Associate Professor in Classics and a Kiwi who studied Classical Studies in the Sixth Form (viz., Year 12), removing Latin entirely and Classical Studies from L1 (effectively) looks like nothing so much as a knee-jerk rejection of older subjects with supposedly colonial associations; of subjects which are intrinsically difficult (and therefore intrinsically rewarding to study); or a fiscal rationalization dressed up as pedagogy. To be frank, I don't see why one wouldn't keep Classical Studies as a separate subject but one would keep History (a far narrower discipline with a much more limited range of content and skill development), let alone Geography.	A fortiori (there's a Latin phrase that might be worth looking up), Classical Studies is an even stronger case at Level 1. The subject is multidisciplinary; it is the very essence of a foundational subject. It is rich in content; there is a very well-organised pathway through L2 and L3 and beyond. Indeed, Classical Studies strongly meets Tiriti obligations, inasmuch as Classical culture is (for better or worse) the historical basis for settler colonial culture, and denying Māori (and other) students the opportunity to learn about the basis for Pākehā culture seems suboptimal to me. I am a professional educator; I have children; my wife is a schoolteacher; I believe strongly in evidence-based decisions. I see no evidence that this is a good decision and plenty that it is a bad one. In short: language learning, ESPECIALLY learning a 'dead' language, is by definition a broad based foundational learning exercise, since language learning literally trains and improves the brain and opens up a limitless second (or third) perspective on the world, on society, on culture, and crucially on history. Learning ancient Greek has probably taught me more than any of my other courses or qualifications. I would only allow that criterion 6 (and possibly 7) are not especially	No				2020-02-24 10:17:40	ANON-YFPW-RB12-W	2020-02-24 10:17:40	2020-02-24 10:18:00
No		Disagree		Art History and classics are an important part of Level 1 and combining them with History will make them more of an option and students will miss out on the valuable teaching that is offered.	No			2020-02-24 10:17:50	ANON-YFPW-RB1U-Z	2020-02-24 10:17:50	2020-02-24 10:19:00	
Yes		Disagree	Classics and History are two very distinct subjects, along with psychology and media studies.	That classics & history, and psychology & media studies should not be merged together.	No	No	No	2020-02-24 10:20:17	ANON-YFPW-RBVY-9	2020-02-24 10:20:17	2020-02-24 10:20:31	
No		Strongly disagree		Latin should be included level 1	Yes			2020-02-24 10:26:53	ANON-YFPW-RBVV-6	2020-02-24 10:26:53	2020-02-24 10:27:04	
Yes	although being aware of the intended change the proposals are quite different from the original ideas that were floated quite angry about the proposed changes to the commerce subjects science and classics at level one the people who came up with this are obviously living in a different world and have no experience at actually trying to teach in these reas	Strongly disagree	packaging 3 subjects together into one called "commerce" was dreamed up by someone on another planet who has no idea of the practical implications of this, and to limit science to 4 standards at level one is completely rigid and inflexible the whole thing smacks of cost cutting and penny pinching with no thought to the actual logistics of how this will work in an actual school in new zealand	combining economics accounting and business studies into one subject is a gross over simplification, they are specialist subjects with specialist language, trying to combine 3 into one will lead to all being done poorly or only the part of the subject a teacher is an expert in being emphasised when I look around parliament I see the same problem, a lot of people with wild ideas and no understanding of the practical outworking or economics of their ideas this is a poorly conceived idea from people who want to keep the public financially and economically ignorant rather than financially literate also coupled with the proposal to limit standards to four per subject at level one how do you even cover anything properly the same applies to the science area once again a poorly conceived idea from people who have no touch with reality and have no experience in the teaching area Here's a proposal how about cut some jobs in the ministry of education and have a shake up there, rationale: wasting tax payers money on poorly conceived qualifications and being out of touch with the reality of teaching in NZ	No			2020-02-24 10:29:22	ANON-YFPW-RBVS-3	2020-02-24 10:29:22	2020-02-24 10:29:37	
Yes		Strongly agree		-	no	No	English is fine, as long as the coverage is the same in both areas.	2020-02-24 10:30:13	ANON-YFPW-RBV8-8	2020-02-24 10:30:13	2020-02-24 10:30:23	
Yes		Agree		Nothing	Florist and hair dressing in schools can be added to Hospitality.	Yes	No	2020-02-24 10:28:43	ANON-YFPW-RBVC-K	2020-02-24 10:28:43	2020-02-24 10:30:31	
Yes		Disagree	There is a greater push and need for financial literacy in New Zealand - so why would we not retain Accounting, Economics and Business Studies as independent subjects to help cover this basic need for all young adults to be financially literate	There is a greater push and need for financial literacy in New Zealand - so why would we not retain Accounting, Economics and Business Studies as independent subjects at Level 1 to help cover this basic need for all young adults to be financially literate	No			2020-02-24 10:31:02	ANON-YFPW-RBV9-9	2020-02-24 10:31:02	2020-02-24 10:31:21	
Yes		Agree		no	Moving image/film based Art	No	no	2020-02-24 10:36:02	ANON-YFPW-RBVG-Q	2020-02-24 10:36:02	2020-02-24 10:36:42	

No	Have you seen the current Level 1 subjects? They are already watered down comparing to the old School Certificate courses. One major reason that nobody respects the NCEA Level 1 qualification is that it doesn't offer in-depth knowledge of anything. Do you think the New Zealand students are not dumb enough that you want to further water down the course? In addition, what's the deal of combining the commerce and science subjects while keeping history, geography and social studies are three separate subjects? If you want to combine the subjects for level 1 and be fair to all the teachers affected by this dumb decision, then you should combine the history, geography and social studies into one subject too!	Strongly disagree	Please spare us about you found some "research" to support your claim that this is better for our students. You guys couldn't admit the failure of NCEA and instead of going back to the Bursary system, you decided to put lipsticks on a pig and tried to make it pretty. You'll only see more school and students opt for either IB or Cambridge qualification than the stupid NCEA.	See my response for Question One! It is obvious whoever recommend the change was a history/geography/social studies teacher! Talking about not understanding what other subjects are about and made a change without any consultation.		No			2020-02-24 10:39:03	ANON-YFPW-RBVI-T	2020-02-24 10:39:03	2020-02-24 10:39:15
Yes	I do not approve. Retaining NCEA Level 1 as an introduction to specialised subjects gives students entry level skills which a broad foundational education does not. That is the role of the primary schools. Introducing greater specialisation at Levels 2 and 3 would make the jump much harder for most students. This is likely to lead to a higher rate of failure.	Strongly disagree	This is dumbing down of the highest order	Media Studies deserves to be a stand alone as it teaches the skills of physical production and analysis at a level different from Social Sciences. If incorporated into a generic Social Sciences course, the skills of planning a film, script-writing, planning locations, costumes, props, filming as a group, editing, post production would be merged down into a small time-framed group project. Skills that encouraged our students to go further into Media Studies and then to Weta Workshops and similar would be lost. Further I am unsure that "Food" involves the training needed for further Level 2 courses such as Hospitality, of Food Technology.	Not at the moment.	Yes	I know that it exists but I do not teach in Te Reo		2020-02-24 10:45:09	ANON-YFPW-RBVQ-1	2020-02-24 10:45:09	2020-02-24 10:45:28
Yes		Agree				No			2020-02-24 10:48:41	ANON-YFPW-RBVE-N	2020-02-24 10:48:41	2020-02-24 10:48:50
Yes		Strongly agree		Financial Literacy and Budgeting skills. Life skills on delayed gratification, a skill that has seen a steady decline in, in the instant world these kids live in.	Investing, understanding debt, diversifying wealth, understanding local economy and flow on effects.	No			2020-02-24 10:48:54	ANON-YFPW-RBV5-5	2020-02-24 10:48:54	2020-02-24 10:49:05
No		Strongly disagree				No			2020-02-24 10:50:59	ANON-YFPW-RBV6-Z	2020-02-24 10:50:59	2020-02-24 10:51:22
Yes		Strongly disagree	As a qualified accountant then trained as a teacher, I believe students will be highly disadvantaged not having Accounting taught in Level 1.	Business Studies is a growing area but Economics and Accounting do not necessarily fall into the broad category of Commerce with very little Accounting taught. Parents of students want them to have some business knowledge and with the NZ way of owning your own business some Accounting knowledge is needed. The current proposal does not support the NZ way.	keeping Accounting, Economics and Business Studies separate	No			2020-02-24 10:51:24	ANON-YFPW-RBV7-7	2020-02-24 10:51:24	2020-02-24 10:51:35
Yes		Undecided		I disagree with putting History and Classics together, anyone who has taken these subjects or taught them knows they have very different aspects and skills. When my students found out that these two subjects were to be combined they said "but they are so different!" So even my Y13 class can see the difficulties of combining these two disciplines.		No			2020-02-24 10:51:33	ANON-YFPW-RBVF-P	2020-02-24 10:51:33	2020-02-24 10:51:48
Yes		Agree		Food Science- I presume this is going to be nutritionally based? The many health epidemics facing New Zealanders (diabetes, obesity) today should be an incentive to teach our young people the importance of nutrition, food and cooking.		Yes			2020-02-24 10:52:00	ANON-YFPW-RBV1-1	2020-02-24 10:52:00	2020-02-24 10:52:10
Yes		Disagree	While there are some merits to this - some subjects will disappear, (eg classical studies) in side of others. I feel that schools will simply drop classics standards and focus on History. Many student love the classical context in which they get to focus on their research and essay writing skills. Different content that keeps them interested.	Classical studies will fade away under this guideline. It needs to be kept as a separate option even if not all school have it as their own school		Yes			2020-02-24 10:56:07	ANON-YFPW-RBVZ-A	2020-02-24 10:56:07	2020-02-24 10:56:33
Yes	I think it is a brilliant idea.	Strongly agree				No			2020-02-24 10:56:36	ANON-YFPW-RBVH-R	2020-02-24 10:56:36	2020-02-24 10:56:43
No		Strongly disagree				No			2020-02-24 10:56:38	ANON-YFPW-RBVB-J	2020-02-24 10:56:38	2020-02-24 10:56:58
Yes		Agree				Yes			2020-02-24 10:56:45	ANON-YFPW-RBVM-W	2020-02-24 10:56:45	2020-02-24 10:57:08

Yes	I was aware but was not aware of the plans to then condense courses	Strongly disagree	As a PE teacher we have 2 classes of level 1 health with 57 students enrolled, of that 57, 41 students only take Health where as 16 take Health and another PE course. My issue is around the 72% majority who only take Health but will now have to also do PE standards as they have chosen a subject that currently does not require them to. I feel that we will lose many females from Health as they don't want to do PE. Of the 57 students 40 are female and 31 only take Health, that's 76% of all the girls taking the subject have already choose not to do PE I'm worried the impact it will have if they see PE as part of the course, and if they decide to not take it at level 1 will they come back to it in level 2 and/or 3??	see above concerns about level 1 Health		No			2020-02-24 11:00:08	ANON-YFPW-RBVD-M	2020-02-24 11:00:08	2020-02-24 11:00:47
No	Nope.	Disagree	YOU NEED TO KEEP classics because it is a multidisciplinary subject. It includes historical events, research, traditions, geography, political, archaeology, archeology, philosophy, art architecture, art history, literature, and even drama. Classics is such a wide range subject and should never be taken off level 1, 2, and 3 curriculum.	YOU NEED TO KEEP CLASSICS!!	YOU NEED TO KEEP CLASSICS!!!!!!!!!!!!	No	YOU NEED TO KEEP CLASSICS!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!	YOU NEED TO KEEP CLASSICS!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!	2020-02-24 11:01:34	ANON-YFPW-RBVX-8	2020-02-24 11:01:34	2020-02-24 11:01:47
No		Strongly disagree	I strongly disagree as the whole point of school is to learn what you need for your job in the future and how can you do that when your skills that you need to learn are merged with other topics meaning less time to learn the skills you need.	Classical Studies I strongly feel should not be merged with history for classical studies already has a wide range of topics that you learn and the history will get in the way of that.		No			2020-02-24 11:02:50	ANON-YFPW-RBVA-H	2020-02-24 11:02:50	2020-02-24 11:03:06
Yes	yes i knew it through my teacher	Strongly disagree	classical studies is already a multi-disiplinary subject	classical studies studdies provided you with a broad platform of skills you can take into the outside world		No			2020-02-24 11:05:13	ANON-YFPW-RBVN-X	2020-02-24 11:05:13	2020-02-24 11:06:52
Yes		Agree				No			2020-02-24 11:08:58	ANON-YFPW-RBVK-U	2020-02-24 11:08:58	2020-02-24 11:09:03
Yes	Yes read further down to see how it impacts us.	Strongly disagree	0%	classics in a multidisciplinary subject and provides intellectual in a variety of historical events, traditions, geography, politics, archaeology, philosophy, literature, drama, art and for me architecture. this is important to me to study ancient architecture because of the fact things they have built things that are still standing today, but some things we have built cannot stand 20 years	No, but they need to keep classics,	No	No idea what Te Marautanga o Aotearoa is.		2020-02-24 11:10:07	ANON-YFPW-RBV6-6	2020-02-24 11:10:07	2020-02-24 11:10:13
No		Strongly disagree		I STRONGLY DISAGREE with with the proposed changes to NCEA Level 1! It is, in my opinion, utterly inadvisable to remove the inclusion of Art History, Classical Studies and other humanities subjects at Level 1 and merge them together under one subject, such as General History. Giving greater autonomy to schools in terms of curriculum flexibility has always resulted, and will continue to result in educational and academic disparities! Inviting schools (such as my former high school) to balance up to three subjects (Classical Studies, Art History, History) within a single one (History), and within a single year, would inevitably preclude a fair balance of content matter from all three. I understand that this is acknowledged in the admission that Classical Studies and Art History would be featured to a "low degree" -- though what does this mean, exactly? The "low degree" seems to imply that schools have free rein to completely eliminate these subjects from the curriculum; this I cannot condone. This flexibility I witnessed first-hand at my old school, where, to ensure that the majority of students were passing Level 3 English, NO read texts were taught; instead, for the Critical Text internal, the emphasis was laid in thematic elements in Disney Films, and for the end-of-year	The greatest joys of my high school/college years - ended only the year previous - and of which, there were few, are directly related to the knowledge I gathered in my humanities subjects; specifically, History, Art History, and Classical Studies. Though I have regrets, as we all do, inevitably, but mine pertain to a lack of choice in my options. If I could have studied, French and German and Latin, all NCEA subjects that were not available to me (but could have been through government support!!!). Additionally, subjects which I would adore to see at NCEA Level 2 and 3 are: philosophy, legal studies (an excellent basis of information to the foundations of New Zealand law and government, for those wanting to pursue jobs in related careers, and those not), and Classical Greek. Though if they are not widespread, and taught all throughout the country, in state schools, not just state-integrated and private, then I rescind my desire and will cry at the further perpetuation of a widening division of education. Please consider my aims -- far-fetched, but passionate nonetheless. If nothing else, improving NCEA would begin to remove the elitist CIE and IB curriculums from this	No			2020-02-24 11:14:42	ANON-YFPW-RBVR-2	2020-02-24 11:14:42	2020-02-24 11:14:53
Yes		Disagree	I thought from huis attended that foundational meant assessing of front of curricula skills. This is something employers were keen to see and we wanted to highlight the importance of such things as communication, problem-solving, teamwork.	As above there appears no avenue to strengthen core skills. Subject content knowledge is not necessarily what employers seem to want.		No			2020-02-24 11:15:34	ANON-YFPW-RBVW-7	2020-02-24 11:15:34	2020-02-24 11:15:48
No	Not aware of these changes until our school signposted this last week	Disagree	Understand that there is a goal to make Level 1 more generalised but I don't think that we should limit choices for students by doing things like combining PE and Health - these 2 subjects cater for different students in our school	Don't like proposed changes to PE and Health at Level 1 - most of our current level 1 PE and level 1 Health students choose to do either PE or Health so we are targeting different students and meeting the needs of all of our students		No			2020-02-24 11:21:46	ANON-YFPW-RBVT-4	2020-02-24 11:21:46	2020-02-24 11:21:55

Yes		Agree	Still think a lot of options in The Arts (eg. Dance) in terms of specialisation compared to other subject areas. Also have an issue with religious studies given same weight as, eg. 'Science'.	As above. Science is condensed but Religious Studies is still a subject on its own? Agree, however, that Science should not be specialised at Level 1. Not sure how Media Studies and Psychology fit into Social Studies. They too are not really Level 1 subjects - Psychology being Tertiary level. Religious studies if truly non-denominational and like Universities approach the subject would actually fit better under Social Studies.	I would like standards around Te Ao Maori or understanding the Maori world/ Maori world view that are not Te Reo language standards but are about understanding Maori society/concepts/ beliefs/ tikanga etc. that are offered English medium. I think this should be from Level 1 actually.	No			2020-02-24 11:26:28	ANON-YFPW-RBV3-3	2020-02-24 11:26:28	2020-02-24 11:26:36
Yes		Agree	I agree with the integration of certain generalised subjects such as combining Business subjects into Commerce, and combining History, Classics and possibly Art History. It is important that students do not specialise too early in their education and have a wide base of knowledge. However, that only works if there are stricter requirements such as requiring Science through Level One.	I have a major issue with combining all of the Science subjects into one paper. Science at NCEA is already difficult and does not adequately prepare students to pursue Science-based degrees at New Zealand universities. If anything, Science needs to remain split into Biology, Chemistry and Physics, and get rid of Earth Science, and general Science. Failure to keep the Sciences split into 3 separate subjects fails to promote STEM subjects as viable career paths.	The Ministry should include specialist subjects that are taught at University so students have more knowledge as to what they can pursue. This would include Psychology, a greater focus on analytics, Computer Science, perhaps combining Geology and Geography, Business Management etc.	No			2020-02-24 11:28:44	ANON-YFPW-RBV2-2	2020-02-24 11:28:44	2020-02-24 11:28:50
Yes		Agree		I think it is appropriate to keep NCEA Level One broad and this may allow students the chance to investigate a wider range of topics. However, will the subjects that are designed to come under this broad banner be mandatory for all schools to teach? How can consistency be reached across schools?		No			2020-02-24 11:38:15	ANON-YFPW-RBVU-5	2020-02-24 11:38:15	2020-02-24 11:38:25
Yes	Shocked!	Strongly disagree	Changes in Science are discriminating against those that have a passion and interest in Science specialist areas.	Science is available already at L1 for those that would like to keep some Science but not specialise. A number of students want to progress in the specialist Science areas in preparation for Science degrees, engineering, health sciences etc. The better their foundation the better their understanding and enjoyment in the subject. I feel as if this move is discriminating against students that have a passion for Science and want to specialise in particular strands of Science.		Yes			2020-02-24 11:38:43	ANON-YFPW-RB7Y-A	2020-02-24 11:38:43	2020-02-24 11:38:57
Yes	So how is limiting the number of subjects broadening the Level 1 education?	Strongly disagree	Think of the range of students we have between and within schools and how we can ensure equity between them by narrowing the subjects available?	I would like to see all the Sciences included (General Science, Chem, Bio, Physics, Ag, Hort and Electrotech). This will ensure we have the best courses available for our students as we can pick and choose what suits	Please don't change them! Speak to the teachers and see what they want!	Yes			2020-02-24 11:42:04	ANON-YFPW-RB7V-7	2020-02-24 11:42:04	2020-02-24 11:42:14
Yes		Strongly agree		I would like to see Maori art included. Perhaps carving as a level 2 and 3 subject. I also think that citizenship, democratic process and media studies (specifically media and power in society) are an important part of social studies and should be compulsory contexts/topics.	Carving, Maori visual arts.	No			2020-02-24 11:46:30	ANON-YFPW-RB7C-M	2020-02-24 11:43:05	2020-02-24 11:46:43
Yes	The jump to specialization in Science will be too large	Strongly disagree	- Government has been promoting STEM but the largest change is to make the Science subjects more difficult. - Without the preparation of exams in level 1 I foresee lower results in level 2. - Physics is acknowledged as one of the most difficult subjects and we are removing the foundations.	See above - the changes proposed will make teaching Science in level 2 and 3 more difficult.	- The ministry needs to consult with the Universities with regards to the Science subjects. - Science most often is taken with leading to University. If we are not preparing the students to the standard they require then education is failing. - Are we providing an education? - Murphy's Law: If everything is so easy that an idiot can get it then only an idiot will want it. - When you are finished will we have something the students are proud to get and can use?	No			2020-02-24 11:51:22	ANON-YFPW-RB79-A	2020-02-24 11:51:22	2020-02-24 11:51:42
No		Disagree		Too generalised- science should be split, as should accounting and economics		No			2020-02-24 12:05:20	ANON-YFPW-RB7G-R	2020-02-24 12:05:20	2020-02-24 12:05:30
No		Strongly agree				No			2020-02-24 12:06:17	ANON-YFPW-RB7J-U	2020-02-24 12:06:17	2020-02-24 12:06:26
Yes		Strongly agree		The Science subject at level 1 is very important because it gives students a chance to learn all of the Science disciplines and then be better informed about their science choices for L2. In our school Bio, Physics and Chem are all offered as half year courses. So, in order to try all 3 at L1, they are compelled to take either take 2 option lines or to drop one science and take the two others which then allows them to take another subject e.g. Art. It creates problems e.g. students don't get the broad Sci education that all students should have; some pick up a Sci at L2, having never done it at L1, realise it is not right for them... etc.		No			2020-02-24 12:08:51	ANON-YFPW-RB7Q-2	2020-02-24 12:08:51	2020-02-24 12:09:04
Yes		Agree		Latin continues to have value for some students vocationally eg in medicine or law. Media Studies is a popular subject and has an Arts context. It is not simply a subset of Social Studies.	Media Studies	No			2020-02-24 12:09:30	ANON-YFPW-RB7E-P	2020-02-24 12:09:30	2020-02-24 12:09:46
No		Undecided				No			2020-02-24 12:10:18	ANON-YFPW-RB75-6	2020-02-24 12:10:18	2020-02-24 12:10:30

No		Strongly disagree	Science needs to be more specific and prescriptive, meaning certain topics and fields should be explicitly covered. Level 1 should be a precursor for the following two years of specialization, build on previous learning and guide towards scientific exploration and more in depth look at concepts.	Science needs to require acquisition of new knowledge as well as reflection on scientific method/theory of knowledge. Students at Level 1 do not have the capacity to critically assess results/evaluate methods. They should be applying a scientific approach to investigate, learn new concepts and put their acquired knowledge into context, possibly using a systems approach.		No			2020-02-24 12:10:45	ANON-YFPW-RB7P-1	2020-02-24 12:10:45	2020-02-24 12:11:09
Yes		Agree				No			2020-02-24 12:14:43	ANON-YFPW-RB7F-Q	2020-02-24 12:14:43	2020-02-24 12:14:56
Yes		Disagree	Narrowing choice by reducing the number of subjects and standards does not promote student choice and the very essence of NCEA which is to enable students to assess when ready and co construct course content to improve engagement and interest. Limiting options has a significant potential to reduce student engagement and as a result student success. Wider choice brings greater chances of students discovering the passions and interest and therefore engage in their own learning. A core concept that any educationalist is aware of!	I question the logic of having dance and drama available yet narrowing 3 subjects to one in commerce. Where is the financial strategic plan in this decision. I also disagree with the removal of generic Technology standards and the reliance on individual technology areas to cover these concepts. With the development of Digital curriculum and the need for an adaptable workforce removing the understanding of the design process and technological problem solving ill prepares students for the workforce beyond school.	Combined subject courses that allow for project based learning. ie A creative technology combined with mathematical/science based understanding. Subject combinations that will fill the void between the creative arts and the science and Maths style engineering or pure subjects	No		2020-02-24 12:16:27	ANON-YFPW-RB7B-W	2020-02-21 13:13:46	2020-02-24 12:16:32	
No		Undecided	They don't seem to be terribly different, in the list above			No			2020-02-24 12:17:35	ANON-YFPW-RB7I-2	2020-02-24 12:17:35	2020-02-24 12:17:45
Yes		Strongly disagree		Biology, Chemistry and Physics have disappeared. This will greatly reduce the scientific competence of students wanting to go on in the sciences. This questionnaire is also bogus as it has no way of determining who the response is from. As a classroom teacher with over 30 years experience in teaching science, I might have expected my response to be valued more than someone with no knowledge of the curriculum and assessment ... but obviously I was mistaken.		No			2020-02-24 12:18:59	ANON-YFPW-RB77-8	2020-02-24 12:14:11	2020-02-24 12:19:34
Yes	I have concerns that the broad approach, whilst being more relevant to a school, may have an impact of the knowledge required for the higher specialism unless schools are supported and funded properly for this change.	Undecided	It will very much depend on whether schools are supported properly, with time for them to develop a new level 1 teaching program that will allow specialist knowledge to be acquired for success at level 2	no	there should be a realisation that science covers a very broad spectrum of knowledge and skills, schools need guidance about how to maintain a balance across this knowledge base	No			2020-02-24 12:19:38	ANON-YFPW-RB7Z-B	2020-02-24 12:19:38	2020-02-24 12:19:56
No		Agree		At Our School Media Studies is separate at Year 11, and Psychology is an option at year 12. Putting them altogether at Year 12 and calling them Social Studies seems a backward move not a move to allowing specialisation.		No			2020-02-24 12:20:15	ANON-YFPW-RB7H-5	2020-02-24 12:20:15	2020-02-24 12:20:30
Yes	I was aware but thought this actually meant a more broad support not a narrowing down of potential for learning. You've condensed 5 different subjects subjects, Biology, Chemistry, Earth and Space Science, Physics, and Science into just 4 standards of Science, while leaving languages and arts as they were there are still separate French, Spanish, Music, Drama etc How on earth do you expect students to get a better understanding of Science when you are offering them less? Biology and Physics are just as diverse - I would argue more so than Spanish and French and we will be doing our students a disservice by offering them so little at level 1. You're setting up students to fail in the Sciences. We are already getting full grown adults that believe in "Flat Earth" or are "Climate Change Deniers" and "Antivaxers" these are always people with a limited back ground in Science and the proposed changes to the NCEA Science is going to contribute even more to this as a global problem, and believe me it is a problem when people choose not to vaccinate their children because they don't understand Science and those children are dying.	Strongly disagree	As above, you are narrowing Science not broadening it. Appalling.	You need to include standards for Biology, Chemistry, Earth and Space Science AND Physics so that we can build course for our students. We currently offer 4 different science based courses at our school giving students the opportunity to achieve in Science. You will be removing that now. Unless you provide a BROAD selection. Also can't understand how you can use the word broad when you clearly mean narrow. I also notice that you think Ag and Hort is important enough to have it's own subject - preparing our youth for farming industries, which are industries that need to significantly improve their practices as they are contributing hugely to our country's greenhouse gas emissions. STEM is likely to produce humans that can help here - and you are reducing their opportunity - have you no future focus?	Biology, Chemistry, Earth and Space Science, Physics.	Yes			2020-02-24 12:20:49	ANON-YFPW-RB7M-X	2020-02-24 12:20:49	2020-02-24 12:21:00
No		Agree				No			2020-02-24 12:23:03	ANON-YFPW-RB7X-9	2020-02-24 12:23:03	2020-02-24 12:23:12
No		Strongly disagree		Stop fiddling and bring it back to basics! You're confusing the kids and the parents by changing things all the time. You have stuffed the system up since we had school cert' anyway! The whole point is to aim to pass. Not pass everyone!		No	Again...too much time, money and effort is being spent on appeasing a small percentage of the population.	Again...too much time, money and effort is being spent on appeasing a small percentage of the population.	2020-02-24 12:23:02	ANON-YFPW-RB7D-N	2020-02-24 12:23:02	2020-02-24 12:23:27

No		Strongly agree	I believe these changes will give students a more level playing field with fewer advantages given to schools/students that have numbers to run early specialisation courses eg Level 1 Physics. I do not think these changes will affect the quality of the Level 3 graduates - they will know the same stuff as they do now.	I am delighted to see Maori Performing Arts given the status it deserves. Losing Latin is not a loss. Reducing subject numbers at level 1 is better for small schools	No	No			2020-02-24 12:26:44	ANON-YFPW-RB7A-J	2020-02-24 12:26:44	2020-02-24 12:26:52
Yes		Agree		- Unsure from this table whether Food Science sits with Technology or Health and PE - Unsure why Agricultural and Horticultural Science has been kept as a subject while the rest of the sciences have been amalgamated	No				2020-02-24 12:31:51	ANON-YFPW-RB7K-V	2020-02-24 12:31:51	2020-02-24 12:31:57
Yes		Undecided			Equity and fairness issues in between standards needs to be addressed at this time. Especially for Unit Standards such as Sociology. Students who take Sociology at Level 3 can achieve 29 credits. As the unit standards are graded, when they achieve these at Merit and Excellence level, this counts towards their overall endorsement of Level 3. A large number of students in recent years have gained Level 3 endorsed at Merit or Excellence, largely as a result of the hard work that they have put into Sociology, but they can't use these credits for University Entrance. It is important to note that just because Sociology is graded unit standards, it is no easier than achievement standard subjects. In fact in many cases, it is far more difficult. For example in the Level 3 graded unit standards 8999, 8995, 28121 and 8991 students are required to Evaluate a social structure / social institution / social process / social theory. This means that a student must "form a critical opinion, based on reason and evidence, of a social structure (or institution / process / theory) in terms of its key aspects and of its influence on individuals and on society". To gain Excellence a student is required to	No			2020-02-24 12:32:34	ANON-YFPW-RB7R-3	2020-02-24 12:32:34	2020-02-24 12:32:41
Yes		Undecided	Current Materials Technology assessments available are Technology which are great for your best and most able students. The other option is Unit Standards provided by ITO's such as BCATS and Competenz. These units are far better suited to the wide range of students and are much better for workshop based courses teaching the skills required before designing is required (such as needed in Technology Achievement Standards). Worry is the retention / ensuring these units (or replacement units) are still available under the proposed NCEA changes.	Ability like current NCEA Level 1-3 to have different stands under technology eg Engineering, Wood. This requires Unit Standards as the Technology Achievement Standards are broad to cover all subjects but won't allow for more than one subject in this area.	See above - ensure able to have different strands of Technology	No			2020-02-24 12:32:25	ANON-YFPW-RB7E-7	2020-02-24 12:32:25	2020-02-24 12:32:44
No		Undecided				No			2020-02-24 12:32:44	ANON-YFPW-RB7W-8	2020-02-24 12:32:44	2020-02-24 12:32:54
No		Undecided	Concerned about science becoming a single subject. But could be a good thing if done well.	Currently when schools offer just "science", students only learn a very small amount about each of physics, chemistry, and biology - one or two topics of each. If the new single "science" is optional and is broader and includes more than the current material, then that is a good thing. It certainly is true that in the real world there is a lot of overlap between different areas of science, e.g. biologists require knowledge of physics. Some schools offer "science" and "extra science" and if the new single subject science is equivalent to both "science" and "extra science" that is a good thing. [Compare to the British system where the norm is for students to take "double science" and earn 2 GCSEs which are a combination of physics, chemistry and biology]. https://www.my-gcse.com/9-1-gcse-science-a-guide-for-parents/ .] Concerns Putting science as a single subject means that if it is optional, we might see students who enjoy physics dropping science because they don't like the writing in biology, etc. Or, someone who wants to take chemistry/biology for future study in healthcare might be put off if they have to also take physics. Could limit career options if		No			2020-02-24 12:34:13	ANON-YFPW-RB7E-9	2020-02-24 11:51:15	2020-02-24 12:34:33
Yes		Strongly agree		No	No	No			2020-02-24 12:37:09	ANON-YFPW-RB7A-5	2020-02-24 12:37:09	2020-02-24 12:37:26

Yes		Strongly disagree	Keep Phys Ed and Health separate.	Keep Phys Ed and Health separate. Health is becoming a massive subject on it's own and can give a really good intro to the year 12 and 13 course. Physical Education is still a great place for a practical based subject which still suits a lot of our learners.		Yes			2020-02-24 12:37:59	ANON-YFPW-RB7T-5	2020-02-24 12:37:59	2020-02-24 12:38:11
No		Agree				No			2020-02-24 12:38:15	ANON-YFPW-RB73-4	2020-02-24 12:38:15	2020-02-24 12:38:31
No		Strongly disagree		When looking at the recommended new list of subjects I have great concern regarding Commerce. The knowledge/skills that students will require in order to be successful in level 2 accounting we will not be able to cover it in a commerce subject at Level 1 in conjunction with business studies and economics. There will not be enough time to cover all three together. It is the same as combining dance, drama and music into a new subject called performance art. All three are linked but are significantly different. If you want to combine it I would suggest that business studies and economics are combined and accounting still stays separately. Unlike accounting, students can pick up business studies and economics with out having it in the previous years.	no	No			2020-02-24 12:39:21	ANON-YFPW-RB72-3	2020-02-24 12:39:21	2020-02-24 12:39:38
Yes		Disagree	What changes - these subjects are exactly the same as the previous ones just with different names!	I am confused. Are you promoting non-specialised learning? If Science is now supposed to include all facets of biology, chemistry, physics etc, it will be a very watered down option. And how will it be different from year 9 or 10 Science?	Where is philosophy, psychology, and a much clearer breakdown between classical English (the deconstruction of texts) and Communication Skills? Where are the skills-based courses? Most boys particularly, are not interested in Shakespeare, poetry or linguistics and won't need these skills on the end of a chainsaw! Where are the core subjects that will enable these students to gain success?	No			2020-02-24 12:41:18	ANON-YFPW-RB7U-6	2020-02-24 12:41:18	2020-02-24 12:41:25
Yes	Good but if the more able students are going to be doing level 1 there should be assessment of the more challenging aspects of the curricula available as well (or they need to do Cambridge or...)	Strongly agree				No			2020-02-24 12:48:11	ANON-YFPW-RBHJ-U	2020-02-24 12:48:11	2020-02-24 12:48:29
Yes		Undecided				No			2020-02-24 12:49:56	ANON-YFPW-RBHC-5	2020-02-24 12:49:56	2020-02-24 12:50:02
No		Undecided				No			2020-02-24 12:49:37	ANON-YFPW-RBHV-R	2020-02-24 12:49:37	2020-02-24 12:51:16
Yes	I have been keeping up with the proposed changes, and have attended the initial public meetings a couple of years ago.	Strongly disagree	I don't understand why Science has been reduced to a very broad and vague looking achievement standards, when other curriculum areas have been allowed to have more subjects at Level 1. I had hoped that this new era of NCEA would provide wide and diverse opportunities for learners of all abilities, and I don't think the 4 proposed standards will provide the depth and breadth of material to engage and support students. The assessment framework looks very poorly thought through, and I have concerns that my children are going to be studying a very vague, bland Level 1 Science program with no meaningful educational outcomes. I also can't see how this will prepare them for L2 or L3 science based learning as no information has been provided showing the whole pathway from L1 to L3.	Science should definitely have more subjects and a wider range of assessment opportunities. I can't see how the 4 proposed AS's for L1 Science are going to stretch and engage our learners and prepare them for the senior science disciplines. At the other end of the scale I can't see how these new standards are going to support our most vulnerable learners - I fear they will become disengaged and fall even further behind. The beauty of the NCEA was that it provided a diverse and rich range of materials that could be used to develop engaging and achievable outcomes for all students.		No			2020-02-24 12:51:57	ANON-YFPW-RBHS-N	2020-02-24 12:51:57	2020-02-24 12:52:08
Yes		Strongly agree				No			2020-02-24 12:52:38	ANON-YFPW-RBH8-T	2020-02-24 12:52:38	2020-02-24 12:52:54
Yes		Strongly agree	I agree with the decreased specialisation at L1. I have seen the problems students encounter with specialising too early and encountering road blocks to potential tertiary study/careers later on. Subject specialisation should only come later on, when students have gained broad subject knowledge and therefore make informed decisions. I strongly agree with the proposed changes.	I have concerns about the integration of te reo texts in the teaching of English, and making it a component of the curriculum. Teachers need to use the most appropriate target text for their course and year level, and also select the strongest text for this purpose. This is often an established text, and students have a desire to build knowledge of the canon of literature. Forcing te reo Maori texts into the course seems anathema to this, and many English teachers will not be trained to deliver this content. Te Reo literature should be part of the Te Reo course.	No	No			2020-02-24 12:53:10	ANON-YFPW-RBH9-U	2020-02-24 12:53:10	2020-02-24 12:53:20
No		Disagree	We need to keep the Science options like Biology, Physics and Chemistry together with a general Science option at level 1. There will be students that know early on what they want to pursue and should be able to start specializing around science as early as possible.	Financial Literacy		No			2020-02-24 12:53:46	ANON-YFPW-RBHG-9	2020-02-24 12:53:46	2020-02-24 12:53:59

No	The table is clear and explains intended changes well.	Agree	As a Science HOD I am pleased about the removal of Specialist Science subjects from Level One as it only serves the best interests of students from schools large enough to support such choice on their (larger) timetable. Now the students from smaller schools that can only afford to offer Science won't be disadvantaged going into Specialist Level 2 Sciences. This levels the playing field for smaller schools. Hopefully the difficulty level of NCEA 2 Externals will be reduced in compensation for there not being so many students entering Level 2 with the advantage of having studied the specialist Science at Level One. This will benefit those students from Smaller schools, and possibly encourage greater participation at Level 2.	See above; happy for smaller schools.	A fair range to choose from already. I would not like further dilution of numbers choosing the academic subjects like Chemistry/Physics by offering any more non-academic subjects like Media studies/ Photography, when students opting for such subjects have outlets already in English/History/Art.	No	Just as I am not familiar with the content of History/Music/Mandarin. Should I be?	N/A.	2020-02-24 12:57:41	ANON-YFPW-RBHU-C	2020-02-24 12:57:41	2020-02-24 12:58:05
Yes		Strongly disagree	When STEM is so important why are we getting rid of Physics, biology , chemistry and earth and space?	When STEM is so important why are we getting rid of Physics, biology , chemistry and earth and space?	Level 2 and 3 must have Physics, biology , chemistry and earth and space?	Yes			2020-02-24 12:59:48	ANON-YFPW-RBHQ-K	2020-02-24 12:59:48	2020-02-24 12:59:58
No		Agree				No			2020-02-24 13:01:07	ANON-YFPW-RBHE-7	2020-02-24 13:01:07	2020-02-24 13:01:45
No	I am horrified to see media lumped together with psychology as 'social studies'. If media is to be incorporated it should be into English.	Strongly disagree	See above. Media studies is about critical awareness of how the world is presented through film. In a digital age this is a serious concern. English teaches film study and critical awareness. Social studies does not teach media interpretation skills like how sound manipulates a viewer. This is a set of skills social studies teachers do not have. That means it will not be taught well or removed. Given the importance of the media industry and young people's interaction with media it should be given to English faculties instead.	See above. (Note -I am not a Media teacher). There are also few specialised teachers of that subject -I imagine most will lose their jobs as the subject isn't in high demand. Losing that speciality would be a really bad thing for the profession. Media must be taught well at year 11.	I am concerned that food science is not including food chemistry from a Science view. Please make sure this isn't limited to vocational studies only but also includes those who wish to be food chemists. They are put off taking the subject at Level 1 at present.	No	I am familiar with the speaking aspects as it links to my subject. I am also familiar with the practical elements as we have a course running in our school where they learn traditional fighting styles. I am hoping it extends to environmental science and well being?	Not at this stage -just listing a subject doesn't provide much to work questions from.	2020-02-24 13:04:21	ANON-YFPW-RBH5-Q	2020-02-24 13:04:21	2020-02-24 13:04:27
No		Disagree				No			2020-02-24 13:05:19	ANON-YFPW-RBH7-S	2020-02-24 13:05:19	2020-02-24 13:05:24
Yes		Undecided				No			2020-02-24 13:05:08	ANON-YFPW-RBHP-J	2020-02-24 13:05:08	2020-02-24 13:06:17
Yes		Disagree		I am very concerned to see that Level 1 Media Studies is not on the list. Now more than ever before, our young people are absolutely bombarded with incredibly harmful, distressing and/or contradictory messages via the media. It is absolutely imperative that students develop the tools to able to understand that media is a construct, and the effects media have on us as a society and as individuals. I believe it is incredibly socially irresponsible and damaging not to include this as a separate subject at Level 1; arming students with the tools to navigate the media is the best protection for our young people, who are currently able to be targeted by individuals and organisations 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, who do not have the young person's best interest at heart.		Yes			2020-02-24 13:10:28	ANON-YFPW-RBH1-K	2020-02-24 13:10:28	2020-02-24 13:10:34
No		Agree		No	No	No		In English would be helpful as I do not know what the Table 2 means in just Te Reo Maori	2020-02-24 13:11:23	ANON-YFPW-RBHZ-V	2020-02-24 13:11:23	2020-02-24 13:11:42
No		Agree				No			2020-02-24 13:12:20	ANON-YFPW-RBHH-A	2020-02-24 13:12:20	2020-02-24 13:12:30
Yes		Undecided	Not sure what the disadvantages could be for students. At least NCEA level 1 prepares them for level 2	Prob good idea not to specialise too early. So I agree potentially with this plan.	None that come to mind	No			2020-02-24 13:12:28	ANON-YFPW-RBHB-4	2020-02-24 13:12:28	2020-02-24 13:12:39
Yes		Disagree				No			2020-02-24 13:16:20	ANON-YFPW-RBHM-F	2020-02-24 13:16:20	2020-02-24 13:16:31

Yes	I was aware and understand the reasoning, I don't have to agree with it. I saw no problem with keeping Level One as it was. Was there ever a choice whether or not to keep Level One as is or was it just a knee jerk reaction to someone who thought it had past its use by date? For some students Level One is the limit and a stretch and it was good to allow them to specialize to some extent. I understand some may argue it is better to give such a student a broader base. I am all for larger standards as I thought the system encouraged the breaking down of learning into credit sized bits rather than looking at learning in context. It may be a stretch for some of the less able to pick up the L2 standards with no prior knowledge. I hope the initiative doesn't just broaden the gap between the able and the not so able.	Undecided	It depends what they come up with. I do not like Accounting, Economics and Business Studies all merged into some bland Commerce. Beginning at Level 2, with no prior knowledge other than that of a proposed "Commerce" will make it harder for the less able to pick up these subjects and will kill them off.	See above reservations on Commerce		No			2020-02-24 13:16:26	ANON-YFPW-RBHD-6	2020-02-24 13:16:26	2020-02-24 13:16:44
Yes	Yes it is hard to judge how effective the changes will be as we don't know what level 2 and 3 look like. Major concern is around the expectations of the Universities once change has been implemented and how that will effect school programmes.	Agree	No real issues. Will cause some staffing concerns with PD being required for staff to teach areas they currently do not.			Yes			2020-02-24 13:17:16	ANON-YFPW-RBHX-T	2020-02-24 13:17:16	2020-02-24 13:17:25
Yes		Undecided	I don't like how the social sciences have been grouped back together. I think they need to be available separately like currently offered.	I would like to see Nutrition included at Level 1 or as a bigger portion of Food Science	Nutrition	No			2020-02-24 13:25:02	ANON-YFPW-RBHA-3	2020-02-24 13:25:01	2020-02-24 13:25:11
Yes	I like the way you're thinking of consolidating several subject areas into a more general subject area as most kids have absolutely no idea what they're doing tomorrow let alone a prospective job in 3 or 4 years time. I am concerned how the subjects derived from Te Marautanga o Aotearoa are going to assist students into jobs down the track. There seems to be a lot of options within this, but I worry hugely about where the teachers are going to come from to lead these classes. It's a constant struggle at the moment to fill quality teachers in Te Reo positions and we don't have the expansive options that are being proposed. Staffing will be a huge issue.	Agree	I fear for the subjects derived from Te Marautanga o Aotearoa - the quality of staff to support these programmes. It's a struggle at present, with all the extra options subjects derived from Te Marautanga o Aotearoa, it seems unlikely qualified personnel will be available.	Typing used to be a subject back in the day, and is more important today than ever before. Children learn their own way to navigate a keyboard with a couple of fingers, but touch typing is a life skill and the most important skill I ever learned at school. Bring back typing as a subject and teach children to touch type. Every employer would appreciate a employee who can touch type.	Office Management - touch typing, writing letters, emails, itineraries, spreadsheets, pamphlets, brochures, telephone etiquette ...	Yes		There is such an expanse - too many! If you're thinking of these being individual subjects it's ridiculous. I don't think you've explained the table very well. Are there two subjects? Te Reo Rangitira & Hangarau and there 3 or 4 topics within or are the 7 topics listed individual subjects? It has not been clearly explained. The question above is also not written correctly. I'm presuming it should read "If you answered 'yes' to Question 5 (not 4, as you have above). Obviously a lot of \$\$ and consultation went into devising this Questionnaire and really it could've been a whole heap better.	2020-02-24 13:27:01	ANON-YFPW-RBHN-G	2020-02-24 13:27:01	2020-02-24 13:27:15
Yes		Agree		Things not included eg. Media studies I'm presuming this is just for level one and would be included in level 2/3?		No	This should remain optional	No	2020-02-24 13:27:22	ANON-YFPW-RBHK-D	2020-02-24 13:27:22	2020-02-24 13:27:40
Yes		Agree			Religious Studies	No			2020-02-24 13:28:24	ANON-YFPW-RBH6-R	2020-02-24 13:28:24	2020-02-24 13:28:40
Yes		Agree		No comments.	No.	No			2020-02-24 13:28:43	ANON-YFPW-RBHR-M	2020-02-24 13:28:43	2020-02-24 13:29:28
Yes		Strongly disagree				No			2020-02-24 13:38:27	ANON-YFPW-RBHW-S	2020-02-24 13:38:27	2020-02-24 13:38:38
Yes		Agree				No			2020-02-24 13:40:45	ANON-YFPW-RBH4-P	2020-02-24 13:40:45	2020-02-24 13:40:58
No		Undecided	I see this change to generalisation of subjects slowing the progress of high achieving students especially those who already have a clear pathway mapped out.	I think we need to offer more subjects in the Technology area. We need more engagement in this area to ensure our workforce has suitable candidates for the future. This is an area where our young adults can be hooked into learning and achieve success while seeing very clear links to their future and therefore the value of what they are learning. We hear a lot of talk around boys education and achievement but I don't see much positive work in this area. I can see this subject area being developed specifically for this reason.	I think there is currently enough choice at Level 2 and 3.	No			2020-02-24 13:42:04	ANON-YFPW-RBHT-P	2020-02-24 13:42:04	2020-02-24 13:42:17
Yes		Strongly disagree	The proposal to subsume Classical Studies and Latin within History is, in my opinion, a poor decision. These subjects are gaining in popularity (5) and provide a valuable outlet for strongly academic students, and for students who enjoy the narrative and language of ancient times. These subjects support inclusiveness (2) and the credibility of NCEA (7). If NCEA seeks a broader, foundational Curriculum (1), how can the diminishing of these subjects be consistent with this objective? As for the question of relevance, one only has to look to the achievement of Classics scholars to see how far one can progress with this kind of learning - JK Rowling, Boris Johnson, and Chris Martin (lead singer of Coldplay), to name a few			Yes			2020-02-24 13:42:35	ANON-YFPW-RBH2-M	2020-02-24 13:42:35	2020-02-24 13:42:54

No	I have not heard of this and think it is a way for the government to ignore the educational wishes of students in order to promote bureaucracy and cut corners	Strongly disagree	I believe by merging sciences that contain specialties in a world where the field needs to be specific. Your cheapening a subject and creating a narrow view that teachers will soon be forced to expand and catch up before they even reach level 2, hence delaying in-depth learning. Add this to the proposed change to classics and history which I think is atrocious and quite frankly disturbing	I believe that by merging classics and history you are ignoring the broad depth covered in these subjects especially if your still covering New Zealand history, international history which are both separate fields to the complex socio-economic world of Classics which explores modern philosophy and world via one of Civilisations biggest foundations. These subjects should remain separate options same as the sciences even if you create a interlaced course with agriculture and biology. Still as a first world country with significant financial resources that can back the ministry of education I think the subjects especially classics and history, the sciences and media and social studies (which are so unrelated if aiming for level 2) can remain supported in the same way they are now as there is no true demand for change and you are cheapening our education system which puts our overall understanding as a nation down you are meant to be lifting up the youth not surpassing their passions in the name of short cuts and budgets when the government overall can afford it and should not walk over the youth and their opportunities in the name of a frankly hare brained scheme.	I believe that we can not even look at further specialist subjects if we are seeing the extreme cuts that are going to harm any form of specialisation.	Yes	It is important but not at the cost of over all subjects that will affect and help all students of all cultures especially as multiculturalism means students who do not come from pakeha or Maori backgrounds are now apart of the system and need to engage with the wider world.	Hey I understand the proposal but it needs to be calculated against the overall nation and if it does go ahead, and the other subjects are saved, we need to have extreme caution to ensure all sides of various tribes are heard and we are not creating a blanket education.	2020-02-24 13:42:26	ANON-YFPW-RBH3-N	2020-02-24 13:42:26	2020-02-24 13:42:58
Yes		Disagree	Not enough information provided, do not agree that you can have a level 1 Commerce course then into a level 2 Accounting, Economics or Business Studies course. The whole foundation of these subjects are established in level 1.	I am not totally against the idea as a general commerce subject through level 1, 2 and 3 would be an advantage. There is not enough information provided, to assess the changes and effect on the commerce subjects. I definitely and strongly agree that you can not have a level 1 Commerce course then into a level 2 Accounting, Economics or Business Studies course. The whole foundation of these subjects are established in level 1 and if they are affected in any way then the knowledge to be able to move forward would not be present. A revamp of Accounting and Economics subject are overdue, noting the movement in accounting to computer work and analysis and in economics a change that it should reflect the changing world to include environmental constraints.		Yes			2020-02-24 14:07:36	ANON-YFPW-RB4Y-7	2020-02-24 14:07:36	2020-02-24 14:07:48
Yes		Disagree	I would like Latin to continue as a language option.	Philosophy should be added.	I hope Latin, Art History and Classics would still be available at L2 and 3. I would like to see Philosophy included.	Yes			2020-02-24 14:08:08	ANON-YFPW-RB4V-4	2020-02-24 14:08:08	2020-02-24 14:08:21
Yes		Undecided	Although in principle i think the proposed subjects will allow students to have a greater range, it still seems like more could have been done if this was the intention. From my H&PE perspective i will be interested to see how it pans out to allow for breadth. The whole change to NCEA i do think is a great idea, and a great time to be involved in education.	As above... Although in principle i think the proposed subjects will allow students to have a greater range, it still seems like more could have been done if this was the intention. For example why wasn't History and Geography merged also. From my H&PE perspective i will be interested to see how it pans out to allow for breadth across a curriculum.		No			2020-02-24 14:08:14	ANON-YFPW-RB4C-H	2020-02-24 14:08:13	2020-02-24 14:08:35
No		Strongly agree		no	no	Yes		no	2020-02-24 14:09:51	ANON-YFPW-RB4S-1	2020-02-24 14:09:51	2020-02-24 14:10:03
Yes		Strongly disagree	Removing Latin is problematic. Not only does Latin provide a context to engage in language learning, and therefore increasing literacy, it is also a discipline which is connected to the taonga of our bicultural nation. Removing Latin at Level One reduces a valid pathway of learning into Levels 2 and 3 and will preclude learners from engaging in the discipline knowledge and transdisciplinary skills inherent in learning Latin. There is sufficient evidence that learners, particularly those with low literacy, make accelerated progress in their English language capabilities when they learn Latin. Bundling subjects together, such as the science discipline, may make sense as there are common contexts for learning and clear transdisciplinary skills within. However, bringing media studies, social studies, and psychology and art history, classical studies, and history together may not be as logical. Each of these subjects has the inherent subject knowledge and discipline-specific skills - for example, analysing how a culture or society expresses itself and makes commentary on the world around them through various media (literature, art, philosophy, science for Classical Studies, visual art in art history, and film, TV, and print media for media studies) provides a stronger foundational base of learning compared to a less complex skill set of cause, effect	Revert the decision to remove Latin as a Level One subject. Keep the subjects distinct. There is not a strong rationale to bundle subjects together - science and social science disciplines. Endorse the inclusion of Maori performing arts		Yes			2020-02-24 14:11:23	ANON-YFPW-RB4B-6	2020-02-24 14:11:23	2020-02-24 14:11:30

Yes		Strongly disagree		Health and Physical Education may be under the same curriculum area, but are very different subjects. The 'clientele' of students we have in these areas are sometimes the same students, but for the most part, many students only take one. There are many teachers who are also very passionate about PE, but dislike teaching Health, or visa versa.		No			2020-02-24 14:14:39	ANON-YFPW-RB49-7	2020-02-24 14:14:39	2020-02-24 14:14:51
Yes	However there are more changes than I expected. It is a sensible shift but I am concerned with the suggested amalgamation of some subjects that don't fit together naturally. A new overarching Commerce subject makes sense and our school already offers this. Also Science as this has traditionally been a general subject option at L1 so should not affect students negatively moving onto to specific Science specialities at L2.	Undecided	Whilst some of the changes make sense like General Science and Commerce other combinations are not going to sit together well if at all. I would like to see the draft standards for the subjects I teach and for the subjects I am familiar with before I make a final judgement. I have some concerns over how the new 'externals' will be set up and assessed and would like to see some clarity around this when the draft standards come out.	Classical Studies will never get air time in a History classroom. Many History teachers are not experienced and/or trained in Classics so few will bother to include it. With the inclusion of a compulsory NZ topic adds to the unlikelihood of there being enough time in the year to introduce Classics. Skills students develop in History are not necessarily transferrable to the Classics classroom. Depending on the development of the new standards Classics may not fit into any of the assessments and though we are trying to move away from teaching to assessment realistically students are not interested in doing work if its not working towards credits. Whilst this is a further attempt to get students away from credit counting and teaching to assessments it will not stop it from happening and students will generally not work well (or possibly at all) if no assessments for credits are involved. Though the school I am at has not taught Latin since the end of 2018 it is sad to see this subject completely removed. Is there not a way to keep this as an option? Media Studies does not even tangentially link to Senior Social Studies as the Achievement Standards currently stand so I do not understand how these can be forced together but the	Lower ability English, Science and Mathematics programmes that will allow students to experience further academic success that would allow for them to step up to L2 in these subjects in their L3 year.	Yes	But not as much as I feel that I should be	I do not understand how Pāngarau will differ from Mathematics? Does not Tikanga ā-Iwi go against the idea of keeping things broad at L1? As how this is taught is specific to the iwi or hapu teaching this course. Whilst this subject would/could be amazing it needs to be assessed the same way as all subjects and it's narrowness should preclude it from the L1 subject list. Why is Tai Puroto not a part of Ngā Mahi ā Te Rēhia as this encompasses entertainment arts. I also assume that Kapa Haka will fall under this heading (Ngā Mahi ā Te Rēhia). Is Hauora not already covered in the senior Health curriculum? It is an aspect of it in our school. Or will this link into Pōtaiao? This is a fantastic	2020-02-24 14:19:06	ANON-YFPW-RB7N-Y	2020-02-24 12:29:38	2020-02-24 14:19:29
Yes		Agree				No			2020-02-24 14:20:28	ANON-YFPW-RB4G-N	2020-02-24 14:20:28	2020-02-24 14:20:44
Yes		Strongly agree				No			2020-02-24 14:23:46	ANON-YFPW-RB4J-R	2020-02-24 14:23:45	2020-02-24 14:24:44
Yes		Disagree	Health and Physical Education need to be separate subject areas.			Yes			2020-02-24 14:29:28	ANON-YFPW-RB4E-K	2020-02-24 14:29:28	2020-02-24 14:29:41
No		Undecided			Linguistics	No			2020-02-24 14:29:14	ANON-YFPW-RB4Q-Y	2020-02-24 14:29:14	2020-02-24 14:29:46
No		Disagree		I am disappointed that the solution that has been thought up for "learning across the breadth of the curriculum and not closing doors to pathways too early" has taken away opportunity. It moves the proverbial doors further away, meaning students' options are restricted to later on. The real solution is to make NCEA flexible, as it was made to be. As a sixteen-year-old, now NCEA Level 2 student at Te Aho o Te Kura Pounamu, I believe that schools and teachers within them do not use NCEA how it was intended to be used. They simply adapted it to be used as it was before, to the detriment of students. Students have been left with a system that, while not basing their grades off of classes or anything alike, has brought the culture and rigidity of School C with it. The individual standards available provide the opportunity to learn uniquely and flexibly, meaning in theory a student could be seventeen years old and still choose to go back to another subject at Level One. The student wouldn't need to be held back a year - the year number/level would likely be irrelevant anyway! Having the opportunity to move around and try new subjects even if one didn't choose them at the beginning of the year is an incredibly valuable asset because it stops students from being walled onto one path which they may have realised is not the one they want to walk on.		No			2020-02-24 14:32:12	ANON-YFPW-RB4S-3	2020-02-24 14:32:12	2020-02-24 14:32:40

Yes	Though I don't see how this will effect the Religious Studies curriculum.	Disagree	There are changes being proposed to Religious Studies that I don't agree with. Too much emphasis on NZ and not enough room for all the material we have to get through as a religious school.	Re Religious Studies: to have one standard on NZ Religion at each level is too much. That's 1/4 of the material for a nation not even 200 years old. It appears to me that you have kept the present Ethics and Scripture (Narratives) standards, but have combined the History and Theology into one in order to make way for the NZ Religions standard. Again, we see the NZ curriculum eliminating that which many would see as the foundation of a full education: History and philosophy/theology. In addition, I have a feeling that if schools skip one standard -- if they do 18 instead of 24 credits -- it will be the NZ religion one they skip. Thus Nzqa's idea of promoting NZ religion more will have failed; it will have had the opposite effect. Furthermore, the differences between Level 6, 7 and 8 (yrs 11, 12 and 13, or Ncea Levels 1, 2 and 3) seem to me to be very arbitrary. They are not workable. In particular re the NZ Religion standard. I don't see how we can do the work at level 6 (yr 11, level 1) without also doing the work at Level 7 (yr 12, Level 3) and even Level 8 (13, 3). They are too bound together to be arbitrarily speared as the Assment Matrix tries to do.	I've submitted something earlier on Classical studies, Latin and Art History.	No			2020-02-24 14:34:55	ANON-YFPW-RB4P-X	2020-02-24 14:34:55	2020-02-24 14:35:05
No		Agree	Art History and Latin are important in the broader context of the world. The derivation of language from Latin as well as the cultural references to Roman times are of interest and education to our children. Art History is important to visual arts in the same way that arithmetic is important to algebra... one begat the other.	Art History and Latin are important in the broader context of the world. The derivation of language from Latin as well as the cultural references to Roman times are of interest and education to our children. Art History is important to visual arts in the same way that arithmetic is important to algebra... one begat the other.	Cantonese seems to be a relevant language also in the context of NZ's geography and trading partners.	No			2020-02-24 14:37:11	ANON-YFPW-RB47-5	2020-02-24 14:37:11	2020-02-24 14:37:18
No		Undecided				No			2020-02-24 14:38:59	ANON-YFPW-RB4F-M	2020-02-24 14:38:59	2020-02-24 14:39:22
Yes	The ideas behind this move are fine - but I would argue that people have different definitions of the word "broad". Not all Social Sciences are the same - Classics is NOT the same thing is History. It is not a "specialisation" of History. It is its own discipline which encompasses many different aspects. These, such as literature or art, are not touched in History, so are therefore not something that people will choose to specialise in during the later years.	Strongly disagree	I disagree with Classics Level 1 becoming a part of History. Without it being a Level 1 subject, you run the risk of four things: 1. The subject stops being valued because it is not at Level 1. If students pick another subject over it, they might not pick it up in Level 2 if there is a pathway for it. 2. Student engagement - our subjects should be driven by student interest, and there is student interest there for Classics. It is wrong to cut that off as an avenue for students to explore. It does not "support pathways for individual learners", with it also removing the chance for "demand for a subject" 3. Level 1 Classics provides a foundation for Level 2 and Level 3 - I would argue that removing Classics DIRECTLY contradicts the purpose of NCEA to "support coherent and robust pathways into Level 2" 4. Classics is a discipline that provides information about society and how we live our lives today. It is respected and removing it as an option, I believe, lowers the "credibility of NCEA as a qualification"	Classics and History are two completely different disciplines. Combining them does not make sense, and could seriously hurt Classics as a subject.	NA	No	NA		2020-02-24 14:41:57	ANON-YFPW-RB41-Y	2020-02-24 14:41:57	2020-02-24 14:42:05
Yes		Agree		It is important that chemistry, physics and bio is not lost in these new standards. We need more detail and clarification in the supporting documents to ensure that science is taught to a high standard and that they don't become social studies standards.		Yes			2020-02-24 14:42:37	ANON-YFPW-RB4Z-8	2020-02-24 14:42:37	2020-02-24 14:42:47
Yes	The concern is that if subjects are too broad then it will be harder to specialise in Level 2 since students may not have the required specific foundation needed to cope with Level 2 in that subject. For example if there is very little accounting at level 1 and someone wants to take it at Level 2 then I don't think we will be able to offer the same sort of difficulty that we offer now.	Undecided	I think I need to see the subject matrix at each level to decide whether I should support or not.	I don't think commerce should be all 3 economics, BS and accounting. These are vastly different subjects and areas of study and to give a little snapshot at level 1 of each will not actually give the foundation needed in economics and accounting in particular to be able to do a robust study at Level 2.	No	Yes	No		2020-02-24 14:43:11	ANON-YFPW-RB4H-P	2020-02-24 14:43:11	2020-02-24 14:43:25
Yes		Agree		Dropping Art History while retaining Dance and/or Drama seems mistaken. Art history gives valuable context to not only the other arts subjects but to the social sciences too.		No			2020-02-24 14:43:34	ANON-YFPW-RB4B-G	2020-02-24 14:43:34	2020-02-24 14:43:59

Yes		Undecided	I can see the benefits of some of the proposed changes - for example, amalgamating all the Sciences into one subject. This is what many schools do already. However, a couple of the other changes seem a bit arbitrary and may disadvantage some students.	I am a little concerned that the Humanities subjects are being disadvantaged with this revision. I am not convinced that amalgamating Media Studies and Psychology into Social Studies is a 'good fit.' Social Studies is not a popular subject at Level 1 and not every school teaches it (although I wish they did). This may mean that Media Studies and Psychology may not get taught at all, which would be a shame. I would have thought that Media Studies, particularly, is more closely aligned with English, than Social Studies. I am also concerned that if Media Studies, Classical Studies, Art History and Psychology are amalgamated into 'parent' subjects at Level 1, then this might affect the uptake of students into the subject at Levels 2 and 3. I certainly wouldn't like to see them disappear at Levels 2 and 3. I also wonder at the long list of Arts subjects and languages - if the intention is to offer a 'broad' qualification and some of the Humanities subjects are being deleted or amalgamated - why are there so many individual arts and languages being offered?	No				2020-02-24 14:44:56	ANON-YFPW-RB4M-U	2020-02-24 14:44:56	2020-02-24 14:45:05
Yes		Agree			Yes			2020-02-24 14:47:01	ANON-YFPW-RB4D-J	2020-02-24 14:47:01	2020-02-24 14:47:12	
No		Agree			No			2020-02-24 14:48:12	ANON-YFPW-RB4X-6	2020-02-24 14:48:12	2020-02-24 14:48:22	
No	Firstly, I wonder about the whole process when 'aware about' is included in the first question instead of 'aware of'. I accept change in education is forever being researched and developed, but seriously question the idea that these groups, who are clearly removed from classroom involvement, are suitably qualified to be imposing some of these decisions.	Disagree	My concern is for Level 1 Commerce subjects, especially Accounting and Economics. These are challenging relative to Business Studies and students benefit hugely from being able to take them at Level 1. It is a fact also that for significant numbers of students, a Level 1 qualification is the highest they will attain before leaving school. In Accounting, the new and extensive terminology and concepts take time to absorb, just as Biology at Year 10 does. The move in some countries to replace Accounting and Economics with Business Studies, is in my opinion misguided and deprives stronger students of the opportunity to excel in these more challenging subjects. Making Level 1-3 Accounting available, allows students to build a strong foundation for tertiary study and what's more, it enables those whose learning is slower, to aspire to a very worthy qualification.	No	No			2020-02-24 14:48:48	ANON-YFPW-RB4X-F	2020-02-24 14:48:48	2020-02-24 14:49:00	
Yes	There has not been enough time for professional teachers to discuss the changes to NCEA and they haven't been consulted.	Strongly disagree	I cannot see the point of these changes.	I don't see how a change is going to benefit students' learning and achievement.	No	No		2020-02-24 14:51:22	ANON-YFPW-RB4N-V	2020-02-24 14:51:22	2020-02-24 14:51:43	
Yes	Yes, I was very aware of how horrific and narrow the NCEA education was.	Strongly agree	Although I believe there should be more broadening of subject availability and more subjects available to choose and learn about, this is a good start.	Yes, I believe there should be more internals and fewer externals. We need to be taught that learning is about research skills, and the ability to learn, retain, and compose information in a way that is markable and to a high standard, not on our ability to do anxiety-inducing all-nighters in an attempt to retain information to repeat onto paper in our externals. ALSO the ability to use a computer should be taught to students (and teachers), considering the majority of jobs nowadays require knowledge of how to work computers, e.g Word, Excel, Outlook, Powerpoint etc. I believe that Health Education should be compulsory up to Year 11, which would also have to have a broader level of topics taught. (E.g. personal hygiene, sex education, drug and alcohol usage, well-being etc etc) As Health Education is more important and necessary to our lives than some other specific subjects, it is important to teach it and its topics for a while into our schooling so students are aware of different things like taking showers, social cues etc. The Te Reo Maori course is garbage in my opinion. When I took it in Years 9, 10, and some of Year 11, it was truly horrible and difficult to learn anything. Which I found surprising as I had been in a bilingual class for the previous 4-5 years in primary	No	No, I don't believe I am familiar with it.	n/a	2020-02-24 14:52:03	ANON-YFPW-RB4K-S	2020-02-24 14:51:32	2020-02-24 14:52:09	

Yes	As a secondary school teacher have been informed of the intended change to a broader education at Level 1	Strongly disagree	you state "students value access to learning across the breadth of the curriculum" yet in Science 5 subjects becomes 1. This does not lead to "NCEA Level 1 refocused to support a broad, functional education" as it limits not broadens and does not meet criteria 4 approved by the ministry in "supporting schools to create well designed and coherent local curricula". the change in Science seems to be more about saving money (less standards written and assessed) than about common sense and meeting your stated objectives	yes include all the current level 1 science subjects as they are very different (there is no current overlap) just links between them that can be made . Like the idea of Maori performing Arts added as a subject .	No	No			2020-02-24 14:51:53	ANON-YFPW-RB46-4	2020-02-24 14:51:53	2020-02-24 14:52:18
Yes		Agree				No			2020-02-24 14:57:42	ANON-YFPW-RBAR-Z	2020-02-24 14:57:42	2020-02-24 14:57:56
Yes		Agree			Mathematics and Statistics as separate subjects. Possible inclusion in the future of data science which pulls from a broader learning area base than just mathematics and statistics.	No			2020-02-24 15:03:44	ANON-YFPW-RB4W-5	2020-02-24 15:03:44	2020-02-24 15:03:54
Yes		Undecided	Within the Technology curriculum am concerned that the new Materials which replaces Construction and Mechanical Technology could limit Fashion/Textiles as a subject within schools. Both Fashion and workshop (hard materials) programmes have existed to date, however they have both accessed the same suite of standards making double dipping an issue for conflict. While the need for pathways from Materials into trades (building etc) and design are obvious, Fashion/Textiles remain as a important subject for pathways into retail and design careers. Standards that address both subjects has been fraught, separating the two subjects would allow for recognition of their different identities.	As above: Within the Technology curriculum am concerned that the new Materials which replaces Construction and Mechanical Technology could limit Fashion/Textiles as a subject within schools. Both Fashion and workshop (hard materials) programmes have existed to date, however they have both accessed the same suite of standards making double dipping an issue for conflict. While the need for pathways from Materials into trades (building etc) and design are obvious, Fashion/Textiles remain as a important subject for pathways into retail and design careers. Standards that address both subjects has been fraught, separating the two subjects would allow for recognition of their different identities.	As above.	Yes			2020-02-24 15:04:24	ANON-YFPW-RB44-2	2020-02-24 15:04:24	2020-02-24 15:04:55
Yes	There are equity issues here - some subjects have become a lot more broad than others. The five Sciences have been pared down to a general Science paper, and the Humanities have lost Classical Studies and Media Studies and seen Economics, Business Studies and Accounting culled down to a single Commerce subject, whereas Arts have kept Visual Arts, Dance, Drama and Music, and Technology retains four separate subjects. Some learning areas are being significantly more disadvantaged than others.	Strongly disagree	The comment that Media Studies and Psychology are "only supported as possible contexts for Social Studies" is ridiculous. The teaching and learning guidelines for Media Studies are, at best, on tangential with the objectives for Social Studies in the NZC, and looking at the current L1 Social Studies achievement standards, there's virtually no meaningful overlap between what would happen in a level 1 Media Studies classroom with what happens in senior Social Studies.	Retain Media Studies as a distinct subject at Level 1 NCEA. At a time where democratic processes are under attack across the world, and fake news / deep fakes are becoming increasingly savvy, media literacy and the ability to unpack and analyse (and also for students to counter / construct their own media texts) is becoming more and more important.	No	Yes	No		2020-02-24 15:05:01	ANON-YFPW-RB43-1	2020-02-24 15:05:01	2020-02-24 15:05:11
Yes	It seems to have been a long time to get the Science matrix out!	Disagree	for Science, it seems the new Standards are more about "What is Science" than actual Science. Physics teachers are worried about the gap in knowledge of the concepts of Physics between CL4/5 and CL7 . This could make the jump from NCEA L1 to NCEA L2 in Sciences more difficult If a standard is supposed to be about 4 weeks which is one suggestion I read, four Standards is not enough to encourage students But most particularly for the kind of students I teach, the proposed Standards seem to be heading towards an even higher literacy requirement than the current matrix.	Putting all specialist subjects into just one Subject 'Science' looks fine. That is in fact what most of us are doing now. The nitty gritty is going to be how to get a broad understanding of Scientific concepts into a course with just the four proposed Standards. By that I mean deeper understanding of concepts such as genetics and how waves transfer energy as opposed to the 'Big Ideas' being put forward. It is possible that reports as assessment tools will markedly add to Science teacher workload. I currently required report for "understanding of ..." to be no more than 1000 words. But many students will submit pages without adequate structure without a lot of scaffolding. The traditional way of writing up practical work makes sense. Bigger and group work for a report-type topic can be more easily assessed in other ways than 20+/5000+word essays. Two methods are Presentations with peer questioning and Portfolios. Using Science fair project work and the IVPT format are also methods I have been involved with which have been successful.	The five current Specialist subjects in the Science domain cover current and foreseeable issues very adequately Much of the work for sustainability can be studied as part of Earth Space Science and one or more of the traditional three, Bio, Chem and Physics.	No	Not with all of it. But certainly with some of the Science areas and the concepts of Wjaka mana and whakawhanga tangata which we have been putting into practice at advisories for a number of years now		2020-02-24 15:04:32	ANON-YFPW-RB4T-2	2020-02-24 15:04:32	2020-02-24 15:05:14
Yes	I was not aware that Biology, Chemistry and Physics were being removed.	Strongly disagree	I believe Biology, Chemistry and Physics standards should remain.	Biology, Chemistry and Physics should not be removed. Removal of choice of contexts/ content that allowed courses to be developed for all learners. The current science standards do not allow for coverage of the curriculum achievement objectives.		No			2020-02-24 15:12:24	ANON-YFPW-RB42-Z	2020-02-24 15:12:24	2020-02-24 15:12:26

Yes	foundational = broad range that teachers can then tailor to their students	Disagree	Having Science plus other subjects e.g. Physics at Level 1 gives greater variety and ability to be broad. With the new Science being more NOS based, then allowing schools to take a couple standards from Science and a couple from say Physics, ESS, Biology and Chemistry would allow for variety and cater for more students.	With the new Science being more NOS based, then allowing schools to take a couple standards from Science and a couple from say Physics, ESS, Biology and Chemistry would allow for variety and cater for more students.		No				2020-02-24 15:13:20	ANON-YFPW-RB4U-3	2020-02-24 15:13:20	2020-02-24 15:13:31
Yes	However, whenever a key subject is proposed for deletion from the list (such as Latin) it appears that the proponents of this change have no understanding of why this language is so important. For a start, it demonstrates that language is built up in patterns and systems so that most formal English can be "deconstructed" to its Latin roots. Just a basic understanding of Latin gives students a greater understanding of English and the grammatical structure that underlies it. (None of the Romance languages do this to the same extent, and the Asian languages are completely different again.)	Strongly disagree	The reason for this is that we serve our gifted students very badly. These students no longer have their own classes and tend to be left languishing in the body of a cohort of their age group. When there are specific challenging subjects for the brighter students, they can learn the basics at NCEA level 1 and within a relatively short amount of time, dip into Caesar and Virgil. An understanding of Latin brings an understanding of an entire civilisation and the ability to adapt different lenses to evaluate what has happened depending on the time frame.	The concept that Classics should be dropped at level 1 is equally absurd. The Classical lens is fascinating because only the clearest thinkers do really well in this subject, but other subject report that the Classics students who are absorbed in the subject bring a "carry-over" clarity and hence enthusiasm for the other subjects. This works particularly well for subjects that require higher order left brain thinking in the Humanities. Not included: Bahasa Indonesia (the largest Muslim nation on earth - and also a Pacific neighbour. While BI is taught in hundreds of Australian schools and high schools it is met with ignore in New Zealand. This is a tragic state of affairs.	Bahasa Indonesia at NCEA levels 2 and 3.	No				2020-02-24 15:18:47	ANON-YFPW-RBQV-1	2020-02-24 15:18:47	2020-02-24 15:19:10
No		Agree		Basic financial principles. Eg: Income v. outgoings. Rent, food, power, motor vehicle costs/bus, uni fees etc. How to budget.	Budgeting more in-depth.	No				2020-02-24 15:21:15	ANON-YFPW-RBQC-E	2020-02-24 15:21:15	2020-02-24 15:21:41
Yes		Agree		Psychology association has spent a VERY long time getting the subject recognised in NCEA, not having it as a separate set of standards at L1 is a poor choice.	Statistics should be separated completely from Mathematics at L2 (as it is at L3). Statistical thinking needs its own space. Very little of it can be discussed using mathematical concepts. Take universities for example, they don't even have Statistics in the same COLLEGE as mathematics. We have been teaching Statistics as a stand-alone course for about 5 years, but are hamstrung due to the very low credit count and the fact the exam is just L2 mathematics (disadvantaging those doing both stats and calc)	Yes				2020-02-24 15:22:13	ANON-YFPW-RBQS-X	2020-02-24 15:22:13	2020-02-24 15:22:23
No	The 'generalisation' of Level 1 seems to come at a steep cost - the loss of Media Studies, Classical Studies, Art History and Latin are of particular concern. Classical Studies itself is a generalist course comprising of Ancient History, Ancient Art and Architecture, and Ancient Literature - there is no way this range would be covered within a generalist History course. There is enough to cover in History as it is. Losing the ability to specialise at Level 1 will put students on the back foot for Level 2 and 3 and have long term implications for the level at which they enter tertiary study. There are already concerns about these levels, why compound the problem?	Strongly disagree	I absolutely disagree with the proposed subjects and the absorption and removal of valued subjects such as Latin, Art History, Media Studies and Classical Studies from the curriculum. As a teacher, I have taught a Level 1 Classical Studies course in the past and it is a fantastic course which allows students to have success and scaffolds them for a future in the arts (through continuing to study Classical Studies at Level 2 and 3; contributing to their University Entrance qualifications). The skills involved in Classical Studies are multidisciplinary and support students in their preparation for tertiary study. Many of my students are passionate about Media Studies and find it's absorption into Social Science confusing. It is a highly creative subject with valuable skills and would be difficult to pick up at a higher level of senior school without the foundational learning of Level 1 Media Studies. Additionally, expecting teachers who are trained in Social Science to pick up the teaching of lower level media studies in the curriculum adds an unnecessary workload and devalues the study already undertaken. This also applies to the other subject areas absorbing new curriculum foci: History teachers to have specialist knowledge of Classical Studies and Art History, Latin teachers to lose their specialised teaching area which they have studied for, and Social Scientists to pick up	If a change must be made, I suggest that pathways are made available for both generalised and specialist courses. For example, students could choose to take L1 Classical Studies L1 History or L1 General History. Similar (or the same) standards could be included in both courses. This way students who know what they want to specialise in from Year 11 are not disadvantaged, while the general course allows students to still access the Level 2 courses without being pushed into a subject they find they don't have use for. Often the size of a school already plays a role in limiting what options are available to a student. By removing the possibilities of these subjects from them completely this is a further disadvantage, particularly to those in small rural schools. For myself, Classical Studies was not an option at my school, nor was Art History, Latin or Media Studies. However, I was able to do Classical Studies by correspondence and went on to major in it at University and now am a Classics teacher. If I had the option of any of those other subjects I would have taken them too!	Soft materials or Fashion Design. See comments above.	No	Not as familiar as I would like and not enough to offer any feedback on it.			2020-02-24 15:25:48	ANON-YFPW-RBQ8-3	2020-02-24 15:25:48	2020-02-24 15:26:10
Yes		Strongly disagree	The combining of subjects currently taught separately will reduce choice for students and only make it harder for students wishing to go to Lev 2 and 3. The lack of any specific content requirement for the Science standards proposed for Lev 1 cannot possibly be good for those who already find the jump from Lev 1 to Lev 2 a challenge. Students could enter Lev 2 Physics for example who may have done no Physics in Lev1. They already struggle with maths concepts and having also no knowledge of basic physics ideas will make it almost impossible for them. The proposed Lev 1 changes may be better for those not wishing to specialise, but will be disastrous for higher achieving students who do. In fact for those students who wish to specialise the proposed ideas seem thoroughly boring and may even put some off from doing any science at all.	For Physics there needs to be externals that are challenging, not so called externals that could also be done as internals. These need to be done as exams that actually test a students knowledge and also problem solving abilities. The proposed changes offer none of this and seem to be just dumbing it all down in the hope that more students will pass. The rationale behind all this seems to be based on purely ideological grounds with noble sounding social goals but nothing in the way of rigorous educational standards. If the proposed changes were run in parallel with the option to still have separate physics, chemistry and biology papers it may be a solution.		No				2020-02-24 15:27:58	ANON-YFPW-RBQG-J	2020-02-24 15:27:58	2020-02-24 15:28:39

Yes	I don't agree with this change. I think that high school is all about specialising - students should have the chance to study what they want to study ASAP, rather than having to wait until Level 2 and 3 to specialise.	Disagree	Media studies should be a Level 1 subject - not placed under the Social Sciences umbrella. It takes soooo much work to get the students to the required level for Level 2 NCEA, that they need Years 10 and 11 to be able to get the appropriate foundation.	Why are subjects with such small national cohorts of students (such as Samoan) included as NCEA Level 1 subjects, but ones that have large numbers of students (such as Media Studies) aren't included?	Possibly - what does student feedback say?	Yes				2020-02-24 15:55:35	ANON-YFPW-RBQE-G	2020-02-24 15:55:35	2020-02-24 15:56:01
Yes	With the current information on offer, for those subjects that are having several strands amalgamated into one e.g. Science, it is hard to see how this creates a broad foundation at L1. It seems more restrictive. Schools will no longer be able to select from a broad range of standards to design courses that suit the akonga in their classes.	Strongly disagree	I feel strongly that amalgamating all of the Sciences into the 4 proposed standards will sound the death knell for students entering the senior sciences. The current standards in L1 provide a good platform for L2 and students can see the progression in learning.	The removal of the L1 Chemistry, Physics, Biology, and Science standards is a travesty. Students will be entering L2 with less preparation. Students will be less likely to choose the senior sciences if they do not feel they have a good grounding in the subject from L1.	Human Biology	No				2020-02-24 15:58:56	ANON-YFPW-RBQF-H	2020-02-24 15:58:56	2020-02-24 15:59:14
Yes	Why are we attempting to broaden Year 11 in Science and further specialise Years 12 and 13? Why are we even contemplating a systemic change with so little lead in time? Wherer is the equity in workload?	Strongly disagree	Lumping all the sciences together and expecting an improvement in results against other OECD countries is complete bollocks! This will not help with senior sciences in any way. As it is we struggle to get students to the level required for NCEA level 2 (and that is with very specific teaching at level 1)	Sciences should be handled separately at least for assessment purposes at year 11. Having a broad brush approach to science is not desirable when we have very few truly generalist science teachers. Why are some subjects not amalgamated? Who made these decisions? Why have some been combined and not others? Is there some rationale or is this all another knee jerk virtue signalling poorly thought out and implemented piece of government rhetoric. Who is this aiming to please?	No. Leave it alone! Human Biology should be returned, it is applicable and useful!	No				2020-02-24 15:58:52	ANON-YFPW-RBQJ-N	2020-02-24 15:49:51	2020-02-24 15:59:15
No		Strongly disagree	There are two main changes that I find confusing as they are not good combinations. 1) The first is the combination on Media studies and Psychology into the topic of social studies. Being a specialist Social and Media studies teacher I can clearly see the benefits of both subjects and also that they do not combine. While they do deal with themes that are similar the skill sets that these subjects build are very different. I struggle to see how you will be able to successfully combine these two without dropping some of the skill sets that students learn. I think it is essential to have Media studies as a subject offered at level 1 as it is an area that is continually growing and impacting students lives more and more. If they do not learn to be critical with the media we will develop a society of people who take information at face value. 2) The combination of Business, Eco and Accounting into one will drastically disadvantage the students in their second year of NCEA. The specific skills and knowledge that are taught at level 1 build the foundation for students who will then go into more technical elements at level 2. The combination of these subjects at level 1 means many students will be missing the skills needed at level 2 and thus, we are setting them up for failure.	I think the inclusion of a Maori performing arts topic is a great suggestion and will be very beneficial to further embracing Maori culture in New Zealand.		No				2020-02-24 15:59:17	ANON-YFPW-RBQ1-V	2020-02-24 15:59:17	2020-02-24 15:59:32
No		Agree		Love the addition of te reo performing arts, like the combination of sciences into one. Seems very strange to add media studies into social sciences.	no	No				2020-02-24 15:56:57	ANON-YFPW-RBQ5-Z	2020-02-24 15:56:57	2020-02-24 15:59:44
No		Disagree				No				2020-02-24 16:04:51	ANON-YFPW-RBQZ-5	2020-02-24 16:04:51	2020-02-24 16:05:13
No		Strongly disagree	We need a bigger focus on science. Without an understanding of science we wind up with more anti-vaxers, anti-GMOers and people who do not understand science, and often grow to fear it out of misunderstanding	More sciences. Science is incredibly important for the growth of humankind. We should be encouraging kids to delve deeper into sciences	NA	No				2020-02-24 16:05:21	ANON-YFPW-RBQJ-K	2020-02-24 16:05:21	2020-02-24 16:05:30
No		Undecided	I am in favour of bringing in Maori performing arts. It would be good to have Science under the one subject, but will schools just have Science 1 and Science 2, so students can cover Bio, Chem and Physics. Will they feel that they get through the prior knowledge for Level 2 and 3 and for those wanting to continue Sciences at University?	I agree that Latin is not really important anymore - especially at level 1. But it is good that the other languages are status quo.		No				2020-02-24 15:58:32	ANON-YFPW-RBQP-U	2020-02-24 15:58:32	2020-02-24 16:07:35
Yes		Strongly disagree	I disagree with combining Health, Physical Education and Outdoor education into one set of standards, especially if we only get 4 standards. I would like a more than 4 standards for PE, 4 separate standards for Health and 4 separate standards for Outdoor Education. More choice than just 4 standards would be great.	as above - would like to keep Physical Education , Health and Outdoor Education as stand alone subjects so that student who have a passion for this learning area can take a combination of two of these subjects to suit their needs and strengths.	I believe Physical Education, Health and Outdoor Education should all have their own standards at Level 2 and level 3 so that students can select a course that best suits their needs or passions if they wish to do so.	No				2020-02-24 16:12:52	ANON-YFPW-RBQM-R	2020-02-24 16:12:52	2020-02-24 16:13:08

Yes	I was aware that there was to be change and an actual "cut" to NCEA Level 1 but what it was to be did not come across. Broad and foundational education sounds good, but it needs to be robust, transparent and more practically minded as this generation lacks simple practical automotive skills that were present 10-20 years ago. To put it in simple terms; students know how to put a lightbulb into a socket based on what they read using their internet skills, but lack the practical skills to actually do it by hand. There is too much emphasis on developing Tertiary skills and analysis, while practical/trade skills are not taught or lack support due to the lack of teacher staffing shortage to teach these skills.	Undecided	The changes are not exactly earth shatteringly "new". Core subjects are still taught. How about Engineering, Psychology and more in depth anatomical Biology in order to support what the job market dictates we need. How about teaching Emotional Intelligence and Parenting to help future generations become better decision makers?	See above comment.	I teach Technology and the Arts and am aware that more students lack simple cognitive and automotive skills because these skills are replaced by technological devices. There needs to be more input by the primary sector to prepare our students for the secondary sector in teaching primary aged children to read, write, -yes, as well as critically think using practical application without the constant emphasis on "having fun" by playing games. Yes, having fun is good, but by learning to love to learn, not at the cost of wasting valuable learning time by undervaluing our students abilities. We treat our children as if they are simple minded instead of complex beings who need to be challenged to become active thinkers and doers at a higher level earlier in their "steps of learning".	Yes	Being bilingual is important to NZ growth and understanding (as is evident in the growth of understanding in European countries who learn three or four languages). However, a balance needs to be established as not all are linguistically minded. Choice is good, but so is a variety of choice for those who wish to become doctors or plumbers. Students and parents need to	How do students know what wellbeing/hauora looks like if it is not shown by example?	2020-02-24 16:15:40	ANON-YFPW-RBQD-F	2020-02-24 16:15:40	2020-02-24 16:16:52
Yes		Strongly disagree	I disagree as Physical Education, Health and Outdoor Education should all be seen as different courses of study as they all have different specialities. If you combine them, this will have negative affect on students and the scaffolding for learning will be less in specific areas	Where does Outdoor education fit in to this? It is a specialist subject and needs to be seen as its own subject along with Sport Science and Health across all levels	Outdoor Education needs its own Achievement Standards along with Sport Science and Health	Yes		This also needs more development and its own Achievement Standards	2020-02-24 16:17:52	ANON-YFPW-RBQX-3	2020-02-24 16:17:52	2020-02-24 16:18:06
Yes		Agree				No			2020-02-24 16:21:54	ANON-YFPW-RBQA-C	2020-02-24 16:21:54	2020-02-24 16:21:59
No		Strongly disagree	Removal of subject specific content form Level 1 does very little to prepare the students for specialist subjects in Level 2. This approach is extremely short-sighted and as Level 1 is optional it will be very interesting to see how many schools decide to continue with it in 2021.	While it is worthwhile to encourage a broader view in Level 1 it has become too broad and the standards as outlined are very heavy for literacy which will be a problem for some students and the "external" as outlined for a subject such as Science do absolutely nothing to prevent questions on authenticity of students work. Personally I have been correcting NCEA Level 1 external examinations for 10+ years...I will not be doing so in 2021.	Please dont...not until you actually fix the mess that will be created by the Level 1 review.	No			2020-02-24 16:22:25	ANON-YFPW-RBQN-S	2020-02-24 16:22:25	2020-02-24 16:22:38
Yes	Aware but not in agreement	Disagree	It is another lowering of the bar set in NZ regarding education.	The merging in Social Sciences and Commerce is a bad idea, these subjects have identities in their own right and they are devalued by somebody deciding they are worthless without merging them with other subjects.	No	No			2020-02-24 16:25:09	ANON-YFPW-RBQK-P	2020-02-24 16:25:09	2020-02-24 16:25:20
No		Strongly disagree	Combining Economics / Accounting / Business Studies into one subject "Commerce" is a very backward step for three distinct, popular subjects. I have no confidence that the Ministry will be able to provide a four standard Commerce course that covers anywhere near the variety and flexibility that the subjects currently offer.	Keep Accounting / Business Studies / Economics separate. Certainly review the content, there is ample opportunity to refresh and redesign the content for 21st century learners.		No			2020-02-24 16:28:21	ANON-YFPW-RBQR-W	2020-02-24 16:28:21	2020-02-24 16:28:27
No	This is a recipe for disaster. It makes no sense.	Strongly disagree	It is a waste of time and human hours. The people are the ministry have no idea of what they are talking about	Leave Accounting and economics alone	no	No			2020-02-24 16:37:17	ANON-YFPW-RBQW-2	2020-02-24 16:37:17	2020-02-24 16:37:29
Yes		Strongly disagree				No			2020-02-24 16:37:40	ANON-YFPW-RBQ4-Y	2020-02-24 16:37:40	2020-02-24 16:37:56
No		Agree	I think more emphasis is needed on accounting. Anyone in any business for themselves or running a department in a larger organisation needs to understand how accounting works. It has a much wider application for successful businesses of all kinds than does Economics.			No			2020-02-24 16:38:39	ANON-YFPW-RBQT-Y	2020-02-24 16:38:39	2020-02-24 16:38:52
Yes		Disagree	If the key Science disciplines can be accommodated in a single subject then the exact same thinking should be applied to the Social Sciences. This does not appear to be a coordinated proposal.			No			2020-02-24 16:45:29	ANON-YFPW-RBQ3-X	2020-02-24 16:45:29	2020-02-24 16:45:41
No	I have just being notified in the last week about Commerce option.	Strongly disagree	I am speaking for Commerce subject and there is no way the 3 subjects Accounting, Business Studies, and Economics represent Commerce. They are a very different subject on its own.	Accounting, Business Studies and Economics are 3 individual subjects. The numbers entered for external prove that this is a subject that is in demand and students who this as individual subject do really well in yer 12 and 13, gaining subject endorsements. I strongly believe these subjects should be left on their own.		No			2020-02-24 16:51:32	ANON-YFPW-RBQ2-W	2020-02-24 16:51:32	2020-02-24 16:51:43

No		Strongly disagree	Economics, Business Studies and Accounting are all stand alone areas of learning which form the foundation at Level 2/3 and eventually at University.	Specialist subjects require specialist teaching to provide students with the opportunity to pursue a specialist career pathway.		No			2020-02-24 16:53:13	ANON-YFPW-RBQU-Z	2020-02-24 16:53:13	2020-02-24 16:53:29
No		Undecided				No			2020-02-24 16:55:34	ANON-YFPW-RBFY-5	2020-02-24 16:55:34	2020-02-24 16:55:48
Yes		Undecided				No			2020-02-24 16:58:53	ANON-YFPW-RBFV-P	2020-02-24 16:58:53	2020-02-24 16:59:12
No		Agree		Would also love to see Pasifika studies (combining history, arts, language)	More vocational options	No			2020-02-24 16:59:48	ANON-YFPW-RBFC-3	2020-02-24 16:59:48	2020-02-24 16:59:57
Yes	I like it	Strongly agree				No			2020-02-24 17:05:24	ANON-YFPW-RBF5-K	2020-02-24 17:05:24	2020-02-24 17:05:32
No		Agree				No			2020-02-24 17:12:08	ANON-YFPW-RBF8-R	2020-02-24 17:12:08	2020-02-24 17:12:19
No	Aren't you worried it will water down the expectations in english maths and science which are generally the 3 subjects employers look for.	Agree		Glad to see maori performing arts included		No			2020-02-24 17:12:43	ANON-YFPW-RBF9-S	2020-02-24 17:12:43	2020-02-24 17:12:54
Yes		Disagree	This looks to dumb down the options available for in depth learning in y11.		Yes, a far broader curriculum much more available across State schools, including philosophy, psychology, sociology.	No			2020-02-24 17:23:13	ANON-YFPW-RBFG-7	2020-02-24 17:23:13	2020-02-24 17:23:23
No		Strongly agree				No			2020-02-24 17:39:10	ANON-YFPW-RBF1-A	2020-02-24 17:39:10	2020-02-24 17:39:20
No		Disagree				No			2020-02-24 17:41:32	ANON-YFPW-RBFQ-H	2020-02-24 17:41:32	2020-02-24 17:41:42
Yes		Undecided	I am highly confused as to why religious studies features as one of the four key subject areas? There was mention of it in the general information.	Love that Māori Performing Arts is being included.		Yes	I'm concerned about "development" when subjects derived from this curriculum are already insufficiently resourced, support for subjects from the marautanga are far too slow to be developed , eg Level 3 TRR.	We need assurance that all standards will be on the UE approved subjects list eg Māori Performing Arts.	2020-02-24 17:45:23	ANON-YFPW-RBFE-5	2020-02-24 17:45:23	2020-02-24 17:45:36
No		Strongly agree				No			2020-02-24 17:47:33	ANON-YFPW-RBF5-N	2020-02-24 17:47:33	2020-02-24 17:47:42
Yes		Disagree		The proposal that Classical Studies only be supported as a possible context within history to a low degree, ignores the unique knowledge, skills, and pathway that Classical Studies provides along from Yr. 11 onwards.	History of Aotearoa (Mandated), Te Reo Maori (Mandated), Civics (Citizenship responsibilities), and Financial Literacy.	No			2020-02-24 17:50:50	ANON-YFPW-RBFG-G	2020-02-24 17:50:50	2020-02-24 17:51:20
No	This was never discussed at the MoE stakeholder community hui's	Agree	Agree with new Maori performance arts, not sure about media studies sitting in social studies.	Ummm does soft materials and Design not exist?	Pasifika performing arts	No			2020-02-24 17:55:34	ANON-YFPW-RBF7-Q	2020-02-24 17:55:34	2020-02-24 17:55:45
Yes		Agree		There is a lacking of skills-based real-world qualifications that can be taken at an earlier age -	Practical hands-on courses to support environmental studies - PADI or SSI Scuba Dive Open Water Certificates - Conservation in action - Innovation/technology to support future of NZ and earth - Space/Astronomy	No			2020-02-24 18:00:12	ANON-YFPW-RBF6-G	2020-02-24 18:00:12	2020-02-24 18:00:36
No		Strongly agree				No			2020-02-24 18:04:31	ANON-YFPW-RBF1-H	2020-02-24 18:04:31	2020-02-24 18:04:46
No		Strongly disagree				No			2020-02-24 18:23:03	ANON-YFPW-RBFZ-T	2020-02-24 18:23:03	2020-02-24 18:23:10
No		Agree		I think dropping Latin makes sense		No			2020-02-24 18:38:43	ANON-YFPW-RBFH-8	2020-02-24 18:38:43	2020-02-24 18:39:03
Yes	It seems very vague as to what is going to be implemented. As a teacher in Visual Arts I am left with many questions concerning how we are going to be expected to teach under such vague information available to us. Why is there a continued expectation for teachers to provide the work when officials decide on change without real consultation. Where is the time supposed to come from to adapt programmes of work and assessment. To me it feels like you are pushing the Arts into what is not a good fit. Expecting pupils to be able to show in 5 credits a portfolio of practical works does not allow for sufficient development of ideas and outcomes that are resolved.	Disagree	I believe Art history has a foundational role in the Visual arts and should not be dismissed as it establishes great subject knowledge to allow pupils to learn along practical outcomes the theory and a history of visual arts in our world.	Media works along side of and leads into the visual arts and should be optional for pupil choice. Dismissing it from the subject choice narrows practical pupils's options for subject choice.		No			2020-02-24 18:42:40	ANON-YFPW-RBF8-2	2020-02-24 18:42:40	2020-02-24 18:43:01

No		Strongly disagree		I have strong objections to the proposals for Level 1 Classical Studies and Latin. Firstly, the proposal to remove Level 1 Classics and have it included at a low level in History means that in reality it will not be taught at all. History teachers are likely to continue with their courses especially if no assessments are available for the art and literature aspects of Classics. Secondly, if the aim is for students to specialise at L2 and L3 they require a foundation. With little, or likely no, L1 Classics they will not receive this. Thirdly, Classics (and Latin) is a subject many students are passionate about and want to take from an Year 9. If schools are willing to provide these classes why remove the option?		Yes			2020-02-24 18:59:46	ANON-YFPW-RBFM-D	2020-02-24 18:59:46	2020-02-24 18:59:59
Yes		Agree				No			2020-02-24 19:15:42	ANON-YFPW-RBFD-4	2020-02-24 19:15:42	2020-02-24 19:15:53
No		Disagree	Psychology, although within the domain of Social Sciences, has more in common with Science. To remove Level 1 Psychology and expect it to be taught within the context of social studies is unreasonable. At level 1 it provides teachers with the opportunity to touch upon various approaches, provide a generalised understanding of research methods and look at a few fields which can then be extended / looked at in more detail at Level 2. It is a complex subject that is more academic than some realise so to get through the material and allow for practical work, it is necessary to focus on the subject at Level 1. My question is also - what does Psychology have in common with Media Production? It does not make sense to combine these subject areas. In addition, Economics, Accounting and Business Studies are 3 very separate subjects. I was a practicing Chartered Accountant for many years but that does not mean I was able to teach Economics or Business Studies. I received my experience of the latter in running my own business. Also Accounting is requires a lot of time if it is to be taught well. Yes, there are some schools that offer a combination of Economics and Accounting but they do not cover any where near the required content to have a full basic understanding. Specialising at Level 2 from this starting point requires a lot of work and classroom			No			2020-02-24 19:26:16	ANON-YFPW-RBFX-R	2020-02-24 19:26:16	2020-02-24 19:26:25
No		Strongly agree				No			2020-02-24 19:28:48	ANON-YFPW-RBFA-1	2020-02-24 19:28:48	2020-02-24 19:28:59
No		Agree				No			2020-02-24 19:41:53	ANON-YFPW-RBFN-E	2020-02-24 19:41:53	2020-02-24 19:42:07
Yes		Undecided	Until we see what is being proposed it is difficult comment.			No			2020-02-24 19:45:59	ANON-YFPW-RBFK-B	2020-02-24 19:45:59	2020-02-24 19:46:10
Yes		Agree		Very happy to see Visual Arts included- the creative thinking intrinsic to Visual Arts is a necessary? vital skill in today's world		No	I feel ml should know more about this		2020-02-24 19:48:24	ANON-YFPW-RBF6-P	2020-02-24 19:48:24	2020-02-24 19:48:41
No		Disagree	By cutting the sciences we are creating a less knowledgeable generation.			Yes			2020-02-24 19:56:52	ANON-YFPW-RBFR-J	2020-02-24 19:56:52	2020-02-24 19:56:59
Yes		Strongly disagree	Initially, I supported the idea of one general science domain at level 1, however, now that I have seen the proposed standards with the exclusive emphasis on nature of science and lack of emphasis on skill and basic content knowledge I see that this would be detrimental for senior science specialization at level 2 and 3. As a teacher of senior chemistry, I already have to battle with weak prior knowledge and skills of students entering senior chemistry due to teachers without the adequate depth of subject knowledge teaching at junior levels. To design a program to embed broad enough content strands into these assessment requirements would be an immensely difficult task. On a personal note as a student if I was assessed exclusively this way in science I would not have carried on with science to higher levels. The goal of being more inclusive may end up excluding others like myself.	Retaining subdomains in science to keep the content strands embedded closer within the standard along with the nature of science.		No			2020-02-24 19:57:00	ANON-YFPW-RBFW-Q	2020-02-24 19:57:00	2020-02-24 19:57:34
Yes		Agree				Yes		It looks like Te Reo Rangatira and Hangarau are headings in the table. I'm assuming this is just a formatting issue?	2020-02-24 20:02:41	ANON-YFPW-RBF4-M	2020-02-24 20:02:41	2020-02-24 20:02:56

Yes		Undecided		I would like to see outdoor education as a subject or will there be scope to put this under Physical Education as we do currently? Would like to see this as a stand alone subject, very popular with students real life meaningful learning, would also fit in well with our world need for environmental sustainability	Outdoor Education	No				2020-02-24 20:08:24	ANON-YFPW-RBFT-M	2020-02-24 20:08:24	2020-02-24 20:08:41
Yes		Disagree		Media studies is very different to social studies and would appeal more to students interested in careers relating to drama or public relations. Social studies is more closely aligned to an interest in politics, sociology, history and economics. I therefore think these should remain as separate options at Level 1. I am concerned that only offering science at Level 1 is too broad for students progressing to study the individual sciences at Levels 2 & 3. Being able to study individual sciences at Level 1 in depth gives a stronger foundation for later study. This is especially important for students entering highly competitive fields of study e.g. veterinarian or medicine.	Law and politics .	No				2020-02-24 20:20:10	ANON-YFPW-RBF3-K	2020-02-24 20:20:10	2020-02-24 20:20:26
Yes		Strongly disagree		Removing Classics at Level 1 and Latin is a drastic step. Totally disagree with this move.		No				2020-02-24 20:35:43	ANON-YFPW-RBFU-N	2020-02-24 20:35:43	2020-02-24 20:35:55
Yes		Strongly disagree	Tuning NCEA level 1 science into four standards does not give students the flexibility that they require. Many students in our school take multiple level 1 sciences. This would become difficult with only four achievement standards. My suggested improvement would be to offer ONE additional achievement standard in each context strand eg Earth and Space, biology, physics and chemistry.	My suggested improvement would be to offer ONE additional achievement standard in each context strand eg Earth and Space, biology, physics and chemistry. This would offer 8 standards in Science, which compared to the original level matrix is a significant reduction, but gives students/teachers flexibility they require. I agree that the NOS, science vision statement are very important but so is content, otherwise students are unable to put their knowledge/skills into meaningful contexts. Science is fundamental to NZ achieving it vision of a knowledge economy. When other learning strands are maintaining up to 11 subjects and science down to two, I would argue that we are going away from creating a knowledge economy.	Yes- Chemistry, Earth and Space Science, Biology and Physics.	No				2020-02-24 20:43:03	ANON-YFPW-RBMV-Z	2020-02-24 20:43:03	2020-02-24 20:43:09
Yes	I feel that the current suggestions are not broad at all - in fact they narrow the subject choices. I also don't think the current suggestions are foundational as they lack any inclusion of Mātauranga Maori - something that all New Zealanders should have knowledge of - it is after all the point of difference for any person educated in New Zealand..	Disagree	I think the alignment is poor and outdated because our curriculum has not kept up with global trends and it is missing key aspects of learning that all New Zealanders should experience.	Basing the subject alignment on a curriculum that needs revising is in my view flawed. While twiddling with the subjects by a process of reduction - many into one (e.g sciences) does not make learning broad. It in fact means it is narrowed - less depth and more coverage. Does this improve learning? The aim to make it more accessible is not in my view achievement with the current rearrangement. As well, in trimming off subjects that also embrace outside of New Zealand histories and knowledge, I feel that we are missing out on a global understanding of the rest of the world as well. Do we have the bigger picture so that our qualification acknowledges both local and global thinking? I don't feel that we have this right.	Yes, while 98% of Maori students are in mainstream classrooms, I think it is important to include options for selecting Mātauranga Maori as a specialist subject alongside of Te Reo. Most New Zealand young people can go through secondary education without any knowledge of Mātauranga Maori and find that they do not know enough to make a difference to our collective commitment to the Tiriti o Waitangi. As well, in trimming off subjects that also embrace outside of New Zealand histories and knowledge, I feel that we are missing out on a global understanding of the rest of the world as well. Do we have the bigger picture so that our qualification acknowledges both local and global thinking? I don't feel that we have this right.	Yes	It is an excellent document that is undergoing a full review to renew and update - much like we should be doing with the New Zealand Curriculum.	I don't know enough about the subjects under development but I do hope that there is accessibility of these subjects for the majority of Maori in mainstream classrooms.		2020-02-24 20:47:41	ANON-YFPW-RBMC-A	2020-02-24 20:47:41	2020-02-24 20:48:14
Yes		Strongly disagree		Destroying specialist science is a very shortsighted move. It makes it much more difficult to offer a flexible course. Science is the largest subject, it covers the entirety of human knowledge, and the amount of knowledge is increasing exponentially. The importance of students leaving school with a working understanding of science is more crucial than ever. These changes will make it that much harder for students not studying science at Level 2 to gain that working knowledge.		No				2020-02-24 20:48:09	ANON-YFPW-RBMS-T	2020-02-24 20:48:09	2020-02-24 20:48:20

Yes		Strongly disagree	I think you are limiting the access students have to the influences of the ancient world by collapsing Level 1 Classical Studies. This is not an off-shoot of History. Classical Studies departments may only have a few teachers in there departments but can also have very strong numbers for classes, if you take away Level 1 you can put peoples livelihoods at risk. If you are diminishing the importance of Level 1 and suggesting it comes under the umbrella of History (which it does not at all- there are thousands of years difference!) what is to say you will not devalue it in later years for the other two levels and more livelihoods become at stake. The skills, knowledge and expertise gained in Classical Studies carry students into a huge number of pathway opportunities, when you collapse a subject you are telling them that these skills are not important. STEM is not the only important area of the future of education!		No				2020-02-24 20:48:40	ANON-YFPW-RBMV-W	2020-02-24 20:44:07	2020-02-24 20:48:50
No		Agree			Yes				2020-02-24 20:52:21	ANON-YFPW-RBM8-Y	2020-02-24 20:52:21	2020-02-24 20:52:30
Yes		Agree	As long as external exams are still part of the new changes. Otherwise you will lose the competitive nature of top students, and Science will not be seen as a preferred subject of choice.	There must still be external assessments at level 1 Science.	No				2020-02-24 20:57:38	ANON-YFPW-RBM9-Z	2020-02-24 20:57:38	2020-02-24 20:58:14
No	Amalgamation of subjects is inconsistent across the range of subjects and learning areas.	Strongly disagree	Problems to gain foundation learning in subjects that are grouped will cause access difficulty for students at Level 2 and onwards.	The grouped subjects already have the flexibility to design a course to suit their students based on the existing AS available. Why deny Schools and students the opportunity to specialize at Level 1 if that provides the best outcomes for their learners? What will a qualification at Level 1 in Commerce mean to employers?	AS in Financial Literacy	No			2020-02-24 20:58:53	ANON-YFPW-RBMG-E	2020-02-24 20:58:53	2020-02-24 20:59:03
No		Agree			No				2020-02-24 21:13:00	ANON-YFPW-RBMJ-H	2020-02-24 21:13:00	2020-02-24 21:13:10
Yes		Agree			No				2020-02-24 21:14:47	ANON-YFPW-RBMQ-R	2020-02-24 21:14:47	2020-02-24 21:14:57
No		Undecided	Where does Hospitality as a subject fit in? What happens to Home Economics? Does Food Technology have a more science focus?		No				2020-02-24 21:30:57	ANON-YFPW-RBME-C	2020-02-24 21:30:57	2020-02-24 21:31:23
No		Agree		Good to combine commerce subjects under one roof and also science	no	No			2020-02-24 21:38:49	ANON-YFPW-RBM5-V	2020-02-24 21:38:49	2020-02-24 21:38:57
No		Strongly disagree	As teacher of Accounting and Economics I am concerned that 'level one commerce will have very limited accounting content due to the practical constraints of the subject and the ability to access the subject directly at Level Two in most settings' Concerns: - Accounting, Economics and Business are very individual and differing subjects. - The skills and knowledge in each of these areas are very different. - The skills taught at Level 1 underpin the foundation of success in Level 2 and Level 3. - As a pathway into future success in Level 3 and Scholarship Accounting and Economics, students require knowledge that is embedded during teaching during Level 1. - There is a clear future career pathway in all of these areas and they are INDIVIDUAL at University. - Nationally student numbers in Accounting and		No				2020-02-24 21:43:07	ANON-YFPW-RBMP-Q	2020-02-24 21:43:07	2020-02-24 21:43:48
No	I personally believe this is an atrocious approach to the gateway to tertiary education and employment. Year 10 should be the year that the "foundation" that you speak of is laid. Select schools already offer a few NCEA Level 1 Internals at Year 10 to integrate students into senior school. At Year 11, when a student turns 16 years old they are legally able to leave school. How can a student be prepared for later life when they have no specialized courses to help guide them on the path to a career they love. This change will undoubtedly increase the amount of drop outs exponentially. It celebrates mediocrity. It will ultimately hinder a students ability to gain NCEA Level 2 and 3. Encouraging students to stay at school will benefit the economy.	Strongly disagree		Commerce encompassing 3 subjects is diluting the current studies in Accounting, Economics and Business Studies. What happens to specialist teachers? What happens to specialized courses which have already commenced?		No			2020-02-24 21:47:07	ANON-YFPW-RBM7-X	2020-02-24 21:47:07	2020-02-24 21:47:25
No		Undecided			No				2020-02-24 22:09:53	ANON-YFPW-RBMF-D	2020-02-24 22:09:53	2020-02-24 22:10:04

Yes		Disagree		Art History and Classical Studies are academic subjects that nevertheless remain accessible to students. They contribute to the improvement in students' writing, and enhance understanding of the world - the aim of any humanities subject. (I'm an English teacher.) Numbers of Scholarship students indicate that Classics in particular is strong. Subsuming it within History shows a lack of understanding of the distinction between those subjects. Art History numbers are comparable with Dance, and almost double those of Agriculture and Horticulture and French, and three times those of Samoan.		No			2020-02-24 22:18:43	ANON-YFPW-RBM1-R	2020-02-24 22:18:43	2020-02-24 22:18:47
No	I knew there were proposed changes, but was not sure of the details.	Undecided		I think some of the courses combined under one umbrella course are a bit much to teach as one course. Seems like it will be more of a taster for what you may choose in level 2 or 3	Can't think of any	No			2020-02-24 22:26:17	ANON-YFPW-RBMZ-1	2020-02-24 22:26:17	2020-02-24 22:26:27
Yes		Agree			Would like to separate Mathematics into Calculus, Statistics and Mathematics at level 2	No			2020-02-24 22:28:48	ANON-YFPW-RBMH-F	2020-02-24 22:28:48	2020-02-24 22:29:03
No	I think its not good to kill subjects and form a merger of some subjects to form one subject like Commerce and Social Studies and putting less content for some subjects at Year 11 level which would lead the students knowing less about that subject at Year 12 & 13 level and thus not choosing it.	Strongly disagree		As a commerce teacher, I think merging Economics, Business Studies, and Accounting is not good. I think these 3 subjects are all of different nature and putting very little Accounting content in Year 11 Commerce would definitely kill the subject at Year 12 level since students would have very limited knowledge of Accounting. We need Accounting to be a subject of its own so that basic skills are being taught at Year 11 level. Most students just love the calculation bit of commerce which is given to them through Accounting. We already have Accountants on the immigration shortage list and limiting Accounting at Year 11 level will further worsen the problem.	No	No			2020-02-24 22:34:50	ANON-YFPW-RBMH-M	2020-02-24 22:34:50	2020-02-24 22:36:25
No		Disagree	The changes to Science, Social Studies and commerce, along with the removal of construction seem a real loss to students. These subjects help our students gain valuable knowledge in these more specialised subjects and can steer career and life choices. I think the proposal is taking away this chance.	Science should stay varied. The broad differences in the sciences allow students to follow an interest and passion which can lead to engineers, doctors, scientists. Frequently students don't connect with all and can be easily dissuaded from this important pathway. Similar with social sciences. Our need for psychology in the future requires the access to understanding younger.	The future of work needs to be considered- what will the world need more of and what's missing. We need to educate our students in subjects that will be of use. But do not forget the value of life skills that we so frequently forget to teach them	No			2020-02-24 22:46:41	ANON-YFPW-RBMD-B	2020-02-24 22:46:41	2020-02-24 22:46:57
No	I think it's not the best idea as it just seems like repeating year 10, but this time with credits. It will make the jump to Level 2 even bigger and more daunting than it already is.	Disagree	You are changing like three subjects, and just merging a whole bunch which doesn't make a lot of sense to me. The students should be selecting their subject direction in year 10, then starting to specialise in level 1. They can change if they want in level 2/halfway through level 1. Finish their specialisation in level 3.			No			2020-02-24 22:53:10	ANON-YFPW-RBMX-Y	2020-02-24 22:53:10	2020-02-24 22:53:17
No		Undecided			yes	Yes			2020-02-24 23:08:49	ANON-YFPW-RBMA-S	2020-02-24 23:08:49	2020-02-24 23:09:09
No		Disagree		Science at Level one should better prepare students for study at L2 and L3 by offering more diversity. This will be problematic if specialised strands like bio, chem, physics are removed at level1		Yes			2020-02-24 23:16:11	ANON-YFPW-RBMN-N	2020-02-24 23:16:11	2020-02-24 23:16:31
Yes		Agree	On the face of it, it seems logical	More life skills should be apart of some of these subjects eg. budgeting, credit cards etc	I'm not sure at this stage.	Yes	Somewhat	I would if my tamariki were still in kura, with this curriculum, but they are now in mainstream. I prefer to leave to those who currently access these types of kura.	2020-02-24 23:22:55	ANON-YFPW-RBMK-J	2020-02-24 23:22:55	2020-02-24 23:23:07
No	Was unaware of this progress	Undecided	The strict combination of eco and accounting into commerce is worrying. It is a question of flexibility of standards here also. Overall, the idea to not limit pathways is appreciated. However, it should be noted that a major limit to pathways like these currently is which subjects schools offer. Eg my school offers no commerce l2 or l3. This is something that should not happen. Maybe ensure this does not happen to start off	Please be very careful with how commerce is structured. It could really turn some students away from the subject if it doesn't support what they want to do and what they are actually not interested in.	Legal studies in conjunction with history. I did this subject through te kura and while I did not enjoy the way it was taught online, I feel it would fit well in my past history classes.	No			2020-02-25 01:12:51	ANON-YFPW-RBMR-S	2020-02-25 01:12:51	2020-02-25 01:13:01

Yes	"Art History and Classical Studies only supported as possible contexts within history to a low degree." - this does not reflect the above statement of "broad, more foundational education"	Disagree	Combing subjects will make it harder for teachers to teach more than just the basic overview of subjects. Expecting History to cover over 2000 years of social history as well as touching on Art is ridiculous. This should not be like the "History of the World in 2 minutes" videos on youtube.	Art History doesn't just teach you about art, it teaches you about the development of the human race, about new inventions, philosophical ideas, trauma. You learn to examine the visual and analysis it, able to read and decipher symbols. You learn about history across continents, viewpoints wider than just the traditional Euro/American perspective. It allows marginalised students to find their voice. It also provides a practical style of writing. Giving students who struggle with task of analysing pointless movies and books and the opportunity to explore the same themes through aesthetics. By cutting Art History at level 1 you are also risking the future of Art History at level 2 and 3, and therefore admission into university Art History. The arts are important, you will have happier students, this is not about money but the wellbeing of the future generations of NZers.	Improve Art History. Support the Arts and as a result support creatives of NZ.	No		N/A	2020-02-25 01:14:56	ANON-YFPW-RBMW-X	2020-02-25 01:14:56	2020-02-25 01:15:15
Yes		Strongly disagree		The removal of Latin is illogical. Latin supports the development of English vocabulary and grammatical structures. It is foundational to studying other Romance languages. Latin vocabulary supports the study of the sciences and law. Latin spurs the development of analytical thinking and literary analysis in the upper levels supports literary analysis in English and the social studies. In short, the removal of Latin from the curriculum would be a grave loss to students and disadvantage them in our globalized economic reality.		Yes			2020-02-25 03:45:29	ANON-YFPW-RBM4-U	2020-02-25 03:45:29	2020-02-25 03:45:42
No	But I agree with it	Undecided	Would this mean more workload for the students having to cover a broader subject ?	It looks great just having sons i'm concerned over too much time in the classroom?	No.	No			2020-02-25 04:48:49	ANON-YFPW-RBMT-U	2020-02-25 04:48:49	2020-02-25 04:49:13
Yes		Strongly disagree	Latin should not be removed from the list of languages.	Latin is a foundation of western culture. Learning Latin exposes pupils to crucial linguistic, cultural and historic principles; to get rid of it would be short-sighted and anti-intellectual.		No			2020-02-25 06:24:24	ANON-YFPW-RBM3-T	2020-02-25 06:24:24	2020-02-25 06:24:42
Yes		Disagree				No			2020-02-25 06:35:13	ANON-YFPW-RBM2-S	2020-02-25 06:35:13	2020-02-25 06:35:24
Yes	Only after application for RAS groups.	Undecided	I like integrating media with my music class and I wonder if this will effect that.	I have found that the media standards can run alongside a whole range of subjects and have incorporated them into PE and music in the past.	Outdoor education	Yes	No		2020-02-25 06:38:56	ANON-YFPW-RBMU-V	2020-02-25 06:38:56	2020-02-25 06:39:06
Yes		Agree		I did Art History at schools (7th form) and found it a valuable class.		No			2020-02-25 07:18:00	ANON-YFPW-RBKY-X	2020-02-25 07:18:00	2020-02-25 07:18:14
No	Only really heard that all subjects would be 4 standards with a 20 credit value. Welcomed this idea until I saw the proposed L1 Science standards.	Undecided	Difficult to make a judgement as we do not have details of L2 and L3 subjects standards and therefore cannot tell if appropriate pathways are available.	There is nothing to prepare students looking to follow an academic pathway in Science. With a big push from the government on STEM based careers I find this surprising. The proposed L1 Science standards will not meet the needs of our academic students and will not meet the needs of our less able students. We need standards available for students in Biology Chemistry and Physics at L1. How many other countries offer an equivalent year 11 Science curriculum with no specialisation in the Sciences available?	L2 and L3 Science standards	No	There seems to be an increasing focus on Maori in the curriculum. Whilst I welcome this, lets not forget that we are preparing students to work in an ever increasing global community. A strong focus on local and NZ issues does not prepare students for this		2020-02-25 07:38:18	ANON-YFPW-RBKV-U	2020-02-25 07:38:18	2020-02-25 07:38:36
No		Agree				No			2020-02-25 07:47:49	ANON-YFPW-RBKC-8	2020-02-25 07:47:49	2020-02-25 07:47:56
No	That was not clear until now	Strongly disagree	Specialist science subjects must be maintained at level 1	Content is vital in Science. The removal of Biology, Chemistry and Physics specific standards (and therefore content) will have a significant damaging effect to these areas and an impact on the quality of Science understanding in our students.	no	No			2020-02-25 07:52:58	ANON-YFPW-RBK5-R	2020-02-25 07:52:58	2020-02-25 07:53:06
Yes		Undecided	Where does Outdoor Education fit in now? We use PE Ach Stds at the moment.	Where does Outdoor Education fit in now?	Outdoor Education	No			2020-02-25 08:00:10	ANON-YFPW-RBK8-W	2020-02-25 08:00:10	2020-02-25 08:00:19
No		Undecided		Religion should not have a place on the list. If you are going to include that then you need to include the Maori Performing Arts. These 2 topics only are applicable to a certain number of students. I think if you are going to overhaul, it needs to be for ALL students.		Yes	no		2020-02-25 08:02:56	ANON-YFPW-RBK9-X	2020-02-25 08:02:56	2020-02-25 08:03:06

No		Strongly agree		I think the new subjects are excellent and will achieve the intention, to give young people the opportunity to get a taste of subjects across a number of disciplines before specialising. I am particularly pleased to see commerce being introduced rather than specialist subjects under that banner. Also, I am happy that science remains broad at level 1. I am a business owner who hires graduates often and I am impressed by the NZ education system having spent 15 years living and working in the UK. My children are now year 7 and year 9 and I think what we offer in this country is the opportunity for them to develop a love of learning. Great work!		Yes			2020-02-25 08:10:51	ANON-YFPW-RBKJ-C	2020-02-25 08:09:03	2020-02-25 08:11:09
Yes		Undecided		The revised digital technologies subject should include more subject specific skills at level 2 and 3 (as should the other technology areas). Within Technology, developing a proposal/brief through working with a client or stakeholder, and design thinking are generic skills. The proposal suggested these concepts would be weaved into the newly developed achievement standards. This action would undermine what is trying to be achieved in each technology subject and particularly in Digital Technology has already diluted and marginalised the unique skills and knowledge associated with each of the Tech subjects.	Computational Thinking / Computer Science. Digital technologies has just been expanded to 2 areas within Technology (Designing and Developing Digital Outcomes, Computational Thinking). What was the rationale behind that if it is immediately collapsed again?	No			2020-02-25 08:11:38	ANON-YFPW-RBKJ-F	2020-02-25 08:11:38	2020-02-25 08:11:54
Yes		Agree		Am concerned that Science may be narrowed down too much, too broad.	NO	No	I would PD on how to read and speak Te Reo		2020-02-25 08:24:53	ANON-YFPW-RBKJ-P	2020-02-25 08:24:53	2020-02-25 08:25:05
No		Disagree				No			2020-02-25 08:25:16	ANON-YFPW-RBKJ-A	2020-02-25 08:25:16	2020-02-25 08:25:23
No	We knew there were upcoming changes but not the extent or intention of these changes.	Agree	Agree: Like the idea of doing less, too much time currently spent assessing. More time in quality teaching is great. Still short of detail though.	No feedback	Would like to know the specialist subjects being available in DigiTech eg Media very Programming.	No			2020-02-25 08:25:41	ANON-YFPW-RBKJ-N	2020-02-25 08:25:40	2020-02-25 08:26:05
Yes	Were aware of changes and how the may impact upon teaching and learning. Did not know how wide the changes were going to be.	Agree	I like the idea of doing less assessments and more quality teaching. Unclear of all information		Interested in how the specialist subjects within Digital Technologies is going to be affected with less assessments on offer e.g. Digital Media vs. Electronics vs. Programming	No			2020-02-25 08:25:31	ANON-YFPW-RBKJ-T	2020-02-25 08:25:31	2020-02-25 08:26:05
Yes		Agree	Specialisation too early severely limits later options and choices.	Accounting is becoming more computer based in real terms and is becoming less of a specialised occupational choice. For commerce, only basic accounting principles need apply.		No			2020-02-25 08:26:49	ANON-YFPW-RBKJ-V	2020-02-25 08:26:49	2020-02-25 08:27:10
Yes		Undecided				No			2020-02-25 08:35:53	ANON-YFPW-RBKJ-B	2020-02-25 08:35:53	2020-02-25 08:36:08
No		Agree		I believe it would be great to have a subject "Health Sciences" (more in depth than the current health/physical education subject). Health Science would be beneficial for students interested in a career in health sciences such as nursing, medicine, dentistry, physiotherapists, speech language therapists, occupational therapists, psychology etc. As a student at college I studied biology level 1-3 and this subject did not cover the human body, its focus was more on the environment. Physical education I found had a focus on sport specifically how the body works in regards to muscle movement/anatomy. There was not much focus on internal organs or human pathophysiology. Another subject which I believe would be beneficial to New Zealand/globally would be a subject one based on the "environment". Incorporating science, social science, global warming, Treaty of Waitangi, our impact on the environment, laws around the environment, environments at risk e.g our rivers, flora/fauna. This subject could lead onto careers in Business, DOC, government jobs, law, sustainable farming, etc	I believe it would be great to have a subject "Health Sciences" (more in depth than the current health/physical education subject). Health Science would be beneficial for students interested in a career in health sciences such as nursing, medicine, dentistry, physiotherapists, speech language therapists, occupational therapists, psychology etc. As a student at college I studied biology level 1-3 and this subject did not cover the human body, its focus was more on the environment. Physical education I found had a focus on sport specifically how the body works in regards to muscle movement/anatomy. There was not much focus on internal organs or human pathophysiology. Another subject which I believe would be beneficial to New Zealand/globally would be a subject one based on the "environment". Incorporating science, social science, global warming, Treaty of Waitangi, our impact on the environment, laws around the environment, environments at risk e.g our rivers, flora/fauna. This subject could lead onto careers in Business, DOC, government jobs, law etc	No			2020-02-25 08:42:25	ANON-YFPW-RBKJ-P	2020-02-25 08:42:25	2020-02-25 08:42:47
Yes	However, this should be at year 10 with an emphasis on literacy and numeracy to give a basic school leavers' certificate. A higher school certificate at year 12. Year 13 should only be for university papers (taught by teachers - examined by the university) to give a seamless higher education path.	Undecided	Nothing is in concrete yet. Knowing the Ministry it will be uncertain/directionless and left up to the teachers to implement the best they can which will be projected on to the students reducing the quality of education in NZ.	In commerce, students who can do accounting can not necessarily do economics, and vice versa. Forcing them to do both in an amalgamated subject will be unfair.		No			2020-02-25 08:49:40	ANON-YFPW-RBKJ-Y	2020-02-25 08:43:16	2020-02-25 08:49:46

Yes		Strongly disagree	As a History teacher myself, I am opposed to incorporating classics at Level 1. These disciplines are quite distinct, but also, our curriculum is already jam-packed. I would not have time to cover modern history as well as ancient history at Level 1 (or any level). I also feel that Senior Social studies and Media studies are vastly different. I would support psychology being incorporated at Level 1 with Social studies, but certainly not media studies. Media teachers require a very specialized skill set, and in most schools they are English teachers, not Social Sciences teachers.		No			2020-02-25 08:49:52	ANON-YFPW-RBKM-J	2020-02-25 08:49:52	2020-02-25 08:50:03
No	I still thought level one was going to be removed	Undecided		I am concerned about the removal of art history as I don't think this is currently supported/taught in umbrella subjects (e.g The Arts and social sciences) . Learning visual literacy is crucial in our increasingly visual world and art history gives e perfect framework in which to do this. Art history enables people to understand the important role the arts have played and can play in the socio-political arena, particularly in our own pre and post colonial history.	I would like to Art history try further developed as per my previous statement to improve its relevance and status in the new millennium - walking backwards going forwards	No		2020-02-25 08:55:43	ANON-YFPW-RBKX-W	2020-02-25 08:55:43	2020-02-25 08:56:03
No	I was informed about it by my Head of Science.	Undecided	More details required.	The need for change needs to be demonstrated with data and a careful consideration of knock on impacts. Science and Technology development has been shown to be critical in the development of strong economies. Altering the education practices can potentially be detrimental to this.	Philosophy. Languages (more generally). Digital Technology. More specific and applied sciences/technology.	Yes	It's an important but developing process.	2020-02-25 08:55:46	ANON-YFPW-RBKA-6	2020-02-25 08:55:46	2020-02-25 08:56:04
No	At our school, we were not informed of these changes to support a broad more foundational education at Level 1. We only got an email from the Principal about a week ago informing us of this.	Disagree	The condensing of 11 Achievement Standards into 4 for DTG limits the choices available for students, especially if you are teaching a mixed ability class. There should be a separation between students choosing to take DTG (print, multi-media and web design) and those who want to take CSC (programming). Not all students have the ability to do CSC and if Achievement Standards are not offered for DTG then this discourages them from taking the subject.	There should be a wider range of Achievement Standards offered for DTG and CSC as they are two separate subjects taken by students at our school, e.g. a choice of 5 Achievement Standards at Level 1 for DTG and CSC not 4 for both subjects. Also, there is the issue of where to get the trained teachers from to teach DTG and CSC? The student teachers are not coming from Auckland University or AUT as they can get a higher salary in the business sector working as IT technicians and programmers. Even with the new DTG curriculum from Yr7-10, where are the PLD courses? So far, there is little available and we are supposed to be implementing the new curriculum this year.	No		2020-02-25 08:57:07	ANON-YFPW-RBKD-9	2020-02-25 08:51:55	2020-02-25 08:57:16	
No		Strongly disagree		Accounting should still be a separate subject. There is sequential learning content like Mathematics and it is necessary for the full L1 course to be taught to continue with the existing L2 and L3 courses.		No		2020-02-25 09:02:53	ANON-YFPW-RBKK-G	2020-02-25 09:02:53	2020-02-25 09:03:07
Yes		Strongly disagree	Health and Physical Education are two completely different subjects that are taken by different students in our school. I do not support this (from a Dean's perspective)		No		2020-02-25 09:06:36	ANON-YFPW-RBK6-U	2020-02-25 09:06:36	2020-02-25 09:06:44	
No		Agree	I support the view that Level 1 should be broad based, and understand how the subjects that are being merged are being done so in their learning areas. I have some questions about how some subjects fit together under a single umbrella - e.g. although Media St falls under humanities, it is generally considered part of English in most schools. Are the three commerce subject areas compatible as a singular subject? etc		Yes		2020-02-25 09:09:32	ANON-YFPW-RBKR-Q	2020-02-25 09:09:32	2020-02-25 09:09:41	
Yes		Strongly agree			No		2020-02-25 09:14:56	ANON-YFPW-RBKW-V	2020-02-25 09:14:56	2020-02-25 09:15:02	
Yes		Undecided		I do not see Home Economics as Food Science!! They are two different things. I believe Home Economics would be better classified as Food & Nutrition - as that is an integral area of learning for our young people to help improve their health and well-being. Food Science has a more technological science-related approach which could sit alone as a technology curriculum subject.	No		2020-02-25 09:20:23	ANON-YFPW-RBKT-5	2020-02-25 09:20:23	2020-02-25 09:20:31	
Yes		Strongly agree			Yes		2020-02-25 09:27:41	ANON-YFPW-RBK3-R	2020-02-25 09:27:41	2020-02-25 09:28:03	
Yes		Disagree	I do not believe there should so many subjects available in the Social Sciences area but the 4 sciences are put into one. As a society we are trying to encourage more students into the sciences and why can they have 3 subject emerging from Social Studies at Level 1 (Geo, Hist and social studies) but only one science. It send the wrong signal as to what we want for the future and begins to cheneel students into areas that are less needed for the future. The Technologies have been given subject specialiation early why not the sciences.		No		2020-02-25 09:29:43	ANON-YFPW-RBK2-Q	2020-02-25 09:29:43	2020-02-25 09:30:08	

No	I wasn't aware, but am now.	Agree	It doesn't effect me directly. I feel it follows a pattern of expansion of subjects with the threat of diluting the quality and value. Moving towards a more streamlined approach which aims to maintain or enhance quality. I think this is a give and take feature of a dynamic organisation.			Yes	Some familiarity. Still Maori and Pasifika are not achieving on par with their peers in their cohort.			2020-02-25 09:34:55	ANON-YFPW-RBKU-T	2020-02-25 09:34:55	2020-02-25 09:35:02
Yes		Strongly agree		Not sure why Maori Performing Arts has to be a separate subject. Shouldn't all subjects have a small amount of content covering this and then in Level 2 go into specialisation as with other subjects.		No				2020-02-25 09:37:42	ANON-YFPW-RBNU-1	2020-02-25 09:37:42	2020-02-25 09:37:58
Yes		Disagree	Combining the individual Science topics into a single topic would seem to contradict the policy to promote STEM subjects.....			No				2020-02-25 09:40:57	ANON-YFPW-RBNV-X	2020-02-25 09:40:57	2020-02-25 09:41:13
No	Why is this necessary? The current system is gaining the desired results – Just to raise the KPI outcome don't shift the goalmouth.	Strongly disagree	Leave it as it is.	Learning Languages - apart from English and Te Reo Māori all other languages should be optional.	Mathematics - Calculus and Algebra should also be elaborated as Statistics individually.	Yes				2020-02-25 09:46:59	ANON-YFPW-RBNC-B	2020-02-25 09:46:59	2020-02-25 09:47:35
Yes		Strongly disagree	5 Tech subjects 3 social sciences 1 (arguably 2) science subjects ENOUGH SAID	Science is not 1 subject. Physics and Biology are as similar as Geo and History		No				2020-02-25 09:48:56	ANON-YFPW-RBNS-U	2020-02-25 09:48:56	2020-02-25 09:49:07
Yes		Strongly agree		Managing finance as a compulsory curriculum for every one at school. Importance of using sustainable material in our everyday life.		No				2020-02-25 09:52:22	ANON-YFPW-RBN8-Z	2020-02-25 09:52:22	2020-02-25 09:52:38
Yes		Disagree		Having only 4 standards for science at level 1 will make it difficult for schools to offer more than one science course at level 1. While I understand NCEA L1 is supposed to be broad the jump to level 2 specialist science subjects (at the current Level 2 level) will be significant and difficult. 2 standards per specialist subject at level 1 would be a workable compromise.		No				2020-02-25 09:56:59	ANON-YFPW-RBN9-1	2020-02-25 09:56:59	2020-02-25 09:57:08
Yes		Strongly disagree	The changes to the Science curriculum are significant and will have a negative impact on learners.	Reducing Science from 5 to 1 subject will have a significant impact. Allowing for two strands i.e. Nature of Science and General Science, would give schools more flexibility to adapt their learning programmes for their students. There needs to be some content requirements for a general Science course for students who plan to continue with science at Level 2 and 3. I do agree with the current standards proposed , but there needs to be additional standards which ensure students learn about the science concepts that impact on everyday life i.e electricity, chemical reactions	The reduction of the number of standards to 4 will restrict subjects like Agriculture/Horticulture being split into two separate, and distinctly different courses. Agriculture, Horticulture and Agribusiness should be 3 different subjects at Level 2 and 3 to allow for specialisation in an important area for the New Zealand economy. I would like to see Chem, Physics and Bio remain separate subjects in Level 2 and 3.	No				2020-02-25 10:03:29	ANON-YFPW-RBNG-F	2020-02-25 09:58:55	2020-02-25 10:03:32
No		Agree		Some component of Religious Studies to be included in Social Studies - exploring Religious thought from across the globe. Religion, even in secular communities shapes societal norms and it is important for young people to be aware of this.	Leadership	No				2020-02-25 10:04:52	ANON-YFPW-RBNJ-J	2020-02-25 10:04:52	2020-02-25 10:05:01
Yes		Agree		No	No. Just keep drama. In this age of screen communication, students desperately need to maintain their human to human communication skills.	No				2020-02-25 10:12:57	ANON-YFPW-RBNQ-S	2020-02-25 10:12:57	2020-02-25 10:13:23
Yes	Not a clever solution. Students need greater emphasis on Arts to provide the creative, solution-focussed workplace of the future.	Strongly disagree	Obviously designed by politicians and education academics - not people with experience of the workplace. Also, no account taken of spiritual aspects - probably why depression and suicide levels are so high. There is no teaching on an individual's place and purpose.	Commerce as one subject will not assist students to reach depths of understanding required. Combining science is a good idea if it reduces the dominance of this subject, which is disproportionate to the importance in the workplace.		No	It is not relevant to most New Zealanders, as it is not an international language. It is relevant culturally only.			2020-02-25 10:19:06	ANON-YFPW-RBNS-W	2020-02-25 10:19:06	2020-02-25 10:19:15
No	I was unaware of these specific changes. I was though aware that changes would be occurring to NCEA in the way of how many standards were to be completed during the year and the credits associated with each standard.	Strongly disagree	I believe that the commerce change is not going to be of any help or support to students as the three subjects(Accounting, Economics and Business Studies) all have a different set of skills and students are attracted to the three different areas. It will not help to develop foundational skills for students to progress through properly into Year 12 and 13. This will also not be helpful for the development of students with Financial Literacy skills for life as it may have an impact on a Business Studies/commerce course at Year 10.			No				2020-02-25 10:19:00	ANON-YFPW-RBNE-D	2020-02-25 10:19:00	2020-02-25 10:19:21
Yes		Strongly agree	Too many students specialise too early (especially in the sciences) to the detriment of their overall development.			No				2020-02-25 10:21:15	ANON-YFPW-RBNP-R	2020-02-25 10:21:15	2020-02-25 10:21:28
No	I teach Technology in a big urban school and we offer a lot of courses in the senior school. We need more standards that do not cross over if students choose electronics, metal based tech and wood based tech.	Undecided	I would need more detail to make an informed decision. How it would effect me at the chalk face	More standards for the cross over students that take one two or more tech subjects at the senior school.	Where does electronics fit in ??	No				2020-02-25 10:24:34	ANON-YFPW-RBN7-Y	2020-02-25 10:24:34	2020-02-25 10:24:46

No		Strongly disagree	This demonstrates a dumbing down of the education system intended to inculcate lower expectations and to game higher grades. The homogenization of science and the removal of subjects like art history, classics and Latin create a divide between state and private systems and suggest that these are somehow elite subjects: 'frills'. This has knock on effects downstream, on the university system and on structural inequalities.	Science subjects shouldn't be homogenised. Also the elimination of certain subjects the present administration considers elite frills will paradoxically reinforce inequalities. Also where is maths with algebra?? If you get rid of that you create a generation of students who will struggle to make the shift from statistical reasoning (math as a proportion) to mathematical reasoning, with major impacts on key STEM sectors.	No	Yes		No	2020-02-25 10:28:49	ANON-YFPW-RBNF-E	2020-02-25 10:28:49	2020-02-25 10:29:06
No		Strongly agree		no	no	No		No	2020-02-25 10:42:12	ANON-YFPW-RBN1-5	2020-02-25 10:42:12	2020-02-25 10:42:57
No		Agree		It seems that the national schooling system is shifting toward making the population more skilled to have it ready for the 'tradie' life. Good move if we want to be an independent nation, bad move with the global forecast of unskilled foreign refugees able to take any job for peanuts. Only time will tell with this issue. The issue with the languages, though, is different. NZ should aim to integrate the migrant population rather than trying to want them to impose their culture and values over our own. Teaching languages is good when it opens the door for Kiwis to the world. Teaching languages for the sake of making refugees feel welcome poses a risk for those refugees to never want to adapt to our culture. I think offering Samoan, Tongan and Cook Island Maori weakens the Kiwi culture.	More humanities!	No		No	2020-02-25 10:48:25	ANON-YFPW-RBNZ-2	2020-02-25 10:48:25	2020-02-25 10:48:38
Yes	you should keep classics as its own class	Undecided	you should keep the classes as they use to be	keep classics and history as their own classes	classics as its own class	No			2020-02-25 10:54:47	ANON-YFPW-RBNH-G	2020-02-25 10:54:47	2020-02-25 10:55:10
No	I didn't find out about it until recently, but it's stupid.	Strongly disagree	Come on, man! If you eliminate specialist subjects at level one, then they may as well not specialise at any level!	Many subjects which are being eliminated are important for essay writing skills, general life skills, and special interests/important focuses.	Nah.	No	Never even heard of it.		2020-02-25 10:55:15	ANON-YFPW-RBNB-A	2020-02-25 10:55:15	2020-02-25 10:55:25
Yes		Strongly disagree		As a year 13 student who has taken classical studies since level 1, I think it is an invaluable addition to the curriculum. The skills learnt in classics are incredibly useful and I know that the unique approaches taken in a classics course have made me a much better writer, reader, and critical thinker, and have made me much more aware of our world today as the Greco-Roman world was the foundation of Western society. The difference between a history course and a classics course is significant, and from my experience, history does not offer what classics does, not to mention the fact that classics is the only option for students who are interested in and fascinated by the classical world, of which there are many. I genuinely recommend taking classics to all younger students that I know and I think it would be very unfortunate if people at level 1 were to lose this option. Being able to take classics in level 1 is what made me realise that it is something I am good at and want to pursue.		Yes			2020-02-25 10:58:20	ANON-YFPW-RBNM-N	2020-02-25 10:58:20	2020-02-25 10:58:26
No		Strongly disagree				Yes			2020-02-25 10:58:27	ANON-YFPW-RBND-C	2020-02-25 10:58:27	2020-02-25 10:58:43
Yes		Strongly disagree	Science, the knowledge and understanding that underpins health, technological advancement, environmental sustainability, and natural disaster prediction and mitigation, which are essential to improving the standard of living in New Zealand, is being catastrophically reduced. There is a multitude of people who are anti-vaccination, anti-1080, anti-fluoride and supporters of a wealth of conspiracy theories because science literacy is already so low, and yet the government is pursuing an educational policy that will make it worse.	Please increase the quantity, and quality, of science in the curriculum, not decrease it. Every New Zealand child should have the opportunity to be science literate, and appreciate the role of statistics in science, even if they do not pursue mathematics to the level required to handle those statistics.		No			2020-02-25 11:15:43	ANON-YFPW-RBNX-Z	2020-02-25 11:15:43	2020-02-25 11:15:58
Yes		Undecided		If science at level 1 is now generic, does that leave space for whenu to be recognized in the Marau as it stands now the Marau putaiaio at level 1-3 doesn't give mana to matauranga maori as chemist/physics experts only limits them to ecology and biology.		Yes	see last questioned answered		2020-02-25 11:23:42	ANON-YFPW-RBNA-9	2020-02-25 11:23:42	2020-02-25 11:23:50

Yes	Although this was clouded by comments in the media about doing away with NCEA at Level 1 and comments about the introduction of project based learning.	Strongly disagree	I strongly disagree with Economics, Accounting and Business Studies being merged into one subject. The explanatory notes also add there will be very little Accounting in this course. The three subjects have distinct learning outcomes, knowledge and skills. The students taking these subjects are also quite different. Forcing Business Studies students to take Economics and vice versa is a step backwards. Other subjects are allowed to build knowledge and skills in Year 11 but Economics, Accounting and Business Studies will pretty much start from scratch in Year 12. There are equity issues for students going forward. The suggestion of a Level 1 Commerce course is like going back to the days of the subject Economic Studies and this seems to ignore the progress that has been made in these subject areas over the last few years. I am wondering why Accounting, Business Studies and Economics have been singled out. (I realise other subjects had minor changes but this is big for ACC BST and ECO). Word from the CETA reps was they didn't ask for this, they didn't discuss it and they were not told about this until the official announcement. It seems like a case of being seen to consult and then the Ministry doing what they had wanted to do all along. The discussion with CETA was not carried out in good faith.	I have made most of the points in the previous box. From what I have said above, I think Accounting, Economics and Business Studies should remain as separate subjects in Year 11.	There are a huge range of subjects on offer already at Level 2 and 3 depending on the size of the school so I don't think there is a need for more specialist subjects in the school I teach in.	No			2020-02-25 11:46:20	ANON-YFPW-RBNN-P	2020-02-25 11:46:20	2020-02-25 11:46:40
Yes		Agree		Classical studies and Art history are too large on their own to simply be included in History to a low degree. These subjects are complex and would require a more in depth exploration in order to get anything out of them. This would require them to remain as their own subjects. At level two and three of NCEA, this will have an effect on understanding if it is to be removed as an individual subject.		No			2020-02-25 11:48:57	ANON-YFPW-RBNK-K	2020-02-25 11:48:57	2020-02-25 11:49:04
No		Undecided				Yes			2020-02-25 11:50:55	ANON-YFPW-RBN6-X	2020-02-25 11:50:55	2020-02-25 11:51:21
No		Agree				No			2020-02-25 11:52:58	ANON-YFPW-RBNR-T	2020-02-25 11:52:58	2020-02-25 11:53:12
Yes		Strongly disagree	It is a continuation of the dumbing down of education, we continue to cater for the bottom end to the continual detriment of the top end. This is just more bureaucratic nonsense from a Ministry that has no real interest in improving education but would rather increase or decrease the admin depending on the year.	Combining the Sciences into one area is a bad idea but even worse is the Commerce combination. Economics and Business Studies are in the social sciences and Accounting is in the Mathematics area to start with. Accounting will die under this proposal and Economics and Business Studies will be severely weakened.		Yes			2020-02-25 11:54:51	ANON-YFPW-RBNW-Y	2020-02-25 11:54:51	2020-02-25 11:55:02
No		Agree	I agree in principle with keeping things broad so that students can then specialise but feel that it would be beneficial to include Philosophy to help develop critical thinking and ethics for better decision making in future generations	As above Philosophy and ethics should be a fundamental subject. Our kids need to understand why they have the ideas and beliefs they do and how to reason. And the history of rational thought.	Design thinking and customer experience/digital design	No			2020-02-25 11:57:33	ANON-YFPW-RBN4-V	2020-02-25 11:57:33	2020-02-25 11:57:40
No		Strongly disagree				Yes			2020-02-25 11:59:04	ANON-YFPW-RBNT-V	2020-02-25 11:59:04	2020-02-25 11:59:16
Yes		Agree				No			2020-02-25 12:07:36	ANON-YFPW-RBN3-U	2020-02-25 12:07:36	2020-02-25 12:07:53
Yes		Disagree				Yes			2020-02-25 12:11:24	ANON-YFPW-RBN2-T	2020-02-25 12:11:24	2020-02-25 12:12:13
No		Strongly agree				No			2020-02-25 12:19:14	ANON-YFPW-RBPV-3	2020-02-25 12:19:14	2020-02-25 12:19:25
Yes		Strongly agree				No			2020-02-25 12:26:15	ANON-YFPW-RBPV-Z	2020-02-25 12:26:15	2020-02-25 12:26:23
Yes	I have concerns that such a broad Level 1 will be detrimental to students intending to take specialist science subjects at Level 2 and Level 3. There is a certain amount of content that is strictly necessary which can not possibly be covered.	Disagree		See question 1. Perhaps if you provide the broad spectrum options for Physics, Chemistry, Biology and ESS as you have for general science. Standards that are able to be used to cover the big ideas in these specialist subjects.		No			2020-02-25 12:27:25	ANON-YFPW-RBPB-D	2020-02-25 12:27:25	2020-02-25 12:27:32
Yes		Agree				No			2020-02-25 12:35:49	ANON-YFPW-RBPB-2	2020-02-25 12:35:49	2020-02-25 12:35:58

No		Disagree	I don't agree with how some of the subjects are grouped in the new target subject list. Specifically around the Commerce, Sciences and Health and PE. Aside from that there should also be some standardisation across high schools and colleges as to the number of subject taken and what courses are compulsory. My children's college has 6 subject at Level 1 where as others only have 5. PE or Health are compulsory courses at our college at Lvl 1 but I know of others where they are not.	Without seeing what the Level 2 & 3 subject lists contain it is difficult to see how the revisions to Level 1 subjects translate into the following years. Combining 2-3 subjects into 1 overall topic seems to generalising too much. I don't agree with combining Economics, Business and Accounting into one subject if there is not going to be much accounting covered. If you are going to combine any I would suggest keeping Economics separate and having more focus on accounting and good business practice together. Psychology seems like an odd subject to have as a Level 1 subject so agree with this being left out to a degree but Social Studies and Media Studies are two separate areas. Also with science, currently there is mainstream science at Lvl 1 which covers the main topics. However, if you have advanced students who have taken Lvl 1 NCEA in Yr 10 then they need separate or advanced subject to take in Yr 11. Earth and Space science are already only Lvl 2 and 3 subjects at our college. Again, Health and PE - my son and daughter hated Health as a subject in Yr 9 and 10 which was combined in those years. Separating them at Level 1 NCEA (still compulsory at our college to take one) was great for my son as he has excelled in PE but had no interest in the Health aspect of	Mathematics. My biggest issue is that at Lvl 2 and 3 Statistics and Calculus are separated into two subjects. Quite often there is a cross over in requirements in tertiary or employment requirements, but to cover both topics it takes up two subjects and reduces other subject options if taking both. Why is there not a maths option at Level 2 and including level 3 that adequately covers both subjects?? I know of a tertiary student that has studied commerce subjects and on the advice of his teacher took statistics at high school. At university level he has failed one maths paper and struggled with a second attempt which contained calculus type questions (worth 20 points) which he has no understanding of.	No			2020-02-25 13:07:21	ANON-YFPW-RBPQ-U	2020-02-25 13:07:21	2020-02-25 13:07:51
Yes	Was clearly outlined in the workshop and information about the change package received last year.	Undecided	A number of the subjects that are being absorbed are popular, however will reserve judgment until seen plan for level 2 and 3.	Until we can see standards it is hard to comment on how the lost subjects may be dealt with.	Unsure at this stage	Yes			2020-02-25 13:09:47	ANON-YFPW-RBPE-F	2020-02-25 13:09:47	2020-02-25 13:09:56
Yes	This philosophy of a teaching a broader and more foundational education at Level 1 is well supported and has always been the case with NCEA Level 1 and School Certificate before NCEA was implemented.	Strongly disagree	It appears from the subject list provided that some learning areas have had their broader and foundational base reduced eg 1. Physical Education/Health. This combines 2 learning strands into only one 2. The Arts - removal of Art History 3. Social Sciences - loss of Classical Studies. 4. The addition of Media Studies/ Business / Accounting as Commerce in a Social Studies context?	If NCEA is to be broad and foundational why not look at increasing the number of subjects . to truly reflect this Look at other oversea's models e.g. Germany	It would be great to see a proposed list for Level 2 and 3 but should include : 1. The Arts - Art History 2. The Social Sciences - Classical Studies, Sociology, Accounting, Media Studies, Financial Literacy and Business Studies. 3. Physical Education, Health and Outdoor Education 4. Sciences - Marine Studies, Horticulture, Earth Science and the core traditional sciences of Biology, Chemistry and Physics.	No			2020-02-25 13:15:40	ANON-YFPW-RBPS-Y	2020-02-25 13:15:40	2020-02-25 13:15:55
No	Last I checked in with Education policy was last year, when the Latin Scholarship exam was facing the axe.	Disagree	I think removing Latin at Level 1 will only serve to erode any option of it at Levels 2 and 3, because language learning typically demands long and continuous exposure (Art History hopefully would avoid this fate, as it is not a language). Classical Studies might also be eroded unless it is a compulsory module of Level 1 History. Merging all the Sciences seems much too broad of a stroke and would leave a lot of catching up for higher levels, but Earth and Space Science might be managed between Physics and Geography.	As above. Though I would add despite New Zealand's declining trend in Latin, the language and Classics are having something of a non-traditionalist renaissance in both Australia and the US, which I hope we will also soon experience here. Students should also hopefully have a good idea of which sciences interest them by Year 11, with Years 9 and 10 kept broad in focus. Though these topics are often tied up in Social Studies, a Philosophy option that incorporated Ethics and NZ Historical, Cultural and Civic matters with Religious Studies might replace Religious Studies (or exist alongside it)	I am unsure whether Digital Technologies further specializes into pure Programming, but this could be valuable.	No	Sounds great though!		2020-02-25 13:30:47	ANON-YFPW-RBPP-T	2020-02-25 13:30:47	2020-02-25 13:31:07
Yes		Undecided				Yes		no	2020-02-25 14:00:09	ANON-YFPW-RBP7-1	2020-02-25 14:00:09	2020-02-25 14:00:18
Yes	Yes, I was aware of this but did not think that level one media studies would be shafted. Media studies is not a specialisation. It is an important aspect of our everyday lives and should be studied from level one onwards. *** Media Studies is more relevant than ever before. Our young people have more access to media consumption and also media creator. Media of all forms increasingly is becoming embedded into all aspects of life and therefore having Media Studies as a stand alone core subject seems more important than ever before. In Media Studies, young people are encouraged to engage with texts through different cultural lenses, analyse how media creates meaning around ideology, race, gender and given skills to become active participants and creators. *** The subject has a huge focus on teaching the skills of critical thinking and analysis. These skills are transferable not just in different subjects in school, but into students' future careers in every field. *** As schools in increasingly seek to integrate classes and offer credits from multiple disciplines in one subject, at the very least there should still be Media Studies AS's available to do, as they can be effectively and usefully integrated into any number of projects - from Physical Education, to Design to Fabrics, to Drama. *** If Media Studies is absorbed into Social Studies (along with Psychology), it seems to me that Social Studies will then have an even greater variety of subjects and topics to attempt to cover than it already does. This will leave little room for going in-depth into any, which surely is doing a disservice to	Strongly disagree	*** Media Studies is more relevant than ever before. Our young people have more access to media consumption and also media creator. Media of all forms increasingly is becoming embedded into all aspects of life and therefore having Media Studies as a stand alone core subject seems more important than ever before. In Media Studies, young people are encouraged to engage with texts through different cultural lenses, analyse how media creates meaning around ideology, race, gender and given skills to become active participants and creators. *** The subject has a huge focus on teaching the skills of critical thinking and analysis. These skills are transferable not just in different subjects in school, but into students' future careers in every field. *** As schools in increasingly seek to integrate classes and offer credits from multiple disciplines in one subject, at the very least there should still be Media Studies AS's available to do, as they can be effectively and usefully integrated into any number of projects - from Physical Education, to Design to Fabrics, to Drama. *** If Media Studies is absorbed into Social Studies (along with Psychology), it seems to me that Social Studies will then have an even greater variety of subjects and topics to attempt to cover than it already does. This will leave little room for going in-depth into any, which surely is doing a disservice to	*** Media Studies is more relevant than ever before. Our young people have more access to media consumption and also media creator. Media of all forms increasingly is becoming embedded into all aspects of life and therefore having Media Studies as a stand alone core subject seems more important than ever before. In Media Studies, young people are encouraged to engage with texts through different cultural lenses, analyse how media creates meaning around ideology, race, gender and given skills to become active participants and creators. *** The subject has a huge focus on teaching the skills of critical thinking and analysis. These skills are transferable not just in different subjects in school, but into students' future careers in every field. *** As schools in increasingly seek to integrate classes and offer credits from multiple disciplines in one subject, at the very least there should still be Media Studies AS's available to do, as they can be effectively and usefully integrated into any number of projects - from Physical Education, to Design to Fabrics, to Drama. *** If Media Studies is absorbed into Social Studies (along with Psychology), it seems to me that Social Studies will then have an even greater variety of subjects and topics to attempt to cover than it already does. This will leave little room for going in-depth into any, which surely is doing a disservice to		No			2020-02-25 14:06:06	ANON-YFPW-RBPF-G	2020-02-25 14:06:06	2020-02-25 14:06:29

Yes		Agree		too much art subjects. science is amalgamated in one which is not specific	no	No			2020-02-25 14:24:53	ANON-YFPW-RBP1-U	2020-02-25 14:24:53	2020-02-25 14:25:13
No	I was only made aware through the press release that this would involve Commerce subjects.	Strongly disagree	With regards to the combined level 1 Commerce Course; Accounting, Economics and Business are very individual and differing subjects. The skills and knowledge in each of these areas are very different. The skills taught at Level 1 underpin the foundation of success in Level 2 and Level 3. As a pathway into future success in Level 3 and Scholarship Accounting and Economics, students require knowledge that is embedded during teaching during Level 1. There is a clear future career pathway in all of these areas and they are INDIVIDUAL at University. Nationally student numbers in Accounting and Business at Level 1 are increasing (or being maintained). Students financial capabilities are a concern nationwide, and this proposal limits students access to varied pathways where this is a predominant idea. It appears that Commerce subjects, and Accounting in particular, will be a step behind with respect to learning as it is not able to be accessed at Level 1, or will need to be condensed significantly to fit in the other subject's ideas (trying to cover the key foundation ideas of 3 subjects in one is just not feasible) This will have a negative impact on student's	With regards to the combined level 1 Commerce Course; Accounting, Economics and Business are very individual and differing subjects. The skills and knowledge in each of these areas are very different. The skills taught at Level 1 underpin the foundation of success in Level 2 and Level 3. As a pathway into future success in Level 3 and Scholarship Accounting and Economics, students require knowledge that is embedded during teaching during Level 1. There is a clear future career pathway in all of these areas and they are INDIVIDUAL at University. Nationally student numbers in Accounting and Business at Level 1 are increasing (or being maintained). Students financial capabilities are a concern nationwide, and this proposal limits students access to varied pathways where this is a predominant idea. It appears that Commerce subjects, and Accounting in particular, will be a step behind with respect to learning as it is not able to be accessed at Level 1, or will need to be condensed significantly to fit in the other subject's ideas (trying to cover the key foundation ideas of 3 subjects in one is just not feasible)		No			2020-02-25 14:32:46	ANON-YFPW-RBP2-4	2020-02-25 14:32:46	2020-02-25 14:33:01
Yes		Disagree		It seems a shame that Art History is not part of the Arts subjects.		Yes			2020-02-25 14:37:05	ANON-YFPW-RBPH-J	2020-02-25 14:37:05	2020-02-25 14:37:14
Yes		Strongly disagree	The development of STEM skills in NZ is critical. Combining and generalising the L1 science subjects serves no purpose at all. How are schools supposed to plan L2 & L3 in line with university requirements if L1 doesn't provide a suitable foundation into the sciences. Also putting media studies into social studies seems equally short sighted. Most schools don't offer L1 social studies, and at a time students are confronted with and connected to such a wide range of media, social and otherwise, it seems amazing that you would want to limit the exposure they have to the study of the media. Just amazingly short sighted.	Losing media studies and the combining the sciences are both mistakes. You are asking our children to be guinea pigs. The suggestion that schools are going to deliver a broad framework is undermined by the diminishing availability of humanities subjects. It's hard to believe that Religious Studies goes untouched - just consider how many students are impacted by a form of media on a day to day basis compared to how many who would know one end of a church from the other.		No			2020-02-25 14:48:53	ANON-YFPW-RBPH-C	2020-02-25 14:48:53	2020-02-25 14:49:06
Yes		Strongly disagree				No			2020-02-25 15:01:48	ANON-YFPW-RBPD-E	2020-02-25 15:01:48	2020-02-25 15:01:59
No		Strongly agree		Include Sports, sewing, etc for basic needs. For the students struggles academically	Programme for students with Special needs. Acknowledge their strength & disadvantaged.	No			2020-02-25 15:08:05	ANON-YFPW-RBPX-2	2020-02-25 15:08:05	2020-02-25 15:08:35
No	There were a lot of mixed messages. The ideas are not well thought out. The Science group is mostly made of general science teachers. Physics and Chemistry are very poorly represented.	Strongly disagree	We have created a huge gap between level 1 Science and level 2 specialist sciences. This is going to be a huge stumbling block for students taking up level 2 sciences. Science courses have been continuously watered down under NCEA system. This is the change that will make NZ science look very weak when compared to OECD countries	have done so for level 1 science.	We need specialist subjects to start at level 1.	Yes		There are too many technology subjects. Not enough emphasis on science and mathematics	2020-02-25 15:09:56	ANON-YFPW-RBPA-B	2020-02-25 15:09:56	2020-02-25 15:10:18
Yes		Agree	A general comment I have that doesn't seem to fit anywhere else is around the side effects of reducing specialisms. In NZ, Social Sciences are taught as one broad subject in years 9 and 10. In countries like the UK specialism of these same sorts of subjects occur from year 7. Consequently, by the time students make decisions about specialising before entering year 11 they haven't actually done history, geography and economics separately and they are 4 years behind in the development of the specialist skills and knowledge these subjects will require of them. This has consequential knock-on impacts for school leavers and universities, especially when we compare our students internationally. The curriculum allows for contexts in the economic world and the natural world for example, but this assumes we have teachers with hugely broad specialisms capable of delivering that content. In reality what we have is history, geography and economics specialists teaching junior social studies with their own limited and very different sets of skills and knowledge. Of course, other teachers also end up teaching the catch-all junior course, in my school just within the last 3 years this includes specialists in Materials Technology, Physical Education, Religious Studies, English, Drama, Maths and Te Reo Māori, all of which had no experience of teaching the subject	I think on the whole the list is good. This will depend a bit on what is required to be taught when we see the new Achievement Standards. It's a good idea to keep Economics, Business and Accounting from specialising at level 1, but it isn't necessarily a great idea to dilute one to include the other two. I am a faculty leader and timetable at a medium size college of around 500. We can't specialise to the level of separate sciences or multiple commerce subjects as there aren't enough students to make it viable in a year group of 100. This would be hugely problematic for security of tenure for teachers, hugely inefficient use of staffing funding which is already not enough and would introduce yet more competition for students within schools as they would be directly linked to employment opportunities for staff, which would exacerbate the problems many teachers are hoping you would fix with this review. Rationalising these specialisms at level 1 might help with finding teachers. The sad state of morale and status in teaching in NZ means many schools have to accept the people that respond to job adverts, rather than being able to employ the quality specialists they should have. It is prudent that with less specialist knowledge required for level 1 this will mean staffing becomes easier to	If we are looking to specialise more at L2 and 3 then there is a very good argument for separate Human Geography and Physical Geography. NZ has a unique approach, with NZQA using cultural and natural to differentiate between these two very distinct branches of the same subject. I would say that the distinction between human and physical geographies is as much as the difference between the technology subjects or even the sciences. I would also contend that NZ is crying out for more qualified people in both areas. There is a much publicised lack of planning professionals, stalling urban development and in turn contributing to rising house prices. If there is an area we need to be promoting more then I am still to encounter it. The self interested pushing of digital and STEM priorities completely misses the importance of better understanding the relationships and phenomena that make up our societies.	No			2020-02-25 15:16:22	ANON-YFPW-RBPM-Q	2020-02-25 14:53:54	2020-02-25 15:16:32

Yes		Undecided		I don't agree with the plan for Health/ PE as I feel it takes away the chance for student knowledge going into level 2 with the possibility of having less time on both subjects and the possibility of less practical time in the subject	No	No			2020-02-25 15:19:00	ANON-YFPW-RBPN-R	2020-02-25 15:19:00	2020-02-25 15:19:06
Yes		Strongly disagree	1. The social science area is heavily impacted - this shows a disregard for this subject area. 2. The integration of Media Studies into Social Studies and History teachers have sufficient knowledge to teach a new subject area. 4. A far better solution would be for Social studies to integrate these subjects at Year 10. The current curriculum is very vague and needs more specific direction for a media studies or classics component.	1. I strongly disagree with the alignment of Media Studies at Level One into Social Studies. 2. Media awareness is paramount in our digital era - understanding how social media impacts our lives and having the ability to create media as part of young people's skill set is being seen as an important skill as businesses seek to establish a media presence.	No				2020-02-25 15:24:28	ANON-YFPW-RBPK-N	2020-02-25 15:24:28	2020-02-25 15:24:43
Yes		Agree				Yes			2020-02-25 15:25:11	ANON-YFPW-RBP6-Z	2020-02-25 15:25:11	2020-02-25 15:25:22
Yes		Disagree		I do not believe that removing Latin and Classical Studies is a smart move in any way for the New Zealand education system. Furthermore, merging each of the sciences into one blanket subject effectively removes the individuality of each science and may make it less attractive overall as a subject of study. I am a third year student at the University of Canterbury studying Mechanical Engineering and struggled very much in biology at school. Once I specialised into physics, chemistry and maths I found my footing, however if I had been forced to take biology along with these subjects, I do not believe I would have been as passionate about sciences as a whole, as I am today. Students should absolutely know that each science has its own niche in terms of method of study, area of study, and field of application. They are individual subjects and deserve to be treated as such.		Yes			2020-02-25 15:30:51	ANON-YFPW-RBPR-V	2020-02-25 15:30:51	2020-02-25 15:31:04
Yes		Disagree	I disagree with there being a list of approved subjects. This immediately focuses learning design on siloed subjects whereas the NZC talks about Learning Areas and the need to design programmes based on students' needs and interests by combining LOs across Learning Areas. We would have much stronger alignment with the NZC if, in our desire for a broad and balanced curriculum at Year 11 (as for Years 1 - 10), there was a set of ASs attached to each Learning Area. The current structure points to the qualification (assessment) determining what programmes will look like in a school at Year 11. This is, therefore, a backward step	Remove the list of subjects all together and have ASs for Learning Areas.	No	No			2020-02-25 15:44:54	ANON-YFPW-RBPW-1	2020-02-25 15:44:54	2020-02-25 15:45:04
Yes		Agree	Pleased that the Arts are remaining as vital and significant NCEA subjects			No			2020-02-25 15:49:22	ANON-YFPW-RBP3-W	2020-02-25 15:49:22	2020-02-25 15:49:42
No		Strongly disagree	Separate Science standards required. Why are languages treated differently? Why not have 'Linguistic Studies' and students have to apply their chosen language to a given context?	Yes. Separate Science should be there to allow students with special interest in these subject more choice. The draft standards will not allow them to do this, and will make teaching and learning far less interesting for teacher and student. This is an appallingly stupid decision.		No			2020-02-25 15:56:50	ANON-YFPW-RBP2-V	2020-02-25 15:56:50	2020-02-25 15:57:01
Yes		Undecided			Global perspectives	No			2020-02-25 15:57:57	ANON-YFPW-RBPU-Y	2020-02-25 15:57:57	2020-02-25 15:58:09
Yes	I think in principal having core subjects assessed at Level 1 (Lit and num) is wise. So the students can focus on project based exploration learning for some of the time, rather than being so attached to how many credits some work is. But I do feel concerned with the how the school would 'administrate' this. I think having Global Perspectives would be excellent, at Year 11. A lot of students will struggle to bother doing stuff if it's not assessed, this mindset will be needing to change obviously!	Undecided	I can't see many differences in the above list.	Why not have Latin at Level 1? Just why not? I think it's perfectly reasonable to still include Latin. I don't teach it, my kids (actual children, not students) don't learn it, but I know a lot of people (students) who love it. It would be great to rename 'social studies' to something like Global Perspectives. This would entail all those subjects.	Global Perspectives would be amazing - look it up, coming from the IB curriculum.	No	Do you mean the content of it in te reo? I don't really understand the question. I am familiar that there is a NZ Curriculum in te reo Maori, but I'm not familiar with the content because I don't speak te reo.	No	2020-02-25 16:00:03	ANON-YFPW-RBSY-8	2020-02-25 16:00:03	2020-02-25 16:00:10
No		Agree				No			2020-02-25 12:32:22	ANON-YFPW-RBPS-W	2020-02-25 12:32:22	2020-02-25 16:06:06
No		Agree	There doesn't appear to be much of a change to the subject list			No			2020-02-25 16:10:46	ANON-YFPW-RBSV-5	2020-02-25 16:10:46	2020-02-25 16:10:59
No	This option, particular for Physical Education and Health as a combined subject rather than separate subjects is not a good idea. Each subject requires its own teaching and learning for foundations for level 2 and level3	Strongly disagree	Most of the subjects that are proposed to be integrated under the subject title/umbrella are separate so they can be taught with more depth and clarity	PE and Health need to remain separate as they are very different subject areas and require learning in different contexts in order to be ready to apply this knowledge at level 2 and 3	No	Yes	No		2020-02-25 16:10:59	ANON-YFPW-RBSC-J	2020-02-25 16:10:59	2020-02-25 16:11:13
Yes		Strongly disagree		Too vague, needs more thought. Bio chem and physics need to be separate		No	Yes		2020-02-25 16:26:52	ANON-YFPW-RBSS-2	2020-02-25 16:26:52	2020-02-25 16:27:02

Yes		Strongly agree		I agree with the rationale for the changes and think they will work well at Secondary School.		No	I cannot read Te Reo but have read the English Curriculum		2020-02-25 16:29:44	ANON-YFPW-RB58-7	2020-02-25 16:29:44	2020-02-25 16:29:56
Yes		Strongly disagree	The shrinking of Science down to 4 different standards is too drastic. Not enough thought has gone into the process! You cannot take 3 VERY different specialist subjects and shrink them down to 4 VAGUE social science topics. Its not preparing the students for specialist subjects at Level 2 at all. There is no way to tailor the courses for the students in front of you. The literacy levels are too high for Year 11 students. But there is no CORE science anywhere in there to prepare students for Year 12, which means that we are going to have to teach the Year 11 skills somewhere in the Year 12 course.	The shrinking of Science down to 4 different standards is too drastic. Not enough thought has gone into the process! You cannot take 3 VERY different specialist subjects and shrink them down to 4 VAGUE social science topics. Its not preparing the students for specialist subjects at Level 2 at all. There is no way to tailor the courses for the students in front of you. The literacy levels are too high for Year 11 students. But there is no CORE science anywhere in there to prepare students for Year 12, which means that we are going to have to teach the Year 11 skills somewhere in the Year 12 course.	NO	No			2020-02-25 16:30:58	ANON-YFPW-RB58-8	2020-02-25 16:30:58	2020-02-25 16:31:16
Yes		Strongly disagree	External marking sounds great for workload, but by the time teachers have provided feedback points they may as well mark it as an internal - more work to align reports to certain word lengths etc.	Four standards for science actually limits creativity as you can't pick and chose standards for a course. It feels like only a few contexts would work for each standard. Not enough basis for teaching the core concepts of bio, physics and chemistry before adding into real life contexts that can be difficult to explain, even for a year 13.		No			2020-02-25 16:31:46	ANON-YFPW-RB58-P	2020-02-25 16:31:46	2020-02-25 16:33:32
Yes	The changes seem to be a dumbing down of Science and potentially increasing disaffection from P/ Male and lower literacy students. Broad contexts will work as long as we have standards that prepare students for level 2 and 3 pure sciences. Areas such as the arts/ tech and social sciences have not had their whole area put into 4 standards. Bright mathy students will not be motivated by written reports etc. Students with less literacy will also be disaffected by reports.	Strongly disagree	The changes seem to be a dumbing down of Science and potentially increasing disaffection from P/ Male and lower literacy students. Broad contexts will work as long as we have standards that prepare students for level 2 and 3 pure sciences. Areas such as the arts/ tech and social sciences have not had their whole area put into 4 standards. Bright mathy students will not be motivated by written reports etc. Students with less literacy will also be disaffected by reports. This feels like Science is lower down on the list of priority and that Science is now being treated like 'social' science rather than pure science using contexts.	The changes seem to be a dumbing down of Science and potentially increasing disaffection from P/ Male and lower literacy students. Broad contexts will work as long as we have standards that prepare students for level 2 and 3 pure sciences. Areas such as the arts/ tech and social sciences have not had their whole area put into 4 standards. Bright mathy students will not be motivated by written reports etc. Students with less literacy will also be disaffected by reports.	With the lack of extension in these new standards, you are basically getting rid of level 1 science. This will have an impact as students will still be all about credit farming as that is still a thing even though there are changes. What is the point in these changes if it puts your actual 'sciencey' students off science! Physics will be absolutely affected and therefore uptake at level 2&3 and subsequently university! We thought STEM was key for NZ future, these changes show that science is being down graded.	No			2020-02-25 16:38:03	ANON-YFPW-RB58-Z	2020-02-25 16:38:03	2020-02-25 16:38:37
Yes		Strongly disagree	Science as proposed will not prepare students for year 12	Science needs to have specific content at Year 11 in order to prepare students for year 12	No	No			2020-02-25 16:39:16	ANON-YFPW-RB58-4	2020-02-25 16:39:16	2020-02-25 16:39:36
Yes		Strongly disagree	Our students have a broad base anyway at Level 1. If History and Classics were combined at level 1 it would require a re-write of the standards.	We don't offer Latin or Classics at Level 1, but do offer Classics at Level 2 & 3.	No	No			2020-02-25 16:39:51	ANON-YFPW-RB58-Y	2020-02-25 16:39:51	2020-02-25 16:40:17
No	I only learned about this recently	Strongly disagree	You're getting rid of all my favourite subjects(Classics, Earth & Space sciences and Latin)	Latin, Classics and Earth & Spaces sciences should remain their own subjects	Yes - Graphic design and Software engineering	No	No		2020-02-25 16:40:43	ANON-YFPW-RB57-6	2020-02-25 16:40:43	2020-02-25 16:41:02
No	I don't believe the proposed changes will result in a broader education in science at level 1 when you consider the proposed standards. The standards will need to be linked to a context and students will likely develop in-depth knowledge of these contexts but their breath of science understanding will be narrowed. If a broad, foundational science education at Level 1 is the goal, the proposed standards will not meet this goal. Including a greater range of subjects will allow schools to design a programme that is broader and better meets the needs of their students.	Undecided	As a science teacher, I am undecided about the dropping of specialist science subjects and replacing it with one course. This is exacerbated by the fact that the proposed new standards at Level 1 focus on the nature of science to the exclusion of science as a body of knowledge. There are many students who enjoy the intellectual challenge of learning specialised science knowledge at Level 1. Having one science subject and only four standards does not give schools the flexibility to meet the learning needs of the diverse range of students at Level 1. It may result in NCEA being dropped at Level 1. Is this the intention?	Including specialist sciences at Level 1 enables flexibility for schools to design programmes that meet the needs of their students. I think specialist sciences (physics, chem, bio) should be maintained for Level 1.		No			2020-02-25 16:41:41	ANON-YFPW-RB58-M	2020-02-25 16:38:11	2020-02-25 16:41:50
Yes	I knew, however, the condensing of science standards has eliminated a foundational education of each science. How are students going to be prepared for Level 2 Chemistry, needing to know about ions, bonds and other FOUNDATIONAL skills with such broad standards at Level 1? How are tomorrow's physicians, dentists, engineers, etc supposed to get the knowledge and understanding required for those life or death jobs with such watered down foundational knowledge? How does this reduce teacher workload??	Strongly disagree	I cannot understand how the performing arts can still get separate credits (music, drama, dance), but science is now condensed. There are separate skills required within each scientific discipline that cannot be condensed without watering down the actual science. A biology investigation is different from a physics investigation which is different from a chemistry investigation. You CANNOT combine them!!! By doing what the Ministry is proposing, the actual science is being taken out and becoming social science. This is not what the world needs. This will not help future doctors, engineers, inventors, climate change scientists, the people needed for the future. The changes also do not prepare students for Level 2, Level 3 or university sciences.	The sciences must be separated in order to build true foundational knowledge. The foundations of Chemistry are vastly different from the foundations of Biology and the foundations of Physics. If you combine all of them, students are not able to gain the knowledge and skills necessary to be successful in the future.	By watering down the sciences, which is what the proposed Level 1 changes are doing to science, will put future scientists (doctors, engineers, etc) off science. This will drastically reduced numbers for Level 2, Level 3 and university science courses. This will result in fewer doctors, engineers, etc. I thought STEM was the future of New Zealand. How are these changes supporting that?	No			2020-02-25 16:42:19	ANON-YFPW-RB58-N	2020-02-25 16:42:19	2020-02-25 16:42:29

No	I was aware in general; however, not about the specific changes that have now been proposed.	Disagree	My response is primarily aimed at the proposed Level 1 Commerce course but applies similarly to other condensed subject courses. Whilst I understand that creating a broad subject that does not "lock in" students to a particular area, I have never found this to be the case in practice. Students will change subjects in later years, should they be able to show that they are capable of new learnings. A broad course can already be compiled by a school that sees it as appropriate for their learners by combining achievement standards. My main concern, however, is about the dilution of subject knowledge. Students will find Levels 2 and 3 significantly more difficult with only a surface level knowledge of Level 1 content.	Another approach, for broader foundational knowledge, may be to have a commerce course in the junior years (for example, years 8 - 10) that is set as a compulsory option, much like digital technologies. Courses for science and social science already have this.		No			2020-02-25 16:48:03	ANON-YFPW-RB51-Z	2020-02-25 16:48:03	2020-02-25 16:48:20
No		Strongly agree			Music Technology Music Creation	No			2020-02-25 17:12:02	ANON-YFPW-RB52-9	2020-02-25 17:12:02	2020-02-25 17:12:26
Yes		Strongly agree				No			2020-02-25 17:20:34	ANON-YFPW-RB5H-Q	2020-02-25 17:20:34	2020-02-25 17:20:44
Yes		Agree		I like the idea that students will be able to complete a broad set of learning across a range of subjects without having to specialise at aged 15.		No			2020-02-25 17:23:15	ANON-YFPW-RB5B-H	2020-02-25 17:23:15	2020-02-25 17:23:24
Yes		Undecided				No			2020-02-25 17:26:37	ANON-YFPW-RB5M-V	2020-02-25 17:26:37	2020-02-25 17:27:05
Yes		Disagree	The Social Sciences area is far too broad if it is changed to Social Studies. Students will miss out on some vital learning and particularly some understanding of their world around them. Do no try to push everyone down the STEM line - we need people with soft skills and the 4 Cs as well.	Please don't remove Media Studies. One Achievement Standard overlaps with English (a close viewing one) but no other subject offers media criticism and media literacy - both vital skills to have. Furthermore, none offer students practical film making or journalism - both enjoyable and useful. We want our students to have digital literacy - don't remove the one subject that teaches it.		No			2020-02-25 17:36:00	ANON-YFPW-RB5K-7	2020-02-25 17:36:00	2020-02-25 17:36:08
No		Agree		I think bunching sciences under 1 subject could have detrimental effects. I used to teach in the UK where sciences are split in Y9. In my opinion science is taught better when it is taught holistically within a discipline. Eg teaching motion in physics is quite shallow until you go over it from a force perspective. Teaching electrodynamics builds on motion with specific types of force. Teaching nuclear physics is far better when you can include motion of particles, the forces on them which requires understanding from emag etc. Picking a few modules from each subject for "science" doesn't reinforce these links and deeper understanding, putting NZ pupils at a disadvantage in L2&3 and against peers competing for international jobs and courses beyond this. I also think that fewer science modules will be taken at L1 as a result of this, and that it will be harder for pupils to decide which sciences to continue with into L2		No			2020-02-25 18:03:17	ANON-YFPW-RB5A-G	2020-02-25 18:03:17	2020-02-25 18:03:29
No		Agree				No			2020-02-25 18:11:00	ANON-YFPW-RB5K-T	2020-02-25 18:11:00	2020-02-25 18:11:13
Yes		Strongly agree		Media Studies being integrated into Social Studies only fits within certain contexts. It might be wiser to include it within English, given the two subjects' similarities. But I also believe there are some relevant and interesting contexts which could serve Social Studies a great benefit.	Persistence of Classical Studies/Ancient History as specialisation subject/s into level 2/3 would be highly beneficial.	No			2020-02-25 18:18:17	ANON-YFPW-RB56-5	2020-02-25 18:18:17	2020-02-25 18:18:25
Yes		Disagree		The very notion of siloing of subjects is inherently flawed. Within businesses, it is considered a fatal thing to do, when you silo your different areas. Instead, collaborative systems need to exist wherein a science student sits alongside an art student and develop things together. This increases understanding and breadth of knowledge for both students.	See above	Yes			2020-02-25 18:18:40	ANON-YFPW-RB5R-1	2020-02-25 18:18:40	2020-02-25 18:18:50
Yes		Strongly disagree	There should be room for individual Science disciplines i.e Bio, Chem, Physics to allow extension of student interests. We do use some standards from within Chem. More flexibility should be encouraged.	Please see above	Continue to keep Bio Chem and Physics separate. Each needs the existing range of background content in order for students to be prepared to study at higher levels.	No			2020-02-25 18:40:28	ANON-YFPW-RB5W-6	2020-02-25 18:40:28	2020-02-25 18:40:40
Yes		Strongly disagree	There should be room for individual Science disciplines i.e Bio, Chem, Physics to allow extension of student interests. We do use some standards from within Chem. More flexibility should be encouraged.	Please see above	Continue to keep Bio Chem and Physics separate. Each needs the existing range of background content in order for students to be prepared to study at higher levels.	No			2020-02-25 18:41:25	ANON-YFPW-RB54-3	2020-02-25 18:41:25	2020-02-25 18:41:36

Yes		Strongly disagree	There should be room for individual Science disciplines i.e Bio, Chem, Physics to allow extension of student interests. We do use some standards from within Chem. More flexibility should be encouraged.	Please see above	Continue to keep Bio Chem and Physics separate. Each needs the existing range of background content in order for students to be prepared to study at higher levels.	No			2020-02-25 18:42:14	ANON-YFPW-RB5T-3	2020-02-25 18:42:14	2020-02-25 18:42:20
Yes		Undecided				No			2020-02-25 19:07:36	ANON-YFPW-RB52-1	2020-02-25 19:07:36	2020-02-25 19:07:44
Yes		Strongly disagree			Further development of Philosophy and Psychology as a subject.	No			2020-02-25 19:37:22	ANON-YFPW-RB5U-4	2020-02-25 19:37:22	2020-02-25 19:37:27
Yes		Strongly disagree	Classics and Latin need to be offered		Civics education and financial literacy	No			2020-02-25 19:41:40	ANON-YFPW-RB3V-6	2020-02-25 19:41:40	2020-02-25 19:41:57
No	I am a Classics teacher in the UK but considering moving to New Zealand.	Disagree	See next response	Classical Studies - this subject vitally enables students to examine ideas about how the individual should operate within society and respond to others outside their society through the safe lens of studying the most influential ancient culture on modern society. Concepts such as humanity, identity, religion, beauty, justice, government, refugeeism, morality, warfare, power & leadership are explored, all of which are significant in developing broad critical thinking skills required in many vocations: law, politics, commerce, creative industry etc.		No			2020-02-25 19:41:55	ANON-YFPW-RB3V-3	2020-02-25 19:41:55	2020-02-25 19:42:13
Yes	Yes, but it is not equally broad!	Strongly disagree	The ability to have separate subjects in L1 is one of the strong suits of NCEA at present.	Given the current plans to gut the Science assessments, having separate Bio, Chem and Physics standards will enable schools with a strong academic focus to continue to cater to the needs of their students, who can handle actually being expected to know things!		No			2020-02-25 19:46:50	ANON-YFPW-RB3C-G	2020-02-25 19:46:50	2020-02-25 19:46:54
Yes		Strongly disagree	Financial Capability and commerce subjects are essential for NZers going forward - that has been asserted time and time again by many organisations. Why eliminate subjects that rank in top 13 for entries in external choices (economics 16000 , accounting 10500 and Business st 6000) and in top 20 for internal subjects (economics 12 000, accounting 15000and business st 14400) and but leave subjects such as dance (not in top 20 in either int or ext choices)and drama (int 16000 and ext 5000) as separate subjects. research about future job skills - link here from the World Economic Forum from the study done by David Deming https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2016/09/jobs-of-future-and-skills-you-need/ clearly shows Financial Managers is leading the pack with Management Analyst and Accountant next while Economist is still holding its place. The data of student numbers taking these subjects supports the popularity of these subjects individually as well as student success in these areas. In particular as I noted above , that many subject areas that have less students engaging with them nationwide have been able to maintain their status as individual subjects.	Keep commerce subjects separate. As a professional who has taught in the subject area for over 20 years I am very concerned about the proposal to 'combine' Level 1 Accounting, Business and Economics at Level 1 into a single cell subject entitled 'Commerce' with limited Accounting. I have the following concerns: •Accounting, Economics and Business are very individual and differing subjects. •The skills and knowledge in each of these areas are very different. •The skills taught at Level 1 underpin the foundation of success in Level 2 and Level 3. •As a pathway into future success in Level 3 and Scholarship Accounting and Economics, students require knowledge that is embedded during teaching during Level 1. •There is a clear future career pathway in all of these areas and they are INDIVIDUAL at University. •Rationally student numbers in Accounting and Business at Level 1 are increasing (or being maintained). •Students financial capabilities are a concern nationwide, and this proposal limits students access to varied pathways where this is a predominant idea.	Can we even assume Accounting Economics and Business studies will be included in this list. They should be.	No			2020-02-25 20:06:08	ANON-YFPW-RB3S-Z	2020-02-25 20:06:08	2020-02-25 20:06:18
No		Strongly disagree		You can't cancel subjects. You can cancel achievement standards I suppose, but that won't stop schools from teaching those subjects. There are valid educational reasons why schools offer individual sciences at Year 11. They will still do that, but may look at other qualifications if NCEA is not available. Keep Physics, Biology, Chemistry please.		No	I didn't know that there was such a thing. I would like to learn more, especially about science (Matauranga Putaiao). I will need to if I am to teach science next year.		2020-02-25 20:30:50	ANON-YFPW-RB38-5	2020-02-25 20:30:50	2020-02-25 20:31:08
No	I prefer specialized subjects as students may end up having to take subjects they are not interested in. Eg. may only want to do biology but have to take chemistry and physics	Agree				No			2020-02-25 20:33:53	ANON-YFPW-RB39-6	2020-02-25 20:33:53	2020-02-25 20:34:06

Yes		Agree	I agree for most curriculum areas however I disagree with Health and PE coming together	Health and PE- as a teacher of both subjects at NCEA L1 I clearly see how different the students are in each subject. I am concerned about the impact the changes would have on numbers selecting the course if it were 'combined' to some degree. Many students would dislike the need for potentially more book work, while others would be put off by the 'practical' sporting requirements. I feel it would be a disservice to those students and may also have a direct impact on staffing numbers. I fully support 'general science' at level 1, I do agree that specialisation does not need to occur until Level 2 and 3.	N/A	No			2020-02-25 20:35:02	ANON-YFPW-RB3G-M	2020-02-25 20:35:02	2020-02-25 20:35:30
Yes	But only vaguely aware of details	Strongly agree				Yes		I think they look good	2020-02-25 20:39:48	ANON-YFPW-RB3J-Q	2020-02-25 20:39:48	2020-02-25 20:40:04
No	This was vague in the original document - deliberately so to not cause any negative feedback from subjects that were to be marginalised.	Strongly disagree	The proposal is decreasing flexibility and student choice - which is at the heart of 21st century education. The marginalizing of Media Studies to a context within Social Studies is misguided. It is still relevant that employers are looking for creativity, problem solving, teamwork and interpersonal skills as desirable skills for school leavers. Media Studies covers all of these skills. Most schools are using media more for the production focus which allows concept development, planning, feedback, production and publication. This can't be buried within Social Studies a subject that students will be reluctant to take. Schools will just do Social Studies with Media as a course to get around this restrictive proposal. As my school offers media at all year levels, this proposal is stopping pathways.	In addition to the comments above, Media is a great example of a dynamic course that students enjoy doing given the theory and practical nature of it. It's moved on from the stale English based Media courses of old - it's rich in doing and no less important that any of the visual arts subjects that seem to have retained. As my school doesn't do Level 1, this change doesn't impact me. We'll continue to offer Media courses. However, a lot of schools aren't in this position so it's a slap in the face to see something like Religious Studies given preference over Media or Classics. Who is driving RS being an important course?	No. Leave what is there alone. Don't crowd these Year levels with more science or maths based subjects.	No			2020-02-25 21:01:07	ANON-YFPW-RB3Q-X	2020-02-25 21:01:07	2020-02-25 21:01:28
Yes		Strongly disagree	I wish to submit against the proposed exclusion of Latin for the following reasons. - Latin should not be considered narrowly solely in terms of its status as a non-spoken language. Latin is a complex language and learning it provides much wider skills in logic, syntax, and grammar. A background in Latin can also assist with the subsequent learning of Romance languages and provides an understanding of the origin and meaning of many words in the English language. - While Latin does not support the Crown's obligations under the Treaty, neither do many other subjects. Subjects such as Chinese and Korean do not meet that criterion, yet they are proposed to be continued. - Similar to public reaction against Radio New Zealand's plans to close down the Concert programme, Latin is a hallmark of a civilised society that understands its history and origins. Discarding the language and knowledge of an ancient society that have influenced so much of our modern world would be a further backward step toward loss of underlying knowledge in our society. There is a place to learn about our history, be it Māori history or ancient history, alongside more vocational-based	Retain Latin - see above.	N/A	Yes	N/A	No feedback.	2020-02-25 21:11:18	ANON-YFPW-RB3S-2	2020-02-25 21:11:18	2020-02-25 21:11:35
No		Agree		Getting rid of Level 1 Latin is an unintelligent move. Latin is a difficult subject and getting rid of Level 1 Latin would not only disincentivize more people from taking it due to not getting credits, but will most certainly lead to the removal of Latin for NCEA altogether which is uncalled for due to the numerous educational benefits Latin has. It helps strengthen knowledge of the English language and challenges your brain to think in ways it otherwise wouldn't. Unless of course, your plan is that you WANT to remove Latin entirely and if so it's uncalled for. As well as this you are not treating other languages as you are treating Latin. Why let students take all other languages at Level 1 and not Latin? It's dumb. Also combing sociology with media studies and psychology literally makes zero sense and I understand that it would be supported as possible contexts for the subject but all three subjects are quite different.		No			2020-02-25 21:42:45	ANON-YFPW-RB37-4	2020-02-25 21:42:45	2020-02-25 21:43:02
Yes		Strongly disagree		I believe Latin should still be included at Level 1 for as long as it is included at levels 2 and 3- it is beneficial for learning other languages and for certain careers such as law.		No			2020-02-25 21:48:38	ANON-YFPW-RB3F-K	2020-02-25 21:48:38	2020-02-25 21:48:46

Yes	Yes but I don't see the point of adding more subjects at Level 1 such as Maori Performing Arts. If other subjects can be 'absorbed' under a broad umbrella then surely this one can also.	Strongly disagree	The amalgamation of subjects under Social Sciences goes too far. It is the usual case of tipping a number of hard to pigeonhole subjects into Social Studies. As a former HOD Social Sciences I strongly object to this. Media Studies and Psychology have absolutely no place under a broad Social Studies curriculum. Please explain the rationale. If you are going to get rid of Art History and Classical Studies at Level 1 then I would argue one could equally make a similar case to exclude a number of other subjects at this level such as Religious Studies, Dance, Drama, Maori Performing Arts. It seems a rather arbitrary call by someone...again...what is the rationale?	See above. I would not like to see the loss of subjects such as Classics and Art History at higher levels. (thin end of the wedge syndrome) One could argue, and it is supported by many business leaders in NZ, that all students need a stronger grounding in economics and financial management if we are to strengthen our economy and have a more committed workforce. One would hope that this is addressed in the Commerce subject area, but it seems it is being weakened by these changes. What is driving this course of action?	Coding and software development. Political studies/the rise and fall of societies/civilisations/how lessons of history are absorbed or ignored/outcomes	Yes	Care needs to be taken in this area. Are there proven practical outcomes for students electing this pathway? Are there sufficient teachers in to reo to teach these subjects. (many schools struggle already to secure effective teachers of te reo) This pathway shouldn't develop as a softer option. There are already too many of these for students. Again...see NZ	See above	2020-02-25 21:53:42	ANON-YFPW-RB3P-W	2020-02-25 21:13:30	2020-02-25 21:53:56
Yes		Undecided				No			2020-02-25 21:59:40	ANON-YFPW-RB31-X	2020-02-25 21:59:40	2020-02-25 21:59:57
Yes		Undecided	Where are the lifeskills subjects	Lifeskills subjects: day to day and employment lifeskills.		No			2020-02-25 21:59:54	ANON-YFPW-RB3Z-7	2020-02-25 21:59:54	2020-02-25 22:00:22
Yes	Only after reading the information above	Undecided	I have some concerns about the structure for Technology subjects in particular Construction and Mechanical Technology being lumped together into Materials Technology. Does this mean that Soft Materials, Woodwork and Mechanical Engineering are all lumped together into one subject? If so I would be concerned that students are not getting the length of time they need to develop the skills for each of the disciplines as they require very different knowledge and skills. Also where would Hospitality -a unit standards based course fit in?	Would Art History and Latin be offered in Level 2 or 3?	See above, also Photography, Sculpture, Graphic Design which could include web design. There are often lots of cross overs between DVC, digital technologies, media studies and even business studies that need to be sorted out.	No	No		2020-02-25 22:32:30	ANON-YFPW-RB3H-N	2020-02-25 22:32:30	2020-02-25 22:32:49
No		Undecided		Where is fashion? It is a multi billion dollar industry... why are students missing out on this?	Fashion	No			2020-02-25 22:35:11	ANON-YFPW-RB3B-F	2020-02-25 22:35:11	2020-02-25 22:35:19
No		Strongly agree		No	Not sure	No			2020-02-25 22:35:13	ANON-YFPW-RB3M-T	2020-02-25 22:35:13	2020-02-25 22:35:25
No	It seems like getting 14 and 15 year olds to choose specialisations is promoting the idea of there being limited or singular pathways in life. That seems narrow-minded. We should be promoting a diversity of interests throughout secondary schools not narrowing their focuses.	Strongly disagree	I don't understand the perceived benefits of removing subjects like Latin and Art History. Both contribute to an understanding of the development of contemporary European (and by extension New Zealand) culture. To remove these as an option is short-sighted.	See above.		No			2020-02-26 06:06:29	ANON-YFPW-RB3D-H	2020-02-26 06:06:29	2020-02-26 06:06:47
No		Disagree	Merging certain subjects will result in less knowledge. For instance biology and physics have to be taught by different teachers in order to cover them well. Some subjects will be eliminated by this change - like media studies or psychology (what do they have in common at all?). There is enough context to learn within social studies already, adding more will result in less knowledge.	Merging certain subjects will result in less knowledge. For instance biology and physics have to be taught by different teachers in order to cover them well. Some subjects will be eliminated by this change - like media studies or psychology (what do they have in common at all?). There is enough context to learn within social studies already, adding more will result in less knowledge. I could go on. If you want add more choices for students, you don't have to exclude subjects that may be an interest to many.		No			2020-02-26 08:05:57	ANON-YFPW-RB3A-E	2020-02-26 08:05:57	2020-02-26 08:06:26
No	was not made aware	Disagree		Students will be forced to take subject matter they have no interest in, it doesn't seem right to merge popular subjects (like Business Studies, when compared to others unmerged) either.		No			2020-02-26 08:15:19	ANON-YFPW-RB3N-U	2020-02-26 08:15:19	2020-02-26 08:15:41
Yes		Strongly agree				No			2020-02-26 08:39:28	ANON-YFPW-RB3G-3	2020-02-26 08:39:28	2020-02-26 08:39:35
Yes		Strongly agree			Outdoor education	Yes			2020-02-26 08:38:10	ANON-YFPW-RB3K-R	2020-02-26 08:38:10	2020-02-26 08:47:46

Yes	I strongly agree with the move towards a wider foundational level focus underpinning NCEA Level 1. A rationalisation of subjects offered is sensible and one with which I thoroughly agree. *Please note that this submission has been undertaken by a current teacher of Classical Studies with over twenty years experience.*	Strongly agree	With the idea that Levels 2 and 3 of the NCEA be the 'specialised' years, I strongly agree with the rationalisation of subjects outlined in the proposal. While there will always be reasons to maintain or sustain subjects such as Classical Studies or Latin at Level 1, if the foundational raison d'être for this level is to be maintained, there must be rationalisation of subjects. Making exceptions for one or another will undermine the broader foundational goal, which I think is far more important. The suggested subject changes in the proposal make sense and align with the national curriculum. I fully support it.	I know there will be much push-back on the removal of Classical Studies at Level 1, but it must be acknowledged that, in terms of pupil enrolments nationally, it is a very small subject indeed. I support its removal on the grounds outlined above in terms of meeting the goal of a broad-based foundational NCEA Level 1. I fully support the abolition of Latin from the NCEA qualification. It has been a marginal subject for many years, maintained largely by a handful of schools. In the minds of its advocates there will never be a good time to abolish Latin, but its time has passed as a viable academic subject in our schools and in our national qualification. Despite the benefits extolled by its proponents, it remains a fact that very few learners take the subject nationally, undermining their arguments. Just as classical Greek was once taught before abolition, now is the time for Latin. There may be a backlash from an elitist minority, but the time has come for it to go.	No. If anything, there needs to be rationalisation of subjects rather than creating more!	No			2020-02-26 08:53:33	ANON-YFPW-RB3R-Y	2020-02-26 08:51:37	2020-02-26 08:53:46
Yes		Strongly disagree	This is an absolutely shocking and limiting move for the education of NZ students. Reducing the subjects for Science to just Science and Horticulture will limit the scope for designing courses appropriate for different students and will also reduce the ability of students to gain key foundation knowledge required to access higher level specialist subject content. This will cause further disparity between the haves and have nots, and increase inequality in terms of those students who can access higher education.	Science needs to have its specialist divisions of Physics, Chemistry and Biology so that a range of knowledge based content can be covered to allow students to access further high level education in these specialist subject areas.		Yes			2020-02-26 08:54:59	ANON-YFPW-RB3W-4	2020-02-26 08:54:59	2020-02-26 08:55:12
Yes		Agree		No			2020-02-26 08:59:27	ANON-YFPW-RB34-1	2020-02-26 08:59:27	2020-02-26 08:59:38
Yes		Agree		provide more versions of assessments to help provide more options for teaching	outdoor education	No			2020-02-26 09:35:24	ANON-YFPW-RB3T-1	2020-02-26 09:35:24	2020-02-26 09:35:45
No	I was not made aware of this up until 14 Feb 2020. It has not been a transparent process and the information has not been easy to access.	Strongly disagree	Physical Education and Health are two completely different subjects. Yes, they use the same curriculum, however, the content that Health Education offers at level 1 is valuable to create life long learners. My students are up in arms at the proposed change. It will de-validate the subject, and the thought of doing anything practical terrifies them. At yr 10 they do both PE and Health, then being able to choose what they want to do at yr 11. The content at level 2 HED requires in-depth understanding requiring solid and sound content at level 1. The wellbeing of the students need to come first. Students when told about the changes, said "if we have to do both PE and Health standards, they would not choose the subject." At level 1 I have 2 classes of 30 with most of these students choosing to move into levels 2 and 3. Students are passionate about Health are very disappointed to see it lumped into PE.	Keep Health and PE separate. Whenever we have a societal issue (mental health, suicide, bullying) it is placed onto the Health dept to teach and educate about keeping safe, wellbeing, thoughts feelings, safe relationships, consent, strategies). We are a subject that saves kids' lives. Parents have thanked me for relighting the spark with their kids and I would hate for this to change or be taken away from them. Parents often say to me, if we had Health like this when I was at school I would have taken it" or "thankyou so much for teaching such valuable skills that my kids use every day, you are making such a difference". Health matters to so many people.		No			2020-02-26 09:44:01	ANON-YFPW-RB3Z-3	2020-02-26 09:44:01	2020-02-26 09:44:13
Yes		Undecided	We never know if new systems will be as successful as the old, or how long they will take to start working properly.		English - I would like novel study to be compulsory for Levels 1, 2, and 3.	No			2020-02-26 09:46:12	ANON-YFPW-RB32-Y	2020-02-26 09:46:12	2020-02-26 09:46:33
Yes		Agree	Agree with the combination of science subjects to provide students with the same broad base. Students often struggle with the desire to take a number of science subjects early and the restrictions of a school timetable. Some concern over the combination of commerce subjects especially in relation to the comments about the lack of Accounting in Level 1, given the current lack of Accounting in junior social studies this could present some barriers for students being able to access this subject matter early enough to understand the pathways that develop from it, and the skills with which they arrive at university with given the high percentage of students who take this subject and head to university.			No			2020-02-26 10:04:55	ANON-YFPW-RB3U-2	2020-02-26 10:04:55	2020-02-26 10:05:08

Yes		Undecided	<p>It's really not ideal for the fringe subjects like Classics which are likely to be left by the wayside. However, there's nothing to stop these being offered as individual subjects and using the new standards anyway, unless there's a specific mandate to remove those entirely.</p> <p>Psychology under Social Studies makes no sense, and I find it hard to think the new standards will be able to be made general enough to work with Media Studies and Social Studies as well.</p> <p>In Science, the grouping means that departments are free to support whichever mix of subjects they find most beneficial, but this is likely to increase the prominence of biology and especially be bad for Earth and Space, which was already not in a good position. Teachers will choose which subjects for each general standard are beneficial, and for a lot of schools that probably means 2x Bio, 1x Chem, 1x Physics. And Chemistry will probably be an internal - not a great basis for Level 2.</p>	<p>Stopping supporting subjects only narrows our curriculum and makes it harder for students to specialise into their interests. Art History in particular is still quite important, and while Latin is in my view a relic of the British schooling system, it's still essential for those students who wish to move into classical studies. We should be offering a wider range of languages, not narrowing them.</p>	<p>We need to keep Level 2 and 3 strong as specialist years and not allow this to erode further into Level 2 in future.</p> <p>I'd personally be interested in some separation of computer science and information technology as subjects.</p>	No			2020-02-26 10:05:17	ANON-YFPW-RBDY-Q	2020-02-26 10:05:17	2020-02-26 10:05:32
No		Strongly disagree	See below.	<p>My strongest point of disagreement relates to a point which was described in a recent media report, in which it was described that Level 1 science will now be assessed based on the nature of science, rather than specifically assessing scientific knowledge and skills. I disagree with this for a number of reasons.</p> <p>Firstly, this leads to false expectations about what is involved in the study of science. On one hand, students who enjoy philosophical conversations around science will be misled, and may be quite ill-prepared to encounter more technical scientific teaching in Level 2. On the other hand, students who are black-and-white thinkers, and who may make excellent scientists, could be put-off by the more philosophical approach to science. These students may choose not to proceed to Level 2 science, in favour of subjects such as Digital Tech, etc. New Zealand could miss out on growing some talented young scientists, by watering down the curriculum to the point where it is either too boring or too abstract for science-minded students.</p> <p>While most of the discussions I have heard include mention of NCEA Level 1 being an introductory qualification, it is important to</p>		No			2020-02-26 10:25:37	ANON-YFPW-RBDV-M	2020-02-26 10:25:37	2020-02-26 10:26:01
Yes	This subject selection does not meet this brief, especially when considering the proposed changes to Science standards. Students locked in to 4 standards per subject does not give schools or learners opportunity to do the best for the students.	Strongly disagree	<p>There are a number of issues with this proposed list. It will dumb down Sciences and does not allow for flexible courses for students who have passions and directions.</p> <p>The Science changes are particularly concerning. For students who are interested and keen on Sciences it does not give good coverage of content to prepare for Level 2 and beyond. Many schools offer a choice to do 2 sciences or 2 sciences worth of standards to increase coverage as Biology, Physics and Chemistry have large content bases and discrete skill sets. This does not allow for this option. In addition the proposed standards are general, and have a heavy literacy focus. This may appeal to very literate arts students who do not want to continue with Sciences but want some useful skills. However, it will be a huge struggle for lower ability students, especially boys with the focus on literacy over content.</p> <p>Schools that are more 'progressive' and want students to do individual programs will be restricted to general courses and not allow students to follow passions into area such as Science, Classics and Media students which often appeal to capable, driven students.</p> <p>I struggle to see how this will aid our students going forward. It may try to falsly lower gaps in achievement by cutting down the top end with bland choices.</p>	<p>There are a number of issues with this proposed list. It will dumb down Sciences and does not allow for flexible courses for students who have passions and directions.</p> <p>The Science changes are particularly concerning. For students who are interested and keen on Sciences it does not give good coverage of content to prepare for Level 2 and beyond. Many schools offer a choice to do 2 sciences or 2 sciences worth of standards to increase coverage as Biology, Physics and Chemistry have large content bases and discrete skill sets. This does not allow for this option. In addition the proposed standards are general, and have a heavy literacy focus. This may appeal to very literate arts students who do not want to continue with Sciences but want some useful skills. However, it will be a huge struggle for lower ability students, especially boys with the focus on literacy over content.</p> <p>Schools that are more 'progressive' and want students to do individual programs will be restricted to general courses and not allow students to follow passions into area such as Science, Classics and Media students which often appeal to capable, driven students.</p> <p>I struggle to see how this will aid our students going forward. It may try to falsly lower gaps in achievement by cutting down the top end with</p>		No			2020-02-26 10:27:00	ANON-YFPW-RBDC-1	2020-02-26 10:27:00	2020-02-26 10:27:08
Yes		Strongly disagree		<p>Latin should not be excluded from the Level 1 Curriculum. It's an important subject which helps develop essential skills like analyzing, memorization and in-depth thinking. This language has been studied for over two millennia, we can't let it fade out of existence.</p>		No			2020-02-26 10:28:09	ANON-YFPW-RBDS-H	2020-02-26 10:28:09	2020-02-26 10:28:26

No	I dont know how you would find out about this it should be more publicly available	Strongly disagree	no thanks	I like art history which i'm taking currently its a good subject and its interesting i also took latin which i found to be very interesting even though it actually has no real world application, it was still helpful for my english/language skills and also helped me with basic knowledge for classics studies media studies is also a very beneficial subject and i think it should be more advertised than it currently is because in an age of entertainment, it should be more important psychology and media shouldn't be combined they should stay separate	a life course/a common sense course we need this for living and what we need to do to survive, taxes and how to live in the world after we leave school because no one has any idea how to do that and it should be compulsory please add this	No		i am unsure what the new zealand curriculum in maori really is, but it sounds like a good idea more people should know maori in new zealand than there currently is	2020-02-26 10:31:55	ANON-YFPW-RBD8-P	2020-02-26 10:31:55	2020-02-26 10:32:16
Yes		Strongly disagree	- Replacing 31 L1 Science (Science, Biology, Chemistry, Physics, ESS) standards with 4 removes all of the flexibility that makes NCEA valuable. We have at least 150 students per year who will miss out on essential preparation for L2 and beyond. These students are our future doctors, engineers, architects, pilots, scientists etc. The step from the proposed L1 into L2 (assuming detailed content-rich L2 and 3 Standards) will not be achievable for many - How do Languages (for example) survive intact when the Sciences are gutted? What is the difference between separating Language into French, Tongan, Japanese etc, and separating Science into Chemistry, Biology, Physics and ESS?	- Put back content specific (Science, Physics, Chemistry, Biology, ESS) standards into L1 so that we can create courses that suit our students' needs.		No			2020-02-26 10:32:09	ANON-YFPW-RBD9-Q	2020-02-26 10:32:09	2020-02-26 10:32:20
Yes		Agree		I would strongly support an 'integrated studies' subject that builds on the front end of the curriculum and supports students in schools not following a traditional 'subject based' qualification.	Again I think integrated studies should continue through to Level 2 and 3.	No	But I would like to see these integrated studies standards being genuinely bicultural across Te Marautanga and the NZC.		2020-02-26 10:32:49	ANON-YFPW-RBDG-5	2020-02-26 10:32:49	2020-02-26 10:32:53
Yes		Strongly disagree	We are generalising subjects eg: the separate sciences become science, So push out the students career path another years o end up with just generalised trained students moving with looking at been jack of all subjects but not master of subject for there career plans			No	Don't care my children are not Maori		2020-02-26 10:34:15	ANON-YFPW-RBDJ-8	2020-02-26 10:34:15	2020-02-26 10:34:27
No	No I wasn't aware, and I feel like this should be more public especially towards the students who will be affected by this change as they're the ones who have to decide what subjects determine their future.	Strongly disagree	I strongly disagree with the proposal - Media Studies, Social Studies and Psychology HAVE NO CORRELATION - In Media Studies you learn film techniques, learn to write screenplays and analyse films and genre. You learn and develop your own film to present and showcase. This is a creative subject that can lead to careers in the film/media industry. - Socials Studies is a subject based on learning topics such as sustainability, geography, immigration, the environment etc. - Psychology which is a subject i'm currently taking and is one of my favourites, HAS NO RELATION TO MEDIA STUDIES OR SOCIAL STUDIES. Yes you can apply psychological elements on these subjects but thats just because you can apply human behaviour to everything but the whole subject is focused on the science of our behaviour and why we do things and what causes us to do this. - If i was wanting to do Psychology in Level 1 again but it was also Media Studies + Social Science I would absolutely HATE IT and see no point as i'm only interested in one aspect of that proposed subject and feel like i'm wasting my time in that class	- Media Studies, Social Studies and Psychology HAVE NO CORRELATION - In Media Studies you learn film techniques, learn to write screenplays and analyse films and genre. You learn and develop your own film to present and showcase. This is a creative subject that can lead to careers in the film/media industry. - Socials Studies is a subject based on learning topics such as sustainability, geography, immigration, the environment etc. - Psychology which is a subject i'm currently taking and is one of my favourites, HAS NO RELATION TO MEDIA STUDIES OR SOCIAL STUDIES. Yes you can apply psychological elements on these subjects but thats just because you can apply human behaviour to everything but the whole subject is focused on the science of our behaviour and why we do things and what causes us to do this. - If i was wanting to do Psychology in Level 1 again but it was also Media Studies + Social Science I would absolutely HATE IT and see no point as i'm only interested in one aspect of that proposed subject and feel like i'm wasting my time in that class	L I F E + C O M M O N S E N S E L E S S O N S !!! we know NOTHING ABOUT ANYTHING (thanks school) so much for preparing us for the "real world" YEAH we know algebra and unfamiliar texts but do we know taxes, bills and other things that you do as an adult NO! we are so unprepared for the world outside of school, WE NEED TO KNOW WHAT THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF AN ADULT ARE AND HOW TO DO THEM AND HOW TO SUPPORT OURSELVES INSTEAD OF BECOMING A BEGGAR DOWN QUEEN ST	No	i have no comment to say as i know NOTHING	2020-02-26 10:51:08	ANON-YFPW-RBDQ-F	2020-02-26 10:51:08	2020-02-26 10:51:22	
Yes	It seems a logical step and the combining of subjects such as history with classics and the social science, commerce areas seems forward thinking.	Undecided	I do have a concern for the development in NZ of apprenticeship style subjects such as building, plumbing, electrician, mechanics, agriculture, farming... where are we building capacity for students to grow in those careers? Are we doing enough given the countrywide shortage of these skilled people?	I would love to see more practical skills based opportunities offered at school in Level 1-3 such as apprenticeship links through building academies, trades academies, sports academies, performing arts academies, tourism and industry academies, land skills and agricultural academies, links to professions such as police, fireman, ambulance community industries as I saw in a school in the states recently. Even links to indigenous culture and tourism and the seafood industry... Just some thoughts to broaden the school skills and experience	Perhaps some of the ideas I mentioned above?	Yes	I believe it is on the right track but again sport, culture and tourism, industry... need to be enhanced even more from early on in education.	2020-02-26 11:00:53	ANON-YFPW-RBDE-3	2020-02-26 11:00:53	2020-02-26 11:01:18	

Yes		Strongly agree		I like the suggested list, it provides Year 11 the opportunity to keep their options broad before making important choices about specializing. They have more options this way.		Yes			2020-02-26 11:02:20	ANON-YFPW-RBD5-K	2020-02-26 11:02:20	2020-02-26 11:02:32
No		Agree				No			2020-02-26 11:02:45	ANON-YFPW-RBDP-E	2020-02-26 11:02:45	2020-02-26 11:02:53
Yes		Strongly disagree		I strongly support keeping classics and history as separate subjects at NCEA level 1. Classics and history are inherently different subjects that focus on completely different subjects and are both inherently valuable subjects for students to access at NCEA level 1. For students that are not interested in taking the multitude of more creative subjects available to them such as music, drama, dance, visual arts, design and visual communications their options are being dramatically reduced. As a student who was interested in writing and social sciences, I would not want my options of subjects so hugely reduced and would be immensely disappointed in not being able to take classics especially.	Definitely believe that there should be some sort of civics education available for NCEA level 2 and 3. This should include how governments work, voting processes, political ideologies, NZ's public institutions and processes, NZ's political history and development. We need youth to become more engaged in the political process and government institutions that hugely affect them. Increased education in these areas will help with this. I would even suggest starting something like this in level 1.	No			2020-02-26 11:21:20	ANON-YFPW-RBD7-N	2020-02-26 11:21:20	2020-02-26 11:21:38
Yes	Yes to a certain degree but not to the "broad" degree it is going especially in the area of the specialised Science departments	Disagree	The revamp has made the area of Science too broad. Students moving into Level 2 will struggle to catch onto the relevant concepts in a timely fashion because of Level 1 being so broad and missing the foundation milestones required for students of that particular year group.	To give equal weighting on all the 3 Science areas of Biology, Chemistry and Physics in the new revised Level 1 Science option.		No			2020-02-26 11:22:22	ANON-YFPW-RBDF-4	2020-02-26 11:22:22	2020-02-26 11:22:42
Yes		Strongly agree				No			2020-02-26 11:23:12	ANON-YFPW-RBD1-F	2020-02-26 11:23:12	2020-02-26 11:23:26
Yes		Strongly disagree		I believe combining multiple subjects into one whole subject is not a good idea, because then students are needing to know knowledge from up to three different subjects into one which will bring a massive challenge when entering level two of those subject. I also personally strongly disagree with combining psychology into social studies as this is a massively growing field in New Zealand and the world.		No			2020-02-26 11:34:44	ANON-YFPW-RBDH-6	2020-02-26 11:34:44	2020-02-26 11:34:52
No		Disagree	Psychology has had a long battle to become established as a 'serious' subject and has only just gained UE. It's exploding in popularity. To water it down at level one denigrates the hard work that has been done.	See above	Sociology	No		No. But like Psychology, Sociology is a subject that naturally taps into a teenager's questioning of the world around them. It will be immensely popular if it implemented properly.	2020-02-26 11:35:23	ANON-YFPW-RBDM-8	2020-02-26 11:35:23	2020-02-26 11:35:42
No	While the intention to offer a broad based education at NCEA Level 1 may have some appeal to the Ministry, it does not help students or teachers. To offer these general science and general commerce along side the specialist options would make sense, it will do more harm than good to those students who do wish to specialize - particularly in Accounting. A foundation level of knowledge is great for general knowledge, but offers very little in the way of high achievement for those who do wish to go on with the subject. It is hard enough to get high confidence in Accounting teaching the course at Level 1-3. Making it a two year course will see students opt in that have not got the capacity for fast paced understanding. Likewise Economics - Micro and Macro courses are able to reflect the needs of the students - a broad course offers a no continuing option.	Disagree	Subject aligned with the NZ Curriculum - lowering the expectation of achievement by broadening the course into a combined composition of general understanding just drops the overall achievement. By all means run an additional course for General Commerce and let students vote with their choices. But to scrap what is working and replace it with less is helping no one. The achievement of students also has an international responsibility. It does not need to be a one size fits all - general Languages (English, Te Reo, Spanish) and general Commerce (Accounting, Business studies, Economics) - just leave the specialist subjects to those who wish to specialize and add a general option for those who just have an interest in a broad education before leaving school.	Combining Accounting, Economics and Business Studies is like combining History, Geography and Economics. Offer non-continuing options at Level 1 and Level 2 if schools want to keep students at school for longer. But students who do wish to go on should not be dumbed down and then over extended, when the course can be spread over three years, but suddenly becomes a two year course. Put the students first. Let them decide what they want by offering general Science alongside Physics, Chemistry and Biology - now that makes sense. Top down decisions do not work at the coal face. The subject combinations are unfair and not applied across the board - just some subjects singled out - totally unfair.	There are specialist subjects at Level 1, 2 and 3. It is not broke so don't fix it. If you want to extend students by offering more choice or offer alongside subjects that are created - ability to communicate (lump all the languages in with English) - what a stupid idea. Have the ability for some schools to specialize and others to go general education. Let the school roll tell you what parents want and what students want - IT IS NOT MEDIOCRACY. If you can't get enough students to attend Polytech then look at Fees Free or change the apprenticeship scheme pay rate, or something else, but don't send heaps of students off having failed a Level 2 course that was unnecessarily compact. Negative students get negative outcomes.	No	Not my place to comment	Not applicable	2020-02-26 11:36:32	ANON-YFPW-RBD2-2	2020-02-26 11:36:32	2020-02-26 11:37:01
No		Strongly disagree	Social science subjects are more complex to just generalize them into one, such as media studies and psychology etc.			No			2020-02-26 11:51:54	ANON-YFPW-RBDX-P	2020-02-26 11:51:54	2020-02-26 11:52:42
No		Undecided				No			2020-02-26 11:54:50	ANON-YFPW-RBDA-Y	2020-02-26 11:54:50	2020-02-26 11:54:58
Yes		Agree		Was any consideration given to a "Career Education" subject? The Govt campaigned on a detailed individualized Career Plan for every school leaver. Currently, most Careers Advisers do not have the time or recognition to do this effectively and fully. Careers advisers time allocation should work on the same time allocation as Guidance Counsellors and also be recognised with the same Management Units as Guidance teachers.	A "Life Skills" subject related to topics and resources that can be found in the School Leavers Toolkit.	No			2020-02-26 12:02:18	ANON-YFPW-RBDN-C	2020-02-26 12:02:18	2020-02-26 12:02:44

Yes	The information from our Associations has been key in order to keep informed.	Strongly disagree	Keeping generality of subject participation at Level 1 is key. Students are asked to early to specialise, especially in the Sciences. However, to lose a subject at this level that so clearly focuses on soft skills, such as Classical Studies, seems foolhardy and poorly thought out.	There is concern regarding the perceived lack of importance of Classical Studies, as a separate subject in and of itself in Level 1. The skills, especially soft skills, taught within Classics are valuable, so to either ignore the subject all together at Level 1 or try to incorporate within History seems incongruous to the claim that NCEA at level one aims for a broad foundational level of study. History and the approach to the teaching and learning of this subject is quite different to the broader topics offered in the study of Classics. A very real pity.	The current specialist subjects are sound.	No				2020-02-26 12:02:55	ANON-YFPW-R9NX-Q	2020-02-21 09:30:44	2020-02-26 12:03:10
Yes		Strongly disagree		As a former engineer business owner and current physics teacher I find the 'dumbing down' of numerical skills in science to be totally unacceptable to the future employability of the boys I currently teach.		Yes	Somewhat.			2020-02-26 12:06:42	ANON-YFPW-RBDX-9	2020-02-26 12:06:42	2020-02-26 12:07:07
Yes		Strongly disagree	I have no understanding why the separate Science subjects (Physics, Chemistry, Biology, ESS) have been collapsed in to just Science. At the school I teach at there are a large number of students who choose to gain specialist subject knowledge in the separate sciences at Level 1 in order to give them a better foundation for further study at Levels 2 and 3. Languages are still separate, as are the Arts and Technology subjects. Why Science?	I have no understanding why the separate Science subjects (Physics, Chemistry, Biology, ESS) have been collapsed in to just Science. At the school I teach at there are a large number of students who choose to gain specialist subject knowledge in the separate sciences at Level 1 in order to give them a better foundation for further study at Levels 2 and 3. Languages are still separate, as are the Arts and Technology subjects. Why Science?	I have no understanding why the separate Science subjects (Physics, Chemistry, Biology, ESS) have been collapsed in to just Science. At the school I teach at there are a large number of students who choose to gain specialist subject knowledge in the separate sciences at Level 1 in order to give them a better foundation for further study at Levels 2 and 3. Languages are still separate, as are the Arts and Technology subjects. Why Science?	No				2020-02-26 12:20:16	ANON-YFPW-RBD6-M	2020-02-26 12:20:16	2020-02-26 12:20:35
Yes		Strongly disagree	Removing the pure Sciences at Level 1 makes no sense. There is a huge increase in knowledge and skill required going into Level 2 for the specialised Science Subjects that these will, in turn, have to be 'dumbed down' too.	As for above - the specialised, pure sciences need to be retained	Agribusiness is a subject which should be included. It continues to be the backbone of our economy and needs to sit alongside Agricultural and Horticultural Science.	No				2020-02-26 12:24:54	ANON-YFPW-RBDR-G	2020-02-26 12:24:54	2020-02-26 12:25:05
Yes		Disagree	The dilution of Economics is a sad loss for economic literacy and decision-making. See my comments below	Merging Economics with Business Studies and Accounting is very sad. I think economic literacy and decision-making skills are right at the heart of what is needed as this century progresses. There is an assumption implicit in this merger that Economics is largely a business/financial skill. This misses the point. We need citizens who can appraise options and policy choices that will maximise outcomes for all of society, both in New Zealand and globally. We are currently witnessing the effects of ignorance in policy-making globally of short-term, insular and fear-based thinking that needs the antidote of rational evidence-based inquiry. Diluting Economics with number-crunching and marketing systems of approach (which are valid for their limited purpose) will weaken our ability to produce insightful citizens in a rapidly changing world. Feel free to merge Accounting and Business Studies due to their close relationship and narrow focus, but let Economics stand alone.	No	No				2020-02-26 12:27:22	ANON-YFPW-RBDW-N	2020-02-26 12:27:22	2020-02-26 12:27:40
Yes	There needs to emphasise on all areas of Science not just NOS.	Disagree	I'm worried about students not getting the foundation to cope with L2 Science. Students may struggle with the large jump and may opt out. Science knowledge of the physical chemical and biological world is crucial as well as ESS to educate our future doctors nurses surgeons engineers etc	Need more options. 4 standards with a focus on NOS is not enough. Maybe 8 standards. 4 standards NOS for students not wishing to continue with Science (NOS) and 4 standards with Bio Chem Earth and Space and Phys. 2 internals could be Chemistry and Physics practical plus theory and 2 externals Biology and Earth and Space Science.	I would like them to consider how the standards can be combined to create authentic courses such as PE Chemistry Food and Nutrition to create a Sports Science course. Or Graphics, computer Science, mathematics and physics to create an engineering type course etc	Yes	Somewhat			2020-02-26 12:29:32	ANON-YFPW-RBD4-J	2020-02-26 12:29:32	2020-02-26 12:29:56

No	I know that there was an intended change to support a broader more foundational education at NCEA level 1. Table 1 contradicts my understanding of the word 'broader'. I thought maintaining a very diverse range of subjects would constitute a broader foundation rather than the now revealed intention of getting rid of a number of key subjects - Latin, art history, physics, biology, and chemistry.	Strongly disagree	The elimination of a number of key sciences and Latin are very disappointing - also the abolishment of art history will reduce the opportunity for NZ students to engage with some great cultural contributions to our rich and diverse New Zealand Culture.	I think there needs to be the opportunity for students to take, chemistry, physics and biology as distinct subjects since many students take multiple sciences which all cover quite distinct content. This also allows students to progress more smoothly in these subject areas from NCEA level 1 to level 2. The proposal to have just science means students will either struggle more in jumping from NCEA Level 1 to level 2 or students will have a much shallower understanding of these subject areas by the end of secondary school further exacerbating the problems faced by tertiary institutions needing to prepare students for their own courses. The lack of Latin in the New Zealand curriculum shows a gross misunderstanding of a key language. Students who have an understanding of latin gain insight into a large number of subject areas and disciplines. The Sciences, Mathematics, medicine, dentistry, law, engineering, design and nursing among others all use a lot of Latin terminology - a deeper understanding of Latin gives students an edge in working within these subject areas and professions. The lack of classical studies is also of concern at level 1 since this prevents students from being exposed to the classical ideas that have formed a large part of the modern world - from politics to science and technology.	Philosophy, Classical Studies, Latin, Art History, all specialist sciences, some trade technologies, engineering science, and technology.	No			2020-02-26 12:45:04	ANON-YFPW-RBDT-J	2020-02-26 12:45:04	2020-02-26 12:45:21
No	Now I do know, I think it is a good idea to keep the pathway broad at this level, allowing for more specialization later.	Strongly disagree	* I think it is deeply disappointing to remove Latin from Level 1 NCEA. Unlike a lot of subjects, this is not a subject that you can pick up later. Like all languages, it requires a foundational level. * If Classical Studies (in my experience a much loved subject) becomes a minor part of History, it will be diluted to such an extent, that it will lose its value. The same would go for Art History, in my opinion. * I also think, with the amount of disinformation around these days, Media Studies is particularly relevant and it would be disappointing to see it minimized.	I believe that Latin, Classical Studies and Art History are culturally valid subjects to be studying in New Zealand. They explore the basis of one of our official languages, and Western Civilization. They certainly provide richness in the curriculum.	I certainly wouldn't be against some level of relatively sophisticated financial literacy being taught, presumably as part of Economics, but a shame everyone couldn't have some access to it.	No			2020-02-26 12:47:14	ANON-YFPW-RBD3-H	2020-02-26 12:47:14	2020-02-26 12:47:39
Yes	The combining of Accounting, Economics and Business studies is of great concern and I believe a flawed concept. These are three specialist subjects and to put them together will find it challenging to employ teachers competent in all of them, especially if this move continues up to Levels 2 and 3. These three subjects saw approximately 41,000 entries to external papers. Compare this to softer subjects such as Drama and Dance which are being retained as stand alone subjects.	Disagree	As above	As above	No there's enough already	No			2020-02-26 13:07:16	ANON-YFPW-RBD2-G	2020-02-26 13:07:16	2020-02-26 13:07:29
Yes		Strongly agree		Kia ora. Yes and it's very specific feedback. As a long-experienced specialised music educator and working musician, I strongly urge that one of the standards (Aural - currently AS91093/AS91275/AS91420) be assessed internally, with students able to use instruments to assist, as happens in real life for working musicians needing to work out harmonic, melodic or rhythmic material. I'm happy to discuss in person or be part of the team.		No			2020-02-26 13:14:50	ANON-YFPW-RBRY-5	2020-02-26 13:14:50	2020-02-26 13:15:04
No		Strongly disagree	using the specialised subject standards from L1 in Science allows teachers to build a course that suits all the learners in their school. Yes 33 standards is way to many, but 4 is not enough.	I would like to see 2 standards from Chemistry Physics and Biology retained to allow more scope for teacher to build courses for all learners. These standards would need to have external exams as students need to be able to practice this technique.	I would like to see the standards left as they are. They don't need to be changed.	Yes		no	2020-02-26 13:15:25	ANON-YFPW-RBRV-2	2020-02-26 13:15:25	2020-02-26 13:15:48
Yes		Strongly agree		Really glad to see Maori performing arts there - would also like to see Pasifika performing arts as Auckland has the largest population of Pacific Islanders and it offers these students an opportunity for leadership.	As long as we keep psychology and philosophy for some of our gifted kids.	No		but should be	2020-02-26 13:22:27	ANON-YFPW-RBRC-F	2020-02-26 13:22:27	2020-02-26 13:22:43
No	But after reading the details, I believe ncea 1 should be broad as students do not have the maturity to decide a career path yet. However exams, assignments should be thoroughly administered so that they know what to expect in senior years, uni and workforce	Undecided	As long as the curriculum challenges the students to think outside the box, i agree to the changes. One should be well versed with theory as well as the practical side of things.			No			2020-02-26 13:50:45	ANON-YFPW-RBRS-Y	2020-02-26 13:45:40	2020-02-26 13:50:55

Yes		Undecided	The new Level 1 science does not align with the NZ curriculum, it over represents the Nature of Science strands of the curriculum at the expense of the four content area strands (which are not represented at all). The potential to design assessments within context that force some level of assessment on the content strands is there, but equally it is not required by the new structure. The reduction of standards offered to Level 1 in Sciences is also massive.	The change to level 1 sciences is massive, with the removal of 4 content areas and the retention of only 'general science'. My biggest concern is that the 'general science' that has been 'retained' is actually all Nature of Science strands, without a single other strand from the science curriculum. It seems unbalanced to treat one area of the Science curriculum as the only area of it worth assessing, and exclude assessment on any of the other 4 strands. A reasonable suggestion I have heard is that Science at Level 1 be allowed to include two other Sciences (like Social Studies has History and Geography). These could be Natural sciences (offering 4 assessments on the Biology and Earth/Space strands) and Physical sciences (offering 4 assessments on the Physics and Chem strands). This would still be a major reduction in the Sci standards available at level 1, but retain balance between the Nature of Science strands and the other Science strands of the curriculum.		No			2020-02-26 14:28:44	ANON-YFPW-RBR9-5	2020-02-26 14:28:44	2020-02-26 14:28:55
Yes		Agree	Some concerns over the impact these changes might have on subject specialists e.g. Media Studies teachers. Although most would have at least one other specialist subject.	Combining subject and reducing the number of Achievement Standards is a step in the right direction. NCEA Level 1 has grown to become cumbersome and needlessly complex. Trying to manage a large number of standards in a single subject area (I'm looking at you Science) have proven to be a significant burden and workload concern.		No			2020-02-26 14:47:41	ANON-YFPW-RBRG-K	2020-02-26 14:47:41	2020-02-26 14:47:51
Yes		Agree		none	possible option for health/nutrition as a choice?	No			2020-02-26 15:15:44	ANON-YFPW-RBRI-P	2020-02-26 15:15:44	2020-02-26 15:15:56
Yes		Agree				Yes			2020-02-26 15:32:08	ANON-YFPW-RBRQ-W	2020-02-26 15:32:08	2020-02-26 15:32:17
Yes	The intended change is commendable. However, the way in which this latest development has been announced is destructive of that outcome. The Comms section at the Ministry needs and overhaul, if it has not been axed. The language used is sometimes inflammatory e.g. "Art History and Classical Studies only supported as possible contexts within history to a low degree". Equally counterproductive is the lack of clarity and certainty about what is going to happen to subjects marginalised at level 1 (e.g. Art History, Classical Studies, Economics, Physics, Chemistry) is also counterproductive. It simply encourages Armageddon thinking.	Strongly disagree	I may or may not agree with Science and Commerce as proposed. There is insufficient information. I totally oppose the new Social Studies and History. I see NO JUSTIFICATION at all for dumping Classics into history (with low support), nor Media Studies into Social Studies as a possible context. Why is the wording different in each case? Both existing subjects clearly meet all seven criteria. Subject associations will no doubt be clarifying why. Is there an eighth criterion that allows some distinction to be drawn between Media Studies, Classics (excluded) and Religious Studies (included)? The decision to eliminate Latin can only be justified in terms of low student numbers. It meets six of the seven criteria.	I am aware that NZACT will be putting forward strong arguments in support of the inclusion of Classical Studies and Latin at Level 1. Duplication is time-wasting. In the case of Classical Studies, I believe it is the role of individual schools to choose the most suitable curriculum for their students. They might require that students choose either subject, not both. The criteria for selection above can easily be incorporated into the revised standards. Latin, on the other hand, is clearly persona non grata at the Ministry. Axing Latin at Level 1 is clearly intended as a death sentence. I would be interested to see appended to this consultation document the research that underpins this decision.	If Latin cannot exist at Level 1, then the first national assessment might still occur at Level 2. If the cost of assessing a small number of students is considered a barrier, then the subject might be internally assessed with some element of national moderation. I would be astounded to learn of any outcry about falling academic standards as a result.	Yes	I am familiar and supportive. I do not see it in collision with the continued existence of Classical Studies, Art History, Media Studies and Latin at level 1.		2020-02-26 15:40:37	ANON-YFPW-RBRE-H	2020-02-26 15:40:37	2020-02-26 15:41:06
Yes		Undecided		Separate sciences give a good foundation for Physics, Chem and Biology in Y12 and Y13.	No	No			2020-02-26 15:48:29	ANON-YFPW-RBR5-1	2020-02-26 15:48:29	2020-02-26 15:48:36
Yes		Strongly disagree		These changes will greatly negatively affect 1. Level 2 2. Disparity between Pakeha and Maori 3. Scientific knowledge of the general population	Please do not do this sort of change to level 2 or 3	No	This will need a vast amount of PD and training. You cannot expect teachers to upskill in this area in this area on their own time.		2020-02-26 15:59:55	ANON-YFPW-RBR7-3	2020-02-26 15:59:55	2020-02-26 16:00:01
Yes	Yes, but the detail was not supplied until quite late.	Strongly disagree	This is a change n the wrong direction for science. Only a few of the concepts such as a little in "communication in science" will be an improvement.			No			2020-02-26 16:00:43	ANON-YFPW-RBRF-J	2020-02-26 16:00:43	2020-02-26 16:00:55
No		Undecided		I don't want to see things lost... and I want opportunities for gifted students so that they are not bored with generic repetitions of basic subject matter covered in lower years.	Unsure	No	Not aware of it		2020-02-26 16:05:03	ANON-YFPW-RBRZ-6	2020-02-26 16:05:03	2020-02-26 16:05:14
Yes	For a Science based subject we need the each level to build into the next for students to thrive. This means NCEA Level 1 Science still needs to contain a large amount of subject specific content for students to cope with the move into Level 2 and 3 specialists (Physics, Chemistry and Biology).	Disagree	No room to cover Biology, physics and chemistry in specific standards at NCEA Level 1. Even though we only offer a general science at Level 1, the standards don't allow us to teach the different stands with the required depth and skills.	I don't mind not having the 3 separate sciences, but the standards in the general science course need to allow for greater depth in teaching these 3 strands of Chem, Phys and Bio. The proposed standards do not allow for this. Too broad.	Biology, physics and chemistry	No	I have had no PD in this area and do not feel confident with this.		2020-02-26 16:04:39	ANON-YFPW-RBRI-W	2020-02-26 16:04:39	2020-02-26 16:06:09
No	I was not aware of this change.	Strongly disagree	The change in standards requires students to have a very high level of scientific literacy. A large number of students lack literacy skills which means that they will not be able to achieve the standards.	Students will understand scientific process but will not have much knowledge on any particular area of science. This will impact on students at levels 2 and 3.	Not really	No	I will have have a lot of difficulty in implementing this.		2020-02-26 16:05:39	ANON-YFPW-RBRH-M	2020-02-26 16:05:39	2020-02-26 16:06:12
No	I was not aware of this change.	Strongly disagree	The change in standards requires students to have a very high level of scientific literacy. A large number of students lack literacy skills which means that they will not be able to achieve the standards.	Students will understand scientific process but will not have much knowledge on any particular area of science. This will impact on students at levels 2 and 3.	Not really	No	I will have have a lot of difficulty in implementing this.		2020-02-26 16:06:24	ANON-YFPW-RBRB-E	2020-02-26 16:06:24	2020-02-26 16:06:33

Yes	I am now aware ie beginning of the year about the detail of this new proposed curriculum.	Disagree	I do not know enough to agree.	In Science , atm I can only see the 'Investigating in Science' idea working the best. I am uncertain about the other 3 matrix working for us as I need a lot more knowledge in these 3 areas to assess my students (specialist Maori cultural values need to be understood fully)	Same as what is being offered to Yr 12 and 13's now.	No				2020-02-26 16:07:14	ANON-YFPW-RBRM-S	2020-02-26 16:07:14	2020-02-26 16:07:32
Yes	But it has been poorly communicated outside the education sector.	Strongly disagree	The grouping together of sciences could work, if the separate pathways keep their own identity within the structure. Replacing Latin with Te Reo defies belief. You, rightfully, propose to include the language and culture of the first arrivals, but at the cost of completely removing the origin of the European history, art and languages. Latin is the most fundamental language for the study of any modern European language, therefore should be the basis in NCEA level 1, to be specialised on in level 2 and 3 by the study of other European languages. It is also the foundation for the history of art, politics, warfare, science, architecture, medicine, religion, etc. To lose Latin would mean that NZ will lose knowledge in every aspect of society.	KEEP LATIN AND ADD TE REO. For the reasoning see question 2.	Do not become a pathway for the trades. A broad education in languages and science gives better preparation for University success. We need students that can read, write, understand science and can think outside the box. We do not need prefab workers.	No				2020-02-26 16:23:55	ANON-YFPW-RBRD-G	2020-02-26 16:23:55	2020-02-26 16:24:06
No		Strongly disagree		All other subject areas have been removed from Science while other subjects still a variety. Science is very important and it should not just be research based. Students should be taught in specialist subjects from L1 to help them advance in it. The 4 standards are not covering Science areas. Only the investigation standard is linked to Nos.	NOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOO	No	How do we get familiar. Will teachers have time to be up skilled?			2020-02-26 16:35:33	ANON-YFPW-RBRA-D	2020-02-26 16:35:33	2020-02-26 16:35:37
No		Strongly agree	If catering avall my son would have got Excellence not Merit for Lvl 1 2019. Disappointing & was unaware it was only pass or fail grading.			No				2020-02-26 16:35:47	ANON-YFPW-RBRN-T	2020-02-26 16:35:47	2020-02-26 16:36:03
No		Strongly disagree	Media Studies should not be lumped in with Psychology and Social Studies.	Media Studies should not be lumped in with Psychology and Social Studies. They are totally separate subjects. Media studies needs its own subject.		No				2020-02-26 16:47:40	ANON-YFPW-RBRK-Q	2020-02-26 16:47:40	2020-02-26 16:47:58
Yes		Undecided				No				2020-02-26 17:12:38	ANON-YFPW-RBR6-Z	2020-02-26 17:12:38	2020-02-26 17:12:46
No		Agree		Only that if the subjects are listed, than schools should provide All these subjects. If they don't it is usually a resourcing issue which the MOE is ultimately responsible for.	I don't know what these are so cannot provide an opinion.	No	N/a			2020-02-26 17:32:12	ANON-YFPW-RBRR-X	2020-02-26 17:32:12	2020-02-26 17:32:36
Yes		Strongly disagree	The jump from Science L1 to L2 sciences - Biology, Chemistry, Earth and Space Science, and Physics is huge enough as it is. Removing standards from L1 Sci that focus on learning about these disciplines will make that jump far too large	While I personally believe L1 students should have a broad experience of science rather than the individual disciplines I respect the right to choose. Removing the individual disciplines, then only assessing NOS is tantamount to saying that content knowledge is unnecessary. Totally ridiculous and laughable to the rest of the world.	No	No				2020-02-26 18:26:34	ANON-YFPW-RBRW-3	2020-02-26 18:26:34	2020-02-26 18:26:59
Yes		Strongly disagree	The combining of the sciences into one subject is absolutely appalling. These are separate disciplines and need specialist treatment.	It has been broadened far too much!	Horticulture needs more standards.	No				2020-02-26 18:36:24	ANON-YFPW-RBR4-Z	2020-02-26 18:36:24	2020-02-26 18:36:32
Yes		Agree		I agree for the most part and particularly congratulate your proposal to discontinue the inclusion of Latin in NCEA Level 1. My primary concern is regarding the integration of Media Studies and Psychology into Social Studies (mentioned in a The Spinoff article): https://thespinoff.co.nz/society/21-02-2020/cheat-sheet-what-is-happening-to-ncea/	Yes. Perhaps Linguistics could be a subject, albeit a very narrow one--perhaps it could be a subset of the Social Studies.	No	I have no feedback			2020-02-26 18:44:55	ANON-YFPW-RBRT-Z	2020-02-26 18:44:55	2020-02-26 18:45:23

Yes		Disagree	Commenting on Level 1 Science, while inclusion of NOS style assessments is positive, it should not be at the expense of the subject specialist areas. Science is a challenging subject to pick up, but shifting this challenge back a year is just moving the stress. Level 2 science students would be extremely disadvantaged under this system. Schools would likely choose to continue their specialist subjects, but not credential them, and this is challenging without knowing where level 2 and 3 are headed. I certainly want my doctors, pilots, engineers, nurses, researchers etc to know their basic foundational skills. In addition, schools need to see the whole range of changes to all subjects - science is proposed to be non-Examination. If there are some examination subjects still then this will impact on the length of time students are in school. I also object strongly to the mode of external assessment as portfolios are very subjective, have a huge teacher and Student workload and assess very similar skills to that in the social sciences. Science has a point of difference to social science, students who like that assessment style and enjoy research, debate etc will take history and English! Give our scientists what they like - they like the black and white nature of science and they like to "know stuff".	See above. While the idea of different assessment styles might seem appealing, in our experience lower ability students or those that struggle are not engaged by this assessment mode. The content of science is necessary, even to be able to research and understand and write "socio-science" style answers. Why are history and geography kept and the sciences not? So there would be three social sciences and only 1 science, all of which, under this new idea would have similar ways of thinking and assessing? This will simply benefit the same types of kids.	Chemistry, physics, biology.	No			2020-02-26 18:45:21	ANON-YFPW-RBR3-Y	2020-02-26 18:45:21	2020-02-26 18:45:37
Yes		Strongly disagree		Science cannot be squashed into one nature of science strand. Without content knowledge, students can not make informed decisions and evaluate situations while still building a foundation for specialising at Level 2.		No			2020-02-26 18:56:48	ANON-YFPW-RBR2-X	2020-02-26 18:56:48	2020-02-26 18:56:54
Yes		Strongly disagree	Putting together Physical Education and Health is a terrible idea. In today's world where the Health industry is one of the fastest growing careers and we have so many issues in the health area particularly around mental health we need to be able to teach these concepts before they get to Level 2 and specialise.			Yes			2020-02-26 19:16:26	ANON-YFPW-RBRU-1	2020-02-26 19:16:26	2020-02-26 19:16:39
Yes		Strongly disagree		The single science subjects at Level 1 should be kept along with their standards. While I fully support the introduction of the NOS achievement standards this should not be at the expense of the core skills that young scientists must be able to learn and be tested on.		No			2020-02-26 19:44:58	ANON-YFPW-RBGY-T	2020-02-26 19:44:58	2020-02-26 19:45:02
Yes	Yes -but not at the expense of gutting the L1 science programmes offered by NZ schools	Strongly disagree	L1 Science Compressing. five well developed curriculum areas/subjects with 33 possible standards to one with 4 standards is completely unacceptable.	L1 Science Compressing. five well developed curriculum areas/subjects with 33 possible standards to one with 4 standards is completely unacceptable. * Removes choice for school to develop programmes that best meets the needs of their students. * Limits the scope of the subject to a narrow area of the curriculum that many experts believe, while important and essential to teach, should not be assessed.	No	Yes	No		2020-02-26 20:14:27	ANON-YFPW-RBGV-Q	2020-02-26 20:14:27	2020-02-26 20:14:49
Yes	I've heard teachers at school talking about proposed changes	Strongly disagree	All these proposed changes effectively dumb down NCEA level one and degrade it as a qualification, students who struggle at level 2 will be leaving school with a nothing qualification and less knowledge than ever before	The sciences should not be combined, as they are the subject where the most general knowledge of the subject is required for long term success, these changes will reduce engagement in sciences and are counter productive to education. In general I believe there should be stronger focus on history as school is where students form their world view, combining it with other subject further limits the learning student can do in this area	No	No			2020-02-26 20:14:31	ANON-YFPW-RBGC-4	2020-02-26 20:14:31	2020-02-26 20:14:50
Yes		Strongly disagree	Subjects too broad force students to 'endure' content they don't really want to do. Mimics Year 10 which is struggle enough. Level 1 specific Sciences and Commerce subjects allow students to focus on aspects based on their own skills and interests.	I do not think Sciences and Commerce subjects should be combined as subjects. I think certain courses should be able to choose to include the standards from other subjects but that the subjects should remain separate. It feels like a cost-cutting measure to reduce the load of the changes.	Yes - Philosophy, Political Science	No	No		2020-02-26 20:32:47	ANON-YFPW-RBGS-M	2020-02-26 20:32:47	2020-02-26 20:32:56
No		Strongly disagree		I believe that latin as a subject should be included in level one, and it should be made more available to other schools.		Yes			2020-02-26 20:51:06	ANON-YFPW-RBG8-S	2020-02-26 20:51:06	2020-02-26 20:51:24
No		Agree				No			2020-02-26 20:56:11	ANON-YFPW-RBG9-T	2020-02-26 20:56:11	2020-02-26 20:56:32

Yes		Strongly disagree	It's a disgrace that you're removing Latin.	Latin is a language that has many broad applications. It is hugely beneficial and helps develop problem solving skills, determination, and an eye for detail. Out of all my NCEA subjects, it is the one I find most rewarding, most applicable to my life, and that I believe will set me up best for my future. NZQA has a duty to expand the options of Kiwi students, not diminish them. Getting rid of Latin would be a sore blow indeed.		No			2020-02-26 20:58:25	ANON-YFPW-RBGG-8	2020-02-26 20:58:25	2020-02-26 20:58:33
Yes		Undecided	I question if removing generic technology will make a disconnect between the Technology curriculum, and 'Technology Subjects' at NCEA. I believe it could segregate the specialist areas in Technology, after years of trying to get cross curricular Technology projects going, which are more representative of the world of work. Why keep Home Economics [very old fashioned]. It should be replaced with Food Technology.	Food Science is too narrow to express what Food Technology involves. Food Science is actually 'technological knowledge' and as such is used to develop food products. I think it should be called Food Technology - the 8 achievement objectives allow for all the knowledge and contexts that are covered in Home Economics. 'Home Economics' is so dated in name, and Food Science is just too narrow in name. All specialist areas within Technology have their own specialist knowledge, but we are also so much broader in practice than just that, and 'Food Science' just does not reflect that. The resistance comes from 'Home Economics' teachers that continue to refuse to accept they are a Technology area.		No			2020-02-26 21:02:24	ANON-YFPW-RBGJ-B	2020-02-26 21:02:24	2020-02-26 21:02:31
Yes		Agree	Agree somewhat but not in its entirety.	Although there is clear indications that some of the subjects that have been removed could be studied under another set or combination of achievement standards, such as using Classical Studies/ Latin society aspects within History or Social Studies there is little likelihood that there will be an opportunity to assess the learning that can be offered in the area of Psychology as it has little overlap with other Social Sciences. Beyond the unique nature of Psychology, it is a subject that offers students an incredibly broad understanding of human behaviour, challenges them to view perspectives differently, and gives them skills to critically evaluate information they are presented with both in and out of the classroom. Concepts covered in Psychology are unlikely to be taught in other areas; however, the learning they take from Psychology can be applied to a range of other Learning Areas to deepen their contextual understanding and develops essential skills that are valuable across the board. Furthermore, student numbers are increasing across all three levels since UE came in early 2019 at a rate that is hard to ignore. Association	Not at this stage.	Yes	No; however, please note how te ao Māori underpins the learning within Psychology. At level 1 there is currently a standard that specifically examines the ethics in an NZ context. High quality responses are generated from students that indicate high engagement with te tiriti as a historical and contemporary keystone.		2020-02-26 21:06:04	ANON-YFPW-RBGG-J	2020-02-26 21:06:04	2020-02-26 21:06:31
Yes		Strongly disagree	L1 Chem consists of the following standards AS90930 (27370), AS90931 (1521), AS90932 (3171), AS90933 (1380), AS90934 (2738), AS90944 (30796) AS90945 (3182), AS90946 (7373), AS90947(10245) Total 87776. The numbers in brackets represent the number of students entered into these standards. Although there are only about 500 students who take a full L1 Chemistry course there are about 6000 students who take at least one of the external Chemistry standards. Also most schools are able to provide key CONCEPTUAL knowledge based general science courses because there is the ability to mix and match standards from different domains as well as the 3 science externals. 2. Even allowing for one "unpopular" external, on average about 2000 students currently take at least one of the L1 Chemistry externals. This compares to about 1500 taking L1 Dance and more importantly the approx 7000 students taking L3 Chemistry - which means over a third of students currently taking senior Chem have undertaken at least one L1Chem standard as preparation. These numbers are larger than other subject areas that have remained distinct eg History and	Suggested improvements: These could be called Physical and Natural Sciences and would still only have 4 standards each so wouldn't break MoE guidelines. The first would have 1 external and 1 internal for Physics conceptual understanding and the same for Chemistry. The latter subject would have the same arrangement for Biology and ESS. With this compromise MoE could still rightly claim a reduction in the number of Science subjects but now more in line with the minor changes to other curriculum areas and it would definitely reduce the overall number of science standards hugely. Some schools would be able to offer a course based on all or majority NOS standards while others might select a range of three conceptual understanding standards plus one NOS. This would allow those schools that do not yet feel ready to launch fully into a totally NOS based course to get a feel for them, develop the skills and resources necessary to implement them gradually over a period of time. Win-win!		No			2020-02-26 21:06:07	ANON-YFPW-RBGE-6	2020-02-26 21:06:07	2020-02-26 21:06:42
No		Undecided		Latin is an excellent subject and should be included. It helps develop problem solving as well as being an impressive skill for employers		No			2020-02-26 21:20:05	ANON-YFPW-RBG5-P	2020-02-26 21:20:05	2020-02-26 21:20:14

Yes		Strongly disagree	Materials Technology is about the development of materials. Schools do not 'develop' materials but 'use' materials in Manufacturing. The exponential growth of 'materials technology' as in the development of new composites, molecular innovation, and science led materials development, sets this subject name up for confusion and ambiguity. "MATERIALS TECHNOLOGY" is NOT an acceptable future proof subject name	Materials Technology is about the development of materials. Schools do not 'develop' materials but 'use' materials in Manufacturing. The exponential growth of 'materials technology' as in the development of new composites, molecular innovation, and science led materials development, sets this subject name up for confusion and ambiguity. "MATERIALS TECHNOLOGY" is NOT an acceptable future proof subject name		Yes				2020-02-26 21:27:03	ANON-YFPW-RBGP-H	2020-02-26 21:27:03	2020-02-26 21:28:11
Yes		Strongly disagree		Science should not all be one subject, there is so much to each individual science that and it would not be possible to create a good foundation for future sciences. Do not get rid of Latin and classics! They are incredibly valuable and rich subjects and it would be such a tragedy for all future students to lose the opportunity to study them.		No				2020-02-26 21:31:29	ANON-YFPW-RBGP-R	2020-02-26 21:31:29	2020-02-26 21:31:40
No		Strongly disagree	Why if we are in a student agency/led time are we cutting subjects and limiting their choice? While students are faced at a very early age of what subjects to take (most don't continue in at Uni, and have grandeur beliefs) surely instead of tunnelling their opportunities, we should be giving them more of a chance to experience something they may not have experienced. Let the language student engage in other languages, let the Science student realise that Art History and Classics are analytical if you take that tact. Look at Sport NZ's proposal, "...which include encouraging young people to play multiple sports rather than specialising early, and an emphasis on fun and development over winning, also continue to be driven by Sport NZ and the five sports." Why if sport is seeing a decline in numbers and kids not being active, are trying to do the same in Education?	You are abolishing L1 Classics. While you have placed an asterisk next to Classics under history the wording of "Classical Studies only supported as possible contexts within history to a low degree." shows a real disregard to our subject. How does a subject that looks at art/architecture, literature, critical response to ancient sources, expressing and arguing points of view not fit into your criteria of " a broader, foundational NCEA Level 1 with increasing specialisation at Levels 2 and 3." And Classics is clearly a rich learning subject with the fact our whole Western Civilisation is built upon what the Ancient Greek and Romans gave to us. For the fact you are abolishing Latin when you have medicine, and law that use terminology still is very short sighted in itself. Maybe your parents didn't allow you to do an Arts degree because it was beneath you, but in your papers you had Medicine, Law, Political Scientists sitting in your Ancient History papers because of their beginnings. Is this how you are going to fix the teacher shortage, by taking away subjects thus taking away jobs? Classics allows the freedom students to explore the ancient world and see how in our modern world it is seen. Many of our buildings are using the Corinthian Columns, while we have modified our democracy to be better than the Greeks, at least we had the Greek	Why are we trying to change something that is not broken? NCEA is great for our Maori and Pasifika students. For the lower ability students that struggle in the end of year external setting. Bank up credits to make sure you are achieving. While Exams are important and Academic achievement is needed, NCEA is a way for students to learn how to deal with stress, time management, and realize that if they don't do the work, they won't get the results. Don't change anything.	No		For the fact this is a review, and something that many teachers are going to be commenting on, surely you proof-readers in your department? While it is obvious question 6 should read "if you answered 'yes' to Question 5, do you have any feedback on the subjects that are under development for Te Marautanga o Aotearoa?" I do applaud the effort to incorporate Maori heritage into the education world. For too long has education not allowed Maori to flourish, and it needs to. There is more to Maori and NZ history than just signing the damn treaty. The Maori were well established before the arrival of the British, and there issues that need to be looked at afterwards. Oh wait are not talking about the Ancient world, and how	2020-02-26 21:42:39	ANON-YFPW-RBGP-7	2020-02-26 21:42:39	2020-02-26 21:42:49	
No		Disagree	- Latin should not be removed as a subject - Because Latin is not taught as a spoken language, it is taught in a way that students can learn grammar, and linguistics which greatly influences their understanding of other languages. - In general there is no point in removing languages from subject lists at level 1. Languages should have uninterrupted attention throughout education. It simply undermines students' ability to learn later on. - While subjects such as STEM sciences and commerce may benefit from generalisation, the value of things social sciences is likely to be undermined if generalised. The option of classical studies should be kept separate: its value is in in-depth learning and analysis. While sciences when specialised tends to silo itself, the arts does the opposite: specificity in the arts leads to being able to make more connections between fields. - The ministry should address this in the context of the continual and general underfunding and devaluing of the arts in favour of STEM subjects.	I think it is a great idea that Māori performing arts is included as a subject, as it speaks to the value of this in our society. I think it is a shame that Latin and classical studies are not included, since this is symptomatic of a general decline in the arts. Some specific points which I can add are that Latin and Classical studies can offer for many queer students the first glimpse or validation of non heterosexual sexualities; and Latin contains knowledge about linguistics and grammar which is retained better than learning other languages, where linguistic structural knowledge is not retained as much. This forms a very strong foundation for all linguistics and language studies at higher levels. In short, the lack of Latin as a subject has a wide flow on effect on further education, more so than other social sciences.		No				2020-02-26 22:11:51	ANON-YFPW-RBGP1-J	2020-02-26 22:08:22	2020-02-26 22:12:11
No		Strongly disagree		Latin should not be excluded. This decision would severely limit the amount of students taking Latin to a tertiary level in New Zealand. Learning Latin provides skills far beyond the language itself. It allows for ease when learning the Romance languages, which are some of the most spoken languages worldwide. It also provides problem-solving skills that are essential in many career areas.	Latin	No		No		2020-02-26 22:36:37	ANON-YFPW-RBGP1-9	2020-02-26 22:36:37	2020-02-26 22:36:42

Yes	A broad foundation, in my view, requires access to the foundations of western civilisation, and in particular to the Greek and Roman world from which the west is largely derived. Accordingly, I view the proposed removal of Classics and Latin as working against the intent of the proposed changes, and think those proposals should not proceed. That is, students should continue to have access to Classics and Latin, so that they can gain an understanding of the origins and underpinnings of their civilisation.	Strongly disagree	The proposed deletion of Latin and Classics would, in my view, destroy a vital aspect of our education system by depriving pupils of the right to learn where and how civilisation originated and how the foundations of our systems of politics, mathematics, philosophy, medicine, engineering, law and so many, many other things were laid. If we lose these things, I fear we will eventually lose civilisation itself. I also oppose the consolidation of Physics and Chemistry into Science. I believe there is a need for intellectually demanding subjects, subjects that most pupils find challenging, and only a few can excel at. STEM subjects are particularly well suited to providing such opportunities for exceptional intellects to demonstrate their capabilities, and we should shun this proposal to dumb down our curriculum yet further.	As above, Latin and Classics provide an entry into the foundations and origins of our civilisation, and so are necessary for anyone who is to understand today's society fully. So, for example, anyone who might wish to enter politics or aspire to a high place in public office should, in my view, have a good knowledge of classical civilisation. Removing it from the curriculum would greatly degrade our polity over time, and I find the suggestion we do so obnoxious and offensive.	Ideally, it would be good to reintroduce (classical) Greek language - I grieve that our society has lost so much of its classical heritage, and would look to reverse those losses. (I also recognise that the decline of the west has progressed to the point where this is probably beyond salvage - but it doesn't hurt to dream.)	No	I regard myself as a citizen of the west, rather than of New Zealand specifically, and I consider nationalism to be more harmful than beneficial. Thus, I consider efforts to foster "national identity" as fostering division and discord among the nations. Accordingly, while I'm happy for Maori to be available to all, I don't see it as hugely desirable.	I suspect you meant "yes to question 5", since (a) Question 4 does not have a y/n option, and (b) Question 5 relates to Te Marautanga o Aotearoa, as does this question, while Q 4 does not. Such an obvious error makes me think this survey was never piloted, which makes me think the whole exercise is not being taken very seriously, and is probably essentially just a sham just so the ministry can claim that consultation occurred.	2020-02-26 22:48:47	ANON-YFPW-RBGB-3	2020-02-26 22:48:47	2020-02-26 22:49:04
Yes		Strongly disagree		Please don't drop Latin. It's a fundamental world language, and New Zealanders need to know it. Investing in Latin widens vocabulary, logic, and English-language (and other language) skills. We need, more than ever, scholars in 21st century dedicated to pursuing Latin rigorously to preserve ancient manuscripts and new scholarship. The language that united Europe for centuries is at least as important to this country as English, not to mention French or German. Thank you.		No			2020-02-26 22:56:49	ANON-YFPW-RBGM-E	2020-02-26 22:56:49	2020-02-26 22:56:59
Yes		Agree		Think commerce should have a greater focus on marketing and draw more from business studies vs. accounting and economics	Marketing, incorporating digital marketing, health sciences, more link to Uni subjects	No			2020-02-26 23:16:43	ANON-YFPW-RBGD-5	2020-02-26 23:16:43	2020-02-26 23:16:51
Yes		Agree				No			2020-02-26 23:40:19	ANON-YFPW-RBGX-5	2020-02-26 23:39:47	2020-02-26 23:40:45
Yes		Strongly disagree		Getting rid of Latin is a huge mistake. Latin is used in fields such as law and medicine, and having that background is extremely helpful. Cutting Classical Studies is a mistake as well, since there is so much content that cannot be fit into a simple history course.		No			2020-02-27 04:34:05	ANON-YFPW-RBGA-2	2020-02-27 04:34:05	2020-02-27 04:34:14
No		Strongly disagree	Please see my comments below.	The removal of Latin from student's available curriculum is not only a break from traditional scholastic curricula, but is a change with far broader repercussions than simply the loss of language-learning availability. Latin has been used throughout history as a language of learned members of society, and is a medium through which many texts are solely available. Learning Latin promotes critical thinking, language analysis, and invites students to the plethora of texts and characters in history, ranging from the Classical Roman Period to the Early Modern. Please do consider that today, more than ever, critical thinking and language analysis, and the inspiration of history are sorely needed in our educational systems.	Personally, I found my course in Logic to be an excellent addition to my studies.	No			2020-02-27 05:05:12	ANON-YFPW-RBGN-F	2020-02-27 05:05:12	2020-02-27 05:05:30
No		Strongly disagree	- Cutting the sciences on the basis that it will be more accessible to students is patronizing and almost insulting to both the quality of NZ students and the ability of their teachers. -If student engagement is the issue, support teachers to develop new programs to teach these subjects. - In a society facing climate change issues and the threat of false misleading information, we need scientific literacy more than ever, especially in the younger generation.	Collapsing the sciences to two subjects, (with the specialized agricultural subject implying that 'science' will be completely general) risks dumbing down the curriculum at a time when we need scientific literacy the most. This won't prepare students to take these subjects at higher levels and sends a bad message about how important they are.		No			2020-02-27 06:13:32	ANON-YFPW-RBGK-C	2020-02-27 06:03:42	2020-02-27 06:14:00
No		Strongly disagree	I believe that offering students a classical language like Latin allows them unique access to historical societies and perspectives. I would even go so far as to recommend that other classical languages like Sanskrit and Classical Chinese could be offered in tandem to increase the scope of these historical perspectives.	Please refer to my response above, comment field where I elaborate on my reasoning for opposing the removal of Latin and classical languages as an option for study.	Other classical languages	No			2020-02-27 06:24:30	ANON-YFPW-RBG6-Q	2020-02-27 06:24:30	2020-02-27 06:24:39

Yes		Disagree	Although Health and Physical Education sit under the same umbrella for the Learning area in our curriculum, and can be combined in a well integrated program, I worry for those students who would choose not to take Level 1 PE/Health if that was the only option for them (as opposed to just Health, which is where there interest lies). I have been teaching Level 1 Health since about 2005 and 2/3 of my students each year would be unwilling to have chosen the subject if it was integrated with Physical Education (as they did not enjoy having the practical lessons in Year 9 and 10). However, many of them still wish to learn the subject content. I strongly believe the two subjects should be kept separate for our students who wish to learn in a Health context but not wish to do PE.	same as above Level 1 PE and Health should be kept separate or we will lose enrolments from students who do not wish to participate in practical sessions for PE. There are ways around this, if they must be integrated (running semestered modules, etc), however I don't believe it will allow for such a robust Health program. More like "PE with a side of Health."		No			2020-02-27 07:18:19	ANON-YFPW-RBGW-R	2020-02-27 07:18:19	2020-02-27 07:18:32
Yes		Strongly disagree		Keep current subjects and think about how to lift the teaching quality, don't waste time and money on this kind of changes with no gain but loss	Absolutely no	Yes		Strongly oppose the changes on Science and Commerce subjects	2020-02-27 07:41:36	ANON-YFPW-RBG4-N	2020-02-27 07:41:36	2020-02-27 07:41:47
Yes		Undecided				No			2020-02-27 08:06:19	ANON-YFPW-RBG3-M	2020-02-27 08:06:19	2020-02-27 08:06:31
No	I'm British.	Agree	Technology seems improved - better than the UK's GCSE. Latin is disappointing.	Latin should continue to be taught. It gives students direct access to the majority of Western source texts for the last 2500 years. It teaches analytical skills that can be applied in any subject, benefitting the student. It is the root of the most widely spoken languages in the world, allowing all Romance languages to be understood at a basic level with only a knowledge of Latin and the sound changes. It is also the root of a good 50% of English's vocabulary, and allows words to be understood without the use of a dictionary. It opens up a pathway into linguistics, classics, law, medicine.	Greek may be suitable for level 2. The ministry could also consider Sanskrit or Classical Chinese, although these are less traditional in Europe and have less relevance to New Zealand.	No			2020-02-27 08:24:34	ANON-YFPW-RBG2-K	2020-02-27 08:24:34	2020-02-27 08:24:47
Yes		Agree				No			2020-02-27 08:26:38	ANON-YFPW-RBGU-P	2020-02-27 08:26:38	2020-02-27 08:26:53
No		Undecided			Mixed media art option for an external folio submission at level 2 and 3 having the option not to submit in one discipline.	No			2020-02-27 08:58:12	ANON-YFPW-RBTY-7	2020-02-27 08:58:12	2020-02-27 08:58:20
Yes	This seems to me the right approach, opening the curriculum to developing more rounded citizens enabled to study with passion the things that excite them.	Strongly agree		The generalization in the foundations of science might be less useful as some students, will at an early age, already have a propensity in interest in particular fields of scientific study.	Mechatronics a fusion of science, technology and mathematics could be a useful focus for senior courses, with a view to future 21st century industrial development.	No			2020-02-27 09:09:17	ANON-YFPW-RBTV-4	2020-02-27 09:09:17	2020-02-27 09:09:34
Yes		Agree	Food science I believe is a good addition to the Health and PE program, there have been times where we wanted to cover healthy food and nutrition practically but the opportunity wasn't there. But this also means a lot of extra theory which will be specified to the science of food rather than just the general nutritional requirements and sports nutrition.	Eager to know more - what each subject will actually look like! Need to get the ball rolling a lot quicker if this is to roll out in 2021. HOLAs, HoDs and teaching staff will have hours of planning to do and resources to make.	Sports Science Sport Technologies Work Experience within the industry	Yes			2020-02-27 09:10:37	ANON-YFPW-RBTC-H	2020-02-27 09:10:37	2020-02-27 09:10:59
No		Agree				No			2020-02-27 09:20:58	ANON-YFPW-RBTS-1	2020-02-27 09:20:58	2020-02-27 09:21:07
Yes		Undecided	I agree with most of the changes above, but disagree with the removal of Latin at level 1. This closes off a pathway for those students who are taking that subject - it's not a subject that can be incorporated into other subjects or that can be picked up at a later stage.	I strongly disagree with the removal of Latin at level 1. I did Latin at school and found the teachers more knowledgeable and competent than many of the teachers in other subjects. Taking Latin helped me learn other languages and helped me understand English grammar (none of my English teachers understood or could teach English grammar). It's a valuable subject and should not be thrown away.	Please keep Latin.	No			2020-02-27 09:35:49	ANON-YFPW-RBTB-6	2020-02-27 09:35:49	2020-02-27 09:36:21
No		Disagree	The requirements for university are that courses have 20 credits to qualify for UE. This type of banding together of subjects will weaken the learning in specialised areas and not prepare students for the rigour of further study.	Media studies is a whole discipline at university. While it could be banded together with English then schools could offer a variety of English courses to suit different learning styles. I can not see the link to Social Studies or how it would strengthen the learning. Media Studies is counted as English as Massey University and others.	Media Studies and Performing Arts Technologies.	Yes	None.		2020-02-27 09:37:05	ANON-YFPW-RBT9-7	2020-02-27 09:37:05	2020-02-27 09:37:16
No		Undecided		NCEA is a mystery to me as a parent, this year my son is doing NCEA level 1, how he achieves these I do not know what or how he will do this. NCEA is still confusing to me as a parent.	Some of the courses offered are they important in the real world??	No			2020-02-27 09:37:17	ANON-YFPW-RBTG-N	2020-02-27 09:37:17	2020-02-27 09:37:36
Yes		Strongly disagree	Very less emphasis on Economics and Financial Literacy.	Very less emphasis on Financial Literacy. How come Geography is taught as a stand alone subject. In my opinion Economics should be offered as a stand alone subject combined with Financial Literacy, Geography, History, Classical Studies and Social Science should be combined as a stand alone subject.		No			2020-02-27 09:56:45	ANON-YFPW-RBTJ-R	2020-02-27 09:56:45	2020-02-27 09:56:59
No		Disagree		I do not like Art History being deleted. I think it is very important cultural knowledge. Likewise Economics is very important and should remain an option at level 1. Finally the collapse of all the science subjects into one common general science will leave too many gaps in students' knowledge when they enter level 2 and 3.		No			2020-02-27 10:04:38	ANON-YFPW-RBTQ-Y	2020-02-27 10:04:38	2020-02-27 10:04:50

No	I knew that there were changes being talked about but not what they were. My daughter is in Year 10 so we are still a year away from NCEA but these changes will affect her	Undecided		I feel strongly that Accounting should be a separate subject in Level 1 - not just a very small part of the economics subject. They are quite different subjects in my view and should definitely be treated as such.		No			2020-02-27 10:07:53	ANON-YFPW-RBTE-K	2020-02-27 10:07:53	2020-02-27 10:08:08
Yes		Strongly agree		Looks like a good broad range to me.	No it seems broad enough	No			2020-02-27 10:08:23	ANON-YFPW-RBTS-3	2020-02-27 10:08:23	2020-02-27 10:08:39
Yes		Strongly agree	I would love it if students no longer got 40 L1 credits in one week for doing agriculture. Further, there should be strengthening of pathways towards Trades and "non-academic" careers. 85% of our students do not go to University, and the overwhelming majority of L2 and L3 courses gear to university. Students are missing out on suitable education to a prepare them for a trade/non-academic career. One of the really negative impacts on teacher numbers was doing away with degree equivalent trade certification. This should be bought back. An experienced cabinet maker with Advanced Trade Certification make far better technology teachers than a Uni-graduate.			No	I, like most teachers, and most Maori for that matter, do not speak Maori. If te reo Maori is to thrive, it must not be "forced" or "legislated" or made compulsory in any way. If Maori are not going to keep their language alive, then no legislation/compulsion will change that. All it does is produce resentment and hostility at being forced to do something.		2020-02-27 10:21:30	ANON-YFPW-RBTP-X	2020-02-27 10:21:30	2020-02-27 10:21:47
No	Keeping subjects at a more foundational level at Level 1 is a waste of time. Year 10 is already a year when foundational work can be covered. The jump in academic demand for understanding from Level 1 to 2 will become even greater than it is now. This is a dumbing down of a curriculum that already fails to demand academic excellence from students at an age where they should begin to experience much more academic rigor than they currently experience. Students are 15 -16 years of age and by combining subjects instead of providing opportunities to specialize creates the impression that most of high school is simple.	Strongly disagree	My comments relate specifically to Science. Making the Science more general in Level 1 makes no sense. It is a subject that is content rich and students should always be given the choice to explore in more depth scientific subjects. Removing the science speciality subjects and creating a general science course only will make the transition into Level 2 much more difficult than it already is. There is a distinct lack of choice in the realignment of the new proposed subjects at Level 1. I do not believe these subjects will provide the good academic foundations needed to be successful at Level 2 and 3.	It is interesting to note that in the Sciences, Agriculture and Horticultural Science is maintained as a separate discipline as there is political capital to be gained. However the other Sciences are not seen as necessary for separate disciplines despite the fact that they form the foundation for many careers for students and probably are responsible for many areas in a modern economy to function efficiently. We should be increasing the specialisation at this Level not reducing it!!!!		Yes			2020-02-27 10:33:15	ANON-YFPW-RBT7-5	2020-02-27 10:33:15	2020-02-27 10:33:32
No	I feel that teachers of specific subjects should have been approached before this information was made public. The first I heard about it was through a news story online. I am happy for level 1 to be broad, to have less assessment etc. but what this looks like in each school should be up to the school.	Strongly disagree	I do not believe that the Ministry of Education has thoroughly thought through the implications of the removal and merging of the subjects they have suggested. Certain subjects in schools are already seen as being less importance or value than others such as languages or social sciences and by making the changes that the Ministry has proposed this will continue to be the case rather than actually providing the broad foundation they have suggested.	The removal of specialised science at year 11 and the move to more generic standards on the nature of science will see students struggle to work at the level required NCEA level 2. I also see a similar issue with this with the merging of Business Studies, Economics and Accounting, Psychology, Media Studies and Social Studies are also 3 very different subjects. The only skills that cross over here really are report or essay writing but even those differ from one another. I do not understand how you cannot see Classical Studies and Latin as subjects that are broad and that help students with careers later in life. Classics at its very definition is a broad foundation subject. Although this subject may be somewhat narrow in its context, its content is extremely broad covering history, religion, philosophy, art, architecture, literature, drama and archaeology. The skills taught in this subject far outweigh those taught in other subject areas. These two subjects are literally the definition of foundation of western literature, language and education. These changes not only affect the level to which these courses can be taught at level 2 and 3 but also what they might look like at university level and beyond. Essentially we will see a dumbing		No			2020-02-27 10:39:03	ANON-YFPW-RBTF-M	2020-02-27 10:39:03	2020-02-27 10:39:17
Yes		Agree	It is kind of hard to comment without knowing what, for example, Social Studies will include as assessment standards.	Good to see Music in there, it is really hard to teach this at years 12 and 13 without the support of a good Level 1 course.		Yes			2020-02-27 10:39:59	ANON-YFPW-RBT1-Y	2020-02-27 10:39:59	2020-02-27 10:40:10

No	I was not aware that some subjects were going to be merged, ie, effectively removed from curriculum.	Disagree		I disagree on the combining of art history, history, and classics. I disagree on the joining of media studies, social studies, and psychology. It devalues subject area expertise. It minimizes those students who do wish to specialize and forces them into courses they wouldn't choose otherwise. It means that some teachers will just choose to not teach classics in history or media studies in social studies and then these subjects will lose out and students interested in them will also lose out. It minimises what they can expect to move into at university. Having lots of different subjects is much more like real life and preparing them for the real world.	NZSL	No				2020-02-27 10:44:40	ANON-YFPW-RBTH-P	2020-02-27 10:44:40	2020-02-27 10:44:48
Yes		Strongly disagree	I can only comment on the commerce part. Accounting, economics and Business can not be combined. Accounting and Economics need Level 1 as a foundation for their specific pathways.	Keep it as it is.		No				2020-02-27 10:44:31	ANON-YFPW-RBTZ-8	2020-02-27 10:44:31	2020-02-27 10:44:54
Yes		Disagree		All general and broad learning should be taking place during the primary years, with the main focus on Reading, Writing and Maths. We should be encouraging interest in the world around us. With extra fun learning experiences such as science, history, geography and culture (including languages). I have found from my experience having a child attend an international school and starting Year 8 in NZ. That it took 3 years to catch up with the concepts she had been working on in an International School. Instead of going to High School to embrace new and exciting learning possibilities. They built rockets using baking powder, something you can safely teach children at a much younger age. Our children need to be encouraged to be global thinkers. Our world and the universe around them is at their fingertips. By the time students get to NCEA they should be ready for more specialised learning.	I believe that there should be an option for students to do NCEA level 1 course in Level 2 and Level3. So if they change their minds about doing sciences or accounting subjects, they have an option to include them into their learning programme in Level 2 and 3.	No				2020-02-27 10:44:50	ANON-YFPW-RBTH-G	2020-02-27 10:44:50	2020-02-27 10:45:17
Yes		Disagree	Yes it will provide a boarder foundation for level 2, but it will also won't be specific/detailed enough for the average/higher achieving students. As a teacher, combining some subjects doesn't allow you to get into any detail on things. Brushing over the top of things doesn't give much sense of achievement. NCEA has already watered down education enough compared with NCEA, changes like this will only continue this process.	The new commerce, social studies and science in Level one will be way too broad. See comments above.	No	Yes		No		2020-02-27 11:16:46	ANON-YFPW-RBTM-U	2020-02-27 11:16:46	2020-02-27 11:16:56
No		Strongly disagree				No				2020-02-27 11:22:20	ANON-YFPW-RBTD-J	2020-02-27 11:22:20	2020-02-27 11:22:35
Yes		Strongly disagree				No				2020-02-27 11:23:30	ANON-YFPW-RBTX-6	2020-02-27 11:23:30	2020-02-27 11:23:44
No		Strongly disagree		Latin and Classical Studies are a crucial part of the secondary school curriculum and provide opportunities for personal and academic growth utterly unique in the curriculum. Latin is also one of the cheapest subjects to teach, in my understanding.		No				2020-02-27 11:24:06	ANON-YFPW-RBTA-F	2020-02-27 11:24:06	2020-02-27 11:24:13
Yes		Strongly disagree		I am particularly worried by the proposed axing of Latin. New Zealand has loomed large in classical scholarship in the second half of the twentieth century, and I worry that depriving young people in New Zealand of the opportunity to learn about such an important part of their heritage would divorce them from it and irreparably damage learning in New Zealand. The proposed removal of art history is also worrying for the same reason, and I am concerned that cramming five science subjects into one will leave young New Zealanders with a shallow understanding of the natural sciences.		No				2020-02-27 11:27:56	ANON-YFPW-RBTK-5	2020-02-27 11:27:56	2020-02-27 11:28:05
No	This is a poorly designed question that asserts explicitly that the proposed changes would support greater specialization, when this is not at all evident from the proposal.	Strongly disagree	Art History, Latin and Classical Studies abolished or minimized. This isn't educational reform. It is a hit list aimed at the Liberal Arts.	Art History, Latin and Classical Studies are foundational subjects for a liberal education. It is astonishing that a language and cultural area with such deep roots and manifest impact on New Zealand should be systematically excluded. The presentist bias of the proposed changes is alarming.		No				2020-02-27 11:32:53	ANON-YFPW-RBT6-4	2020-02-27 11:32:53	2020-02-27 11:33:15
Yes		Disagree	Food Science is not a great option. If you want to rename Home Economics, Food and Nutrition allows for a wider range of topics to covered, including Food Science. By naming it Food Science you are limiting the topic options, and you will also 'turn students off' from the subject who are not inclined to want to learn about the science aspects.	As above.	This is where Food Science should be a subject. It definitely has a place in the curriculum, but it should be at more senior levels.	No				2020-02-27 11:34:10	ANON-YFPW-RBTZ-2	2020-02-27 11:34:10	2020-02-27 11:34:21

Yes		Strongly disagree	The abolition of Latin and the downgrading of Classical Studies as subjects of study would be a great loss to NZ education, and a step backwards from a vision that sees NZ as an outward looking, interconnected international country.	Latin provides a depth of linguistic understanding which enables not only much better understanding of the depth and nuance of English, but provides fundamental structure for learning language generally. It also provides perspective and context for shared Western cultural assumptions, and a standpoint from which those assumptions can be critiqued and re-evaluated. Reducing the curriculum to what is seen as practical now only reinforces the prejudices and values currently held; the long view of history enables deeper and wider thought. Most of the skills and knowledge taught in all subjects - even those that seem the most practical - will be outdated and obsolete in a few decades' time: what will remain are the habits of thoughts and the intellectual maturity developed. Latin and Classical studies are both excellent ways of building these skills.	No			2020-02-27 11:36:27	ANON-YFPW-RBTW-5	2020-02-27 11:36:27	2020-02-27 11:36:36
No		Strongly disagree	Just how much content knowledge will be lost by combining Physics, Biology and Chemistry into a single generic "science" paper?	Physics, Biology and Chemistry should remain taught as individual papers. After all, if Dance, Drama and Geography each warrant individual papers, why not these 3 topics?	No			2020-02-27 11:36:54	ANON-YFPW-RBT4-2	2020-02-27 11:36:54	2020-02-27 11:37:04
Yes		Disagree		While I support the broad thrust of these changes, I think that it would be a mistake to remove Latin from the list of languages offered through NCEA. I'm writing this as an historian - but not a classicist - at the University of Auckland. Part of my job is to edit and translate Latin texts from the Early Modern period (16th-17th century). I first started learning Latin at high school in Dunedin in 1979, and continued to study it for another eight years, three of them at the University of Otago. This training in Latin was my route to a PhD scholarship in Scotland, then eight years lecturing in Aberdeen, and finally my present position back in New Zealand. In my experience it's far easier to pick up a language earlier in life. I've learned other languages throughout my life, and I've helped my graduate students pick them up. But, except in rare cases, I've never seen students who start Latin at university develop that intuitive sense of the language that you get if you start at school. I know a counter-argument to this is that we no longer offer Greek via the national curriculum. But the truth is that, unlike Greek, Latin was the language of most international communication in	No	Not a NCEA level, though my colleagues and I are working to incorporate mātauranga Māori into our undergraduate teaching at the University of Auckland.		2020-02-27 11:39:08	ANON-YFPW-RBT2-2	2020-02-27 11:39:08	2020-02-27 11:39:19
No		Strongly disagree		The abolition of Latin and the downgrading of Art History and Classical Studies is an unwise move which narrows student choice and restricts access to these valuable subjects. They should be maintained so that students who wish to benefit from them can do so. The humanities are important, and so is the study of the past; it is of concern that the latter should especially be targeted in the proposed reform.	No			2020-02-27 11:43:09	ANON-YFPW-RBT3-1	2020-02-27 11:43:09	2020-02-27 11:43:20
No		Strongly disagree		Latin needs to be included as its own subject.	No			2020-02-27 11:49:43	ANON-YFPW-RBT2-2	2020-02-27 11:49:43	2020-02-27 11:50:05
No		Strongly disagree		The exclusion of Latin and Classical Studies is highly regrettable and ought to be reconsidered. The notion that these subjects are elite or irrelevant has long been outdated; they are an important part of the humanities generally and have been shown to help children excel, no matter their background or prior levels of attainment. It is not progressive to cut children off from stimulating and challenging materials. Secondary school curricula should be wide, imaginative and aspirational.	No	It seems necessary and laudable.		2020-02-27 11:51:49	ANON-YFPW-RBTU-3	2020-02-27 11:51:49	2020-02-27 11:52:01
No		Strongly disagree			No			2020-02-27 11:52:47	ANON-YFPW-RB9Y-C	2020-02-27 11:52:47	2020-02-27 11:52:53
Yes	Theoretically sensible. but, NCEA L1 includes Unit Standards for many students. this is the only way that they pass. So if they can't cope with AS, what happens for the foundational education? Will we go back to US in Maths, English etc?	Undecided	again unsure because of the Unit Standards. students get credits for barbecuing, barista coffee making, Boat Masters at L2 (even though they haven't been out in a boat), etc to allow them to get NCEA L1.	I like the broadening of Technology. schools have today strong Whakairo, carving, weaving etc. They require strong hand skills that should be promoted as there will be lots of construction work in the future. A strong need for safety too.	Yes	Essential. Bi lingual students are often good at English as well.		2020-02-27 11:54:42	ANON-YFPW-RB9S-6	2020-02-27 11:54:42	2020-02-27 11:55:03

No	I am new to the NZ secondary system.	Strongly disagree	While recognising that there are many competing subjects for a limited number of slots and that NZ needs to be particularly oriented towards indigenous interests and Pacific neighbours, the proposed abolition of Classical Studies at NCEA Level 1 seems undesirable (see next answer).	Classical Studies deserves a place at this level. It comprises the study of Greek and Roman antiquity which forms the ultimate basis for European intellectual culture and hence for an important strand of Kiwi culture; for example, the structure and ideology of the former British Empire which has played such a significant role in NZ history is difficult to understand fully without some knowledge of its model in the Roman Empire. There are also important elements in modern NZ culture which depend on a knowledge of Latin literature: I myself have worked on the crucial influence of Latin poetry for the work of two of NZ's most important modern poets, James Baxter and C.K.Stead. Classical studies nowadays is also an important force for diversity and intellectual freedom, and presents children with the opportunity to scrutinise the historic injustices of earlier societies in their treatment of minority and vulnerable groups (in Rome, slaves, women, and provincial subjects) and their nationalistic exceptionalism (Rome as divinely-supported Top Nation) which have major lessons for modern NZ society. These are appropriate lessons at this crucial stage of secondary education.	The proposed abolition of Latin at these levels is in my view regrettable. Not only does the learning of this language provide a clearer window on to the lessons of Roman culture (see above); it also provides the basis for learning other Romance languages, including Portuguese and Spanish which have over 700 million speakers worldwide, including a number of important NZ trading and tourism partners in South and Central America. It is a very efficient way of delivering linguistic capacity at school stage, and NZ universities are producing a steady stream of good Latinists who can meet the demand.	No			2020-02-27 11:55:47	ANON-YFPW-RB9V-9	2020-02-27 11:52:51	2020-02-27 11:56:00
Yes	But I had no idea you would go this far. It seems too far to me.	Disagree	I think some subjects coming together like they are risks placing too much pressure on specialist subjects in Level's 2 and 3 to get students ready for Uni	I would be very disappointed to see Commerce replace specialist subjects. Also I think trying to merge all those subjects together into History is a mistake. I myself did History, Art History, and Classics as a student and they are so very different - Classics covers literature, architecture, drama, and art. I don't see how Classics can be subsumed into History when the standards currently in History wouldn't allow for any Classics contexts.		No			2020-02-27 11:57:31	ANON-YFPW-RB99-C	2020-02-27 11:57:31	2020-02-27 11:57:38
No		Strongly disagree				No			2020-02-27 11:58:42	ANON-YFPW-RB9G-T	2020-02-27 11:58:42	2020-02-27 11:58:47
No		Strongly disagree		Latin and Classics are an important part of the secondary school curriculum and should be included.	Ancient Greek.	No		A translation of Table 2 should have been provided so that non-Maori speakers could participate in answering this question.	2020-02-27 11:59:13	ANON-YFPW-RB9J-W	2020-02-27 11:59:13	2020-02-27 11:59:32
Yes	Agree with idea of broad sweep and then specialise.	Disagree	Health and PED is a poor amalgamation.	I teach a year 11 Level 1 Health class. Of the 33 students I teach 2 are co enrolled in PE. The rest are doing health only. The students in the class align differently to the sporty types who enrol for PE. 25 of my class would NOT chose a subject called Health and PE. The students I teach are interested in Social outcomes and they are interested in avoiding judgement from other students. Their motivation for choosing the subject is a result of their awareness. Combining the two subjects and narrowing the assessments available would result in an outcome that would be inequitable to the LGBTQI+ community in our school.		No			2020-02-27 11:59:44	ANON-YFPW-RB9E-R	2020-02-27 11:59:44	2020-02-27 12:00:01
No		Strongly disagree		Latin ought to be preserved	No	No			2020-02-27 12:05:15	ANON-YFPW-RB95-8	2020-02-27 12:05:15	2020-02-27 12:05:30
Yes	This will be great for those who currently find Level 1 difficult - agree that will give all students who complete Level 1 a similar foundation qualification across the board. Employers will know the standard expected, and understand those who go on to complete levels 2 and 3 have more specialized understanding.	Strongly agree	It's more important to hone the skills, rather than the content, at school! More specialized learning should come later / at university!	Still allow students who are capable of completing the higher level courses (2 and 3) to do so (this will be up to each school, but is great at challenging those students who otherwise might disengage because they are not been stimulated enough)	Sociology - essentially what is taught in social sciences, but teaching more about foundation concepts in school so there is some familiarity when undergoing this study at tertiary level	No			2020-02-27 12:12:10	ANON-YFPW-RB9P-3	2020-02-27 12:12:10	2020-02-27 12:12:14
Yes	High school should provide a general understanding in a variety of fields, and not aiming at specialisation, which is the goal of University education	Strongly disagree	The blending of different subjects will seriously harm the possibility of getting acquainted with some subjects, which will be inevitably penalized. I am thinking, in particular, of Classical Studies and Latin, whose study is central to the understanding of globalised cultural dynamics. It helps to understand how Western culture interacts with other equally important civilizations.	Classics and Latin have shaped the history and self-understanding of Western culture. They provide an insight not only in antiquity, but in the whole development of Western thought. Moreover, they are gaining a place also in Eastern education, as they provide the opportunity understand critically the analogies, differences and interaction between East and West.	Ancient Greek	No			2020-02-27 12:14:27	ANON-YFPW-RB97-A	2020-02-27 12:14:27	2020-02-27 12:14:47

No		Disagree		The proposal to drop Classical studies entirely from the curriculum risks wiping out a small but important knowledge base in New Zealand and severely damaging it's teaching at University. Though it is easy to do, it is immensely shortsighted to see it only as the study of the Mediterranean. In fact, classics is a way of studying - through the combination of languages, philosophy, history, visual arts and literature. This is such an important way of working and way of thinking. Classicists need to get better at explaining what it is that they do, but until that happens I hope that moves like this won't close the door on a long-established and important discipline.		Yes			2020-02-27 12:18:56	ANON-YFPW-RB9F-5	2020-02-27 12:18:56	2020-02-27 12:19:22
Yes		Strongly disagree		Latin has a key role for a broad education		No			2020-02-27 12:22:00	ANON-YFPW-RB91-4	2020-02-27 12:22:00	2020-02-27 12:22:33
Yes	Yes I was aware. However I dont necessarily agree with the decision.	Strongly disagree		I do not agree with removing specific science branches from Level 1. Students will struggle to cover the necessary learning to bridge the gap from year 10 to level 3, if this content is not assessed in level 1. Also students will not be able to accurately select which science branches they enjoy for level 2 without experiencing an introduction in level 1.	No	Yes	N/A		2020-02-27 11:27:54	ANON-YFPW-RB1N-V	2020-02-27 11:27:54	2020-02-27 12:40:00
No		Disagree		I strongly disagree with the move to align Health and PE into 1 course subject at Level 1. These two subjects, while similar in some learning outcomes, are fundamentally different in terms of teaching and learning contexts. Students who are engaged and drawn to Health are often not the students who are interested in PE and vice versa. Sometimes there are students who cross-over and engage in both subjects and can see how the interrelationship between them can benefit but that is a small proportion. My fear is that combining the two at Level 1 will force students to choose neither. This will have implications for schools in terms of staffing allocations, resourcing etc. It will also have implications for the students learning in terms of them not taking it at Level 1 and then trying to pick either PE or Health up at Level 2 or 3 because of career pathway choices. I am strongly opposed to this alignment at level 1.	I think Outdoor Education as a specialist subject needs further exploration. Currently a number of schools deliver it but many students opt not to take it because if often has Unit Standards attached to it rather than Achievement Standards. The inclusion of AS's in an Outdoor Education course could provide a valuable pathway for many students.	No			2020-02-27 12:41:51	ANON-YFPW-RB9Z-D	2020-02-27 12:41:51	2020-02-27 12:42:08
No	It should be "aware of"	Undecided	The value of Latin is underestimated for the deeper understanding of language structures, the significance of European history alongside indigenous cultures and the vocabulary of English.	The value of Latin is underestimated for the deeper understanding of language structures, the significance of European history alongside indigenous cultures and the vocabulary of English.		Yes			2020-02-27 12:44:13	ANON-YFPW-RB9H-U	2020-02-27 12:44:13	2020-02-27 12:44:37
Yes	I attended a public meeting about it. However I was under the impression that it was a Standards review not a CURRICULUM review - which is what it now appears to be for Home Economics eg change of name? Removal from Health and PE curriculum.? The new approach does not appear to give much depth to subjects. Will this hinder the big jump into Level 2?	Strongly disagree	There is clearly a misunderstanding of difference curriculum areas eg Technology - Processing and Home Economics are completely different contexts and different curriculum. What is the curriculum for Food Science? Who will inform teachers what this is exactly? What would be the time frame for this. Is it Home Economics with a new name - If that is the case then suggest Food and Nutrition. This is also a practical subject with great opportunities for vocational pathways and careers-large portfolio work is going to be a barrier to students as they have traditionally not managed themselves well at Y11 to do big project work. My experience is that they like smaller chunks of learning to enable success. What happens to students who move schools during a year? This could seriously impact on their achievement. These large portfolios will add to teachers workload not reduce it. (observed in Art and DVC)	There are huge concerns for our nation regarding lifestyle diseases and the cost to our country. Home Economics, food sustainability and dietary patterns has never been so needed in our society. Food studies/Food and Nutrition?Home Economics should be compulsory for every student and not watered down with a combined Food processing and Food Science. Parents are not teaching these vital skills.		No			2020-02-27 13:09:56	ANON-YFPW-RB9X-B	2020-02-27 13:09:56	2020-02-27 13:10:10
No		Strongly disagree				No			2020-02-27 13:10:00	ANON-YFPW-RB9A-M	2020-02-27 13:10:00	2020-02-27 13:10:20
Yes		Strongly disagree				Yes			2020-02-27 13:10:32	ANON-YFPW-RB9N-1	2020-02-27 13:10:32	2020-02-27 13:10:51
No	Isn't that what the first two years of high school are for? The longer students spend on broad, general education, the less time there is for specialised education and, accordingly, the lower the standard that will be achieved in specialised topics in levels 2 & 3. In turn, NZ graduates will be less competitive for positions at Universities overseas and Universities in NZ will have to lower the levels of achievement that they expect - making them less competitive institutions on the global stage.	Disagree		I'm pretty disappointed at the elimination of Latin, Classical Studies, and Art History. With Latin in particular, the elimination of the subject at year one will have knock-on effects on the level of achievement possible at levels 2 & 3. Granted, it is a niche subject, but it is a very important niche for some students and it is a part of NZ's heritage. I am also incredulous at the folding together of all the science subjects, while all these 'technologies' remain separated out.	Civics; Philosophy; Bahasa	No	You mean "to question 5".		2020-02-27 13:17:29	ANON-YFPW-RB9K-X	2020-02-27 13:17:29	2020-02-27 13:17:42

Yes		Strongly disagree	<p>Level 1 Changes to Physical Education and Health</p> <p>I strongly disagree with the proposed changes to level 1.</p> <p>14. For some subjects, a merger or reorganisation at NCEA level 1 may be carried on later levels if the new subject is found to improve teaching and learning outcomes.</p> <p>How does the watering down or merging equal improved learning outcomes? I believe that pupils need more time in a subject area not less. In terms of a merger it also means that you have to get through a combination of disciplines that are now mixed rather than separate. This also means that rather than have full option lines for a year for one discipline that there will be one option line for two disciplines combined. Where is it logical that learning outcomes will be increased with half the time in a combination that students don't even want?</p> <p>Whilst there is some cross over between Physical Education and Health they are different subjects within the same learning area. See some examples below.</p> <p>15. a = a shift to a broader foundation.</p> <p>Once again I see this as a watering down, and in terms of Physical Education and Health merging them into one subject at level 1 would be disastrous. At the school I currently teach at we have four classes</p>			Yes				2020-02-27 13:19:51	ANON-YFPW-RB96-9	2020-02-27 13:18:55	2020-02-27 13:19:59
Yes		Agree		No, there are a good range of subjects available, some of which have been condensed into a single subject.		No				2020-02-27 13:20:10	ANON-YFPW-RB9R-5	2020-02-27 13:20:10	2020-02-27 13:20:23
Yes		Strongly disagree	<p>I can understand the need for keeping students pathways more open, however in science there is solid foundation work that needs to be done so students have to knowledge to address scientific situations. Bringing a broader and more "social" approach to the subject it not going to give them the base they need to further education in sciences. It will set them back a year or more in learning.</p> <p>Not all science careers are literacy based and the new proposals, with essay for exams, means that some students who could be quite capable on the subject may fail "the system" and deemed incompetent in the subject</p> <p>I think many students do better choosing a science that they particularly like. The are more engaged if they can choose chem, bio or physics and hence retain more information. At level one having these options gives students a great idea of what they might like to do.</p> <p>Even is students chose not to continue a career in science after level 1, or high-school, I think it is vital that they learn fundamental science principals. I see a huge lack in scientific knowledge in society and it worries me greatly if the opportunity to teach the fundamental were to disappear and a focus on social</p>			No				2020-02-27 13:23:01	ANON-YFPW-RB9W-A	2020-02-27 13:23:01	2020-02-27 13:23:07
Yes		Strongly disagree		Latin and Classics are essential to the secondary school curriculum. They provide foundational knowledge of the history of political institutions, ethical thought, legal concepts, art and architecture, and countless other facets of human civilization. Latin is of particular value as a basis for the acquisition of languages, especially Romance languages, as well as analytic thinking.	NA	Yes				2020-02-27 13:25:07	ANON-YFPW-RB94-7	2020-02-27 13:25:07	2020-02-27 13:25:25
Yes		Strongly disagree	Classical Studies promote high level cross disciplinary thinking as students have to master sophisticated linguistic analysis and be able to reason with material culture in multiple forms. No other humanistic discipline has these requirements. Latin, of course, is essential to this study and attracts students with a wide range of other interests.			No				2020-02-27 13:25:29	ANON-YFPW-RB9T-7	2020-02-27 13:25:29	2020-02-27 13:25:43

Yes	I think so, although I can't be sure. The initial releases on what NCEA would look like were (and still are) short on realities and long on jargon.	Agree	To be frank, there is little change. Science is already a subject at our school (roll: 1800) at L1 - we don't split it up early. Same for Health & PE - one subject. Media Studies is taught but not Social Studies. Will be interesting on the up-take as the kids seem to enjoy Media Studies, but don't enjoy Social Studies in the junior school. The move to a Commerce subject may be a good one as the subject numbers are dwindling and we may specialise with these subjects too soon. Often pupils realise that in Week 4 or 5 the subject is not what they thought it was. It is clear that Latin and Classics are going as there are not enough people to teach them - does that mean that when we run out of Maths teachers (which we will) , will we stop teaching Maths?	No I don't, but the subject list is virtually unchanged, so I do not think that a claim can be made that NCEA III will be a better and more broad course. What it will depend on is what we are requiring the pupils to do. This means that the structure of assessment must be entirely flexible and must not be long-winded or project or report based in any subject. Basic skills tests of knowledge is where 15/16 year olds in Level 1 are at. As well as ensuring success, this would also ensure much better teaching approaches from teachers.	Currently what is offered subject wise is definitely channeling students to university. It always was this way and NCEA did not change that. While I don't have a specific subject, we need to have courses that prepare students for what is required when they leave school and don't go to university. Preparation for trades could be an example. Financial literacy, which is not done in Mathematics. In Mathematics, at all levels, we are basically preparing pupils to do Calculus, not other more relevant tasks involving numbers.	No			2020-02-27 13:37:32	ANON-YFPW-RB93-6	2020-02-27 13:37:32	2020-02-27 13:37:49
Yes		Disagree				No			2020-02-27 13:44:54	ANON-YFPW-RB92-5	2020-02-27 13:44:54	2020-02-27 13:45:16
No		Agree		The combining of health and physical education. Many students may not be physically adept or "sporty" - but be very interested in health studies. Combining the 2 would mean that these students would likely not select the combined health / PE as they would be uncomfortable with the physicality of the PE subject. This could impact on their ability to study health in level 2, or pursue health related tertiary study.		No			2020-02-27 13:55:05	ANON-YFPW-RB9U-8	2020-02-27 13:55:05	2020-02-27 13:55:20
No		Disagree		You misunderstand Latin's fundamental role in enabling students to write good English, surely a sine qua non for success in the modern world. You are also not allowing them to step outside of, dare I say it, an insular culture.	Latin	No			2020-02-27 14:03:23	ANON-YFPW-RBUY-8	2020-02-27 14:03:23	2020-02-27 14:03:46
Yes		Strongly disagree	Combining three large commerce subject into one year is too much. It will delete a lot of necessary content needed for Level 2 and 3. More pressure on those higher levels. All the basic learning skills are learnt at Level 1.	Combining three large commerce subject into one year's course is too much. It will delete a lot of necessary content needed for Level 2 and 3. More pressure on those higher levels. All the basic learning skills are learnt at Level 1. Also with so many students who do Accounting, Economics and Business Studies in the country, this will affect their achievement rates for Year 12 and 13 in these subjects as the necessary content has not been taught at Year 11. Commerce should be made compulsory at Year 10, in all schools to include Financial Literacy and combining the three course that you want to be introduced at Year 11.		No	Not one of my subjects.		2020-02-27 14:06:58	ANON-YFPW-RBUC-J	2020-02-27 14:06:58	2020-02-27 14:07:47
No		Strongly disagree	I cannot believe why MOE could think that reducing science to just general science at Level 1 could possibly be a consideration. This was never discussed. There is a strong content base required to move onto Y12 and Y13 Chemistry, Physics and Biology. It is not fair to set these students up for failure. There is no way average students could cope with the step up. Should Y12 and 13 sciences also become more general, students will be unable to pass Stage 1 university science papers. Those students with proper background - IB and CIE qualifications will get the places in Med School and Engineering. The number of Pasifika and Maori doing Science (and not at CIE or IB schools) will drop. More schools will pick up CIE and IB.	No	No	Yes	No		2020-02-27 14:08:34	ANON-YFPW-RBUV-5	2020-02-27 14:04:41	2020-02-27 14:08:53
No	This was a complete surprise.	Strongly disagree	In particular Media Studies - the concepts and skills are future focussed. It is a vital part of a 21st Century subject.			Yes			2020-02-27 14:15:55	ANON-YFPW-RBUS-2	2020-02-27 14:15:55	2020-02-27 14:16:13
Yes	Yes, of course, they've been well publicized.	Strongly disagree	Removing classics and art History is an affront to culture. Yes, they might not be as easy to monetize as calculus, but they form an important part of the western tradition. An awareness of great artists and Homer and Virgil can impart an appreciation of culture that children will otherwise not be exposed to. Let me be plain, your proposed changes disgust me. Can't you do anything useful?	1. Retain classics and art history, it's not as if anyone is forced to take them regardless. 2. Also, a grounding in economics is really useful, and it deserves to be a subject on its own. 3. Making psychology and media studies a single subject is a bizarre choice, they have little in common.	It would be worth considering making some form of mathematics compulsory at NCEA level 3.	No			2020-02-27 14:16:04	ANON-YFPW-RBU8-7	2020-02-27 14:16:04	2020-02-27 14:16:18
Yes		Strongly disagree				Yes			2020-02-27 14:19:52	ANON-YFPW-RBU9-8	2020-02-27 14:19:52	2020-02-27 14:19:59

Yes	How involved were subject teachers in the regions? The entire proposal has a whiff about it of surveys conducted largely in the Wellington area and perhaps other major centres. This district - Gisborne - has four secondary schools: three state and one Roman Catholic and it should be noted that all four teach Classical Studies to enthusiastic classes.	Disagree	Whereas there could be value in broadening the History curriculum by including something of New Zealand education's foundational culture which is European and largely based on the civilisations of ancient Greece and Rome, it seems high handed in the extreme to derive schools with well established learning in Classical Studies at Level One. When I taught Classics for many years, Level One students who could not study this because of time-table constraints were sorely disappointed. The reason was they had heard the enthusiasms of Level Two and Three students and wanted to know why it was not offered at Level One.	See above. As a teacher of Art History, often greatly appreciated and enjoyed by Level Three students, it concerns me very much that yet another cultural subject is being down played. This country's very narrow appreciation of anything outside of the land itself and our wider Pacific culture, is alarming. A subject such as mathematics, important for establishing at least rudimentary numeracy, is made sacrosanct despite the irrelevance for the great majority of students, of much that is taught beyond Level One. In a society that makes full use of computers and calculators, what reason is there to insist that study of this subject should continue at higher levels when in decades past - lacking such electronic devices - it was possible for students to drop mathematics after Year Ten! (Refer the old School Certificate regulations of the 1960's.)	Liberal Studies. A course designed to give an appreciation of psychology, philosophy, religion and politics, could go a very long way towards overcoming the general knowledge drought that currently exists among secondary school students in this country. It would have to be broad based, non-sectarian, devoid of specific political or religious ideologies while exposing students to world wide developments and trends and attitudes then linking these to the New Zealand situation	Yes	I fully support this and feel it is worth noting how thoroughly stimulated and engaged Maori students - with a grasp of both their language, culture and history - have been when presented with Classical Studies. In ways that Pakeha often cannot identify, these students see numerous parallels and striking similarities e.g. For how many Pakeha students is there a strong recognition of	I do not have enough detailed knowledge to comment in this category.	2020-02-27 14:23:08	ANON-YFPW-RBUG-P	2020-02-27 14:23:08	2020-02-27 14:23:38
No	I was made aware by a high school teacher friend of mine.	Disagree		I disagree with the plan outlined above particularly in relation to classical studies being rolled a broader subject of "history." In my view, the proposed change would severely limit the ability of teachers to educate students on classical studies which is in itself a foundational subject spanning art, literature, philosophy, culture, sport and politics.	I think that it would be a huge loss not to offer classical studies as its own dedicated subject at level 1.	No		N/A	2020-02-27 14:32:47	ANON-YFPW-RBUJ-5	2020-02-27 14:32:47	2020-02-27 14:33:00
Yes		Strongly disagree	I strongly disagree with the proposal to remove Latin as a subject at NCEA Level 1. Although there are few schools which offer it, Latin is a challenging and worthwhile subject, and it teaches students linguistic and grammar concepts which are no longer taught as part of the English curriculum at any level. Latin also enables students to be aware of the relationships between different languages such as English, French, Spanish etc and gives them a broad understanding of early European history. Latin is taught to a very high standard at Wellington Girls College, and the fact that the school teaches Latin (and has done for decades) is a point of difference for the school in attracting students.	See above. I see no rationale for removing subjects just because they are studied by fewer students - you do not need to scrap subjects just so that you can add new ones.	No	No			2020-02-27 14:55:33	ANON-YFPW-RBUJ-4	2020-02-27 14:54:19	2020-02-27 14:55:36
No		Agree	The change to Food Science is good. However I would like to see Materials technology separated into hard and soft material so that a student can take both subjects if they wish. And yet there still be room for both materials in one course.			No			2020-02-27 14:57:40	ANON-YFPW-RBUP-Y	2020-02-27 14:57:40	2020-02-27 14:57:57
Yes		Strongly disagree	The idea is to support a broad, more foundational education at Level 1, but you are effectively removing Accounting as a subject? Surely we give students more opportunities not less? Does this mean that we then teach the current Level 1 Accounting curriculum at Level 2, because Level 2 Accounting is going to be very difficult without the Level 1 foundation, and I doubt that many students will opt to take it, leading to the end of Accounting as a subject??	If there is going to be very little Accounting as a subject, then call it what it is. Don't say we are combining Level 1 Economics, Accounting and Business Studies but we are having next to no Accounting. You are removing Accounting from the curriculum and combining Level 1 Economics and Business Studies.		No			2020-02-27 14:58:32	ANON-YFPW-RBUJ-6	2020-02-27 14:58:32	2020-02-27 14:58:40
Yes		Strongly disagree	The option to study Latin and Classical Studies should be kept: it is eye opening as it gives an important perspective of life in antiquity which is both very different from our own, and also similar in ways which help us better appreciate our common humanity. Linguistically the study of Latin is know to improve English vocabulary and the grasp of grammar that can aid life long language learning.	The option to study Latin and Classical Studies should be kept: it is eye opening as it gives an important perspective of life in antiquity which is both very different from our own, and also similar in ways which help us better appreciate our common humanity. Linguistically the study of Latin is know to improve English vocabulary and the grasp of grammar that can aid life long language learning.		No			2020-02-27 15:04:17	ANON-YFPW-RBUF-N	2020-02-27 15:04:17	2020-02-27 15:04:33
No		Strongly agree				No			2020-02-27 15:14:31	ANON-YFPW-RBUJ-Z	2020-02-27 15:14:31	2020-02-27 15:14:41

Yes	It is extremely difficult to see the "whole picture" when we have no idea what Levels 2 and 3 will look like. Extremely disappointing to see the changes to Food and Processing Technology - no NPD - absolutely irrelevant to today's world of authentic, client based, real world learning, project management, development of real products for real clients. The Food development industry is one of the biggest areas of growth globally - and Food Science and Home Economics do not address this. Totally dumbing down a subject which is strong in many schools where teachers are using Best Practice, are current and committed to the delivery of excellent teaching and learning programmes. This move would reduce student numbers to almost none - the students are not Difficult to see how students will have the skills and knowledge to manage Levels 2 and 3, particularly in Science.	Strongly disagree	This planning shows little respect for academic students - nor differentiation for learners.	Keep the Food and Processing Technology under Technology.		Yes	Yes, I am aware of it, but I cannot read it as I do not speak te reo Maori.		2020-02-27 15:19:04	ANON-YFPW-RBUZ-9	2020-02-27 15:19:04	2020-02-27 15:19:20
Yes		Agree	Mathematics and Statistics are two very diverse subjects and are best looked at separately	Mathematics and Statistics are two very diverse subjects and are best looked at separately	Mathematics and Statistics are two very diverse subjects and are best looked at separately	Yes		No I would like to see more before I make comment	2020-02-27 15:19:53	ANON-YFPW-RBUH-Q	2020-02-27 15:19:53	2020-02-27 15:20:27
Yes		Strongly disagree				No			2020-02-27 15:38:49	ANON-YFPW-RBUB-H	2020-02-27 15:38:49	2020-02-27 15:38:58
No		Strongly disagree	I teach a low literacy low numeracy science course. I build my teaching program on standards the students can achieve and they also have a say on what they want to learn. By closing standards in Biology, Chemistry and Physics will stop students entering into a science course. I often have students that have found Science a challenge in Yr 10 and when they have completed the vocational science course they find they enjoy this subject and enter back in our Level 2 program in Yr13.	Please leave science as it is. Level 1 allows all students the opportunity to experience success especially those who have issues such as Dyslexia etc. I believe the standards currently in offer at Level 1 are fine. Has the panel considered teacher well being with all the additional portfolio work in the new standards. Where is the support eg PD to upskill us on how to develop, create resources and have the ability to Mark this type of work.		No			2020-02-27 15:57:07	ANON-YFPW-RBUD-K	2020-02-27 15:52:43	2020-02-27 15:57:17
No		Disagree	The science section needs to retain some specialisation - physics, chemistry & biology		Please ensure the sciences are able to be specialised, as well as the maths subjects. Technology subjects need to be more specific - exactly what is available	No			2020-02-27 16:15:37	ANON-YFPW-RBUX-7	2020-02-27 16:13:53	2020-02-27 16:15:40
Yes		Agree		If Health is to be integrated into PE I think the health component should be minimal. Having seen some of what is taught in health (esp the sexuality subjects) it is not necessary content for PE (primarily a physical subject). A stronger science or human biology wing to PE would be more useful.		No			2020-02-27 16:20:10	ANON-YFPW-RBUA-G	2020-02-27 16:20:10	2020-02-27 16:20:26
Yes		Disagree	Concerned that Latin has been withdrawn and several foreign languages included. E.g. Mandarin.	The study of accountancy and economics is well supported by most learning communities and both should be retained.		No			2020-02-27 16:24:23	ANON-YFPW-RBUN-W	2020-02-27 16:24:23	2020-02-27 16:24:33
No		Strongly disagree	Bias in selecting History and Geography to continue but collapsing Accounting and Economics and Business Studies into 1 generic subject.	If students haven't studied the basics of Accounting or Economics in Level 1 then how can they specialise in Level 2. Level 2 will become an introduction and we will lose the depth of subject experience and understanding at Level 3. However having general science at Level 1 will provide students with more timetable time to pick up other option subjects. In our school students often accelerate in Year 10 doing Biology and take 1-3 science subjects limiting their exposure to Humanities and Arts.	I query the need for a Psychology subject ..surely this is relevant for a tertiary course.	No			2020-02-27 16:28:50	ANON-YFPW-RBUK-T	2020-02-27 16:28:50	2020-02-27 16:29:01
Yes		Strongly disagree	The folding of Classics into History is a matter of great concern to me. These are two very different subjects, and any combination would necessarily result in a watering down. Both are subjects which build skills in writing, researching, analysis and critical writing. Why not give students as many opportunities as possible to develop these, and in relation to the areas of the past which most spark their interest?		Philosophy	Yes			2020-02-27 16:49:13	ANON-YFPW-RBUR-1	2020-02-27 16:49:13	2020-02-27 16:49:22
No		Strongly disagree	I feel strongly that Latin and Classics, together with Maori studies, are important for students to understand how New Zealand has developed, and should be available for study. One cannot understand British imperialism of the 19th century, and Western Civilisation in general today, without knowledge of Latin and the Classics. Furthermore, Latin provides a basis for acquiring the Romance languages, spoken by more than 1 billion people worldwide, and understanding English on a deeper level.	See above		No			2020-02-27 17:00:49	ANON-YFPW-RBUW-6	2020-02-27 17:00:49	2020-02-27 17:01:03

Yes		Disagree	I agree that Classics and Latin are very Western ways of thinking and I understand NCEA's push to move away from aspects of outdated Western teaching. However I think that Latin and Classics are incredibly relevant today and are soul enriching to those who are passionate about it. The Classics community is one of the strongest NZ schools and too reduce it's status to part of history is to remove it	I myself am studying Latin and Classics and the University of Auckland and I will be training to be a teacher in Classics and Latin. This suggests obvious bias. The reason I want to teach these subjects is because for those that Classics resonate with, it enriches and fulfils a life and uses the past to teach the present and future. I'm not saying everyone likes Classics because everyone doesn't, but I think not giving the opportunity to those who it brings genuine joy is a shame. And if it was removed I would heavily consider not teaching for NCEA.	A life skills class. In a school system meant to prepare teenagers to become thriving members of society, things like renters rights, how to pay tax, the basics of mortgages and so forth should be taught to some degree	No				2020-02-27 17:02:20	ANON-YFPW-RBU4-3	2020-02-27 17:02:20	2020-02-27 17:02:36
Yes		Disagree	The new curriculum diminishes art/culture subjects and forces far too much content into courses so broad that they cannot possibly cover anything in any true detail.	The exclusion of Classical studies as its own subject and the complete exclusion of Latin as a language is the complete waste. Studying Latin at university-level has increased my knowledge on English grammar which is often missed in English as a subject and penalizes you in other areas of education. Classical studies is a literacy-based subject that is often more interesting and engaging than English while teaching much of the same skills. It also covers far more than mere history, but art and culture and the foundations of modern society.		No				2020-02-27 17:04:20	ANON-YFPW-RBUT-3	2020-02-27 17:04:20	2020-02-27 17:04:28
No		Disagree	My disagreement is with respect to the loss of the subject "Economics" - by folding it (along with "Accounting" and "Business Studies") into the all-encompassing (?) subject of "Commerce" ... (I have an interest here: I am a professor of Economics, and the Head of Department, Economics at the University.) I can understand your objective of reducing the number of distinct subjects ... But to me "Economics" is distinct (I would say that, wouldn't I :)). For example, there is a Nobel Prize in Economic Science - not a Nobel Prize in "Commerce".	Please see my answer to #2 above.		No				2020-02-27 17:15:40	ANON-YFPW-RBU3-2	2020-02-27 17:15:40	2020-02-27 17:15:50
Yes		Strongly disagree				No				2020-02-27 17:17:04	ANON-YFPW-RBU2-1	2020-02-27 17:17:04	2020-02-27 17:17:24
No	As university students most of us have not been made aware of these changes.	Agree	However Latin should still be kept, it is fundamental to most of the sciences and health fields.	Please retain Latin. While the language is not in common use, it is the foundation of most texts in the sciences as well as the medical fields and so is important to most STEM subjects.	Academic English. It is vital to anyone interested in further tertiary study, and the gap is colossal between English used in high school, and what is used at university. Most students struggle with having adequate academic english skills for formulating their ideas especially when writing research papers and essays.	No				2020-02-27 17:20:02	ANON-YFPW-RBU4-4	2020-02-27 17:20:02	2020-02-27 17:20:20
Yes		Undecided	Strong in areas such as an increase focus on being culturally inclusive. However, I disagree with combining Physical Education and Health. I am a Curriculum Director of HPE and we teach Health and PE in our lower school programme and it works well but we get a completely separate cohort of NCEA students taking PE and taking Health. I do not feel this will be in their best interests	To keep PE and Health as separate at NCEA. This change will reduce numbers in both subjects as we will not be catering for the students		No	I am not but I like the fact there is a strong emphasis on this			2020-02-27 17:22:34	ANON-YFPW-RBS6-6	2020-02-27 17:22:34	2020-02-27 17:22:46
Yes		Strongly agree				No				2020-02-27 17:24:01	ANON-YFPW-RBSV-3	2020-02-27 17:24:01	2020-02-27 17:24:11
No		Disagree	Removal of Latin is a poor idea for a variety of reasons. Media Studies is vital given the prevalence of media in every day life and in politics and government. Basic psychology is a must, at the very least a basic understanding of anxiety, depression, and common intellectual disabilities is required.			No	Greater publicity would be fantastic, especially for New Kiwis.			2020-02-27 17:30:14	ANON-YFPW-RBSC-G	2020-02-27 17:30:14	2020-02-27 17:30:30
No		Strongly disagree		How could you remove Classical Studies and Latin? These two subjects are the building blocks not only of education but also of the world. Ancient Rome and Greece were such a vital part of our history, from them we get politics, such as Athenian democracy and Roman republic, we get science, read Pliny the Elder's Natural History and Lucretius on The Nature Of Things, and most importantly we get Literature such as The Iliad, and we get Philosophy. And these things were originally in Latin and Ancient Greek so how can we not offer these languages as options?		No				2020-02-27 17:36:00	ANON-YFPW-RBSS-Z	2020-02-27 17:36:00	2020-02-27 17:36:11
No	I was not aware, and strongly disagree with it.	Strongly disagree	It literally makes no sense whatsoever. Why do you need it to be more broad? Isn't that what year 9 and 10 is for? Why should it take over half of your time at high school to figure out what you want to do, when you might already know? Why should some students have to trudge their way through topics they know they're not interested in, just because they're paired with the one they ARE interested in? It makes no sense.	I think Latin should remain as a language taught at level 1, and that Classics should remain a separate subject from History. Latin is an incredibly useful language. As for Classics and History, I just don't see how you can combine all these subjects and teach them successfully while still showing student what each subject consists of. When I did NCEA level 1, the curriculum (for ALL my subjects) was already too large for teachers to get through effectively in one year.		No				2020-02-27 17:38:57	ANON-YFPW-RBS8-5	2020-02-27 17:38:57	2020-02-27 17:39:09

Yes		Disagree	I am in favour of preventing students from specialising too soon, but if the goal is to prevent specialisation, this proposal is a failure for several reasons: - Subjects are being excluded rather than included. While it is reasonable to expect that a Year 11 Science class might include aspects of all the sciences, it is unreasonable to expect that History will include Classics, or that Social Studies will include Media Studies and Psychology, without significant changes to the way these subjects are currently taught. As a result, this change will rather "force" students to specialise in "History" or "Social Studies" to the "exclusion" of Classics, Media Studies, and Psychology. - The proposal emphasises content over skills and disciplines. For example, while the content of Classics emphasises the ancient world, it teaches textual criticism and historical analysis alongside a variety of other skills. In this respect, it is less specialised than English or History. - Interdisciplinary subjects help prevent specialisation by encouraging students to view problems from a variety of perspectives. Classics, Media Studies, and Psychology are thus better placed to prevent	Art History is listed as "not included" but footnote [1] states that it will be "supported as [a] possible [context] within history to a low degree. It would be far better to incorporate it into Visual Arts, which could use Art History to teach students about the development of the arts they are learning, in the same way that English teaches Shakespeare as well as modern poetry. Other subjects (e.g. History, Social Studies, and English) might find ways to incorporate aspects of Art History to a lesser degree as well, however. The removal of Latin as a language subject is puzzling, because it is no more specialised than any other language. I have been unable to find any reason given for its removal from all levels of NCEA. This change is really troubling to me for several reasons: - All of the intellectual benefits of learning a language can be earned from Latin as well as from other languages. There is no reason to single out Latin for removal except that it is not commonly spoken, but... - ... while I have learned several languages, Latin has been of more practical use to me than any other second language; I have only been able to	Philosophy, Civics, Politics, and Public Policy (both in NZ and around the world).	No			2020-02-27 17:39:18	ANON-YFPW-RB59-6	2020-02-27 17:39:18	2020-02-27 17:39:31
No		Strongly disagree		Classical Studies, Latin, Art History, and Media Studies should not be removed as subjects. This does not create breadth across the level as teachers can choose to just ignore these standards. Students then have to go into these subjects at Level 2 with no prior knowledge. Unless you make a provision that at least one standard from each of these MUST be done in a programme then it is unfair to students. You are also asking teachers to teach things that they may not be specialists in at the level of a national certificate.	No. Instead of changing the subjects I would like to see a focus on upgrading the standards.	No			2020-02-27 17:44:46	ANON-YFPW-RB59-M	2020-02-27 17:44:46	2020-02-27 17:45:08
Yes		Strongly agree				No			2020-02-27 17:45:35	ANON-YFPW-RB51-Q	2020-02-27 17:45:35	2020-02-27 17:46:07
Yes	Yes, however, I was not aware that Biology, Chemistry and Physics were being removed.	Strongly disagree	I am against the culling of L1 chemistry, biology and physics	Include chemistry, biology and physics as standards. The current science standards do not assess subject knowledge at all areas. We need the variety of standards to produce the varied courses our students enjoy.	no, keep as is.	Yes			2020-02-27 17:46:33	ANON-YFPW-RB59-X	2020-02-27 17:46:33	2020-02-27 17:46:35
Yes		Strongly disagree		In times where Latin (and Ancient Greek) as well as Classics are strongly built up in countries that were traditionally not much engaged in these fields (China, South East Asia, Africa, South America), it is a sign of weakness to abolish these fields in schools and high schools. The subjects offer students (and teachers) at all ages the opportunity to reflect upon the other - what we regard as absolutely necessary for engaging with other countries, cultures, and people - and form cultural roots. E.g. my Chinese students and colleagues cannot understand why we abolish our heritage in such a radical way. No roots means no possibility to grow. Prof. Dr. Sven Günther Institute for the History of Ancient Civilizations Northeast Normal University 5268 Renmin Street 130024 Changchun China svenguenther@nenu.edu.cn / sveneca@aol.com		No			2020-02-27 18:13:19	ANON-YFPW-RB5E-J	2020-02-27 18:11:30	2020-02-27 18:13:32
No	This should definitely be something that should see both extensive feedback-gathering and awareness-raising amongst the secondary and tertiary education community.	Strongly disagree	Classics, History and Latin are all highly relevant, stimulating, challenging and fascinating subjects which should not be amalgamated and/or lost.	Classics is so different to history (including elements of history, art, literature, architecture, politics, some language, and even elements of sociology). To study Classics within History would fail to prepare students for a thorough understanding of the ancient world, and therefore give them no context (and little opportunity for comparisons to our own world). They NEED to remain separate subjects!	How are students supposed to specialise in Classics (or even in modern History) if they only have the option to study them in conjunction and not exclusively?	No			2020-02-27 18:22:53	ANON-YFPW-RB5S-2	2020-02-27 18:22:53	2020-02-27 18:23:11
Yes		Strongly disagree	Losing subjects like classics removes opportunities for passionate students and erases the valuable learning that can be gained from these subjects	Losing subjects like classical studies and latin only reinforces the lack of wider knowledge students have and presents a much reduced view of history that mainly focuses on the world wars	Classical studies and latin	No			2020-02-27 18:34:53	ANON-YFPW-RB57-4	2020-02-27 18:34:53	2020-02-27 18:35:00

No	Not effectively publicised	Strongly disagree		For the sciences, in particular, the move is blocking meeting students' needs. It is also going against the STEM movement that NZQA reports on and Tainui is promoting. The same can be said for Accounting and Economics. Why is ag/ hort not removed from L1? It makes no sense.	Programs where students who need learning support. Very little above L1. This area is growing and these students are staying longer in the school system.	No	I am aware but not enough experience to make an informed comment.		2020-02-27 18:43:28	ANON-YFPW-RBSF-K	2020-02-27 18:42:02	2020-02-27 18:43:39
No		Strongly disagree	Classics and art history should be made available as early as possible	I took classics in my last 3 years of high school (NCEA Level 1, 2 & 3), it provided me with a much richer understanding of the ancient world and how it translates into modern day society from government, war, religion etc. I strongly believe it should be offered from year 11 and not lumped into history as they are two very different subjects with entirely different goals in terms of learning and knowledge	Art history	No			2020-02-27 18:47:22	ANON-YFPW-RBS1-X	2020-02-27 18:47:22	2020-02-27 18:47:30
No	The jump from Y11 to Y12 is huge, why make it bigger????	Strongly disagree	How can you let languages have a zillion options and then say science only has general science? What about the arts? Surely you should just have a generic Art? This really doesn't seem to have been thought through properly.	The Science matrix as it stands is a bit muddled. However, I do strongly feel that you need to provide specialist science standards. This will allow schools to develop courses to fit their students.	You'd better not combine them all in to one science in Level 2 and 3. I would hate to be treated by a doctor who was taught holistically and with NOS in mind, but no actual knowledge.	No	I can't read Te Reo		2020-02-27 18:49:04	ANON-YFPW-RBSZ-7	2020-02-27 18:49:04	2020-02-27 18:49:12
Yes	Philosophy should be mandatory at all three levels with a strong emphasis on logic. Students should have to complete an extended essay, as they do with the International Baccalaureate programme, in order to gain University Entrance.	Disagree		Cutting Classics, Art History and Latin, in favour of Maori Performing Arts is disgusting! It is cultural vandalism at it's worst and most obvious. It is a deliberate attempt to prevent white children from learning about their culture and heritage, to convince them they have no culture or heritage. Instead of teaching children about the magnificent and unique achievements of Western Civilisation, you would have them stamp their feet and stick out their tongues like semi-evolved apes! The New Zealand curriculum and NCEA are already dumbed down to a shameful level, that frankly is a form of child abuse. To dumb it down even further with these subject changes is an act that can only be described as an act of evil	Philosophy should be mandatory at all three levels with a strong emphasis on logic. Students should have to complete an extended essay, as they do with the International Baccalaureate programme, in order to gain University Entrance.	No			2020-02-27 18:55:42	ANON-YFPW-RBSF-F	2020-02-27 18:55:42	2020-02-27 18:55:54
Yes		Disagree	Explained below.	Do not change the classifications for Classics, Latin and Art History. They were some of my favourite subjects at school and my school was already considering decreasing or dropping these courses, only keeping them due to them giving NCEA credits at all levels		No			2020-02-27 19:10:10	ANON-YFPW-RBSM-T	2020-02-27 19:10:10	2020-02-27 19:10:31
Yes		Undecided		I believe it to be critical that Health and Physical Education remain as two separate target subjects. These two subject areas often appeal to different students, they are not one in the same and provide the foundation for two separate pathways. Furthermore - what is meant by "new technology subjects"??	Nutrition and/or nutritional biochemistry.	No			2020-02-27 19:19:53	ANON-YFPW-RBSD-H	2020-02-27 19:19:53	2020-02-27 19:20:54
Yes		Undecided		The changes will not make NCEA more accessible though because with so few standards, students who fail will end up with nothing.	No	No			2020-02-27 19:38:27	ANON-YFPW-RBSX-5	2020-02-27 19:37:13	2020-02-27 19:38:33
No		Strongly disagree	I think it's very dangerous to erode established specialisms, both from a student and a teacher perspective. How will this expertise be recovered in future if there is a desire to change track?	Classics, Latin and Art History would be severely threatened (and de facto ended, really) by these changes. They may be "niche subjects" but that does not mean that they are not important in offering some students the chance to develop skills and knowledge that are pivotal to understanding the past in its full linguistic and cultural diversity. These subjects are so specialised in their teaching that it would be difficult for History educators to deliver them and once the expertise of existing teachers was lost it would be very difficult to recover.		No			2020-02-27 19:51:44	ANON-YFPW-RBSA-E	2020-02-27 19:51:44	2020-02-27 19:51:57
No		Strongly disagree	No	The proposed abolition of Latin and Classical Studies is very disappointing. These subjects are fundamental to our understanding of world history, culture, society, language, and literature.	Latin, Classical Studies	Yes			2020-02-27 19:57:25	ANON-YFPW-RBSN-U	2020-02-27 19:57:25	2020-02-27 19:57:36

Yes		Strongly disagree	<p>There is a clear discontinuity between the retention of some specialised subjects, such as Geography, while the specialist Science areas have been condensed into a single Science.</p> <p>If Science is to be reduced into a single subject with "skill-based" assessment, then so should the Social Sciences, Arts, Technology, and Languages.</p> <p>Furthermore, Science has already been considerably reduced, with minimal teaching of the Science curriculum across Years 0 - 8, and even into Years 9 - 10 in some schools; essentially this is forcing the targeted learning and assessment of specialised STEM education into the final two years of secondary school!</p> <p>You wouldn't do this to a language subject, why are you doing it to Science, when there is clearly a need for more STEM graduates in New Zealand?</p>	<p>See above answer; either make all learning areas a single subject: Math, English, Science, Social Science, Language, the Arts, and Technology or keep all specialised subject areas.</p> <p>It is grossly unjust and indefensible to "pick and choose" which subjects you feel are of high value in comparison to others.</p>	<p>I think that Law/Legal Studies should be achievement standards as opposed to unit standards.</p> <p>Unit standards allow schools/subject areas to avoid the complexities and challenges of NCEA whilst pumping students credit numbers with minimal learning.</p> <p>There should be a clear delineation between the "academic" achievement standards and the "vocational" unit standards.</p> <p>Perhaps you should consider making the "skill-based" standards, such as those proposed in for the new L1 Science matrix, Unit Standards and maintain the "specialised content-based" standards as Achievement Standards. This would be more in keeping with the NCEA ethos, maintain flexibility for students and their schools, as well as improving fairness across the NZ curriculum areas.</p> <p>This is actually a really good idea - PLEASE DO THIS!! As a parent and teacher, I beg you!</p>	Yes		Same as previously mentioned; make skill-based assessments Unit Standards and knowledge-based assessments Achievement Standards.	2020-02-27 19:57:53	ANON-YFPW-RBSK-R	2020-02-27 19:57:53	2020-02-27 19:58:12
No	Bring back Latin!	Strongly disagree	Bring back Classics!	Don't abolish Classics!	Ancient Greek	No			2020-02-27 20:00:53	ANON-YFPW-RBS6-3	2020-02-27 20:00:53	2020-02-27 20:00:59
Yes		Disagree	I disagree for the abolition of Latin and Classics from the curriculum.	Classics. Latin and History of Art are key subjects to understand the root of the European Culture which is part of the NZ culture and mentality, and also great part of the Western Civilization in wider	Latin, Classics and History of Art	No			2020-02-27 20:05:53	ANON-YFPW-RBSR-Y	2020-02-27 20:05:53	2020-02-27 20:06:05
No		Strongly disagree		Keep science specialisation (biology, chemistry, physics, ess) so school can offer a program that suits their students		No			2020-02-27 20:12:41	ANON-YFPW-RBSW-4	2020-02-27 20:12:41	2020-02-27 20:12:57
No		Strongly disagree	Latin must be kept in curriculum.			No			2020-02-27 20:14:55	ANON-YFPW-RBS4-1	2020-02-27 20:14:55	2020-02-27 20:15:05
Yes		Strongly disagree	Latin language and literature should be included.	Latin language and literature should be included because it is one of the main and necessary subjects to understand every literary and artistic, also modern, phenomena of European culture. If you do not learn Latin and in general classical culture, you cannot understand texts, paintings, theatrical pieces, musical operas etc which have been produced, over the centuries, throughout the European (and not only European) area.		No			2020-02-27 20:15:25	ANON-YFPW-RBS1-1	2020-02-27 20:15:25	2020-02-27 20:15:42
Yes	It's a particularly stupid decision for the Sciences.	Strongly disagree	The transition to Level 2 will be even more difficult for the students as we try to dumb the curriculum down further	The Sciences should still have the scope to teach specialist content knowledge so that we still have high quality science graduates coming out of universities at the end.	Please do not tinker with or remove the specialist sciences.	No			2020-02-27 20:17:28	ANON-YFPW-RBS3-Z	2020-02-27 20:17:28	2020-02-27 20:17:37
No		Strongly disagree	As a classicist how came through the NCEA system, the reduction of classical studies and the complete removal of Latin from the curriculum is upsetting to say the least. To relegate the topic to a sub-section of a history class would not give the subject sufficient time for students to get to know it and to decide whether or not they would like to continue perusing it. Latin also serves as a fantastic starting point for learning all western and some Eastern European languages. It is also an important skill for those who wish to pursue classical studies. By reducing the two subjects you would be significantly harming the future of classics in New Zealand which has provided the world with some of its most important ancient historians and classicists. NCEA is also meant to be a qualification that is based on the idea of studying your interests, and this would surely hinder many in doing that.			No			2020-02-27 20:26:31	ANON-YFPW-RBSU-2	2020-02-27 20:26:31	2020-02-27 20:26:45
No		Undecided		I think the subjects taught isn't as much an issue as the way in which they are taught and assessed. Teach to keep the curiosity alive, to maintain a love of learning, don't just teach subjects with the goal of getting credits.	Problem Solving, creativity and sustainability. Horticulture.	No		No	2020-02-27 20:36:34	ANON-YFPW-RBSY-B	2020-02-27 20:36:34	2020-02-27 20:36:47
Yes		Strongly disagree		Classics should not be excluded. It teaches us a lot about origins and about how to cope and coexist with different cultures.	Classics, latin and Greek	No			2020-02-27 20:38:46	ANON-YFPW-RBSV-8	2020-02-27 20:38:46	2020-02-27 20:39:11

Yes		Strongly disagree		Not including Latin would be a very retrograde step. Latin is of fundamental importance to young people's understanding at all levels of education of the English language generally in all aspects, including grammar, syntax, and vocabulary, and of scientific and technical vocabulary in particular. A good command of language, including in New Zealand the English language, is vital for young people's self-confidence and aspirations in life, for their communicative competence, for their capacity to make a difference in the world. Latin, and Roman and classical studies generally, are of fundamental importance to young people's understanding at all levels of education of every aspect of Early Modern European culture and civilisation, from law to literature, from architecture and design to the performing arts, and of reflections of this culture and civilisation worldwide.	Classical Greek	Yes	This Curriculum is truly admirable and clearly essential in New Zealand. My understanding is that stands beside and includes English rather than replacing it, in which case my points about Latin above still stand.		2020-02-27 20:44:43	ANON-YFPW-RB8C-N	2020-02-27 20:44:43	2020-02-27 20:45:17
Yes		Strongly disagree	The decision to drop Latin especially in favour of all the other languages suggested is short-sighted and misguided. Where all the other modern languages can be easily picked up when needed with courses made available by other bodies when needed, the removal of Latin at this level will effectly destroy the study of Western antiquity through its main point of ntry, namely, language. This will cut off all students in New Zealand from the greatt tradition of western civilization and seriously hinder thier understanding of literature, the language of the bible, and the culture of the west. It would be a huge mistake.	Plaese include Latin for the reasons given above	Latin classical civilization, Greek	No			2020-02-27 20:47:33	ANON-YFPW-RB8S-5	2020-02-27 20:47:33	2020-02-27 20:47:55
No	Found out recently via facebook	Undecided	Whilst I support a rounded education, some of the new subject combinations seem to place together varied subjects wich have the potential to deter studens from following subjects about which they are passionate as they may potentially not find the partner subjects enjoyable (for example psychology with social and media studies, and, history (a study of past events) with classics (a study of art and literature))	The dropping of Latin does not seem to fit into the talk about wanting to ensure a great breadth of subjects and a rich learning curriculum . Whilst it may well be a dead language, knowledge of Latin can be extremely valuable for developing an understanding of the English language (thus being beneficial to a variety of other subjects also). Furthermore, it can be extremely helpful to those hoping to go on and study subjects like classics (for obvious reasons) as well as philosophy or history with many scholarly texts being written in Latin well after the death of the language as a spoken language.	Philosophy	No			2020-02-27 20:52:27	ANON-YFPW-RB8B-B	2020-02-27 20:52:27	2020-02-27 20:52:41
No		Strongly disagree				Yes			2020-02-27 20:52:57	ANON-YFPW-RB8G-5	2020-02-27 20:52:57	2020-02-27 20:53:04
No		Disagree		Latin is a foundational subject which facilitates all other romance languages, as well as providing a useful springboard for future careers including medicine and law. Reducing classics and classics related subjects will also have a knock on effect at universities where there is already a huge discrepancy between abilities. The idea that psychology should be subsumed under sociology is a joke. Can accounting be partly included under the new food subject as a fundamental part of home economics?		No	But it's a fantastic ideal		2020-02-27 20:59:45	ANON-YFPW-RB8Q-3	2020-02-27 20:59:45	2020-02-27 20:59:59
No		Strongly disagree		Level 1 PE and health should not be combined and should remain as sepearate subjects. Different students opt for these two subjects	Nutrition	No			2020-02-27 21:00:39	ANON-YFPW-RB8E-Q	2020-02-27 21:00:39	2020-02-27 21:00:49
No		Strongly disagree	Disagree with combining subjects and dropping subjects all together. Level 1 health and level 1 PE are very different	Disagree with combining subjects and dropping subjects all together. Level 1 health and level 1 PE are very different . It is not always the same students that take health and PE. Also teachers of health aren't necessarily trained in PE and vice versa	More vocational opportunities and pathways for students who are low literacy and learning difficulties. It is very hard for them to achieve level 2 and 3 at times. I think they should still be able to gain some qualifications from school. The system is partly biased towards students wanting to attend universities and there is way too much emphasis on schools pass rates instead of learning and opportunities for all	No			2020-02-27 21:06:08	ANON-YFPW-RB8S-7	2020-02-27 21:06:08	2020-02-27 21:06:24

Yes	I expected the "broad" aspect to be achieved through adjustment to the Achievement Standards themselves, offering more flexibility. In no way did I expect the list of available subjects to be changed so severely. This is a step backwards. The changes are too radical. Is there any data from other countries that supports a reduced number of subjects as being successful? Subjects have been diluted. This will result in students being less prepared for Level 2. The existing list of subjects should be reinstated.	Strongly disagree	I vehemently disagree with the proposed changes to the subjects. There is no indication of what subjects will be offered at Level 2 and 3. Level 1 in isolation is not helpful, as there is no way of knowing where these subjects will lead. It would be helpful to have an overview of the vision for all the levels. Combining all science subjects is a mistake. Students will not be prepared to specialise at Level 2. General science is already covered at Year 10. Similarly, combining commerce subjects will leave students under prepared for Level 2. They already study general commerce at Year 10. Art History belongs to Art, not to History. Media Studies is relevant to the successful NZ film industry, it should continue to exist as a subject in its own right. The proposed subject changes will "dumb down" the education at Level 1. The jump from Level 1 to Level 2 will be too large, unless Level 2 is "dumbed down" also. These changes may encourage schools to abandon	Food Processing Technology should be reinstated. This subject encourages students to be innovative and develop new products. The food industry is huge, and there are many exciting employment opportunities in the development of new products. It is illogical that Food Processing Technology should be removed. Instead, the subject will be a blend of Home Economics and Food Science. These have nothing to do with the Technological Process. The government encourages innovation and yet NCEA is removing the opportunity for students to be innovative in the food industry. Our students have achieved at Scholarship level by creating food products that compete with food manufacturers in industry competitions. They have gone on to study at tertiary level. They should continue to have this opportunity.	Reinstate the subjects that we currently have.	No			2020-02-27 21:10:23	ANON-YFPW-RB88-A	2020-02-27 20:50:31	2020-02-27 21:10:55
No		Agree		The changes proposed are minimal. I think you've missed an opportunity and could have introduced more subjects, like Computer science and climate change, something that prepare our kids for the future of work and the more challenging environment they will have to live in		No			2020-02-27 21:20:19	ANON-YFPW-RB87-9	2020-02-27 21:20:19	2020-02-27 21:20:48
Yes		Strongly disagree	I think combining sciences will mean that many students will not be prepared for level 2. Furthermore the assessments suggested to go with review are devoid of specific contents which means that many level 2 students coming through this pathway will have real subject knowledge in genetics mechanics and acids and bases as the assessments suggest are so loose in Terms of what they need to know.	Poor idea to allow students to only do one science (2 if you include agriculture) yet 10 languages are offered. Student heed the option to do general science BUT they also heed the option to do individual science (or many schools will offer hybrid 2 option line courses that will cover the 3 strands of science in more depth	Not really	No			2020-02-27 21:21:21	ANON-YFPW-RB8F-R	2020-02-27 21:21:21	2020-02-27 21:21:48
No		Agree		No	No	No			2020-02-27 21:24:34	ANON-YFPW-RB8Z-C	2020-02-27 21:24:34	2020-02-27 21:24:43
Yes		Strongly disagree				No			2020-02-27 21:26:50	ANON-YFPW-RB8H-T	2020-02-27 21:26:50	2020-02-27 21:27:15
Yes		Strongly disagree		Really disappointing to see as someone who is studying to be a classics and art history teacher. Basically putting me out of a job before I even complete my degree. It's very upsetting seeing the lack of emphasis of important arts subjects from which we can still learn so much from. In no way is a combined history and classics course substantial enough to properly prepare students for higher study in either subject. Really disappointed and thought school was meant to be about EDUCATION not this money saving rubbish		No			2020-02-27 21:29:22	ANON-YFPW-RB8B-M	2020-02-27 21:29:22	2020-02-27 21:29:37
No		Strongly disagree		It is a mistake to get rid of Latin. Latin is a great subject for teaching literacy skills and invaluable for introducing students to their cultural heritage as both New Zealanders and citizens of the world.		No			2020-02-27 21:31:34	ANON-YFPW-RB81-3	2020-02-27 21:23:56	2020-02-27 21:31:40
Yes		Strongly disagree	Removing Latin from Level 1 is a poor idea. Latin supports the study of a number of subjects (history, linguistics, Romance languages, English literature, mediaeval studies), apart from the value of Classics itself. Like all languages it is best begun early. To reduce it to a subcomponent of history undervalues it	Latin should be included: there seems to be no rationale for its removal. Roman literature has a great deal to teach anyone interested in colonial experience. Roman history has become relevant to modern political theory (cf the "Tacitus trap"). Fundamental to the study of the world is the study of the past, and Latin is part of that. Delaying its start, and burying it within another subject, is a short sighted measure.	Ancient Greek.	Yes			2020-02-27 21:32:21	ANON-YFPW-RB8M-Y	2020-02-27 21:32:21	2020-02-27 21:32:31

Yes		Strongly disagree	The spread of subjects seems very good in itself, but see below under point 3	<p>Latin is the language of transmission of the classical European traditions of literature, science, law, medicine and philosophy.</p> <p>Access to the original language is crucial to a deep understanding of a culture, as speakers of the other languages would agree.</p> <p>The best time to start acquiring a deep proficiency in any language is earlier than tertiary education.</p> <p>New Zealand should maintain, at least as a specialty subject, the production of a core of secondary students of Latin who will eventually provide the nation with direct access to the classical traditions.</p> <p>Failing to do so risks relegating New Zealand to a second-rate division within scholarship and civilisation. Mandarin is the classical language of East Asia, but even in China, many universities offer Latin courses.</p> <p>Latin should continue to be regarded as one of the classical languages of New Zealand as a predominantly English-speaking nation and one with originally European traditions in politics, science and general culture.</p>		Yes			2020-02-27 21:34:10	ANON-YFPW-RBBD-P	2020-02-27 21:34:10	2020-02-27 21:34:52
No		Strongly disagree		I strongly disagree the new subjects because under the new system less knowledge will be taught which is huge disadvantaged of competition with other students from the rest of the world.		Yes			2020-02-27 21:35:51	ANON-YFPW-RB8X-A	2020-02-27 21:35:51	2020-02-27 21:36:17
Yes		Strongly disagree	I think narrowing such a broad subject down to four standards and claiming it is to broaden students knowledge rather than specialising is ridiculous. It also prevents creative teachers who are adapting standards to the class/students needs from doing their job.	Science needs to have the biology physics chemistry and earth science reinstated.	Electronics would be great to be taken out from under digital technologies umbrella	No			2020-02-27 21:37:19	ANON-YFPW-RB8A-K	2020-02-27 21:37:19	2020-02-27 21:37:32
No		Strongly disagree		As a current PhD student in Classics, I believe the study of Latin is extremely beneficial for students. It is a deep aspect of European culture generally and specifically contributes much of the depth and precision that the English language possesses. Moreover, learning a highly inflected language has huge cognitive benefits. Latin must stay as an option for students.		No			2020-02-27 21:37:38	ANON-YFPW-RB8N-Z	2020-02-27 21:37:38	2020-02-27 21:37:56
Yes	<p>It would be really beneficial to unpack what specialisms are going to be available at Levels 2 and 3, so we see the big picture and 'context' when looking at Level One.</p> <p>A proposed framework of all three Levels should be articulated before any development of the Level One Achievement Standards (and Unit Standards)</p>	Agree	Not able to comment in detail without seeing what is going to happen at Levels Two and Three. Support the proposal in principle.		Arts area - will there be a split of the Visual Arts at L2 and L3? I am not convinced that there are five subjects, maybe three practical art subjects at most. In international Baccalaureate Visual Arts there are (1) two-dimensional forms, (2) three-dimensional forms & (3) Lens / screen / electronic based forms. And then there should be Art History. Technology area - Materials Technology should split to Resistant Materials and Fashion / Textiles Materials at L2 and L3. Electronics could be added at L2 and L3. Quite a lot of the current subject list should be added at L2 and L3 also, e.g. Media Studies, the different Sciences, etc.	Yes	I have read the key documents.	Not fluent enough in my knowledge to provide appropriate feedback.	2020-02-27 21:40:44	ANON-YFPW-RB8K-W	2020-02-27 21:40:44	2020-02-27 21:41:04

Yes		Agree	While I agree that it is a good idea to give kids a broad education at the age of 15/16, I think this slightly oversteps the line a bit. There should still be chance to do some specialisation, and in particular the arts and humanities are disproportionately affected.	I believe the science/commerce mergers are a good idea as they are closely linked and having basic skills will provide a good springboard into more specialised subjects at L2. The same can't be said for the axing of classical studies and history. History is already a very broad subject, and trying to cram the history of art and classics is questionable. Many people I know at my school have a specific passion about older history, and already have baseline knowledge of more recent history from Y9/10 social studies. My best suggestion is to keep history as it is, and merge classical studies and history of art into a type of Ancient History studies, or rename the subjects are Modern History and Ancient History respectively. Although these may seem broad as an adult, the peers at my age (Y11) by now have specific goals and motivations within the field of history and what they learn. In particular Classical Studies requires a thorough baseline knowledge of gods and society before any knowledge at assessment can be done, and I am concerned what could be done if L1 classics is reduced to a mere achievement standard or 2. Also, while it is a rare subject, I support latin staying at L1. Languages at high schools are structured so it follows on from year to year, and it will be very unattractive to kids who have to take Latin for a	I would support separate Statistics/Modeling and Calculus at L2, as there is not enough time in L2 to get decent enough knowledge to start applying in the real world for both disciplines. Another subject addition that would be nice is linguistics, as many people who learn languages are interested in the history and mechanics of languages.	No			2020-02-27 21:42:32	ANON-YFPW-RB86-8	2020-02-27 21:42:32	2020-02-27 21:42:51
Yes		Strongly disagree				No			2020-02-27 21:44:09	ANON-YFPW-RB88-4	2020-02-27 21:44:09	2020-02-27 21:44:20
No		Strongly disagree	Slashing of the sciences (including Latin which is one of the critical languages of science) appears to be contrary to the shortages we have in the workforce and appears very short sighted. The current science options should be maintained to help stimulate and retain students in the field. Without full knowledge of the plans for level 2 & 3 it is hard to justify changes at level 1. If sciences are further neglected in level 2&3 then sciences will die in NZ (or NCEA will become irrelevant).	See answer to question 2. Loss of the science options @ level 1, without knowledge of proposed changes in level 2&3 is unacceptable. Loss of further students from the sciences to the arts (almost no reduction in options) will have a catastrophic impact on the future NZ workforce.		No			2020-02-27 21:46:27	ANON-YFPW-RB88-9	2020-02-27 21:46:27	2020-02-27 21:47:27
Yes	I agree with keeping broad education at NCEA level 1 but we should keep the learning areas broad and have an exam for each subject at the end of year for most subjects (english, maths, science, history etc) rather than project type assessment. We do not want to narrow focus or have students pick and choose from science curriculum as then they have not got good foundation for y12 and 13. Short answer questions over a broad range of knowledge is good.	Undecided		From Science perspective I think students have too much choice and we have students coming from other schools who have covered other standards but students have not done any ionic chemistry then want to do chemistry in L2. All students should have to cover key areas if they want to go on.		Yes		I think in line with other subjects keep it broad in L1 and specialise later	2020-02-27 21:47:53	ANON-YFPW-RB84-6	2020-02-27 21:47:53	2020-02-27 21:48:06
Yes		Strongly disagree				No			2020-02-27 21:48:30	ANON-YFPW-RB8T-6	2020-02-27 21:48:30	2020-02-27 21:48:38
Yes		Strongly disagree	Creating level 1 standards which are too broad then makes specialisation at the higher levels too difficult.			No			2020-02-27 21:57:09	ANON-YFPW-RB83-5	2020-02-27 21:57:09	2020-02-27 21:57:33
Yes		Strongly disagree		There is already so much content to cover in history itself as a subject and so combining classical studies into this is practically and elimination of the subject and would result in many kids missing out on the chance to learn about classical studies in depth. Most people have at least heard of the Greek myths and it is important that people have the opportunity to learn more about the history and culture associated with these Greek myths and the rest of the classical world. Classical studies is so much more than just history, it can include the myths, literature, art, and architecture. It doesn't quite fit the label of history alone.		Yes			2020-02-27 21:57:17	ANON-YFPW-RB82-4	2020-02-27 21:57:17	2020-02-27 21:57:33
No		Disagree				No			2020-02-27 22:00:02	ANON-YFPW-RB8U-7	2020-02-27 22:00:02	2020-02-27 22:00:25
No		Strongly agree	I like the idea of a broader learning experience and then allowing students to specialize as they move to level 2 and 3. Be good to the pros and cons of making these changes			No			2020-02-27 22:05:06	ANON-YFPW-RBEV-R	2020-02-27 22:05:06	2020-02-27 22:05:33
Yes		Strongly disagree	* The exclusion of Latin is a tragedy. * Reducing all science options to one science subject is nonsensical - we need students to engage more with science not less. * History and Classics cannot be combined - they are different spheres of historical study	As above	No	No			2020-02-27 22:06:34	ANON-YFPW-RBEV-N	2020-02-27 22:06:34	2020-02-27 22:06:43

No		Strongly disagree		The exclusion of Latin and Classics is a rather poor choice. Latin and Classics help students to develop a more profound interest in and attention for language phenomena as well as an open-mindedness towards different cultures.		No			2020-02-27 22:09:22	ANON-YFPW-RBEC-2	2020-02-27 22:09:22	2020-02-27 22:09:35
No		Strongly disagree	It seems very short-sighted to exclude Latin and marginalise Classical Studies. Latin is a foundational language, which provides the roots for most modern European languages (even though these are being retained). Classical Studies also provides an important point of reference for the modern world: only by understanding the deep past of human history can we properly plan for and imagine our future. Classical Studies provides a particularly rich body of ideas which still have purchase today (e.g., democracy, empire) as well as a literary tradition which provides critical reflection on its society and provides a framework for critiquing the modern world. This ancient tradition is too important to be cast aside for any society, let alone modern New Zealand society.	See above		No			2020-02-27 22:20:29	ANON-YFPW-RBEC-J	2020-02-27 22:20:29	2020-02-27 22:20:45
Yes		Strongly agree	I disagree with the abolition of Latin	Latin provides the student with a deeper awareness of their own tongue and for a solid foundation to learn foreign languages. It also develops the student's logical abilities, since translation of complex literary Latin sentences involves problem solving and complex reasoning	No	No			2020-02-27 22:24:22	ANON-YFPW-RBEC-Q	2020-02-27 22:24:22	2020-02-27 22:24:37
No		Strongly disagree		The exclusion of Latin would be a travesty, especially if the goal is to truly build a more foundational curriculum. Classics as a field is the origin of much of Western academia, including English, History, and the sciences, and it still functions as an excellent way to teach students the methodologies of these other fields. Furthermore, Classics is an incredibly rich subject, presenting students with complex linguistics, brilliant works of literature, and a crucial period of world history, and losing it would put these students at a disadvantage in their further studies and in life.		No			2020-02-27 22:25:59	ANON-YFPW-RBEC-R	2020-02-27 22:25:59	2020-02-27 22:26:09
Yes	Social Sciences, science and technology seem to be getting the short straw. This will put extra stress in students and teachers due to how wide the net will now be. Students who have a clear direction of where they want to go will suffer now. Also, Maori performing arts should fall under performing arts or Maori. It could splinter both of the other subjects by dividing their bases. Latin is important to the world. It should not be forgotten.	Strongly disagree	Some of the changes aren't bad, but they should be optional, up to the school, teachers and families. The only one I saw that made sense was pe and health. The social Sciences especially seem to be targeted at a time when students have terrible literacy and don't know NZs history. By combining classics and history you take away from both. Something will have to give. If I was in that position I would ignore nz history to the bare minimum in protest, so that I could cover more important global topics since I would now have a super topic. Same goes for science. Why bother teaching some aspects when others are far more impressive for uni. Forget about all the skills you can learn.	As above. This will see the fragmentation of subjects and will kill them over time. Schools should have freedom and final say. It may work for some schools but others definitely not. It will also mean that teachers that are not subject experts will get stuck teaching what they don't know or aren't passionate about. You also combine things that sometimes cover different departments. It won't work. I'd say a lot of teachers will retire early due to this, thus worsening the teacher crisis. School should also focus on academics, rather than including new performing arts. How about we bring technical colleges in. It would solve a lot of these problems as well as societies ills. Aptitude test after intermediate which can recommend whether they go academic or technical. This way students that work better with their hands would have an outlet, rather than disrupting a class. This could also help them get apprenticeships and a head start on tertiary if they chose it. I also think that credits should be reworked. It	Latin and classics would be fine	No	I prefer to work towards the greater good rather than reverse racism where a particular group gets signalled out as priority learners. It's damaging to mana and makes students lose self worth and others; think that they are dumb. NCEA needs to be stricter. Not everyone should pass, it's life lessons.	Some Maori standards offer far too many credits for not a lot of work	2020-02-27 22:29:57	ANON-YFPW-RBEC-G	2020-02-27 22:29:57	2020-02-27 22:30:13
No		Strongly disagree			Horticulture.	No	combining all the sciences together is ludicrous. They are separate disciplines and need to be treated accordingly. They are effectively languages - languages that explain the laws of our physical universe. It's the same as trying to combine French, German and Arabic.		2020-02-27 22:32:36	ANON-YFPW-RBEC-I	2020-02-27 22:32:36	2020-02-27 22:32:46
No		Strongly disagree	The abolition of Latin seems like pointless cultural vandalism.	See above	Latin	No			2020-02-27 22:37:02	ANON-YFPW-RBEC-G	2020-02-27 22:37:02	2020-02-27 22:37:10
Yes		Strongly disagree	see under 3, below	Latin, and Classics, are an important part of the background to today's world, and although they should not be compulsory for everybody they should be made available to those who want to study them, so that the study of them in New Zealand will not totally disappear.		No			2020-02-27 22:37:13	ANON-YFPW-RBEC-4	2020-02-27 22:37:13	2020-02-27 22:37:46

Yes		Strongly disagree	There is no good reason to abolish Latin. It's a fascinating language, which teaches many transferable skills, including logical analysis, and gives access to many of the foundational aspects of modern (international, not just European or Western) culture.					2020-02-27 22:42:44	ANON-YFPW-RBEP-F	2020-02-27 22:42:44	2020-02-27 22:43:04
No		Strongly disagree						2020-02-27 22:54:18	ANON-YFPW-RBE7-P	2020-02-27 22:54:10	2020-02-27 22:54:44
No		Strongly disagree						2020-02-27 23:09:50	ANON-YFPW-RBEF-5	2020-02-27 23:09:50	2020-02-27 23:10:17
Yes		Strongly disagree		The exclusion of Latin is a mistake: the study of this language is highly educational, provides students with logical skills and improves the knowledge of Neo-Latin languages. Many important poets, writers, philosophers wrote in Latin and students should be able to read these significant texts in their original language.				2020-02-27 23:16:06	ANON-YFPW-RBE1-G	2020-02-27 23:16:06	2020-02-27 23:16:39
Yes		Strongly disagree		Classics are an important part of the secondary school curriculum and should be included. People regard the study of Latin and the classics more broadly as elitist, but that is in fact the opposite of the truth. Studying the ancient languages and cultures is, first and foremost, empowering, allowing students to understand and engage with one of the dominant traditions of the past two millennia. More importantly, however, classics is inherently interdisciplinary and self-critical, and encourages students to develop the critical thinking and judgment necessary to solve difficult problems.				2020-02-27 23:20:32	ANON-YFPW-RBEZ-5	2020-02-27 23:20:32	2020-02-27 23:20:40
No		Strongly disagree	Latin and Classical Studies and History of Art are an important part of global culture and therefore the secondary school curriculum and should be included.	Latin and Classical Studies and History of Art are an important part of global culture and therefore the secondary school curriculum and should be included.	Latin and Classical Studies and Ancient/Classical GREEK!!!			2020-02-27 23:21:23	ANON-YFPW-RBEH-7	2020-02-27 23:21:23	2020-02-27 23:21:43
No		Strongly disagree	sidelining classics would be detrimental at that level and for classics in future. They have been proven valuable in helping with out subjects, for instance.					2020-02-27 23:40:25	ANON-YFPW-RBEB-1	2020-02-27 23:40:25	2020-02-27 23:40:39
No		Strongly disagree		My Secondary School Latin studies have enabled me over 75 years to confront a wide range of subjects and occupations that would otherwise have been extremely difficult, if not impossible; and two of my sons who studied Latin (and ancient Greek) owe their successful careers to this area knowledge. The Education authorities in NZ have a duty and responsibility to realize the importance of Latin in forming a young person's mind and in serving numerous branches of knowledge, obviously the arts in general, languages, history, sciences and so on. I strongly urge that this proposal to sweep Latin into the dust be entirely reconsidered.				2020-02-27 23:44:44	ANON-YFPW-RBEM-C	2020-02-27 23:44:44	2020-02-27 23:45:12
Yes		Disagree		I write as a UK-based Classicalist, so you may feel I have no right to a view on the matter. I would say my claim, such as it is, is based on the fact that I have an NZ intellectual pedigree: my PhD supervisor, Robert Coleman, was a proud New Zealander, and I believe the first person to teach Maori language in a British university. Because of him I have always taken an interest in NZ Classics, and admired the strong traditions of teaching subject of a country which could produce so many world-class scholars. Cutting Latin teaching in schools tends to have the following effects. First, it makes the subject the province of well-off students, whose families can work round the system. Second, it breaks a tradition: the subject can survive a low level, but there comes a point at which the generational transmission breaks down and cannot be restarted. Third, it makes it harder for students to study other languages, including such major ones as Spanish and Russian. Fourth, I have never seen convincing evidence that cutting Latin leads to higher standards in any other subject. For these reasons, I would humbly urge a reconsideration of this policy.				2020-02-27 23:49:11	ANON-YFPW-RBED-3	2020-02-27 23:49:11	2020-02-27 23:49:20

No		Strongly disagree		It is a great loss for school students for having no opportunity anymore to learn Latin. Knowledge of the ancient world is valuable in itself, but also gives a great opportunity to think about the Self and the Other on several levels: language, culture, religion, literature, and so on. Studying an ancient language like Latin provides students with a framework to reflect on all those fields both in the past and the present. A subject as Latin is therefore very useful and worthy in present times, precisely because you do not only 'just' learn a language: we need to provide young students with tools to reflect on all those issues and classical studies is an already existing subject to do so.	Latin and Ancient Studies.	No			2020-02-28 00:07:30	ANON-YFPW-RBEX-Q	2020-02-28 00:07:30	2020-02-28 00:07:41
Yes		Strongly disagree		Latin and Classics are an important part of the secondary school curriculum and should be included so that students could know Occidental culture roots and development		No			2020-02-28 00:27:41	ANON-YFPW-RBEX-A	2020-02-28 00:27:41	2020-02-28 00:28:18
Yes		Strongly disagree	Not all knowledge needs to be immediately useful, i.e., to earn your bread. Do we want a society in which lucre is the only commodity of value? In particular, of course, I am talking about Latin. The classics are part of our Western cultural heritage. They need to be taught alongside aboriginal studies. Certainly, the Maori & Tongans were colonial usurpers as much as the Brits. For our students to be denied access to the classics because they have no opportunity to learn Latin & Greek is pitifully myopic.	Latin AND Greek! See my answer to Question 2...		Yes			2020-02-28 00:40:01	ANON-YFPW-RBEX-N	2020-02-28 00:37:07	2020-02-28 00:40:12
Yes		Strongly disagree		The omission of Classics as a subject from the core of learning, only supported via History, is detrimental to giving students the necessary grounding for life in the modern world. Classics, as a subject, is naturally predisposed to tackling the "big questions" that we still have about our world today, within the self-contained world of Classical Antiquity. As we attempt to create a multicultural and open society, tackle issues in politics and understand democracy, international relations and the like; we find solutions to these questions, and are encouraged to challenge them through the study of the Classical World, where we have seen these playing out time and again. Further to this, the study of Latin is an excellent foundation for the study of any and all languages, its striking-off is also a travesty and a mistake.	Classics! For the very same reasons outlined in my response to question 3.	Yes		No. It seems logical.	2020-02-28 00:40:56	ANON-YFPW-RBER-H	2020-02-28 00:40:56	2020-02-28 00:41:19
Yes		Strongly disagree				No			2020-02-28 00:53:32	ANON-YFPW-RBEW-P	2020-02-28 00:53:32	2020-02-28 00:53:50
No		Strongly disagree	The proposal to abolish Latin (and reduce Classics) in New Zealand's secondary school curriculum is ill-considered and short sighted. I am a physician at Harvard Medical School in the United States, and I studied Latin in middle school, secondary school, and college. The skills and knowledge taught in my Latin courses developed my critical thinking abilities and study skills in essential ways. In short, these courses helped me become a better doctor. Removal of such courses prevents the acquisition of these skills, which are difficult to obtain in other humanities courses or in science courses. Latin is a unique bridge between the humanities and the sciences because of the rigor with which it is taught, the skills it inculcates, and the connection to the past that it inspires.			No			2020-02-28 01:42:21	ANON-YFPW-RBE4-K	2020-02-28 01:42:21	2020-02-28 01:42:33
No		Strongly disagree		Cutting Latin is short sighted. Latin is a rigorous subject, known to train minds. Those who study Latin also strengthen their grasp of English grammar and English vocabulary.		No			2020-02-28 01:44:17	ANON-YFPW-RBET-K	2020-02-28 01:44:17	2020-02-28 01:44:47
No		Disagree	I believe strongly that Latin ought not to be dropped from the Level 1 curriculum. Although it is, of course, a minority language, it represents a hugely important tradition extending from antiquity, through the middle ages, to the modern period.	I have given my reasons for retaining Latin in my reply to question 2. It is a vital part of a humanistic program, and should not be eliminated from the Level 1 subject list.		No			2020-02-28 02:14:32	ANON-YFPW-RBE3-J	2020-02-28 02:14:32	2020-02-28 02:14:47

Yes		Strongly disagree		I believe that Latin and Classics are more important today than ever before! We should not forget the fact that our modern world is rooted in Classical Antiquity. Therefore, Latin and Classics should definitely remain part of the curriculum. The study of Latin organizes our minds, teaches us thorough grammar, and helps us learn various languages (not only the Roman ones, but also those belonging to other language families; people who study Latin learn grammar elements that can be applied to very diverse languages). Classics is maybe even more important than Latin, because pupils become familiar with highly important elements of history, literature, arts, medicine, science, etc. As a so-called "synoptic" subject it offers even more contact with the classical world than Latin does. Classics opens the pupils' minds and cultivates their spirits. These two subjects should be taught not only in secondary schools, but also at university level, and not only as minors, but certainly also as majors! These are the conclusions based on my own experience as a secondary school teacher and university instructor of Latin and Classics in the USA and Germany.		No				2020-02-28 02:28:10	ANON-YFPW-RBE2-H	2020-02-28 02:28:10	2020-02-28 02:28:45
No		Strongly disagree		Latin and Greek should be considered as important parts of a complete secondary education, linguistically, historically, culturally.		No				2020-02-28 03:38:48	ANON-YFPW-RBEU-M	2020-02-28 03:38:47	2020-02-28 03:38:59
No		Strongly disagree		Latin and Classics are an important part of the secondary school curriculum. They are essential for anyone wishing to pursue higher education in the Humanities and also play a key role in the general education of the average citizen, allowing them to trace the ancient roots of many modern concepts and phenomena (from empire to democracy, from race to citizenship, to mention only a few obvious cases). Classics and Latin are included in the basic curriculum of most Western countries. New Zealanders would be to a great disadvantage if these subjects are excluded.		No				2020-02-28 03:58:18	ANON-YFPW-RBCY-P	2020-02-28 03:58:18	2020-02-28 03:58:33
Yes		Strongly disagree		The objection is to the elimination of Latin as an offering. Not only is Latin the key to a significant part of New Zealand's history, it is the key to understanding Romance languages and other Latin derived languages (including in large part English) spoken as first language by more than half a billion people worldwide.		No				2020-02-28 04:55:14	ANON-YFPW-RBCV-K	2020-02-28 04:55:14	2020-02-28 04:55:39
No		Strongly disagree	I very much object to the removal of Latin, and the downplaying of Classics generally.	Latin is a subject which many children particularly enjoy (see how they like the spells in Harry Potter!). It also opens up understanding of English, grammar, and culture. Classics offers vistas into especially important periods and ideas, without which a lot of later history, philosophy, and politics makes less good sense.	No.	No				2020-02-28 05:06:18	ANON-YFPW-RBCC-Z	2020-02-28 05:06:18	2020-02-28 05:06:34
Yes		Strongly disagree	Latin should be kept and supported.	Latin is foundational for the Western culture and as such needed for any education worthy of this name.	No.	No				2020-02-28 05:52:55	ANON-YFPW-RBCS-G	2020-02-28 05:52:55	2020-02-28 05:53:18

Yes	This question is stated poorly and is ambiguous. I am not sure what it means.	Disagree	I strongly disagree with the proposal to amalgamate Classical Studies with History. I am a product of the excellent education in Classical Studies at the NZ high school level - I pursued it all the way to 7th form, took Latin and Greek at University, gained admittance to the Program in Classical Philology at Princeton University, won a post-doctoral fellowship at Harvard University, and currently teach at a prestigious liberal arts college in the USA, all in no little part due to the wonderful introduction to the subject that I received at school in New Zealand. I fear that including Classical Studies as but one option in the History curriculum will destroy its integrity as a genuine curricular option. It should stand as an independent option with a cohesive curriculum of its own - I still draw on the breadth of media and ideas that I was exposed to in my classes in Classical Studies. The history of Classical Studies in New Zealand is a long and distinguished one, and is moreover important for our own understanding of ourselves as a country. By preventing future New Zealanders from having access to this important point of orientation, we weaken our sense of our intellectual history and ability to participate in the debates that surround our traditions.	See above.	See above.	Yes	I studied Maori in high school alongside Classical Studies (taking Maori to School Certificate). This combination was particularly rich, and I still draw on it: I am currently studying (from Massachusetts, USA) the late nineteenth-century social reformer and thinker Edward Tregear and his theory that the Maori people were originally Indo-European. This thesis is bizarre and of course		2020-02-28 05:52:59	ANON-YFPW-RBC8-N	2020-02-28 05:52:59	2020-02-28 05:53:18
Yes		Strongly agree				No			2020-02-28 06:41:05	ANON-YFPW-RBC9-P	2020-02-28 06:41:05	2020-02-28 06:41:18
Yes		Strongly disagree		I am strongly of the view that Latin and Classics should remain available at level 1. I must of course declare an interest as a (retired) professor of classics. But I taught it because I believe in it, and I work on it full time in my retirement because it still excites! A country that abolishes classics shuts itself from large parts of the history and culture of the world. I note with admiration the range of languages that are available in your syllabus, but the point of language learning isn't just to communicate with people who are alive today; it is also to have access to the thought and literature of past cultures, and this, not learning how to chat in a modern language, is the experience that is exciting for the best students. As it happens, several of our very best recent graduate students in Oxford have been from New Zealand, as is arguably the most brilliant living Latinist, Denis Feeney of Princeton, and as was the greatest Roman historian of the 20th c., Ronald Syme. So classics in New Zealand isn't a wan imitation of something done in Europe: you are (or have been till now) a thriving part of an international enterprise.		No			2020-02-28 07:02:08	ANON-YFPW-RBCG-4	2020-02-28 07:02:08	2020-02-28 07:02:26
Yes		Strongly disagree		Cutting Latin and the study of Classical Languages is suicidal. Like cutting the roots of a tree, it would condemn our youth to grow without knowing where we come from, and ignorance is a passport to misinformation and manipulation.		Yes			2020-02-28 07:02:34	ANON-YFPW-RBCI-7	2020-02-28 07:02:34	2020-02-28 07:02:49
No		Strongly disagree	I support some of it, but I cannot support the evisceration of Latin and classical studies from the NCEA curriculum. (see below)	I strongly oppose the removal of Latin and Classical Studies, as this would remove access to these immensely important areas of study. I studied these subjects in school and continue to be amazed at how important and useful they have proved to be. Both Latin and Classical Studies provide the single best training ground I know of for training in intellectual precision, historical awareness, and practical wisdom in decision making. Not only are these skills essential to an educated citizenry in any democracy, but they also provide the best training in all the "Soft Skills" that employers keep saying are among the most important skills they look for in potential employees.		No			2020-02-28 07:06:18	ANON-YFPW-RBCQ-E	2020-02-28 07:06:18	2020-02-28 07:06:26

Yes	<p>- I was aware that NCEA was being looked at and that changes may happen.</p> <p>- I was under the impression that current achievement standards were to be adapted and new ones added.</p> <p>- I was not aware that we would be left with only 4 standards in Level 1 Science.</p> <p>- I was not aware that the purpose of the changes to NCEA were to 'support a broad, more foundational education'. I believe that the current number and variety of achievement standards in Level 1 Science already fit the purpose.</p>	Strongly disagree	I teach in a decile 1 high school with a number of transient students. The proposed changes to Level 1 Science will see a decline in student achievement as students will have moved schools & miss learning or lose learning. There is no scope for co-construction with individual students in their own learning program.	As above.	-	No			2020-02-28 07:25:22	ANON-YFPW-RBCE-2	2020-02-28 07:25:22	2020-02-28 07:25:37
No		Strongly disagree		<p>I strongly disagree with the abolishment of Latin at all levels of NCEA. The study of this language, which I benefited from when attending a state school in the 1990s, offers many advantages to students:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a rigorous study of a language with clear grammatical guidance and rules. - a language which facilitates the learning of many others, including (but not limited to) Spanish, French, Italian and of course English itself. - opening up the world of the ancient Romans to students, including aspects of culture which have had a far-reaching impact on our modern world. - a point of difference from modern languages in not relying heavily on spoken interaction, which some students do not enjoy. - the opportunity to read and appreciate poetry, history, biography, letters, and inscriptions in their original form. <p>In addition, the removal of Classical Studies from the Level 1 tranche of NCEA is an ill-thought idea. This subject offers access to a vast range of art, mythology, history, social history, and archaeology - an exceptional variety which a subject such as History cannot compare with. Simply lumping it in as a part of History ignores the huge importance of other aspects of Classical culture, and how they</p>		No			2020-02-28 07:45:18	ANON-YFPW-RBC7-M	2020-02-28 07:45:18	2020-02-28 07:45:39
Yes		Agree		<p>I like the reduction in specialisation in some areas (Science) and the addition of Maori performing arts. I do not agree with merging PE and Health. At our school Health is treated as a separate subject to PE in the junior school and has 3 hours a week allocated to it as do all of our subjects. This is in response to our curriculum review and strong student/whanau voice which called for life readiness. The junior health curriculum is all about physical, mental and social health which are critical elements of success in life. Too often in the past health has been a part of PE and only got considered as an add on (when it was too wet to do PE) or it was the boring theoretical part of PE. With a national focus on Wellbeing, re-emerging Health with PE is not a consistent message about importance.</p>		Yes		Very supportive of the improvements	2020-02-28 07:42:17	ANON-YFPW-RBCP-D	2020-02-28 07:42:17	2020-02-28 07:45:44
Yes		Strongly agree		<p>Science can't be broad. Biology, physics, chemistry are all specific subjects. Also doubt about the teacher, can't believe one teacher is the expert in three subjects</p>		Yes			2020-02-28 07:55:16	ANON-YFPW-RBCF-3	2020-02-28 07:55:16	2020-02-28 07:55:34
No	<p>No evidence of greater specialisation.</p> <p>Flexibility to offer a range of qualification pathways for a range of student abilities is being sacrificed for simplicity</p>	Strongly disagree	<p>Need to work from the end result backwards so you define the desired outcomes first.</p> <p>Need to have useful pathways for a range of student's strengths and abilities</p>	<p>Redefine what is needed for university entrance - in consultation with tertiary providers.</p> <p>Redefine what is needed for non-university high-school graduates to be suitably prepared for other professional training.</p> <p>Work from the top-down to ensure the right skills and abilities are included.</p> <p>Alternative to the currently proposed non-specific content free level 1 standards for science would be to have a two year course that starts in year 10 that has a wide range of standards</p>	<p>Look into adding standards that are more applicable to NZ industry, commercially relevant - perhaps targeting our largest GDP earners of agriculture, horticulture, silviculture and tourism etc</p>	No	<p>Alas, I'm not yet fluent with being able to read Te Reo in a technical way</p>		2020-02-28 08:10:23	ANON-YFPW-RBC1-E	2020-02-28 08:10:23	2020-02-28 08:10:41

Yes	The change is small in some subject areas but the Sciences are being savagely cut. Will the removal of the separate Sciences as subjects mean the removal of Achievement standards within them. We use a mix of standards from Science, Physics, Chemistry and Biology to construct courses called Physical Science and Biochemistry to help prepare our more able students for years 12 and 13. The non-specialist Science students do the ordinary Science course. Why are you cutting back Science and appearing to turn it into Social Studies?	Strongly disagree	Further cutting down of content in the Sciences makes it hard to prepare students for senior subject choices. Students already have a small experience of Chemistry. I am worried that the emphasis on written reports will further erode the amount of guided practical work in this area. Is this aimed to save money in our already under-resourced secondary education sector. You are putting more and more onto teachers to mark lengthy essays and projects.	Only having SCIENCE as a level one NCEA subject is very restrictive to student keen on pursuing the strands of Science. Maybe you envisage importing even more of our medical doctors and engineers in the future. NZ has had a proud history in the Sciences, why are you keen to throw this away??	Possibly Biochemistry as a Level 3 course. This would be valuable for students interested in pursuing Medicine for example.	Yes	A useful option but don't allow it to replace the fundamental Sciences which are just as relevant to our Maori students as to our Pakeha students.		2020-02-28 08:11:15	ANON-YFPW-RBCZ-Q	2020-02-28 08:11:15	2020-02-28 08:12:36
No		Strongly disagree	The proposed change will not prepare students adequately to Level 2 specialisation. This will further put them at a disadvantage as they will experience more gap in their knowledge when they reach Level 2. Specialisation should be encouraged earlier on.	Science specialisation must be included. Merging of specialised areas of science will put students at a disadvantage when they reach Level 2.		No			2020-02-28 08:15:34	ANON-YFPW-RBCB-Y	2020-02-28 08:15:34	2020-02-28 08:15:43
No	Thought was that there would be no changes to the standards, only credit requirements at L1. Had no idea specialist sciences would not be on offer.	Strongly disagree	I don't like the idea of doing away with specialist Sciences at L1. Our students were well prepared for L2 with having specialist subjects. The new format is literacy heavy and many students will have difficulty with this.	The idea of doing away with specialist science subjects is disappointing. Students get teaching in a specific area which prepares them for L2. Expecting students to be able to deal with L2 specialist sciences and be able to memorise concepts for externals without L1 preparation, is ridiculous. The proposed L1 programme does not focus on learning and remembering, just project-based learning which is about students retrieving information and presenting this.		No			2020-02-28 08:22:03	ANON-YFPW-RBCM-A	2020-02-28 08:22:03	2020-02-28 08:22:20
Yes		Strongly disagree	Media Studies has nothing to do with Social Studies, nor does psychology. Classical Studies and Art History are wonderful independent subjects and you should not cut Latin out- it is a missed opportunity. Oh, and don't even get me started on the Sciences!	See above.	I think we should have accessibility for more not less subjects.	No			2020-02-28 08:27:59	ANON-YFPW-RBCD-1	2020-02-28 08:27:59	2020-02-28 08:28:08
Yes		Strongly disagree		Some of these subjects, specifically within the "Social Sciences" tab just won't get the same necessary attention they would otherwise get as stand alone courses. Classical Studies and Art History for example are very often viewed as subjects that attract less amounts of student interest, but this should not lend itself as a reason to remove them as subjects altogether. That same effort put into removing them could have and must be used to advertise these subjects. NCEA is a particularly monotonous form of teaching, and for many students (myself included) Art History and Classical Studies was the sole class they looked forward to. These subjects have directly lead to more critical writing techniques and university degrees.		Yes			2020-02-28 08:36:36	ANON-YFPW-RBCB-N	2020-02-28 08:36:36	2020-02-28 08:36:57
Yes	I have recently completed a Masters in Teaching and Learning and am very familiar with the proposed changes.	Disagree	Being a teacher of many of the Social Studies strands, I do not understand why there would be a reduction of choice for our students. Each of the current strands take a year to teach. With lumping them together, we would essentially have a term on each subject. The jump between NCEA level 2 and NCEA level 1 is already massive for our students, let alone only going into it with a one term of prior learning. I think the new structure does not allow for depth of learning, and will put a lot of pressure on teachers.	I think New Zealand history should be made its own subject, for a full-year attention. History is massive and if we have to cover classical, modern and New Zealand history, that is so many new concepts for students to rapidly learn. As there was announced to be a focus on NZ history, I think that we should commit to it - I am a teacher already teaching the entire level 1 history topic on New Zealand history and the students love it. If I had to then jump from NZ history to classic, I know for a fact the students would not be able to make links between the two - they are two completely different topics, and the standards in particular are very very different so would require a whole new range of skills to be tested. If both classics and history were combined into one exam at the end of the year, I think this would be very difficult for students to jump from NZ history to classics, which require completely different skills with no significant links between the two	I think that NZ history should be a specialist subject for level 2 and 3 as well. Additionally, I think the Pacific Studies currently specialisation courses need to be developed more and turned into Achievement standards rather than Unit Standards. I teach Pacific Studies in a majority Pasifika school, and it is one of our most popular courses at level 3 in particular. The students love to learn about their culture, particularly when we can bring whānau in to chat to them. I think that it should be an achievement standard based course as it seems quite deficit for one of the only specific opportunities for Pacific students to study their own culture be one where it is not recognized the way it is when Māori or Pākehā students do the same. It is an awesome, amazing class, however there is not a lot of support for it from outside the school.	Yes	I did several reports on it as part of my Masters of Teaching and Learning	I don't teach in this area so can't speak to it too much, but from my understanding in a theoretical sense, I think it looks good	2020-02-28 08:42:16	ANON-YFPW-RBCA-X	2020-02-28 08:42:16	2020-02-28 08:43:16

Yes	These proposals were brought in to coincide with the start of the school year....at the busiest time for teachershence it has been quite frustrating to speak with colleagues from other schools.	Strongly disagree	The proposed changes to Science are worrying. It would seem that the aim is to dumb down the Science curriculum at Level 1 to such an extent that students will find the step up to Level 2 separate Sciences even harder than it is now as there is not enough content and skills in the new proposed Level 1 standards. There appears to be only one of the four proposals where practical Science is addressed. This is S1.1 where there is some alignment with what we currently do at Level 1 but will require knowledge to put the experiments into context S1.2 Explore a real world issue....this looks as though it should be under the Social Science umbrella. there doesn't appear to be any clear learning intentions and the emphasis will be on teachers to unpack the standard to dig around for some obvious LIs. Doesn't look rigorous enough to set students up for Level 2 and 3 Sciences. S1.3.....way beyond the thinking of Level 1 students...better suited to University students. S1.4 Low ability students will struggle to critique information. Adults struggle with these ideas let alone 15 or 16 year old students. Way too advanced for Level 1 and where is the solid Science here? There are Level 2 and 3 standards that cover these concepts....leave them where they are and don't	If students decide to leave school at 16 at the end of Level 1, they should have a good solid foundation of Science skills and knowledge. Hairdressing is practical chemistry. Building is practical Physics and Applied Maths. Working in the food industry requires a basic knowledge of microbiology for health and safety. How can New Zealand deal with a plastics problem if citizens have no idea what it is made from?...again basic organic chemistry.	No			2020-02-28 08:55:30	ANON-YFPW-RBCN-8	2020-02-28 08:55:30	2020-02-28 08:55:48
Yes		Strongly disagree	I feel that amalgamating Biology, Physics and Chemistry into Level 1 is like putting German, French and Spanish onto one languages course. Many Scientists and Students have a leaning to one or two Sciences and are less comfortable with a third. It is disadvantaging students who want to specialise as they will not be equipped with enough depth for Level 2 in their chosen discipline.	I feel that amalgamating Biology, Physics and Chemistry into Level 1 is like putting German, French and Spanish onto one languages course. Many Scientists and Students have a leaning to one or two Sciences and are less comfortable with a third. It is disadvantaging students who want to specialise as they will not be equipped with enough depth for Level 2 in their chosen discipline.	No			2020-02-28 09:16:51	ANON-YFPW-RBCK-8	2020-02-28 09:16:51	2020-02-28 09:16:59
No		Undecided		I am a Maori Senior Lecturer at a business school: 1. I disagree with the devolving of Economics, Accounting and Business Studies into one topic. I can only imagine that this would mean the quality and comprehensiveness of these topics will be diluted. Each in and of themselves are important for students to understand if they choose to go forward into a business qualification.	No	I have just seen it.	There doesn't seem to be anything to do with economic development. I could be wrong as te reo is not my strong point. However, given the intense focus on economic development iwi have, this seems to be a significant gap.	2020-02-28 09:18:46	ANON-YFPW-RBC6-K	2020-02-28 09:18:46	2020-02-28 09:19:07
Yes		Strongly disagree		Accounting, Economics, and Business studies are three very different subjects and courses. One of my concerns for merging the subjects is that students will not have the foundations required for Level Two due to the lack of specialisation in Level One. At Y9 and Y10 most schools provide a business studies/enterprise course which covers the basics of accounting, economics and business studies, this gives an overview of commerce subjects. Without allowing students to specialise in Level One, many will not have sufficient foundation knowledge of any of the three Commerce subjects to achieve highly in Level Two. Another concern are teachers who have only studied and taught one of the commerce subjects will now be required to learn and teach in a subject which is not their speciality.	No			2020-02-28 09:30:41	ANON-YFPW-RBCH-5	2020-02-28 08:14:57	2020-02-28 09:30:45

No	I was aware of a change in terms of having 10 internal credits and 10 external credits per subject but not about combining subjects.	Strongly disagree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accounting, Economics and Business are very individual and differing subjects. The skills and knowledge in each of these areas are very different. The skills taught at Level 1 underpin the foundation of success in Level 2 and Level 3. <p>The data of student numbers taking these subjects supports the popularity of these subjects individually as well as student success in these areas. In particular, many subject areas that have less students engaging with them nationwide have been able to maintain their status as individual subjects. I believe the status quo for Accounting, Economics and Business as individual subjects, should remain.</p>	<p>I have the following concerns and recommend that the Accounting, Economics and Business Studies remain as separate subjects at L1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accounting, Economics and Business are very individual and differing subjects. The skills and knowledge in each of these areas are very different. The skills taught at Level 1 underpin the foundation of success in Level 2 and Level 3. As a pathway into future success in Level 3 and Scholarship Accounting and Economics, students require knowledge that is embedded during teaching during Level 1. There is a clear future career pathway in all of these areas and they are INDIVIDUAL at University. Nationally student numbers in Accounting and Business at Level 1 are increasing (or being maintained). Students financial capabilities are a concern nationwide, and this proposal limits students access to varied pathways where this is a predominant idea. It appears that Commerce subjects, and Accounting in particular, will be a step behind with respect to learning as it is not able to be accessed at Level 1, or will need to be condensed significantly to fit in the other subject's ideas (trying to cover the key foundation ideas of 3 	No	No			2020-02-28 09:33:34	ANON-YFPW-RBCR-F	2020-02-28 09:30:43	2020-02-28 09:33:39
Yes		Strongly disagree	Latin is more important than Samoan as it is the basis of the majority of European languages.		Yes				2020-02-28 09:59:44	ANON-YFPW-RBCW-M	2020-02-28 09:59:44	2020-02-28 10:00:00
No		Strongly disagree	In particular in Science, students will not have enough understanding of basic chemistry, biology and physics for Year 12 and Year 13. Therefore Year 12/13 will have to be simplified and then mean extending degrees/or a huge jump into university.	Students need the basic backbone of biology, physics and chemistry to help them	No	Yes	No		2020-02-28 10:12:49	ANON-YFPW-RBC4-H	2020-02-28 10:12:49	2020-02-28 10:12:59
Yes	I was, however, not aware that this would mean an end to Biology, Chemistry, Physics and Earth & Space Science standards also being available.	Strongly disagree	We need to have a wide range of assessment options available, to suit the diverse needs of our students. In our school, we offer only 2 courses at Level 1 (because we are a small school and don't have enough students to offer individual Bio, Chem and Physics at this level), but we can, at present, offer rich learning experiences and assessments to all of our students due to the flexibility offered by standards in Science, Bio, Chem, Physics and Earth & Space Science. Science has a MASSIVE body of knowledge and skills, and to reduce the available assessment standards to only 4 in total does Science a great disservice, in my opinion. As a teacher of over 25 years experience, I have seen and experienced many changes to our teaching and assessment, but never one like this. I am not opposed to change, but I do not support this change.	The skills and knowledge base required for success at Level 2 and beyond require a base to have been built over previous years. Yes, we can still teach and assess the content and skills if we value them, but it seems ridiculous that we would not be able to assess them within our National assessment system. There should be assessment standards available for Bio, Chem, Physics and Earth & Space Science, so we can develop courses which suit the needs of our students, and which will give them the recognised credits which result from National assessment.	No		Surely this curriculum must be the same as the NZ Curriculum, but in Te Reo? For those of us who are not fluent in Maori, this document would not be of much help.		2020-02-28 10:27:16	ANON-YFPW-RBC3-G	2020-02-28 10:27:16	2020-02-28 10:27:29
No		Disagree	My main comments on the subjects are included in the comment box below. Generally, I feel that the sciences should remain separate and that Latin and Classics should not be removed from the curriculum.	<p>There are two key issues I have with the changes. The first is amalgamating the sciences into one subject, and the other is removing both Latin and Classics altogether.</p> <p>Teaching students very general science in Level 1 could prove detrimental to their studies in Levels 2 and 3, especially as they will be thrown headfirst into learning more difficult concepts within the different subjects of Physics, Chemistry, and Biology without having a more solid base. Students need to have a grasp on the sciences before being taught harder concepts, or it will be pointless.</p> <p>My second issue is with the removal of Latin altogether from NCEA, and removing Classics from Level 1. Latin is an essential part of studying ancient history or classics at university, and it is beneficial for students to learn it at high school and develop their knowledge over the three years that they complete NCEA, rather than try and start to learn it when they begin university. Removing it completely will also discourage students from learning the subject at all. This is the same for classics - removing it from Level 1 makes it less likely for students to take it up in Levels 2 and 3, and this will decrease the number of students</p>	No.	No			2020-02-28 10:28:22	ANON-YFPW-RBC2-F	2020-02-28 10:28:22	2020-02-28 10:28:35
Yes		Agree			Yes				2020-02-28 10:33:10	ANON-YFPW-RBCU-J	2020-02-28 10:33:10	2020-02-28 10:33:24

Yes	Yes members of the Health and PE department were aware of the intended change for a broader NCEA at level 1 and agree with that in principal. What we don't agree with is combining two separate subject areas - Health and PE into one subject at level 1. Was there any feedback in your initial consultation (from families, working groups, students, teachers etc) that indicated a combined HPE subject would be the most effective? Or was Ministry data used? Both?	Undecided	Undecided, because again there are aspects of a broad foundation education that we fully support but responding ONLY about combining Health and Physical Education at level 1 we believe policy makers (Ministry) would need to do a much more extensive consultation with policy implementer's (Health and PE teachers) before making a change as significant as this.	We work at a low decile urban school with Pasifika students comprising 80% of our school roll. We believe Health and Physical Education should remain as separate subjects from year 11 to year 13 and should NOT be combined at level 1. Our reasons are outlined below * Year 9 and year 10 is crucial learning time for both Health and Physical Education, however the school timetabling of HPE varies across schools. Currently we have three 1x hour periods a week which is insufficient as it is to each students key concepts and terminology across both subject areas (as teachers we consider cultural aspects in class, but it is also important to bear in mind a lot of the learning/ideas are not always in our students first language). Consequently, there is insufficient time for students to fully grasp the learning. We can't expect students to specialise when everything is taught in only 3 periods a week in preparation for level 1 health AND/OR level 1 PE. Combining Health and PE at level 1 will only exaggerate this issue and students won't have enough background knowledge when they come to specialise at level 2 and 3. * We believe there is a demand at level 1 for the subject in EACH sector have a strong subject association in both Health AND Physical Education.	No	No		N/A	2020-02-28 10:36:46	ANON-YFPW-RBIY-W	2020-02-28 10:36:18	2020-02-28 10:36:50
No	Seems like a good idea. Help give everyone a greater base of understanding and giving them knowledge that will serve them well in life.	Undecided	While the specialist subjects (like Classics and Art Hist) should be conglomerated, I hope that they are distinct enough/well represented to give a good idea to students what the specialization would be like and whether it interests them. The combine classes acting as a smorgs board before the main meal. Get a good and accurate taste of lots of things.	I think you should have a Civics NCEA 1 class, covering our legal system, our democracy, rights/responsibilities as citizens/employees etc. I think it's important for voters to be educated and something like this will likely assist in getting youths to Vote and have fairer representation in our Democracy.	No				2020-02-28 10:50:54	ANON-YFPW-RBIC-7	2020-02-28 10:50:54	2020-02-28 10:51:04
No		Agree			No				2020-02-28 10:50:54	ANON-YFPW-RBIJ-T	2020-02-28 10:50:54	2020-02-28 10:51:15
Yes		Agree		I feel there should be more of an environmental focus. Environmental sciences should be mandatory to be taught to everyone and should be included in the NCEA list.	A stronger focus for all students on business studies. All students should know how to balance books, budget their spending and file taxes.	No			2020-02-28 10:51:54	ANON-YFPW-RBIS-Q	2020-02-28 10:51:54	2020-02-28 10:52:09
No		Strongly disagree	Latin and Classics are two incredibly important subjects. Firstly, the study of Latin helps with English grammar as well as understanding the core grammatical concepts and structures of most languages. Secondly, the far-right use the lack of knowledge surrounding the ancient world to their advantage. By not teaching it you are essentially allowing the far-right to appropriate that history and manipulate the view of the ancient world as NOT ethnically diverse when it was. The way in which they do this is through social media which currently does not have any filtering systems for dubious and weaponised history. Considering that the Christchurch killer used a litany of historical references on his weapon it would be dangerous to stop the teaching of the Ancient world. Tarrant fits into a wider problem of far-right extremist using history both Medieval, Ancient and Modern to support their view of anti-immigration, western superiority and racial eugenics. The Ancient world was ethnically diverse and there was regular cultural contact and mixing of different cultures and people between many different 'civilisations', countries, tribes etc. I would think that New Zealand, being an multicultural country, would want to continue to teach students that	Please see previous comment.		Yes			2020-02-28 10:58:06	ANON-YFPW-RBIJ-V	2020-02-28 10:58:06	2020-02-28 10:58:20

Yes		Strongly disagree	Technology should be one subject. For technology this decision is counterproductive and threatens destroys the progress of and world leading reputation of technology education over the last 20 years aiming to develop common identify and practice to engage students in authentic inquiry based technological problem solving. It also contradicts the mandate to make L1 NCEA a foundational programme from which specialist skills and knowledge can emerge. The change suggests that generic technology standards be integrated through the technology subject. Best practice would suggest the reverse of this would be better, allowing a focus on core skills and knowledge students experience through a range of contexts enabling students a very strong understanding of innovative technological practice. The reverse of this enables an ad hoc approach to developing students' core knowledge and skills with a focus within a subject instead of across. Very little authentic technological development occurs within one of the "supposed" technology subjects. This decision also seems particularly odd given that the science expert group were able to identify achievement standards (AS) that supported all four traditional science subjects, physical, chemistry, biology and Earth Sciences. The change of food technology to food science. Again this decision was not a part of the consultation	Technology focus on the foundational generics taught within and across technological areas, rather than subjects. This removes the idea that everything skill etc has to be assessed. Quality technological outcomes and processes evidence skills and processes. USE the GENERICS- modify to for best practice across all the technological areas.	No	Yes	A vague understanding of its intentions and Hangarau	Keep Hangarau whole too	2020-02-28 11:11:38	ANON-YFPW-RBJ9-W	2020-02-28 11:11:38	2020-02-28 11:12:01
No		Strongly disagree		It will ruin the subjects	No				2020-02-28 11:23:18	ANON-YFPW-RBJ9-B	2020-02-28 11:23:18	2020-02-28 11:23:30
No		Strongly disagree	The abolition of Latin as a subject at all levels of NCEA is, with all due respect, utterly misguided. The present day romance languages are nothing but living, evolved variants of Latin, and the study of the primordial romance language par excellence greatly facilitates the study of the living offspring. In this context, it is also well worth advising that some 60% of the English vocabulary is derived from Latin. Latin terminology continues to be widely used in a number of sciences, such as biology and the medical sciences. Last but not least, the study of Latin provides for excellent exercise and deepening of the cognitive skills and abilities required for any form of tertiary education, especially so at the university or equivalent level. In continental Europe, the combination of Latin and Mathematics is considered as excellent preliminary training for the study of Civil Engineering. Last but not least, Latin should be preserved as a key heritage language for New Zealanders of European descent, on a par with the indigenous Maori equivalent(s). And then there is the historical consideration that Latin was the lingua franca of the Roman Empire, a prime example of a cosmopolitan and multicultural entity that lasted for centuries, and thereafter of much of the literate population in Europe up to the modern era. As such, Latin and its study represent a powerful symbol of globalism and multiculturalism long before the	Cf. supra for a strong plea to keep Latin on the books.	The study of Ancient Greek, the language of ancient Greek philosophers such as Plato and Aristotle and the first direct democracies.	No			2020-02-28 11:41:08	ANON-YFPW-RBJ9-E	2020-02-28 11:41:08	2020-02-28 11:41:19
Yes		Strongly disagree				No			2020-02-28 11:47:19	ANON-YFPW-RBJ9-N	2020-02-28 11:47:19	2020-02-28 11:48:26
No	As a Science teacher I had no knowledge that the separate science subjects were going to be removed. This meant that I have responded to the feedback survey about the proposed L1 Science Achievement Standards without a substantial amount of relevant information.	Strongly disagree	I find it incredible that subjects such as Physics, Chemistry and Biology have been removed, yet there are still 10 different language options and the arts subjects still have six from which to choose. Changing from 31 available standards currently available in Science to only 4 will restrict a school's ability to design and deliver a curriculum that is matched to the ethos of the school and the needs of their learners. Whilst I do not have any concerns about reducing the number of standards available as a whole, the separate sciences have different methodologies and philosophies such that combining them as 'Science' is inappropriate.	Do not remove the separate sciences. The four branches that have been removed are significantly different to each other. The same can be said for the subjects combined into the single 'Commercer' subject. By removing the subjects it forces the amalgamated subject to become more dilute. This will not help to raise educational achievements or to address issues of inequity within the education system. The removal of the separate sciences will also result in a greater 'jump' required for success at Level 2. The proposed standards do not dovetail into the current L2 standards and so this will demotivate students and has the potential to cause an decrease in student achievement in the science subjects at L2.	I am happy with the provision of subjects.	Yes	No.		2020-02-28 11:49:42	ANON-YFPW-RBJ9-S	2020-02-28 11:49:42	2020-02-28 11:49:52
Yes		Strongly disagree		I think combining all science into one will disadvantage children as all subjects will be watered down and when the reach level two they will not have the level of understanding needed for that specific science they choose to follow thru with and then level 2 will be playing catch up. There are lots of languages but less core subjects. I think science maths and English are the most important for life skills and all 3 have been past of as not being of importance		No			2020-02-28 11:50:53	ANON-YFPW-RBJ9-9	2020-02-28 11:47:54	2020-02-28 11:51:00
No		Strongly agree		It's great that subjects have been condensed.		No			2020-02-28 11:51:57	ANON-YFPW-RBJ9-M	2020-02-28 11:51:57	2020-02-28 11:52:08

Yes		Strongly agree	provided the SLO's are carefully aligned to meet the level 2 and 3 standards with no GAP left. the aim should be that by the end of level 1 students should have a clear idea about the various study paths available in level 2 and NOT the getting to know level	level one subject standards should be carefully designed to fill any gap between level 1 and level 2. as the specialised subjects are offered in level 2 , students should have strong understanding regarding their subject choice by the end of level 1.		No			2020-02-28 11:55:11	ANON-YFPW-RBJ7-U	2020-02-28 11:55:11	2020-02-28 11:55:24
Yes	I became aware on 27 February 2020.	Strongly disagree	The abolition of Latin is short-sighted and inexplicable. Latin is a gateway to understanding a large part of the classical world and the western classical tradition of which New Zealand is an heir. It is simply impossible to understand modern New Zealand without understanding Latin, for Latin opens up the Roman world - how it interacted with Classical Greece - and the Middle Ages, in which New Zealand's system of government and political institutions were born. The removal of Latin from the curriculum will impoverish future generations of New Zealand students and leaders.	See above.		No			2020-02-28 11:57:06	ANON-YFPW-RBJF-A	2020-02-28 11:57:06	2020-02-28 11:57:19
No		Undecided	The comment around the lack of accounting taught under Commerce is concerning.	I'm not sure why "Accounting" should be singled out as being significantly affected under the new proposal of "groupings" when Science is now incorporating a far larger group, yet not mentioned as being affected with the new proposal.		No			2020-02-28 12:14:55	ANON-YFPW-RBJH-C	2020-02-28 12:14:55	2020-02-28 12:15:19
Yes		Disagree	I am disappointed that the proposed subject list does not include Classical Studies or Art History at Level 1, and with the suggestion of making Level 1 more broad and foundational. I think this will lead to even bigger knowledge gaps in our senior students than those that already exist. I don't think that we should be making the curriculum easier - our students need to be challenged at school.	I am concerned by the thought that Art History and Classical Studies could be removed from Level 1. I don't think it is appropriate to put them under the umbrella of History, as they are not the same thing. I feel that since they are optional subjects and schools are welcome to choose whether or not they offer them at Level 1, there is no reason to axe them. My concern is that this will have a knock-on effect on Art History and Classical Studies at Levels 2 and 3.		No			2020-02-28 12:17:37	ANON-YFPW-RBJB-G	2020-02-28 12:17:37	2020-02-28 12:17:48
No		Strongly disagree		A teacher of both Accounting and Economics I struggle to understand how students would be better off by removing knowledge and skills from their learning at Level One. Having seen the primary schools move to a more broad way of designing curriculum I can say that I am underwhelmed by the quality of students I receive at secondary school - students are unable to write legibly, they can't undertake simple arithmetic functions without a calculator. It seems obvious to me that no actual research has been undertaken in this area by those that are proposing this change. Neither have they undertaken any valid consultation with teachers or the universities (who frankly, already are dismissive of NCEA)		Yes			2020-02-28 12:27:46	ANON-YFPW-RBJM-H	2020-02-28 12:27:46	2020-02-28 12:28:00
Yes		Strongly disagree		Classical Studies should be retained as a separate subject at all levels of NCEA for the following reasons: - it remains a popular subject at schools and universities all across the country; Christchurch has an internationally outstanding collection of Greek and Roman artefacts that continues to attract much attention from school students all over the country. - In covering the languages, literature, ideas, history and art of ancient Greece and Rome, Classics is a truly wide-ranging, holistic discipline - it is not just history; it is a liberal education in itself and is an ever evolving discipline. - Students of Classics come into contact with profoundly influential works and figures that have shaped our thinking about issues that still concern us today: empire and colonialism, democracy and political systems under stress, war and its aftermath, the quest for an ethical, satisfying way of life. - An understanding of the rich Classical past is not only immensely rewarding in itself, it also gives students a keen lens through which to view the	Art history should be retained so that students can understand the contexts and background that are affecting the Visual Arts today.	Yes			2020-02-28 12:30:13	ANON-YFPW-RBJZ-X	2020-02-28 12:02:32	2020-02-28 12:30:42

No		Strongly disagree	A New Zealander, Edwin Judge (the distinguished emeritus professor of ancient history at Macquarie University, now 93 years old), was my most inspiring teacher of ancient history at Sydney University. His understanding of the political and social life of the late Roman republic arose from the thorough knowledge of its languages (Latin and Greek), which he acquired as a schoolboy and as a young University student in New Zealand. It would be deeply unwise of the Government of New Zealand to deprive present and future school pupils of the key to understanding their and our common civilization which is provided by a grasp of Latin. Do not remove Latin from the school curriculum!	Please see what I have written above.		No			2020-02-28 12:56:47	ANON-YFPW-RBJD-8	2020-02-28 12:56:47	2020-02-28 12:57:03
No		Strongly disagree	It is very disappointing to hear that Latin is no longer to be included in the curriculum. My first Latin teacher, Professor Kevin Lee was an emeritus of one of New Zealand's universities. Professional development opportunities are shared between Australian and New Zealand schools. Each year schools international compete in language competitions developed by the New Zealand company, Education Perfect.	Latin has been a significant area of academic study because it is foundational for the Western canon of Literature. Shakespeare, the Bible and Virgil and Ovid are called on for their insight into human nature, development of language, beauty of imagery, history, geography, mythology, and so much more. Each week I read the learned columnists and without fail they drop in a Latin quote or derivative. The phenomenon of the "transit of Venus" which was behind Cook's exploration is derived from Latin except for the small English word "of". "Trans" is directly from Latin. "it", as in "exit". "Venus" directly from Roman culture and therefore Latin. "et cetera", and as I sit here in an Economics class, "ceteris paribus" are among the many Latin relics which are part of our language heritage. What a pity it would be if New Zealand were to lose a primary ingredient for how we understand language, human nature and the way in which we relate to a past culture, which for all its faults was nevertheless a significant contributor to modern civilisation.		No			2020-02-28 13:11:00	ANON-YFPW-RBJX-V	2020-02-28 13:11:00	2020-02-28 13:11:08
Yes	I do feel this is a big change for my colleagues, but as an English teacher I am used to 'not specialising'. There is a lot to our curriculum area that we cover in one course. Ideally, I would like to see this develop at L2 and L3 - e.g. reading, visual, writing courses ... similar to how other subject areas branch off into specialities.	Agree	as above		Dividing English: In many western countries English is taught as Language, and Literature (2 separate courses). Nationwide we have declining achievement in reading and writing - yet we are not addressing this in terms of where they learn these skills. As much as Literacy is not solely the domain of English depts, ultimately it is these teachers who have the required experience and ability to guide students in developing these skills.	No			2020-02-28 13:29:54	ANON-YFPW-RBJN-J	2020-02-28 13:29:54	2020-02-28 13:30:09
Yes		Undecided		Merging Classical studies into history doesn't make much sense to me. Classical studies isn't really history. History is based on applying known facts, where Classical studies has more of a mythology basis. I am generally in favour of merging Economics, Business Studies and Accounting, although each has some very specific principals, rules and concepts that can contradict each other	Ethics Resilience and mental health	No			2020-02-28 13:34:45	ANON-YFPW-RBJK-F	2020-02-28 13:34:45	2020-02-28 13:38:26
Yes		Disagree	I think Science subjects still need to be separated.			No			2020-02-28 13:43:43	ANON-YFPW-RBJG-T	2020-02-28 13:43:43	2020-02-28 13:44:06
No		Undecided		I would like to raise my concerns regarding the proposed change to combine Accounting, Economics and Business Studies at NCEA Level 1. As a professional in the accounting industry myself, I found completing three years of NCEA Accounting crucial in developing my core understanding of the subject. This has been incredibly helpful in my professional career and has aided my ability to progress professionally. I am concerned for the future of our industry if our youth are not given as much opportunity to learn these core concepts whilst at high school.		No			2020-02-28 13:51:15	ANON-YFPW-RBJR-P	2020-02-28 13:51:15	2020-02-28 13:51:28
Yes		Strongly disagree	Removal of Media Studies is a backwards step and is unacceptable. It should be retained at Level 1, and have Achievement Standards re-done as for the other levels. Having fewer subjects doesn't seem to align with making education broader.	Media Studies should not be removed from Level 1. It strongly fits the 7 criteria listed on this page and thus should be retained.	No, but I am not averse to these emerging.	No	No.		2020-02-28 13:56:31	ANON-YFPW-RBJ4-R	2020-02-28 13:56:31	2020-02-28 13:56:40
Yes		Strongly disagree	currently the skills available to use compliment internal investigations .			No			2020-02-28 14:01:15	ANON-YFPW-RBJT-R	2020-02-28 14:01:15	2020-02-28 14:01:32

No		Agree	I agree with the move to incorporate Te Ao Maori kaupapa in all subjects and recognition of Te Reo as a foundation language. I agree with the move away from specialization Where will students learn about sustainability? And managing their impact? Will this also be an 'all of curriculum' lens? There also needs to be credit awarded for 'community contribution'; recognizing that leadership isn't a badge that you get for being head boy but something that others see in those who work 'for the greater good'. It is as important, if not more so, than individuals getting good grades. Employers want this, parents want this, councils and communities want this - more people who give service to others. and who work together with others to make the things better for people. The earlier we 'teach' this and give credit for it, the more we will keep young people engaged; specially the socially and collectively minded - those who stand to make a real difference. Prioritise the back-end of the curriculum PLEASE - prioritizing individual and purely academic success has not served our country at all well over the past 2 decades!	Where will students learn about sustainability? And managing their impact? Will this also be an 'all of curriculum' lens? Our immediately required response to Climate Change will require leadership from this next cohort....we need to engage them actively - and accredit their contribution - now. There also needs to be credit awarded for 'community contribution'; recognizing that leadership isn't a badge that you get for being head boy but something that others see in those who work 'for the greater good'. It is as important, if not more so, than individuals getting good grades. Employers want this, parents want this, councils and communities want this - more people who give service to others. and who work together with others to make the things better for people. The earlier we 'teach' this and give credit for it, the more we will keep young people engaged; specially the socially and collectively minded - those who stand to make a real difference. Prioritise the back-end of the curriculum PLEASE - prioritizing individual and purely academic success has not served our country at all well over the past 2 decades!	Sustainability Climate change / environmental studies - with an action taking as well as academic approach Strategy and impact management Community contribution and leadership (well beyond sport or academic subject leadership)	No			2020-02-28 14:02:01	ANON-YFPW-RBJ3-Q	2020-02-28 14:02:01	2020-02-28 14:02:13
Yes		Agree		Need to teach young people about lifeskills and give credits for this. Year 11 would be the ideal time - especially getting in before they disengage with school because they aren't academic and there aren't enough interesting, practical options. Don't just throw it to random teachers to teach just to fill in their hours either - we know that doesn't work!! Make it a specialty subject taught people in industry who are skills facilitators and passionate about getting outcomes in their subject area. - What IRD does, how tax works and why you should pay it. - Financial literacy and how to manage banking and bank accounts - Getting a decent CV together and writing cover letters - Doing job interviews - Getting your drivers license - What democracy means and why you should care? - How to enrol and to vote - How to join a youth council or run for Community Board etc. - What government and councils do....and what they don't - How people in community lead and partner with government and councils	Advanced life skills, community leadership/contribution, active citizenship (but not such a boring old fart name)	No	I'd like to know more though		2020-02-28 14:12:50	ANON-YFPW-RBJ2-P	2020-02-28 14:12:50	2020-02-28 14:12:53
Yes		Undecided		It is important to have at least a small proportion of the population in English-language countries should have some knowledge of Latin. The reason is that English is a mongrel language, partly Latinate/Romantic in its origins, and partly descended from Germanic origins. The strict rules that Latin grammar follows are enormously helpful in controlling the formal use of the English language.		No			2020-02-28 14:16:32	ANON-YFPW-RBJU-5	2020-02-28 14:16:32	2020-02-28 14:16:54
No		Strongly disagree	Students will not be ready for Level 2 Physics and Biology.	Keep the current subjects if NCEA cannot be scrapped altogether.		No			2020-02-28 14:23:20	ANON-YFPW-RBXY-B	2020-02-28 14:23:20	2020-02-28 14:23:33
No	I was unaware that you were taking subjects away from the students	Strongly disagree	I think the more specific topics appeal to the students, as they already have foundation learning in Year 9-10	As a person who went through the school certification era, I think that the broader range of subjects appeals to teenagers. They see there foundation learning done at Years 9 - 10. They are ready for more challenging subjects at Level 1z If students aren't ready for these types of subjects - then you have the basic science and tech classes. Don't limit other students just because others don't learn as fast.		Yes			2020-02-28 14:27:05	ANON-YFPW-RBXV-8	2020-02-28 14:27:05	2020-02-28 14:27:19

Yes		Strongly disagree	Firstly we are extremely disappointed that the MoE has chosen to release a significant decision relating to the removal of single science subjects from L1 NCEA, 2 weeks prior to the closure of an on-line consultation about this process. Many teachers feel disenfranchised by this arrogant and insensitive decision and are now feeling that there is little point in responding to future requests for feedback as clearly it is not taken into account anyway. Internal MoE documents also reveal that this decision had already been made in January at the latest, despite assurances to the writing group that the decision about whether L1 Chemistry standards would be developed, would be left up to the Chemistry SEG. This duplicity is extremely disrespectful at best to members of the writing panel in particular.	As HOD Science reducing L1 sciences to one subject and 4 standards is only going to reduce the number and quality of scientists in the future. A very short sighted move with application of knowledge more important than the knowledge itself. What a nonsense, without knowledge there is nothing!		Yes			2020-02-28 14:30:21	ANON-YFPW-RBXC-N	2020-02-28 14:30:21	2020-02-28 14:30:30
No		Disagree	I feel grouping subjects such as science and commerce is not good.	They need to be separated as there so many sub groups that is necessary to further study in.	Maybe food technology More computer technologies study	No		No I would prefer students who want to go down this path to study for this as it does not apply to all. Some of students will leave to go overseas to further their job prospects.	2020-02-28 14:31:53	ANON-YFPW-RBXS-5	2020-02-28 14:31:53	2020-02-28 14:32:08
Yes		Strongly disagree	I was expecting some innovation not just a culling of the old list. This is a real opportunity to introduce something new. Instead, we have just gone with what we had and taken some bits out. Why isn't there a range of new "subjects" many schools have already innovated by taking from various areas and creating integrated courses surely we could be doing that here, what about a subject called physical science or environmental science, these could still be broad and far-reaching or complementary to maths and/or science and/or technology.	Where are the opportunities for broader science interests? there could be new Sciences why have we just reduced, how can less be broader		No			2020-02-28 14:45:03	ANON-YFPW-RBXS-A	2020-02-28 14:45:03	2020-02-28 14:45:21
Yes		Agree	Specifics needed before I would agree to anything, at the moment I agree but very hollow at the moment.	Materials Technology is so disjointed and poorly done, very little is preparing students for life after school.	Materials technology in relation to construction	Yes			2020-02-28 14:52:54	ANON-YFPW-RBXS-B	2020-02-28 14:52:54	2020-02-28 14:53:10
Yes	This is a complete step in the wrong direction for the future political/media/scientific literacy of this country. To be frank, this move will create an uninformed citizenry for Aotearoa New Zealand.	Strongly disagree	Media Studies at Level 1 lay the foundation that is integral for life in this technical age. Not just for journalists, advertisers, and public relations professionals. As a former public relations professional and current PhD student in communication studies, I am regularly appalled at the lack of understanding people have of our democracy. The Facebook comments of older New Zealanders show no understanding of journalism, the parliamentary system or how to separate the political process and performance from the proposed policies. Teaching critical reading in English classes is not enough. This change does our Rangitahi a disservice. On a personal note, my media studies classes at school were a saviour for my life. Before media studies were introduced to me as an option, I did not have confidence in my abilities or belief in myself. I thought I had no academic prowess, but I was wrong. I currently hold a Master of Communication Studies with Honours (First Class) from AUT, where I am currently studying towards a PhD. As a public relations consultant, I could not have developed campaigns that dominated the media landscape and brought up a national conversation on speeding. None of these achievements would have been possible without my teachers Jasmine Johnson and	I would go so far to say that media studies should be a compulsory subject in level one, and taught in the junior school levels of year 9 and year 10. Our school curriculum should include lessons in civics and government to create future citizens that will act on their rights and have an understanding on how politics not only affects them but their peers of different genders, sexualities, faiths, and races. In the achievement standards, there should be less focus analysing films. While this is an important exercise, there needs to be opportunities to foster understanding in: - advertising - public relations efforts to manufacture consent - journalism - an awareness of privacy and surveillance concerns in daily life in relation to companies such as Facebook, Google, Amazon, and Apple	Religious studies should include non-Abrahamic religions, Māori spirituality, and the importance of accepting and appreciating the differences. Less focus on William Shakespeare in Drama and English and instead highlight living and deceased New Zealand playwrights, film directors, poets, and novelists. Include a range of protagonists in stories taught to include more than a straight white man fighting with nature or treating women as playthings.	No			2020-02-28 14:53:40	ANON-YFPW-RBXS-5	2020-02-28 14:53:40	2020-02-28 14:53:49
Yes		Disagree	I believe the combined / general nature of the proposed subject changes will not adequately support the knowledge required to progress into the later years of study.			No			2020-02-28 14:54:18	ANON-YFPW-RBXS-V	2020-02-28 14:54:18	2020-02-28 14:54:29
No		Strongly disagree	I believe the subjects in Level 1 are a great preparation for the following two years.			No			2020-02-28 15:06:24	ANON-YFPW-RBXS-3	2020-02-28 15:06:24	2020-02-28 15:06:33
Yes	It is not going to support Level 2 and 3 Science, it will undermine it massively.	Strongly disagree	By combining the Sciences into 1 giant subject, you reduce schools ability to cater for the needs for their learners. It means the content needed for Level 2 is not being taught and students will struggle to access meaning and concepts in L2, 3 and beyond. It does not make any sense, we need more STEM students not less.	By combining the Sciences into 1 giant subject, you reduce schools ability to cater for the needs for their learners. It means the content needed for Level 2 is not being taught and students will struggle to access meaning and concepts in L2, 3 and beyond. It does not make any sense, we need more STEM students not less. KEEP the Science subjects and their standards so teachers can still meet the needs of all students at L1 and not be forced to teach some fluffy non-sense standards.		No			2020-02-28 15:11:32	ANON-YFPW-RBXS-Q	2020-02-28 15:11:32	2020-02-28 15:11:42

Yes		Strongly disagree	Science - Level 1 Physical Science & Level 1 Biological Science. General science paper does not provide enough challenge for most students at that level and also means level 2 is a significant jump. We should be promoting Science subjects not dumbing them down! Commerce - Economics not to be offered at Level 1. Accounting not to be offered at Level 1 and instead a general Commerce paper. Again not offering enough challenge for students to prepare them for Level 2 Economics and Accounting. Technology - Food Processing Technology will be changed to Food Science and be under Health & Physical Education. This changes the emphasis and will affect preparation for Level 2 Food Processing Technology. Media Studies - Level 1 not to be offered. Again why not? This is an area of learning that is growing in popularity.	Please see above.	Problem solving to be included as a core component of all subjects.	No	But a very good idea including more New Zealand History into the curriculum.		2020-02-28 15:16:51	ANON-YFPW-RBX5-7	2020-02-28 15:16:51	2020-02-28 15:17:09
Yes		Disagree				No			2020-02-28 15:18:00	ANON-YFPW-RBX2-2	2020-02-28 15:18:00	2020-02-28 15:18:36
Yes		Strongly disagree	I strongly disagree with the proposal to drop Latin from NCEA Levels 1-3.	Latin should remain on the NCEA curriculum. The opportunity to study Latin is an enriching and deeply rewarding experience and should not be denied to New Zealand's school students. Latin is the direct ancestor of nearly 50 modern languages, and a major contributor to the vocabulary of many others, including English. It was the language of European literature, history, science, medicine, diplomacy and law for nearly 2000 years. Latin thus opens up intellectual vistas vital for anyone interested in exploring the past or navigating the present. Dropping Latin from the school curriculum will also have a negative knock-on effect on New Zealand's universities, greatly to the detriment of their international reputation as the providers of highly trained academics and top-notch research: those who learn Latin for the first time as undergraduates are at a significant disadvantage in relation to peers who have had the opportunity to study the language at school.		No			2020-02-28 15:24:47	ANON-YFPW-RBX7-9	2020-02-28 15:24:47	2020-02-28 15:24:59
Yes	I was aware of it but didn't necessarily agree with the proposed intentions.	Strongly disagree	For Health and Physical Education, they are completely different subjects focussing on vastly different content and they students we have that take both subjects are very limited. I only have 2 students that take both Level 1 Health and PE which shows the contrast between subjects and how many would be limited by this. It is also concerning from a teacher perspective, specialist Health teachers and not PE teachers and vice versa. If this would be combined teachers would be forced to combine with a subject with very little relationship to the other. It would be like combining Maths and English. You can not expect a teacher trained in Health Education to be trained in Physical Education as well.	Physical Education and Health Education should not be combined into one subject. See points above.		No			2020-02-28 15:25:15	ANON-YFPW-RBX1-3	2020-02-28 15:25:15	2020-02-28 15:25:30
Yes		Strongly disagree				No			2020-02-28 15:25:14	ANON-YFPW-RBXF-R	2020-02-28 15:25:14	2020-02-28 15:25:33
Yes		Disagree	I disagree with the combination of Economics, Accounting and Business Studies at Year 11 as these are very different subjects with an entirely different range of skills. Economics appeals to one type of student and Accounting appeals to different ones. Accounting is more about running the finances of a business and Economics more about policy and the larger economy. How will students know they want to specialise in Accounting in YR12 when they have had very limited exposure to it in YR11. Ditto for Economics.			No			2020-02-28 15:26:23	ANON-YFPW-RBXZ-C	2020-02-28 15:26:23	2020-02-28 15:26:34
No		Strongly agree				No			2020-02-28 15:32:52	ANON-YFPW-RBXB-M	2020-02-28 15:32:52	2020-02-28 15:33:00
Yes		Undecided	Not sure what the nature of the changes are. Already thought that they were aligned with the NC. Therefore, difficult to have a strong opinion either way.			No	Perhaps I should be as a teacher. I have an obligation to do so.		2020-02-28 15:37:58	ANON-YFPW-RBXM-Y	2020-02-28 15:37:58	2020-02-28 15:38:10

Yes		Strongly disagree	I think its quite short sighted to reduce specialist science subjects to a general science. Every subject would have degree of planned progression across the levels, by cutting out the specialisms the following year's level two students will all be disadvantaged by having to play catch up, learning level one content. Plus it appears that New Zealand's Min Ed. doesn't know what Technology is and as a result they're not able to include what the Min Ed believe the new subjects will be called. Does this suggest that they don't see Technology as the application of the physical sciences but, as something unknown, not specified.	My response above covers my general feeling, but as a UK trained NZ time served true technology teacher, I believe we should split the subject into two distinct groups, #1 Design Technology, which is needs and process driven. #2 Control Technology which is sciences driven, i.e, Electronics, Mechanisms, Robotics and Structures. Where the knowledge content is assessed via externals in exam conditions. To simplify things and to make it more manageable each area could have a nationally set Design Briefs or the need could be specified for each area, which still allows for the application of the tech process.. I have differentiated Tech Process models that I'm happy to donate as as tarring point.	As above. Design Technology and Control Technology.	No			2020-02-28 15:43:28	ANON-YFPW-RBXD-P	2020-02-28 15:43:27	2020-02-28 15:44:12
Yes		Strongly agree				No			2020-02-28 15:52:51	ANON-YFPW-RBXA-K	2020-02-28 15:52:51	2020-02-28 15:53:41
No		Strongly disagree		I strongly object to the Ministry of Education's plan to abolish Latin as a subject at all levels of NCEA and Classics at Level 1 NCEA. These subjects enable students to develop high cognitive and analytical strengths, enabling them to succeed regardless of career path. The subject matter is of great interest to students and can inspire lifelong passions and pursuits - once again, regardless of career path.		No			2020-02-28 15:57:55	ANON-YFPW-RBXN-Z	2020-02-28 15:57:55	2020-02-28 15:58:04
Yes		Undecided		To combine all the sciences into one general science will only limit the knowledge the student acquires in the separate areas eg: a student who excels at biology but fails at chemistry/physics will be lost in the general science. If a student who excels at biology is kept interested through only studying Biology then we should produce excellent specialists biologists in the future not just "GPs" the same concept would be found in the Social Studies limitations the MOE suggests...		No			2020-02-28 16:08:04	ANON-YFPW-RBXK-W	2020-02-28 16:08:04	2020-02-28 16:08:20
No	I only found out via our school newsletter	Strongly disagree	Students should be allowed to choose more specialised areas of study from year 11 This will also impact on the position of teachers and the possible decline of subjects			No			2020-02-28 16:18:09	ANON-YFPW-RBX6-8	2020-02-28 16:18:09	2020-02-28 16:18:26
No		Strongly agree			No	Yes			2020-02-28 16:24:34	ANON-YFPW-RBXR-4	2020-02-28 16:24:34	2020-02-28 16:24:56
No		Agree		I did Latin for School Cert back in 1980. The history and culture side was of great value and but the language was not, and I remember very little of it. I am very surprised you could even still study Latin in the 21st century! Time to let it go.		No			2020-02-28 17:09:09	ANON-YFPW-RBXT-6	2020-02-28 17:09:09	2020-02-28 17:09:42
No		Strongly disagree	I believe no specialising early in subjects like economics and accounting and media studies will put children at a disadvantage in there stage 2 learning to where children are now. I think it is a backwards step.	As above		No			2020-02-28 17:11:00	ANON-YFPW-RBX3-5	2020-02-28 17:11:00	2020-02-28 17:11:10
No		Disagree	NCEA is supposed to be an assessment tool for the New Zealand national curriculum. The Technology area is being taken back to silos, with the loss of 'Generic Technology', and with the proposed 4 standards in each subject we are going to lose all the work forward thinking technologists have been doing for years in developing inter-technology projects and courses. Teachers will not want to collaborate when they only have four standards to work with, and no matter how broad they may be they are not going to be as broad as the infinite amount of options the current Technology matrix currently offers. The name 'Food Science' is a backward step and is not reflective of it's position in the Technology curriculum.	The very essence of the New Zealand Technology curriculum is vulnerable under the new proposals. Each strand needs to be represented, and if there is no generic technology to pull in the wider nature of technology, and the generic design process the subject at senior level will become narrower not broader. The beauty in the current Technology NCEA matrix is the breadth we have to utilise any of those standards to make individual courses currently enables us to deliver a broad curriculum. What has caused some standards to be less popular is not their content but the shift from subject advisers and plenty of PLD opportunities to PLD being under CoLs. This is killing professional development in subject areas; in fact already has largely.		No			2020-02-28 17:11:54	ANON-YFPW-RBX2-4	2020-02-28 17:11:54	2020-02-28 17:11:58
No		Strongly disagree	I strongly disagree with the Ministry's proposed subjects for NCEA Level 1, especially the elimination of Latin	Yes, Latin should be retained in Level 1. It is a subject of immense cultural importance. It is a very beneficial subject to study at the secondary level. Its elimination would be very detrimental to students' interests. I am one of the co-directors of the Latin Summer School held annually at the University of Sydney. This year we had an enrolment of over 280 students, half at least of whom were studying Latin at the secondary level, and finding it extremely rewarding and worthwhile.	No	No			2020-02-28 17:15:13	ANON-YFPW-RBYY-N	2020-02-28 17:15:13	2020-02-28 17:15:32

Yes	I think it will have the opposite effect by denying access to more detailed knowledge which would lead to better knowledge at levels 2 and 3. I don't think that 'dumbing down' ("more foundational education") subjects just to get a higher pass rate will result in better educated children. It will actually damage the chances of many children who are capable of learning more specialised subjects.	Strongly disagree	I have been a food scientist for over 35 years. To put Food Technology under a Food Science subject (Food Processing Technology) and then putting it under Health and Physical Education is utter madness! Sure, children need to learn about the nutritive values of different food groups which they should anyway, but to deny them the knowledge of HOW it is processed and the different options available is ludicrous. Another 'dumbing down' opportunity. Good knows it is difficult enough to recruit Kiwis to the industry, this will just make it harder! Suggestion: Don't do this, leave it as it is.	Why eliminate Latin? Yes, I know, it's a dead language blah, blah. But it is also the root of many European languages. Call me old fashioned but it has certainly helped me learn and understand French and Spanish and bit of Portuguese. Suggestion: leave it alone You may not be aware but children these days are capable of learning more at 12-14 than we were. So dropping subjects at level 1 like Art History - I don't suppose any of you has watched a wonderful series called "Civilisations" and the impact of Art on civilisation. Not everyone is glued to cheap reality TV. My daughter has an early interest in becoming involved in forensic studies, so an early opportunity to begin learning about Psychology would be welcome, but you want to stop that too.	I think you should learn how to format your text box responses in NZ English and not American English!	No			2020-02-28 17:15:05	ANON-YFPW-RBKU-7	2020-02-28 17:12:23	2020-02-28 17:15:55
Yes	I'm unfamiliar with NCEA, I sat School Certificate in the early 1990s. I have a child that will enter College in a few years. I passed "science" that year but didn't carry it on, instead I continued with typing and accounting as I thought it would help me to get an office job and it did. I went to Uni in my mid 20s completing a BA. Now I'm catching up on all things science. I'm concerned about science learning in general as my child has a great interest in it. When I went to primary school we had a dedicated science exercise book, I remember learning about thunder and lightening, how magnets work, writing up experiments. At my child's primary school there is very little science (if any) being taught and it bothers me. Of course I don't sit and wait for things to happen, I buy extra workbooks and take out books from the library to help prepare for college otherwise it will be overwhelming, confidence is important. YouTube tutorials help out a lot and the education industry is lucky because of it, you don't have to work as hard yet can take the credit.	Agree	If it's easier for the Ministry to deliver it this way then I agree. The good thing is there are more outside resources that can help students. However school s need to prepare students for the external exam. I found mock exams at school were much easier than external exams. It happens today with the maths exam, I hear about the tears every year.	Broader subjects is better as everything is connected, standing back and seeing the big picture has its advantages. Often students don't know what they want to study in tertiary years .	don't know	No	No	I don't know anything about it, I had a quick read about the subjects. I worry about it. I feel Maori students will decide to take these subjects thinking they... it's hard to word this. It feels separatist. I want to see more Maori in science, medical, commerce..all industries. This feels like a step away. I'm aware of history. You can learn about your culture and algebra simultaneously. The more you mingle with different people the more you learn. Anyway thanks to YouTube you can get help when you need it.	2020-02-28 17:32:20	ANON-YFPW-RBBV-J	2020-02-28 17:32:20	2020-02-28 17:32:28
No	Why is Latin disappearing?	Undecided	Why is Latin disappearing	Why no Latin?	Latin and Greek, Armenian	No			2020-02-28 17:41:54	ANON-YFPW-RBB5-F	2020-02-28 17:41:54	2020-02-28 17:42:02
Yes		Strongly disagree		Keep Science as it is!!		No			2020-02-28 18:30:48	ANON-YFPW-RBBJ-6	2020-02-28 18:30:48	2020-02-28 18:30:58
No		Strongly disagree		I was very disturbed and disappointed to read the news about the proposed abolition of Latin as a subject at all levels of the NCEA in NZ. Latin is not only a fundamental part of our important European heritage, of one of our two main languages, and of our ways of thinking as members of the human race, but learning Latin has also been proven internationally to be one of the best ways to encourage literacy and logical thinking in people of every age, from primary school to pensioners, but especially of secondary school students. Speaking personally, Latin changed my life. As someone from a basically working-class background who had the good fortune to get a scholarship to go to a school where (in 1977) Latin was taught to all 3rd formers, I was at first perplexed: as a 12-year old born in Porirua I did not even know what Latin was, and I had scarcely even heard of the Romans. But once I got into the subject I loved it. In 1982 I went to university in Wellington to major in Latin (and ancient Greek as well as maths) – the first member of my family to go to University. I went on in 1986 as a Rhodes Scholar to do my postgraduate degree at Oxford University in the UK, and since 1989 I have taught Classics (including ancient Greek and Latin) in universities in New Zealand, Australia and the UK; the students	Ancient Greek language.	Yes			2020-02-28 18:45:46	ANON-YFPW-RBBQ-D	2020-02-28 18:45:46	2020-02-28 18:46:00
No	We new a change was coming, but little detail, like the description in the question, was provided.	Strongly agree	As a science teacher, I have taught in several schools that offer a general science course at Year 11. Never had issues with specialisation at Year 12.	No issues with getting rid of Chem, bio, physics at year 11. Likewise the loss of latin is not a concern.	Support the development of Agribusiness, which has done very well so far. Maybe a Food Science/Food technology/Chemistry hybrid course.	No			2020-02-28 18:53:15	ANON-YFPW-RBBE-1	2020-02-28 18:53:15	2020-02-28 18:53:26
No		Strongly disagree		Integrating subjects like media studies (which I see as a very applicable subject to lifestyles and economy today) is very disheartening. Specialised subjects allow teenagers to fully devote themselves to a subject they are intrigued by, without suffering by not being able to perform in the other additions that subject comes with.	Media studies, psychology, classical studies and sciences should be kept separate. A lot of information and specifics is lost when you "integrate" or combine things	Yes			2020-02-28 18:55:19	ANON-YFPW-RBB5-H	2020-02-28 18:55:19	2020-02-28 18:55:27
No		Strongly disagree				No			2020-02-28 19:02:07	ANON-YFPW-RBBP-C	2020-02-28 19:02:07	2020-02-28 19:02:19
Yes	Not to eliminate Latin	Strongly disagree	Not to eliminate Latin or Classical studies	Maintain Latin and Classical studies	Latin	No			2020-02-28 19:46:06	ANON-YFPW-RBB7-K	2020-02-28 19:46:06	2020-02-28 19:46:15

Yes	The proposed changes were addressed on the radio, and I came here to follow up.	Strongly disagree	I vehemently oppose the exclusion of Latin as an option. As one who has benefitted immensely from Latin at secondary level, I am duty-bound to ensure the continuation of these (considerable) benefits for future students. Similarly, I oppose the loss of Classics, which entered the level 1 curriculum only recently and which was a valuable addition at that level. Had Classics not been available at level 1, I would not have taken the subject at secondary level, and perhaps not at tertiary level either, which would have been a tragedy in my own life (having taken the subject at LL, I fell in love with it and made space at all subsequent levels. I have now been offered places at both Oxford and Cambridge to pursue postgraduate study in the subject). Level 1 offers huge flexibility for pupils to tailor their course, with schools allowing a greater number of subject options at that level than in levels 2 or 3. For that reason, it is a year in which pupils can freely explore subjects of interest to them without limiting further pathways. Restricting the wide range of specific subject options available at level 1 is therefore counterproductive - by combining (in reality erasing) fields, you are eroding the agency that pupils have to pursue their potential passions. If anything, more interest subjects should be made available. Honestly, if you want to provide a broad base and	Please continue to offer Classics, Art History, and other specialties as distinct subject options at level 1 to preserve and expand the broad array of choice currently open to pupils at that level. Please also continue to offer Latin as a language option at level 1 and beyond. In brief, Latin offers a window into that Classical mind that underpins our own Western civilisation, hones linguistic and communicative skills to levels not attained by other disciplines, and trains the intellect to academic pursuit. As Classicists, we are already set behind international norms by the low availability of Latin at secondary level, and struggle to catch up at tertiary level. To remove the option entirely at level 1 would further disadvantage us in relation to the rest of the world. Apart from its own intrinsic value (which is substantial), however, knowledge of Latin has immense benefit for study of those many disciplines that have inherited its vocabulary. In studying Anatomy, I myself discovered how understanding Latin transforms a long and tedious list of words to be memorised into a dynamic and immensely useful wealth of descriptive terminology. Latin is therefore helpful not just for Classicists, but also for students of a wide variety	Yes, very much so. First and foremost, I would obviously promote Latin and Classics as essential subjects to continue their presence at secondary level, for the many, varied, and important reasons described above. In addition, I suggest the inclusion of both Philosophy and Psychology. Philosophy I include as essential for a basic understanding of the world and our place in it, as well as developing logical reasoning and communication skills. Psychology I select both because it is a growing discipline and for more practical reason: understanding human thought and behaviour facilitates human empathy and relationship. Please always remember: the purpose of secondary education, like tertiary, is never as a job training program, but rather to equip and mould young minds to create an educated, insightful, and sensitive population. Learning is for learning's sake.	No	No, but I support the general idea of making the curriculum available in te reo. I am concerned, however, that a secondary education wholly in te reo Māori may disadvantage students at tertiary level in NZ and internationally. Such a disadvantage would exacerbate existing barriers to higher education for Māori students. Academically	2020-02-28 19:49:52	ANON-YFPW-RBBG-3	2020-02-28 18:23:24	2020-02-28 19:50:00	
Yes		Disagree		Do not agree with only offering general science. For those students planning to go down a science path this does not give enough of a grounding. This is a very important subject that is not being given sufficient importance.		Yes		2020-02-28 19:59:03	ANON-YFPW-RBBF-2	2020-02-28 19:59:03	2020-02-28 20:01:04	
No		Disagree	Physics, Biology, and Chemistry and Earth & Space science are basic sciences which everyone should learn from NCEA Level 1.	Even with the idea of more specialisation being encouraged in higher NCEA levels, there are basic sciences that every NZ graduate should have learnt and passed.	Astronomy	No		2020-02-28 20:30:03	ANON-YFPW-RBB1-D	2020-02-28 20:30:03	2020-02-28 20:30:12	
Yes		Disagree	I feel Science modules should still be separated as previously	I think separate science modules as previous years should remain the same. As a parent to Science-orientated students they need to be studying their areas of interest from Level 1 to gain that background knowledge before proceeding to higher levels of schooling.	No	No		2020-02-28 20:38:13	ANON-YFPW-RBBZ-P	2020-02-28 20:38:13	2020-02-28 20:38:25	
Yes	Would have loved to have Biology and Chemistry offered in Level 1 at my high school but sadly my school did not offer them at Level 1. Wish they had and am very angry NZQA and the Government are removing these amazing opportunities from all schools.	Disagree	Would have loved to have Biology and Chemistry offered in Level 1 at my high school but sadly my school did not offer them at Level 1. Wish they had and am very angry NZQA and the Government are removing these amazing opportunities from all schools.	Would have loved to have Biology and Chemistry offered in Level 1 at my high school but sadly my school did not offer them at Level 1. Wish they had and am very angry NZQA and the Government are removing these amazing opportunities from all schools. And Media Studies would be better combined with English as they are more closely related. Stupid how you have combined Accounting into the new Commerce course if the new course is going to have very little Accounting content due to the practical constraints of the subject then just leave it as a different subject.	-Notaphily. -Numismatics (Focusing On Coins). -Philately.	No	Never used it as I am not Maori and do not speak or read or write or understand it.	Could have these subjects in Maori: -Notaphily. -Numismatics (Focusing On Coins). -Philately.	2020-02-28 20:51:38	ANON-YFPW-RBBH-4	2020-02-28 20:51:38	2020-02-28 20:51:58
No	Was it in the news?	Agree		Why is Italian not on the language list. It's such an important language in food, art, music and history.	No	Yes	Why no Italian	2020-02-28 20:54:28	ANON-YFPW-RBBB-X	2020-02-28 20:54:28	2020-02-28 20:55:14	
No		Disagree	Broad is good but it needs to be equitable and logical Science and Commerce broad but no other areas??? Look at numbers of students currently taking those specialised subjects - popular so why amalgamate but not other areas. Why not English and Drama? Dance with Physical Education? So many languages - see comments above	Financial Literacy missing	Financial Literacy	No		2020-02-28 21:12:41	ANON-YFPW-RBBM-9	2020-02-28 21:12:41	2020-02-28 21:12:56	
No		Agree				No		2020-02-28 21:33:58	ANON-YFPW-RBBD-Z	2020-02-28 21:33:58	2020-02-28 21:34:17	

No		Strongly disagree	The exclusion of Latin is totally misconceived, for the reasons set out in response to Question 3.	I strongly oppose the exclusion of Latin, which should be included in any decent curriculum. Latin: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> sharps mental flexibility and acuity, qualities that are particularly important in meeting new and unexpected challenges in a rapidly changing world is important for advanced studies in ancient history, archaeology and philosophy as well as being very useful in science, law and medicine is a perfect foundation for a person faced with a personal or professional need to learn an uncommon language, particularly a highly inflected one such as Turkish or Finnish expands English vocabulary is the basis for a major part of the civilisation and literature of English speakers. 		No			2020-02-28 21:46:52	ANON-YFPW-RBBA-W	2020-02-28 21:46:52	2020-02-28 21:47:18
No		Strongly disagree	The exclusion of Latin from the list of subjects is an appalling proposal. Only educational authorities which are completely Philistine could possibly contemplate so retrograde and anti-academic step. The downgrading of classical studies is equally barbaric, particularly since its importance is widely recognised through its multi disciplinary nature and tremendous popularity in a huge number of schools.	See above	Instead of abolishing Latin, the committee should establish a program for the teaching of Classical Greek as well. In addition, Classical Studies as should be strengthened as well because of its relevance, multi-disciplinary nature popularity and general interest.	No			2020-02-28 21:49:25	ANON-YFPW-RBXH-T	2020-02-28 15:30:11	2020-02-28 21:49:55
No		Strongly disagree		Latin and Classics are an important part of the secondary school curriculum and should be included because, reading and understanding Greek and Latin texts, culture and civilization, children start to "read" and understand the world and people in general, and themselves with finest clarity. Which is...a most desirable, strong and helpful start in life for them all.		No			2020-02-28 22:00:45	ANON-YFPW-RBBN-A	2020-02-28 22:00:45	2020-02-28 22:01:10
No		Undecided	Latin disappearing makes sense. Art history also. However Science reducing to one subject and therefore presumably less time is a concern. However when I was at this level, science was one broad subject. What were the reasons for the previous change to Biology, physics etc being separate at this level. Have those reasons disappeared or did it not achieve what was desired? I think all students need a broad base of science. If this is done at year 7 and 8 then it can be divided at year 9. If it is not then year nine needs to still be broad.			No			2020-02-28 22:11:32	ANON-YFPW-RBBK-7	2020-02-28 22:11:32	2020-02-28 22:11:46
No		Undecided				No			2020-02-28 22:12:16	ANON-YFPW-RBBG-J	2020-02-28 22:12:16	2020-02-28 22:12:23
No		Strongly disagree				Yes			2020-02-28 22:32:45	ANON-YFPW-RBBR-E	2020-02-28 22:32:45	2020-02-28 22:32:55
Yes	I like the list of subjects being retained in The Arts.	Agree	The Arts are essential!	No I am happy	Please just retain the arts at those levels with the same arts list of subjects for both levels as listed for arts in Level 1.	Yes			2020-02-28 23:24:46	ANON-YFPW-RBBW-K	2020-02-28 23:24:46	2020-02-28 23:25:06
No		Strongly disagree		Disastrous for Latin, and would undermine a subject in which NZ has long and proud traditions.		No			2020-02-28 23:36:49	ANON-YFPW-RBB4-G	2020-02-28 23:36:49	2020-02-28 23:37:00
Yes		Strongly disagree		Given limited resources, government is necessarily in the business of compromise and expediency. However, this must not come at the expense of principle, and a line needs to be drawn even where economically it is inconvenient. The study of Latin, and Classics in general, introduces students to the fundamental values of western civilisation. 'Liberty', 'respect', 'integrity', 'tolerance' - 'education' itself - these are Latin words; and the texts of Cicero, Virgil, Tacitus and Seneca, to name a few, show how the Romans developed, contested, and sometime died for the concepts that lie behind them. Mandarin provides students with a pathway to the profound ideas of Mencius, Confucius, and Lao-Tze; to deprive your children of the other side of the coin would be to diminish the richness and inclusiveness of your remarkable culture. It would be a sad irony if the country that produced the greatest Roman historian of the 20th century, Sir Ronald Syme, were to remove the opportunity for future generations to similarly excel.		No			2020-02-28 23:53:50	ANON-YFPW-RBBT-G	2020-02-28 23:53:50	2020-02-28 23:54:13

Yes		Disagree	<p>There should have been significantly more consultation with Tertiary institutions. Whilst it is evident that the watering down of NCEA Level 1 is to give failing students a sense of achievement, it should be about creating a realistic stepping stone between each of the NCEA Levels, Tertiary education and finally employment. The current plan will make the jump from Level 1 to Level 2 unachievable for many.</p> <p>I do not believe that putting many subjects under one umbrella will be successful. I have one son who struggles academically. He is in Year 11 this year and for the first time in his life he is going to school willingly because he was able to choose specific subjects that he enjoys and wants to learn. EG: he likes chemistry but hates biology. Forcing him to learn all aspects of "science" for another year would do him no favours.</p>	<p>Why exclude Latin? It is a valuable building block to understanding and passing medicine. If a school is able to offer the subject there is no good reason for not including it. In an effort to broaden choices for NCEA Level 1 pupils, you have done the opposite.</p> <p>You also need to remember that there are some children out there who want to become engineers, doctors, dentists, lawyers, etc and require specialisation at NCEA Level 1 so they gain the necessary skills to achieve at high enough standards to cope (and pass) at each level and ultimately Tertiary study.</p>	<p>Bring back Typing. Most jobs now require typing literacy. Whilst youth of today are savvy when it comes to speed texting it is not sufficient in the real world if you cannot touch type with speed and accuracy.</p> <p>Being taught to type properly will also see a reduction in RSI injuries.</p>	Yes	<p>One could safely assume the subject is the teaching of Maori language and should cover leaning to read, write and speak it, just like any other language.</p>	<p>Teach what you like in Maori, as long as it is voluntary. Given that Maori is not spoken anywhere else in the world and that New Zealand is a melting pot of cultures, it has to be accepted that it is not for all of us.</p>	2020-02-29 00:00:19	ANON-YFPW-RBB3-F	2020-02-29 00:00:19	2020-02-29 00:00:39
No	<p>Te Reo is a racist indoctrination language used to promote apartheid in NZ. It was cited by Maori MP Marama Fox that TeReo was the Trojan horse towards Maori taking sovereignty over NZ. I am against it being a part of any compulsory education program. Sign language teaching imo is ridiculous and almost useless as only 20000 people use it. This government is a fascist creature led by UN puppets to subvert NZ under its power. I hope you're reading this because you are an active accomplice - its true.</p>	Strongly disagree	<p>Again lets not foster separatism because that is exactly what you are spear heading towards</p>	<p>Concentrate on subjects that will give young people a future. Investing time in stone age languages ie TeReo that seek to separate us as a nation is a foolish move.</p>	<p>Science. Anything that supports a return to critical thinking instead of the mindless PC rubbish you are foisting on kids</p>	Yes	<p>Yes, its racist and divisional. Teaching it or endorsement of any kind is foolish since it is aimed at apartheid.</p>	<p>Get rid of race division in NZ. Maori signed the treaty in accordance with the principal that we are all now one people. This radicalism we are seeing is very dangerous for the future of NZ as we are essentially promoting separate systems for MAori</p>	2020-02-29 00:02:31	ANON-YFPW-RBB2-E	2020-02-29 00:02:31	2020-02-29 00:03:44
No		Strongly disagree		<p>Abolishing Latin would be a crime. Latin (along with ancient Greek) is the foundation of the European culture which forms one half of New Zealand culture. Robbing young people of the chance to learn it will disadvantage them, both absolutely and in comparison with young people from Europe and North America against whom they will increasingly be competing in a globalised world.</p>		No			2020-02-29 00:15:54	ANON-YFPW-RBBU-H	2020-02-29 00:15:54	2020-02-29 00:16:06
Yes		Strongly disagree	<p>I strongly disagree with the limitations being imposed upon the science curriculum area in particular and share the concerns of colleagues in other curriculum areas that are being merged into other subjects or eliminated.</p>	<p>With regard to science, the set of achievement standards we currently have spread across the 5 science subjects (general science, chemistry, physics, biology and Earth and space science) offers a broad range of options of content and topics that schools can choose to tailor to students' interests, career pathways and abilities. The proposed change to a general science course based on only the 4 draft standards that are currently out for review seems to offer far too few options to schools to build courses that will support the developing careers of the students. The draft standards also seem to eliminate exams as a form of assessment in sole favour of written reports. Some students favour exams over reports and eliminating exams seems counter to the point of page 4 of the NCEA Review Summary of "Encourage more variety in assessment." I think adding or replacing some general science standards with some of the draft standards may be good. Removing the specialist subjects at Level 1 would make it difficult for those students who want to specialise earlier and would benefit from the content knowledge provided by the specialist subject standards at Level 1.</p>		No			2020-02-29 00:16:16	ANON-YFPW-RWBV-X	2020-02-29 00:16:16	2020-02-29 00:16:40
No		Undecided		<p>The further erosion of Latin is sad, and backwards. In a NZ continually struggling with anti intellectual impulses, championed largely by a generation of people who will not be alive in a future where we look back with regret that our government prevented learning. Latin is part of our history, and we choose our history as much as we choose our present - a bit, but not entirely, some of it we're stuck with - and a high literary language is something worth keeping around, for good of our collective imagination. Don't let the drive to reform become a drive to remove or ruin.</p> <p>Combining the sciences is stupid. Pay teachers more and the STEM teachers will come. Obviously.</p>	<p>Keep Latin.</p>	No			2020-02-29 00:58:18	ANON-YFPW-RWBV-U	2020-02-29 00:58:18	2020-02-29 00:58:28

No		Strongly disagree		It's very sad to see these plans to eliminate Latin and marginalize Classical Studies. These are empowering subjects, giving students knowledge and confidence to inhabit a key aspect of western culture - and to critique the role that that culture has played in global history. Latin is only one language among many that one might want to learn. But its study can be liberating for those students who are less comfortable with the oral dimension of language study, and it gives very rewarding and surprisingly rapid access to some wonderful literature.		No			2020-02-29 02:10:11	ANON-YFPW-RW6C-8	2020-02-29 02:10:11	2020-02-29 02:10:24
Yes		Agree				No			2020-02-29 05:34:43	ANON-YFPW-RW6S-R	2020-02-29 05:34:43	2020-02-29 05:34:58
No		Strongly disagree	I believe combining classical studies with history is tantamount to abolishing it.	I attended a lower decile school in Christchurch. I studied Classical Studies whilst there and went on to study it at university, where I obtained a MA. I now work in the financial division of a contracting company and am a certified quarry manager. Why is that important? Exposure to Classics and Latin at high school is the first step to getting kids to follow their passion into higher education. The critical thinking and rigorous nature of these subjects is reflected in the types of graduates these degrees can produce. I, myself, would not have sought tertiary education if not for Classics. My peers from university now work at a variety of schools, law firms, and government departments.		No			2020-02-29 06:26:36	ANON-YFPW-RW6B-W	2020-02-29 06:26:36	2020-02-29 06:26:48
No		Strongly disagree		Latin should be included		Yes			2020-02-29 06:58:35	ANON-YFPW-RW69-X	2020-02-29 06:58:35	2020-02-29 06:58:44
No	Was only made aware by a social media post, this information needs to be public national news.	Strongly disagree		Classics needs to be maintained. Classical history is the foundation of our learning blocks for history, art, language and music. It helps us gain a broader and deeper understanding of these subjects.		No			2020-02-29 07:25:34	ANON-YFPW-RW6G-C	2020-02-29 07:25:34	2020-02-29 07:25:41
Yes		Disagree	Taking away options is not going to increase educational involvement			Yes			2020-02-29 08:18:22	ANON-YFPW-RW6E-A	2020-02-29 08:18:22	2020-02-29 08:18:31
Yes	Aware of Science, but not the removal of Biology, Chemistry and Physics	Disagree	Removing choice in terms of well defined topics (standards) and a range of assessment modes is a backward step.	Cutting Science down from thirty standards to four is a terrible idea		No			2020-02-29 08:21:29	ANON-YFPW-RW6S-T	2020-02-29 08:21:29	2020-02-29 08:21:43
No		Disagree	I disagree with the changes to science/history and media/psych, but agree with the changes to Latin and econ/business/accounting. Stop dumbing down the curriculum to make the low achievers feel better about themselves.	Stick to core languages - French, Spanish, Mandarin, Japanese, Te Reo . What do Samoan, Tongan, and Cook Island Maori even prepare our students for? PC gone mad.		No			2020-02-29 08:40:04	ANON-YFPW-RW6P-N	2020-02-29 08:40:04	2020-02-29 08:40:17
No		Undecided		I don't agree with the loss of accounting. I think it is a fundamental life skill that is appropriate at this level.	Accounting	No			2020-02-29 08:55:34	ANON-YFPW-RW67-V	2020-02-29 08:55:34	2020-02-29 08:55:54
No	I was aware that NCEA level one was being revised and looked at and that standards were being rewritten and new standards introduced. However, I was unaware that NCEA level one was being completely torn apart and subjects removed in favour for such broad subjects which cannot possibly encompass all the knowledge, learning, and skills students will need to move into NCEA level 2, which is already a massive jump from the current NCEA level 1.	Strongly disagree	SCIENCE CANNOT BE ONE SUBJECT WITH ONLY 4 STANDARDS. You cannot take such a large and broad range of subjects within one entire curriculum strand and expect to be able to squish it all into one subject, it is absolutely ridiculous and not well thought out at all. I understand looking at the science subject and changing up its standards a bit but you cannot then just drop all of chemistry, biology, physics and earth and space science and expect one subject to cover all of that in only 4 standards. At present, having all those subjects allows schools such as mine to offer students different internals from the different science disciplines which allows our students to have a feel of all these different subjects before moving into specializing at level 2. This also goes for the other subjects which are being merged into one in this proposed plan (which is barely even proposed, we all know you have already decided on it but are trying to please people by saying you are 'consulting us').	Once again, SCIENCE CANNOT BE ONE SUBJECT WITH ONLY 4 STANDARDS. You cannot create a more broad NCEA level 1 by doing this, instead you should be offering bits of each discipline at level 1 so students can get a feel of what they want to specialise in at level 2 and are able to do so by having the background knowledge and content knowledge they learn in level 1 to be able to move more easily into the content heavy level 2. You should instead be looking at asking schools to not have specific and separate level 1 physics, biology, chemistry and earth and space science classes, instead asking schools to have one general science course which brings in standards from the physics, biology, chemistry, science and earth and space science subject areas depending on the needs and interests of the students. This will allow students to not have to specialise at level 1 and keep their options open whilst also allowing them to have the foundation of content knowledge and feel for each subject which they will be deciding to specialize in at level 2 and 3.	Leave the subjects at level 2 and 3 alone for science, they need to be specialized for students to be able to transition into university and into a career with ease. we cannot be coddling our tamariki this much, they need to make their own decisions and have the freedom to do so by giving them options to choose from in the first place, they need decision making skills in life and need to learn from their decisions, good or bad.	No			2020-02-29 09:08:00	ANON-YFPW-RW6F-B	2020-02-29 09:08:00	2020-02-29 09:08:18
No		Disagree		I believe that this shouldn't go ahead because students specifically took, eg economics for economics not to do accounting and with this new proposal going ahead making them take accounting as well will put more pressure on the students when it comes to externals etc	No	Yes	No		2020-02-29 09:08:05	ANON-YFPW-RW61-P	2020-02-29 09:08:05	2020-02-29 09:08:21
Yes		Agree				No			2020-02-29 09:10:07	ANON-YFPW-RW6Z-Y	2020-02-29 09:10:07	2020-02-29 09:10:22
No		Strongly agree				No			2020-02-29 09:15:12	ANON-YFPW-RW6H-D	2020-02-29 09:15:12	2020-02-29 09:15:23
Yes		Strongly agree		I think that it is good to combine similar subjects, like PE and Health and Commerce subjects art Level 1.	No	No			2020-02-29 09:15:59	ANON-YFPW-RW6B-7	2020-02-29 09:15:59	2020-02-29 09:16:19
Yes		Strongly agree				No			2020-02-29 09:16:28	ANON-YFPW-RW6M-J	2020-02-29 09:16:28	2020-02-29 09:16:39

No		Strongly agree	I like the idea of the subjects being more generalist in nature than specialised. Often in education it can be surprising that one enjoys a topic that they would not otherwise have considered. If something is included in the teaching that would not have been chosen by the individual it opens up opportunities that may not have been considered otherwise		No			2020-02-29 09:26:11	ANON-YFPW-RW6D-9	2020-02-29 09:26:11	2020-02-29 09:26:25
Yes		Strongly disagree			Yes			2020-02-29 09:29:43	ANON-YFPW-RW6K-W	2020-02-29 09:29:43	2020-02-29 09:29:49
No		Strongly disagree			No			2020-02-29 09:32:48	ANON-YFPW-RW6A-G	2020-02-29 09:32:48	2020-02-29 09:33:02
Yes		Strongly disagree			No			2020-02-29 09:57:54	ANON-YFPW-RW6N-K	2020-02-29 09:57:54	2020-02-29 09:58:18
Yes		Agree		It is a shame that Latin is being removed. Although not taken by many it is a useful subject for those interested in classics	Classics and Art History need to stay with an option to do Latin.	No		2020-02-29 10:05:10	ANON-YFPW-RW6K-G	2020-02-29 10:05:10	2020-02-29 10:05:22
Yes		Disagree		Mathematics and Statistics should be 2 subjects. If it is not split at Level 1 it definitely should be split at Level 2. Interesting that the sciences have been combined but a great number of languages are still offered.	Mathematics and Statistics should be 2 subjects definitely at Level 2.	No		2020-02-29 10:23:39	ANON-YFPW-RW6E-U	2020-02-29 10:23:39	2020-02-29 10:23:54
No	Not until the school advised us	Strongly disagree	General dumbing down of level 1. We should be challenging all students to achieve and preparing them well for L2 and L3. Not just okay to be average. What you are proposing is Stopping access to clear, quality pathways and valuable learnings Not improving it. Offering a general subject in science is not giving a clear pathway to students to achieve in L2 & 3. Economics not offered. Accounting not offered. Media studies not offered. Changes to Technology. I disagree with the proposal.		No			2020-02-29 10:43:22	ANON-YFPW-RW6R-Q	2020-02-29 10:30:31	2020-02-29 10:43:25
Yes		Strongly agree			Yes			2020-02-29 10:49:28	ANON-YFPW-RW6W-V	2020-02-29 10:49:28	2020-02-29 10:49:40
No		Strongly agree			Yes			2020-02-29 10:50:36	ANON-YFPW-RW64-S	2020-02-29 10:50:35	2020-02-29 10:50:46
Yes		Agree		No	No			2020-02-29 11:01:03	ANON-YFPW-RW6T-S	2020-02-29 11:01:03	2020-02-29 11:01:36
No	I'm curious to know how putting classics under history as a subject for level 2 and 3 promotes greater specialisation when classical studies is already a specialised subject on its own which teaches and promotes different ideas and social lessons for children than say the study of world wars which is often taught in NCEA	Strongly disagree	Media studies and psychology are vastly different subjects. Media studies at high school is often the study of film and entertainment media. How does that fit into social studies? Media studies is the study of communication and visual studies. It's an English subject. Classics and art history are vital art academic classes. History is ever growing and it's so vast it's not possible to have both classics and history under one subject as many facts and lessons will be only half taught or missed entirely. How does this bode for those wanting to further their studies at tertiary? Subjects in NCEA should be there to help teenagers find passions in subjects they want to continue after high school. It should be encouraging students to widen their studies into subjects that they otherwise would not have been familiar with. Taking out specialised subjects such as art history and classics stops that. You are no longer allowing students to explore the arts or points in history that they otherwise could further study in and find passion in.	Yes. I think a report and a survey to current and recent alumni NCEA students should be taken place. I'm curious to know how students and teachers feel about these changes. As I know some people who are currently training to be teachers in history and classics and this proposal threatens their job and career. In a time where there is a serious fall in availability of teachers as well as a fall in the respect and treatment of teachers by the ministry of education the proposal to take out vital subjects would mean lost jobs for many teachers who specialise in these subjects. Students of classics come into contact with events, ideologies and art that shapes their way of thinking and understanding of the world. Many classics students are able to have a larger sense of understanding social changes and changes in power from the study of such things as Greek mythology and Imperial Rome. How are these lessons going to be then transcribed into history where, arguably, most of which is greatly influenced by classical figures and leaders. Many leaders refer to classical figures in their influence. Taking out classics is meaning that a large amount of understanding of the world is being taken from these students and hindering their opportunity to further better themselves in a subject that is continuously growing and developing as well as	No			2020-02-29 11:12:19	ANON-YFPW-RW63-R	2020-02-29 11:12:19	2020-02-29 11:12:37
Yes		Strongly agree			Yes			2020-02-29 11:12:59	ANON-YFPW-RW62-Q	2020-02-29 11:12:59	2020-02-29 11:13:04
Yes		Strongly disagree			Yes			2020-02-29 11:13:11	ANON-YFPW-RW6U-T	2020-02-29 11:13:11	2020-02-29 11:13:17

Yes		Strongly disagree		With regard to the proposal to merge Level 1 Psychology, Media Studies and Social Studies I am disturbed as these subjects have quite different curricula. Psychology is a rapidly growing subject and over the years a significant amount of work has been invested into a programme that develops over the 3 year period a scaffolded learning process that builds on the previous year's work. In the dilution you propose the foundation would have to be effectively added into the Level 2 programme which would then weaken the level 3 outcomes. Currently at Avondale College we have [as of last week] 129 students taking level 1 Psychology (with a similar number at Levels 2 and 3). In comparison there are 24 students taking Level 1 Media Studies and we do not offer Level 1 Social Studies. For comparative purposes there are 85 students taking Level 1 Geography and 79 taking Level 1 History. The level of engagement in Psychology comes about from students talking to each other and the value they place on what they have learnt and experienced in the programme. The cynic within me questions whether this is part of a cost cutting process, level 1 is optional [a way to reduce the work load of moderation and exam setting and marking]. I suspect the number of schools opting out is small leading to small savings. By dropping some subjects and merging	No that I am aware of.	Yes	I am aware of this.		2020-02-29 11:22:20	ANON-YFPW-RWWY-Y	2020-02-29 11:22:20	2020-02-29 11:22:38
Yes		Undecided				Yes			2020-02-29 11:25:26	ANON-YFPW-RWWV-V	2020-02-29 11:25:26	2020-02-29 11:25:36
Yes		Strongly disagree	How do you expect students to have the knowledge required for level 2 or 3 sciences (chem, physics etc) without learning the foundational requirements needed at level 1?	Science should remain the way it is in order to allow students to gain the necessary knowledge to succeed at level 2 and 3. Without that, a majority of level 2 will be learning the knowledge students would have previously gained at level 1 prior to the commencement of the changes.		Yes			2020-02-29 11:46:57	ANON-YFPW-RWWC-9	2020-02-29 11:46:57	2020-02-29 11:47:10
Yes	I think the overview looks good. I agree with the broad focus in the sciences.	Strongly agree		A positive step forward. Things need to be reviewed and changed regularly.	Not that I am aware of.	No			2020-02-29 11:50:34	ANON-YFPW-RWWS-5	2020-02-29 11:50:34	2020-02-29 11:50:46
No		Strongly disagree	The removal of Latin as a Subject in level one is one that does not support the mission statement of the proposed changes, not only does it take away from the legitimacy of NCEA as a credible national standard but also removes the broad nature of level one that the changes are intended to do. Latin is a subject that is renowned for its academic standing in the world from scholars of past and present, to remove it as a possibility for students of New Zealand would be a slight on their future in academics.	See above, Latin should be included due to its standing in the world of academics, its capacity to teach students of the world around them and the origin of the languages primarily spoken today and to ensure that students are given the opportunity to experience Latin alongside other languages.		No			2020-02-29 12:09:37	ANON-YFPW-RWW8-X	2020-02-29 12:09:37	2020-02-29 12:09:55
Yes		Undecided	I support some, but not all changes	+ Long overdue to add Māori Performing Arts as separate Arts discipline - Dropping Physical Education which I understand is more 'applied' or practical than Health and Physical Education could disadvantage students that are not so strong in literacy - Concerned about combining the different science disciplines into just one science course: Offering separate disciplines allows keen scientists to spend more time on their chosen field(s); also weaker students can benefit from focusing on just one of the disciplines rather than a mish-mash of all disciplines pushed into one year. o Wondering if incorporating Art History and Classical Studies under the History umbrella will do any of the three justice?	I'm more interested to see cross-curricular approaches, teaching across several learning areas, incorporated in learning at all levels. Suitable Achievement Standards can then be chosen by the teachers to describe the work completed by students and award the respective standards and credits. Life is messy, it's cross-curricular, and so if solving the problems our students will encounter in their work life. I believe our school system needs to get them prepared for this.	No			2020-02-29 12:12:21	ANON-YFPW-RWWS-Y	2020-02-29 12:12:21	2020-02-29 12:12:34
Yes		Disagree		- Knowledge of Latin (and ancient Greek!) and the richness of Greek and Roman culture develops skills in intellectual rigour, critical analysis, self-expression and synthesising a diverse range of material — all highly prized qualities in the job market today. - Latin is the source for around half the words of English as well as being the mother-tongue of Italian, French, Spanish and other 'romance' languages'; it is a great resource for improving one's understanding of English		No			2020-02-29 12:31:43	ANON-YFPW-RWWI-G	2020-02-29 12:31:43	2020-02-29 12:31:55
No		Disagree				No			2020-02-29 12:37:51	ANON-YFPW-RWWQ-Q	2020-02-29 12:37:51	2020-02-29 12:38:15

Yes		Strongly disagree	Strongly disagree about exclusion of Latin.	Education should be more than a series of passing encounters with unrelated items: it should enable pupils to acquire intellectual possession of themselves and their circumstances and to widen their spiritual horizons. The study of Latin (and Greek) provides, perhaps uniquely, just such an enablement: through these subjects, pupils are taught to think as much as to learn; they acquire high-grade, transferable skills; they emerge with a linguistic awareness that unlocks their understanding of English and other languages. Most of all – Latin and Greek provide a cornerstone of European heritage; it was Joyce who once said not to know Latin is to be forever 'a shy guest at the feast of the world's culture'.		No			2020-02-29 12:44:12	ANON-YFPW-RWWE-B	2020-02-29 12:44:12	2020-02-29 12:44:22
Yes	I'm glad that broad is bicultural	Disagree	<p>Firstly I am all for our education system becoming more bicultural and recognising who we are and where we come from as New Zealanders. Te Reo and English are critical, but we need to consider broadly where these languages and cultures come from and understand these histories. My high school didn't have Latin as an option but I loved studying Latin and Greek at University and understanding language and English better in the process. Why did I go to University? Because I loved Classics.</p> <p>- In covering the languages, literature, ideas, history and art of ancient Greece and Rome, Classics is a truly wide-ranging, holistic discipline - it is not just history; it is a liberal education in itself and is an ever evolving discipline. I've been working in arts/education/museums so it can be practical but it's an amazing foundation.</p> <p>- Knowledge of Latin (and ancient Greek!) and the richness of Greek and Roman culture develops skills in intellectual rigour, critical analysis, self-expression and synthesising a diverse range of material — all highly prized qualities in the job market today. Critical thinking is literally critical.</p> <p>- Classical Studies remains a popular subject at schools and universities all across the country; for</p>	See above		No			2020-02-29 12:54:02	ANON-YFPW-RWW5-U	2020-02-29 12:54:02	2020-02-29 12:54:14
Yes		Disagree	<p>It is not so much the range of subject choices as the workload for each subject that is at fault</p> <p>In principle I believe that L1 is superfluous for a large body of students</p>	I am ok with consolidating history science and forgoing more specialist subjects at L1	No	No			2020-02-29 13:17:54	ANON-YFPW-RWWP-P	2020-02-29 13:17:54	2020-02-29 13:18:25
No		Agree			No	No			2020-02-29 13:26:34	ANON-YFPW-RWW7-W	2020-02-29 13:26:34	2020-02-29 13:26:54
Yes	Classics is a very important subject for the understanding of how western societies developed and having that available at NCEA level 1 is vital. The proposed changes would eliminate the possibility for students to learn Classics at level one and as such I am strongly opposed to said changes.	Strongly disagree	As is the intention of the proposed changes, in later years students are encouraged to specialise. This leaves little time to dabble and try different subjects, and level 1 of NCEA is a very valuable space for students to study a range of subjects before settling down into their speciality. Refining the subjects available at level 1 would severely limit students in their ability to try new things before committing to them for study over several years.	Classics must stay. It is a very different subject than history and lumping it into the already broad subject would lose what makes classical studies special if not lose it altogether. Please reconsider the proposed subject list to include classics as a level 1 NCEA understanding of the subject is a very useful tool even if one does not continue study after level 1.	Adding subjects that are currently only available at university level like anthropology would give students more opportunities than are currently available to them.	No			2020-02-29 13:34:07	ANON-YFPW-RWWF-C	2020-02-29 13:34:07	2020-02-29 13:34:16
Yes		Agree	I am from the Arts sector. At this point, I agree with the format for Music, Art, Drama and Dance. My question is with the Performing Arts Unit Standards and the pathway that currently exists with them. I know they are now administered through Skills Active but I assume they will still have a place in the curriculum along with other Unit Standard based courses. They do provide a essential link to the real life opportunities that we want in future focussed education and provide students with the experience to access courses and careers beyond school.	As above, Performing Arts standards can provide a relevant, industry-based course	As long as the Performing Arts continues that would be great. HOWEVER, I would like to see the two domains for Music, that currently exist in L3, continue into the future and maybe come into L2 as I cannot see how these courses can be compacted into two internals and two externals without losing the ability we currently to offer the variety needed. Music is, by it's nature a course that covers a huge range of different areas and these cannot all be thrown together without watering down what is offered.	No			2020-02-29 13:49:43	ANON-YFPW-RWW1-Q	2020-02-29 13:49:43	2020-02-29 13:50:01

Yes	I was aware that this was a goal, though exactly what this would mean for my subject was never quite clear. "Foundational" can have many meanings in different contexts, it seems.	Strongly disagree	I think that there is a real risk of the narrowing of science into one subject will be interpreted as a directive to reduce the amount of science learning of Year 11 students by some institutions. I think that in science, this will lead to schools having to design Year 11 courses entirely outside of the scope of NCEA assessment to cater for the interests and needs of many of their learners. The certificate at Level 1 will then become largely irrelevant.	We should retain Physics, Chemistry and Biology options at level 1. Currently, these subjects offer standards that are genuinely foundational for the understanding of the sciences. Removing these will reduce the flexibility of courses we can offer students at this year level. Removing these at level 1 will make it very hard to structure NCEA courses that provide learners foundational knowledge and skills required for success in the sciences.	No, but before any sense can be made of changes to Level 1, we need clear information about the changes that are proposed for levels 2 and 3. I assume that groups that have developed this proposal have a clear sense of how Levels 2 and 3 will need to change. This thinking needs to be made clear to survey respondents before any changes are implemented at Level 1. Only by seeing the whole picture can we judge whether the proposed changes have any hope of improving outcomes for our learners.	No			2020-02-29 14:06:04	ANON-YFPW-RWWZ-Z	2020-02-29 14:06:04	2020-02-29 14:06:29
No		Strongly disagree		Classics is too broad of a subject to be 'included with history' it is the study of so many different aspects, from the literary epics from Homer and Virgil to foundation of the worlds first democracy! The history taught in NZ schools far lacks the diversity that it should have, there is more to history than the ANZAC's and the treaty of Waitangi, they are obviously momentous parts of our young nation's history however in order to create well rounded, culturally diverse young adults there needs to be more world history focus to create a more inclusive society. It is through a lack of knowledge and understanding that prejudices are born.	Classical studies	No			2020-02-29 14:20:24	ANON-YFPW-RWWH-E	2020-02-29 14:20:24	2020-02-29 14:20:48
Yes		Agree		Will Food Science still incorporate the food safety and meal planning that is covered presently by Home Economics but not in Processing Technologies? I believe these two components are very important for the health of society and they are carried through to Level 2 when the students focus on specific areas that are of interest to them and can lead to career opportunities e.g. early childhood / care of the elderly. Food is not just manufacturing but the use and incorporation of it into our daily lives.		No			2020-02-29 14:24:25	ANON-YFPW-RWWB-8	2020-02-29 14:24:25	2020-02-29 14:24:57
No		Disagree		The Commerce subjects should be stand alone. There are a niche of students who thrive on the individual subjects.		No			2020-02-29 14:35:36	ANON-YFPW-RWWW-K	2020-02-29 14:35:36	2020-02-29 14:35:51
Yes		Undecided		I feel we should allow students to study multiple sciences at level 1. Our future needs more science minded individuals and we should not be dumbing down those who are ready to do a more intensive level 1. Starting at level 2 could be another option however for students ready to.	-Computer science -Philosophy -leadership/self development -law/human rights/global studies	No			2020-02-29 15:17:04	ANON-YFPW-RWWW-X	2020-02-29 15:17:04	2020-02-29 15:17:16
Yes	Some subjects require a good foundation level in order to proceed to further knowledge.	Disagree	As above, some subjects cannot be integrated into other overarching headings due to the nature of providing a good basis for further study.	I agree on the change to commerce. I do not agree to putting psychology under social studies - not enough time to do it justice. I do not agree to Art History being put under the History umbrella. This subject needs a full course of study in order to further study at University. By lessening the time for this subject it will impact further down the track to University studies in Art History - specialist subject. The same goes for Classics - you cannot put this under History, as it covers a number of areas that will be missed, to the detriment of further studies at University. I do not agree with removing Latin. This is a specialist subject, and if you remove it schools will be forced to go elsewhere to teach it. This subject is important to the sciences, medicine, pharmacy etc. Please do not remove it.	As above	Yes	No		2020-02-29 15:30:33	ANON-YFPW-RWWA-7	2020-02-29 15:30:33	2020-02-29 15:30:44
No	Not aware what changes going to be, just knew something was happening!	Strongly disagree	Don't like that science is being grouped into one subject. At our school the different science options for level one ncea are good and provide for all children. Science is essential please don't dumb it down, it's so vital in so many aspects of work!			No			2020-02-29 15:36:21	ANON-YFPW-RWWW-M	2020-02-29 15:32:08	2020-02-29 15:36:26

No		Strongly disagree	<p>Firstly I would like to comment on the fact that every demographic imaginable appears to have been represented in the focus groups involved in this process...that is every demographic other than the "average" Pakeha/European, middle class citizen or student who's interests and needs appear not to have been considered.</p> <p>It appears that the focus is being concentrate on the needs and wants of Maori and Pacifica. The addition for example of Maori Performing Arts at the expense of Art History highlights this perfectly. It would seem that Western / European History is no longer of importance in a country still strongly connected to Europe and the UK. Somewhat of an irony.</p> <p>Latin is a foundational language throughout the western world. To no longer offer it as a subject choice is a disgrace and quite frankly an embarrassment.</p> <p>Surely we want the to turn out students capable of understanding the basics of the development of Western Civilisation AS WELL AS the rich and diverse culture and history of our own country and Pacific neighbours. We should be celebrating that diversity and our ability to teach our students a broad range of subjects so they become citizens of the whole world and not limit their knowledge to our own back door.</p>	<p>With dropping Art History, Classics and Latin the foundation of any European based learning disappears. Whilst I appreciate the importance of catering to our Pacifica and Maori students by increasing subject options that may appeal to that demographic we must not limit the options for students who want to study Western and European Civilization and heritage.</p> <p>Classics covers Religion, Literature, Philosophy, Art and history. Some of the greatest minds, and works to ever be discovered are studied in Classics.</p> <p>Latin is used every day often without us even knowing we are using it. Medicine, Horticulture, Law, Religion the list goes on. To drop this language is to cap the possibilities our students are given. Classics, Latin and Art History are some of the more difficult subjects we challenge our students with. Generally those who are drawn to these subjects are those who want to specialise in a defined area and will work hard to achieve. I believe by not offering these subjects we are effectively "dumbing down" our students and funneling them all in one direction, which ultimately limits their potential for further study and achievement.</p>	<p>Mindfulness and mental wellness. This should be something that is offered right throughout the curriculum from the very early years and then become an area of specialisation. We have seen such a spike in mental health issues over the past few years and this would be a positive step to start managing that space and getting ahead of the issue.</p>	Yes			2020-02-29 15:39:37	ANON-YFPW-RWW-D-A	2020-02-29 15:16:40	2020-02-29 15:39:48
No	<p>The new Science standards came as a complete (unpleasant) surprise. For schools like ours which specialise in preparing students for tertiary study the proposed changes will increase teacher workload with an increase in compulsory internal credits e.g. now having to assess 3 investigations instead of just one. This review of NCEA was meant to decrease teacher workload but the proposed changes are set to magnify it.</p>	Strongly disagree	<p>The reduction of the separate Sciences to 2 subjects, Science and Agriculture and Horticulture is of grave concern. This will severely hamper teachers ability to prepare students for tertiary study in the field of Science and will continue our slide down the PISA rankings.</p>	<p>Continue with separate Science subjects at Level 1 because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the proposed Science standards have no content therefore only a fraction of the curriculum needs to be delivered to achieve them. I pity any poor student who changes schools during the year. - Science is and always will be a content laden subject. There is too much content to fit into one course. (Of course the new standards get around that by having no content) - many students enjoy taking double science. We have students taking a variety of combination science. If this change goes ahead there will only be one possibility - Science and Ag - currently level 1 prepares students for level 2 Science. If the proposed changes go ahead there is no point to level 1 Science. - if separate Sciences are not maintained there will be a mass exodus of schools from NCEA to Cambridge. 	<p>Bring back Human Biology. This subject was always popular with Maori, Pasifika and Pakeha students before it was axed.</p>	No			2020-02-29 15:41:10	ANON-YFPW-RWW-G-V	2020-02-29 15:39:35	2020-02-29 15:41:31
Yes		Disagree		<p>Only 1 general science with no provision for different strands</p>		Yes			2020-02-29 15:48:37	ANON-YFPW-RWW-R-R	2020-02-29 15:48:37	2020-02-29 15:48:54
Yes		Disagree		<p>Only 1 general science with no provision for different strands will make the jump to level 2 subjects even harder for our students to achieve at higher levels.</p>		Yes			2020-02-29 15:50:55	ANON-YFPW-RWW-W-W	2020-02-29 15:50:55	2020-02-29 15:51:05
Yes	<p>Briefly heard about the intended change but do not support the concept. Go back to the basic of why education is important. We need good quality of education to excel not generalizing to suit the needs.</p>	Strongly disagree	<p>The education must be thought through and built based on quality and worldwide acceptance. We must not compromise to derive a separate set of standard within NZ only. By lowering the standard, we will lose our competitiveness and it will have a great impact to future generation. Education is key for the nation to excel!!!</p>	<p>Biology, Physics and Chemistry subjects should never be generalised into one general science subject. The students need to learn each subject thoroughly.</p> <p>What is the next path for Performing Maori Arts - Is there a demand for the students who take this subject when they graduate? We must think of a way which equip the students well when they finish high school.</p> <p>Art history should not be excluded as it is important for students majoring in arts to learn the history and how it develops.</p>	No	No			2020-02-29 15:55:31	ANON-YFPW-RWW-4-T	2020-02-29 15:55:31	2020-02-29 15:55:42

Yes		Strongly disagree	<p>As someone who had a profoundly inspirational time at school learning Art History and Latin, I'm saddened by the proposal to remove both subjects from the high school curriculum. Both subjects have been extraordinarily useful for me in my career as a writer, teacher, and academic in literature and writing, and their removal from the curriculum would be a loss.</p> <p>Learning Latin gave me an abiding interest and understanding of the way language works, which led me to learn several other languages and to have the ability to communicate more effectively in English as well. Learning Art History was a bonus that I didn't expect, and that came for me in 6th form at a moment when my interest in art was developing. It has helped me understand my own artistic inclinations and practice, and given an important depth to my life.</p> <p>I'm pleased to see the retention of Arts more broadly, but am concerned that an over-utilitarian/vocational approach can shut down critical thinking and broad cultural knowledge in many dimensions. These subjects can often seem to be in the realm of 'privilege' and 'elitism' but removing them entirely from the curriculum actually further shuts down a broad understanding of culture and its operations.</p>	I would like to see the Ministry encourage more study of language, literature and culture. Ancient Greek, Anglo Saxon, Ceramics, Music History.... All of these would be of interest to some students, and the Ministry could be radical in encouraging an appreciation of these subjects as integral to well-being and culture in the community.	Yes	As an academic and teacher at university who specialises in children's literature, I have explored the curriculum in order to understand what is being taught to New Zealand children. Its strength seems to me to be its flexibility and scope. In comparison with the Australian curriculum, which is rigid and hierarchical, it is an enlightened and interesting		2020-02-29 15:57:07	ANON-YFPW-RWWT-T	2020-02-29 15:57:07	2020-02-29 15:57:20
Yes		Undecided		<p>I think Accounting should be retained as a level 1 subject in its own right. For students who struggle with literacy, but have computational ability, commerce is a high language-burden subject, which is also quite reliant on knowledge of local and global markets. From my experience working with these students, this is a stretch for many, especially English language learners, and migrants, for whom accounting is a possibility for them, and can lead to vocational pathways while they continue to develop their understanding of NZ as well as their language proficiency. It is a pathway subject and if students did leave at the end of Year 12 because Level 3 of school generally was too difficult for them, then two years of practical accounting is a very useful subject.</p> <p>As well, under Learning Languages, I think learning English AS a language is important to be put here, with appropriately culturally-sensitive assessment to make migrant, refugee and international students progression along progressions, for example against ELLPs, more meaningful, worthwhile, and motivational. As well, Maori from immersion language programmes coming to secondary school are learning English as a second language. That these cohorts of students' efforts to learn English is not considered equal to native</p>	No	I would like to though!		2020-02-29 15:59:13	ANON-YFPW-RWW3-S	2020-02-29 15:59:13	2020-02-29 15:59:32
No	I do not support the proposed changes	Strongly disagree	Current economics and accounting courses build on broad curriculum offered in year 9 and 10. Focus must be with ensuring pre NCEA years deliver their foundational goals		No			2020-02-29 16:42:00	ANON-YFPW-RWWU-U	2020-02-29 16:42:00	2020-02-29 16:42:24
No		Strongly disagree	Strongly disagree with the removal of Latin. I challenge you to survey all students in any field and find a strong percentage still working in that area. From my perspective, learning Latin and speaking with teachers who have a focus on general growth and understanding was fundamental to my future growth. I am now starting my own business and credit my strong background in classics (including Latin and Greek) for starting me down this path of self exploration and growth.	As said above, strongly oppose the removal of Latin.	No	I appreciate the importance of this focus		2020-02-29 16:49:23	ANON-YFPW-RWZY-2	2020-02-29 16:49:23	2020-02-29 16:49:33
Yes		Strongly disagree	I do not believe removing Biology, Chemistry and Physics from L1 general science is the correct way to go.	Add a single standard from Biology, Chem and Physics and make a single NOS standard compulsory. I believe the other strands of the curriculum need to be assessed and not just the NOS strand. It is overarching but is nothing without the other strands.	No, don't destroy the focus of the sciences as you have currently done with L1.	Yes		2020-02-29 17:10:37	ANON-YFPW-RWZS-V	2020-02-29 17:10:37	2020-02-29 17:10:39

Yes	I generally agree with this. As a Visual Arts Teacher that has been our Department's ethos for many years and we run a Y11 course that is broad-based within the visual Arts.	Agree	I think it aims to strike a balance between breadth and depth and general vs specialisation.	Just a couple of comments Re Level 1 Art History. We have previously found some of these Standards valuable in a broad-based course we constructed to support students with learning struggles. Perhaps a couple of the L1 Art Hist Standards could travel into the options for L1 Visual Arts eg 91016 and 91018 Regarding Media Studies. This subject does have quite a rich digital technological aspect and it seems like pulling it of Level 1 out misses an opportunity.	no	Yes	I am familiar that it exists and I think that Te Ao Maori underpins it - but I cannot read Te Reo.	no	2020-02-29 17:36:16	ANON-YFPW-RWZ8-1	2020-02-29 17:36:16	2020-02-29 17:36:30
No		Strongly disagree		Latin and classical studies are fundamental parts of education		Yes			2020-02-29 17:59:54	ANON-YFPW-RWZ9-2	2020-02-29 17:59:54	2020-02-29 18:00:10
No		Agree		Media studies, social studies and psychology don't really lump together very well. Though of the three social studies is the one to keep. Religious studies should be removed as it's own category. Lump it in with social studies. Good call on getting rid of Latin and Art History. Those are niche subjects that won't be useful for most jobs.	Civics or citizenship. New Zealanders need to understand how their government is structured and how they fit into the bigger picture. Also practical life skills like making a home budget, applying for a loan, writing a cv and doing interviews. Even reading forms and filling them out correctly is something many adults struggle with.	No			2020-02-29 18:17:33	ANON-YFPW-RWZG-G	2020-02-29 18:17:33	2020-02-29 18:17:41
Yes		Strongly disagree	Having the specialised sciences at level 1 helps students develop understanding of the base-level concepts required for further success in the sciences. By combining these into general science and putting greater focus on NOS, students will have greater difficulties in accessing the concepts taught at levels 2 and 3.	Do not combine biology/chemistry/physics in level 1. Having them separate will: - Give teachers greatest flexibility in being able to select standards that are suitable for their learners - Better allow students to grasp the concepts necessary for success in level 2/3 science courses	No	No			2020-02-29 18:39:04	ANON-YFPW-RWZJ-K	2020-02-29 18:39:04	2020-02-29 18:39:18
No	Not until the information came through via fellow teachers and online discussion groups.	Disagree	I'm strongly against the removal of separate science subjects for a start.	Biology, Chemistry, Physics. These really help as a base for the same subjects at levels 2-3		No			2020-02-29 18:40:56	ANON-YFPW-RWZQ-T	2020-02-29 18:40:56	2020-02-29 18:41:03
No		Strongly disagree		Science, Biology, Physics, Chemistry, Earth science, Ag / Hort.	Electronics, Human Biology	No			2020-02-29 18:43:20	ANON-YFPW-RWZE-E	2020-02-29 18:43:20	2020-02-29 18:43:31
Yes		Strongly agree		I think this is a great move, and reflects the true nature of level 1. Level 1 is not a time for students to be specialising.		No	Sort of not really a no.		2020-02-29 18:51:15	ANON-YFPW-RWZS-X	2020-02-29 18:51:15	2020-02-29 18:51:34
No		Strongly disagree		Why change what isn't broken? What evidence do you have that these changes will provide more opportunities for success for our students? What about teacher workload?		Yes			2020-02-29 18:55:30	ANON-YFPW-RWZP-S	2020-02-29 18:55:30	2020-02-29 18:56:06
Yes		Strongly agree				Yes			2020-02-29 19:04:21	ANON-YFPW-RWZ7-Z	2020-02-29 19:04:21	2020-02-29 19:04:30
Yes	However I did not think they would be restricting L1 to the level that they are.	Strongly disagree	to not offer the specialised Science subjects id very short sighted. you wants moe specialised L2 and L3 sciences but you are breaking up the foundation on which these subjects are based on. It will take a lot longer to cover the L2 subjects as the topics that are needed are not being taught in L1 any more. Even if a school does not offer a L1 Physics or Chemistry subject as such they offer aspects of those courses within their Science programmes. You are making a lot less choice available to engage students in what should be a core and very important subject.	I really like the inclusion of L1 MPA but not if it impacts on L2 and 3 courses. They are usually only able to get credits for performance once over the three years and every year hundreds of hours of work goes into Kapahaka. What about Pasifika performing arts? There are students all over the country spending hours studying and perfecting performances for Polyfest. Should they not get some sort of acknowledgement. Each student is different. Some really like History topics and would take both History and Classics. My children really liked Science and took General science in yr 10. They then took 1 or 2 specialised Science subjects in L1, and then moved through L2 and 3 specialised Science subjects with outstanding prior knowledge. This kept them enthused and engaged. Why are getting rid of Latin. I know only a few schools teach it but it is useful in the sciences and medicine and students have taken it by correspondence. L1 Biology is good for less able students as they are usually able to relate to it better than to Chemistry and Physics subjects. The new scheme will mean students may struggle to achieve as here will be less options they can buy into. This is especially true of our more recent	Environmental studies and sustainability should be developed fully with what is happening in the world.	Yes	I have a basic understanding of it and have looked at some of the papers. I am not fluent in te reo Māori though.	NO. I am not able to communicate in te reo Māori enough to do so.	2020-02-29 19:13:12	ANON-YFPW-RWZF-F	2020-02-29 19:13:12	2020-02-29 19:13:24
Yes	What a shame the "watered down education" option was taken by people who, I can only assume, have never taught.	Strongly disagree	The only hope here is to find a school that opts out of offering NCEA Level 1 and keeps some element of rigour with an eye on Levels 2 and 3. It is astonishing how the bar continues to be lowered in a world screaming out for our children to actually be prepared for life after school. There is nothing wrong with learning content. Don't get rid of Art History or Classics - there is nothing wrong with using these subjects to expand the mind and grow brains.	Reasons are given above for retaining Chemistry, Physics and Biology.	Not necessarily but please do not tinker with Level 2 and 3. In the world where individuals at the Ministry have pet projects, I suspect they will be. Shameful.	Yes	Surely, you won't tinker with this. Just leave it be!	I do not know enough to comment	2020-02-29 19:18:22	ANON-YFPW-RWZ1-T	2020-02-29 19:18:22	2020-02-29 19:18:38
Yes		Strongly agree				No			2020-02-29 19:23:18	ANON-YFPW-RWZ2-3	2020-02-29 19:23:18	2020-02-29 19:23:38

Yes		Disagree	Is not broad enough. Makes less choice for students. Doesn't provide a strong foundation for L2, in particular the science subjects.	More science subjects. Provides a robust and interesting pathway into the sciences. Also. will provide a solid foundation for taking the subject further in L2.	The key is to keep the rigour at L2 and not making it easier but it should be strengthened.	No			2020-02-29 19:27:37	ANON-YFPW-RWZH-H	2020-02-29 19:27:37	2020-02-29 19:28:06
Yes	I think this is ok as long as there is coverage guaranteed of all science so that the pathways can be specialised at level 2 and 3	Undecided	If a child has a future goal as my son has who is year 11, opportunity for specialisation for him was important. I want him to have the best foundation to reach his goals.	If there are specialist available in subjects I'd hope they would be teaching their specific area within the general science framework. Silly to waste talent and to have a biologist who doesn't understand physics trying to teach it when there is a physics teacher on staff.	I think in year 12 and 13 at the sciences should be split out. By year 12 and 13 students know what general direction they are headed in. For someone who is headed into medicine or science a general science course is not going to give the in-depth knowledge that the specific subjects can.	No			2020-02-29 19:28:56	ANON-YFPW-RWZB-B	2020-02-29 19:28:56	2020-02-29 19:29:10
Yes		Agree				Yes			2020-02-29 19:34:56	ANON-YFPW-RWZM-P	2020-02-29 19:34:56	2020-02-29 19:35:02
Yes	It appears there will be yet another dumbing down of Science, with the removal of single science specialisms at Level 1 - a ridiculous proposal making the country look dumb and stupid on an International Stage!	Strongly disagree	Keep what we have and make it academically more challenging. Weight subject standards in terms of academic difficulty/challenge. E.g How can a L3 standard in PE be equivalent to a Level 3 Calculus paper in terms of the same number of credits - ridiculous! No wonder no one wants to teach Science and Mathematics.	Keep the single Sciences at Level 1. Science is NOT A SOFT option. Science requires academic rigor and academic discipline - it is not like studying PE, Drama or cookery!	NO - lets hope you do not botch the Level 2 and Level 3 single Sciences. I guess if you do this, all that will be required to teach at secondary level in the Sciences is a generalist non-specialist qualification e.g maybe a home eco teacher will be teaching Physics and Chemistry. It would probably solve the specialist teacher shortage in NZ? The other problem with the teaching profession in this country is that it is virtually a female dominated profession with a small proportion of males. No wonder it is perceived as a second income earner ('pin money'), low pay, low status. There are quite a few Science teachers that do not 'know there stuff' and should not be in the profession.	No	No - what about the large number of Chinese and Indian immigrants in NZ? Will teachers have to learn mandarin, Urdu etc.		2020-02-29 19:44:10	ANON-YFPW-RWZD-D	2020-02-29 19:44:10	2020-02-29 19:44:27
No		Agree		Change to Science at level 1 just a return to the way it used to be. Good move because many forced to specialise completely at Level one which is too early.		No			2020-02-29 19:51:16	ANON-YFPW-RWZX-1	2020-02-29 19:51:16	2020-02-29 19:51:33
No	Very little indication if any was given to say that the changes, especially to sciences, were being contemplated	Strongly disagree	Removing subjects such as Latin, Classics and economics and accounting will narrow the learning options. Not a good thing.	As a science teacher I believe the removal of chemistry, biology and physics and the evisceration foundational learning in science are major backward steps that will impact negatively on students and eventually the community sooner than later. The teaching at level 2 will be further diluted as basic skills and ideas that should have been mastered previously are taught.		No			2020-02-29 19:58:46	ANON-YFPW-RWZA-A	2020-02-29 19:58:46	2020-02-29 19:59:01
Yes	However this approach will result in students dropping out of Science subjects as the content difference will be vast.	Strongly disagree	It is not common across all subject areas at level 1. Science reduces to 4 standards while Social Studies still has Geography, History and Commerce at Level 1 as does Technology.	The draft Science standards reduce the scope to offer different courses based on student needs. It will also result in students going off to university with less knowledge which will impact on that sector also.	No, leave them as they are.	No			2020-02-29 20:01:28	ANON-YFPW-RWZN-Q	2020-02-29 20:01:28	2020-02-29 20:01:44
Yes		Strongly disagree				Yes			2020-02-29 20:15:25	ANON-YFPW-RWZK-M	2020-02-29 20:15:25	2020-02-29 20:15:33
Yes		Strongly disagree	Strongly disagree with Classics joining History: Classics is a passion/interest subject. It's also available as a major/minor at university. Removing it as its own subject limits people's exposure to the subject. Some people enjoy Classics but don't like History. Disagree with Media Studies joining Social Studies: I never understood what Social Studies was at school. I like the idea of combining it with psychology (which I didn't realise was a subject), but I don't agree with adding it to Media Studies. Media Studies is a specific area which is relevant to many different careers. Strongly disagree with the Sciences being combined: There wouldn't be enough time to really explore each subject if they're combined; I imagine this would be problematic when they're separated as Level 2 subjects. Highly likely to turn students away from sciences all together - particularly as some sciences are associated with maths while others aren't. Limits the specialised knowledge and ability for students to try different areas before further study.			No			2020-02-29 20:30:37	ANON-YFPW-RWZ4-W	2020-02-29 20:30:37	2020-02-29 20:30:50
Yes		Agree		Like level 1 science standards but need academic pathway as well for serious science students i.e separate sciences or physical sciences of chem and phys and natural science of bio and earth/space science.		No			2020-02-29 20:34:27	ANON-YFPW-RWZT-W	2020-02-29 20:34:27	2020-02-29 20:34:40

No	I was not aware this was the philosophy but support this idea because I feel too often students at Level 1 specialise in areas they think they want to learn and then later on realise they do not have the interest or aptitude for this subject area. I guess you could also have the philosophy that they get a taster of many subjects at Level 1 then start to specialise later on when they have had the experience of a subject and understand more fully what is involved and where it may lead.	Agree	I think the curriculum has a broad pathway and good AOs and aims to give students the skills and knowledge to help them succeed in their world. I think the area that it may lack in is providing knowledge and skills for the vocational pathway although, the Technology curriculum could do this.	I am surprised in a secular school system that Religious Studies remains at Level 1. I feel that Religious Studies could easily be fitted within the context of the Social Studies course at Level 1.		No			2020-02-29 20:44:12	ANON-YFPW-RWZ2-U	2020-02-29 20:44:12	2020-02-29 20:44:30
Yes		Strongly disagree		Why have all the languages and everything else but not the individual sciences. They are very different and will not prepare students for Level 2 at all. This is poor planning.		No			2020-02-29 20:50:49	ANON-YFPW-RWAY-9	2020-02-29 20:50:49	2020-02-29 20:50:53
No	Just learnt about it now, through recent news media articles and reading the intro to this questionnaire.	Undecided	General proposal/direction seems sound, but I have one major objection, outlined in question 3.	Latin needs to remain. It is a fundamental building block of the English language. For those of us that struggle with spelling, and constructing coherent sentences, learning Latin helped my ability in English tremendously. This is something I didn't gain from English lessons, because the focus was/is on drama, Shakespeare, and novel studies. My children have inherited my lack of ability in English and I would like them to have the opportunity to improve their English through learning Latin, as I did. If anything, to highlight the point, Greek should be added to the NZ curriculum to help with understanding all the technological and medical concepts in English that derive from Greek.	To continue with Latin at Levels 2 and 3.	No			2020-02-29 20:55:38	ANON-YFPW-RWAV-6	2020-02-29 20:55:38	2020-02-29 20:55:54
Yes		Agree	Generally I agree with the above changes, however, Food Science in comparison with Home Economics seems a narrowing-down. How do we prepare a future generation of physical and mental healthy citizens if they are not prepared well in managing their own lives, one important source of happiness? Food science is only one part of it. I would prefer to keep Home Economics that encompasses budgeting, sustainable living, and food science, etc.	Art History should be included, as this would give students a better perspective of where the present popular art forms come and help them make better choice in develop their own views of art. Popular art forms to some extent swiped away a lot of traditional things. This may be good, yet may be a loss of great value as well.	Selfcare and Resilience to combat a future full of risks and challenges.	No		No	2020-02-29 20:59:27	ANON-YFPW-RWZ8-U	2020-02-29 20:59:27	2020-02-29 20:59:38
No	The scheme is narrow-minded. It limits choice, by schools (which should play to their strengths) and students (who may never hear of subjects excluded or omitted here). For all the clichéd talk of "paths" and "gateways" to learning, the exclusions will have the opposite effect; debarring students from powerful disciplines which you are preventing them from experiencing.	Strongly disagree	Why can't individual schools make more choices than these? What have the NZ universities said about the issue of university entrance? How does this range of choice of subjects compare with that of other countries, especially Australia?	The dropping of Latin ignores the degree to which English intertwines with Latin over centuries: in lexis, syntax, philosophy, logic, you name it. Knowing Latin gives access to kindred languages, including languages from its Indo-European family. For these reasons Latin is easier to learn than some of the languages which do remain. It provides a far better way into abstract and intellectual disciplines which use language, not least colonial and world history. The emphasis on history is short-sightedly weakened by omitting Latin, and art history.	Let a school offer languages which connect with its own history and clientele. Increase the sphere of choice. The proposals are bland but coercive.	No		No.	2020-02-29 21:11:28	ANON-YFPW-RWAC-K	2020-02-29 21:11:28	2020-02-29 21:12:03
Yes		Disagree	Perhaps a backward move. There was General Science only back in the seventies when I was at secondary. My children definitely benefited from specialising in Chemistry and Physics. The gap between secondary and tertiary education may be too large without specialisation in Year 11	Why is Art History missing? Not everyone want# to do visual art.	My main concern is that Science should not be generalised. This gives students no options to do say just chemistry and physics. Biology, is much easier to pick up later, or even at entry to Uni.	No			2020-02-29 21:19:42	ANON-YFPW-RWAS-3	2020-02-29 21:19:42	2020-02-29 21:20:10
No		Strongly disagree	I fundamentally disagree with the idea. It seems works on the philosophy that level 1 is the first year of schooling not the 11th. By the time students reach level 1 if we've done our job right they should have a very good idea about where their strengths and interests lie. Should be have the option for students to have broad stroke courses like science and commerce, yes but should we also allow the vast majority of students who know what they want to pursue to specialize at that level yes. This limits us to one pathway.	I endorse the added subjects of commerce and maori performing arts, but I do not see the advantage in removing any of the subjects.		No			2020-02-29 21:39:19	ANON-YFPW-RWA8-8	2020-02-29 21:39:19	2020-02-29 21:39:28
No	I had heard anything to suggest this	Strongly disagree				No			2020-02-29 21:41:54	ANON-YFPW-RWA9-9	2020-02-29 21:41:54	2020-02-29 21:42:07
No		Strongly agree				Yes			2020-02-29 21:56:03	ANON-YFPW-RWAG-Q	2020-02-29 21:56:03	2020-02-29 21:56:12

Yes		Strongly disagree	Please do not remove art history and classics from the subject list. These classes help foster thought, values and creates a unique environment within the classroom.	Please separate PE and health. Our current sex education is not sufficient. It does not cover LGBT, mental, emotional or cultural health surrounding sex. New Zealand is a progressive multicultural country, please do not disservice our future.	Life skills. - general law (consumers act, human rights) - speech and communication skills (explaining, summarising, how to politely complain) - accounting (budgeting, managing money) - mental health (understanding limits, respecting oneself and others) - navigating cultural/generational differences - empathy (asking a student to lead the class instead of teacher. Chats? Have faith) - preparing students for university (ask them to lead their own project) - interacting with social media	No			2020-02-29 22:03:41	ANON-YFPW-RWAJ-T	2020-02-29 22:03:41	2020-02-29 22:03:58
No		Undecided	Far too much focus on languages and not enough Science.	Languages have been on a downward spiral for many years. Class numbers are always low, you often see composite classes. Offering so many language options is not broadening the curriculum at level 1. Knowing another language is great to learn, but not as powerful to know in 2020 due to the ability to use technology and have access at your finger tips if you need to know a phrase or pronunciation. So many options does not make sense when four areas of Science are bundled into one subject.		Yes			2020-02-29 22:26:51	ANON-YFPW-RWAQ-1	2020-02-29 22:26:51	2020-02-29 22:27:08
No		Disagree	I am concerned that reducing exposure to physical sciences will erode on the foundation of science knowledge and will weaken performance			No			2020-02-29 22:32:01	ANON-YFPW-RWAE-N	2020-02-29 22:32:01	2020-02-29 22:32:10
Yes		Strongly disagree		Sciences. We are dumbing it down by dropping the single sciences. Why was there no mention of dropping the single sciences when you had the 100 meetings around the country?		Yes			2020-02-29 22:50:31	ANON-YFPW-RWA5-5	2020-02-29 22:50:31	2020-02-29 22:50:46
No		Strongly disagree	Classics and art history is integral for learning as it teaches us history of people rather than just wars and colonization. Instead of facts you learn to think critically and abstractly about human culture and the evolution of ideas.	Classics and art history is integral for learning as it teaches us history of people rather than just wars and colonization. Instead of facts you learn to think critically and abstractly about human culture and the evolution of ideas. It should not just be included in history, to understand it in depth it needs to be it's own subject		No			2020-02-29 23:10:34	ANON-YFPW-RWAP-Z	2020-02-29 23:10:34	2020-02-29 23:10:56
No		Strongly disagree	I strongly believe that Classical Studies should stay on the curriculum.	Classical Studies provides a fundamental background to the evolution of civilisation and provides cross curricular links to all subjects in some respect. Ancient mythology and epic literature have been sources of inspiration for famous works of literature for centuries and provide an essential foundation to studying this field. Latin and Classical Greek are the basis of a large number of Indo-European languages and knowledge of this grammar enables pupils to excel at linguistics. The culture, law and politics of Athens and Rome allows pupils to understand how our own political, social and economic landscape has evolved and knowledge of the history of these momentous civilisations allows us to better understand our own more recent history. I strongly believe that denying pupils the opportunity to study Classical Studies will hinder their academic advancement, as it complements such a wide range of subjects.	Ancient History	No			2020-03-01 01:16:38	ANON-YFPW-RWA7-7	2020-03-01 01:16:38	2020-03-01 01:16:57
No		Disagree		The removal of Latin from the language curriculum is terribly short-sighted and is sure to be regretted over time. While it is true that large numbers of students are not likely to pursue the language, it remains a cornerstone of cultural and linguistic understanding for any society which derives whole, or in part, from European history, as New Zealand sure does. Ensuring that Latin may be taught to those aspiring to better understand our Classical heritage, the structure of many European languages, and the legacy of traditions ranging from theology to modern linguistics, is not a pedagogical luxury but an moral obligation to future generations.		No			2020-03-01 01:39:12	ANON-YFPW-RWAF-P	2020-03-01 01:39:12	2020-03-01 01:39:27

Yes		Strongly disagree	see below	It is crucial to retain Latin in secondary schools. Achievement in Latin correlates highly with high performance on standardized tests and improved reading and writing skills. It impresses colleges and Universities (the chief admissions officer at Harvard University said in court that those who study Latin or Greek in high school have an edge in admissions!). And, of course, studying Latin provides a unique window into an ancient civilization with much to teach us about our own world and timeless works of literature.		No				2020-03-01 04:53:17	ANON-YFPW-RWA1-1	2020-03-01 04:53:17	2020-03-01 04:53:37
No		Strongly disagree				No				2020-03-01 04:56:21	ANON-YFPW-RWAZ-A	2020-03-01 04:56:21	2020-03-01 04:57:53
No		Strongly agree			No. Looks like the chosen core subjects covers a broad knowledge base (level 1).	No				2020-03-01 06:48:10	ANON-YFPW-RWAH-R	2020-03-01 06:48:10	2020-03-01 06:48:40
Yes		Strongly disagree	Although I understand the rationale, I disagree that this approach will have the desired intent. These proposed changes seem to me to be watering down of what is currently a much more rigorous and adaptable range of subjects.	Biology, chemistry and physics as specialist subjects need to be included. These changes will make it impossible to meet the requirements of the curriculum in one very dense course AND meet the requirements of the newly proposed assessment standards.	NO! I have no faith in the ministry to make any changes that are in line with teacher professional knowledge or best practice. The proposed changes to sciences and science assessment that appear to be being pushed through leave me with no confidence in NZ education.	No				2020-03-01 06:52:36	ANON-YFPW-RWAB-J	2020-03-01 06:52:36	2020-03-01 06:52:54
Yes		Strongly agree				No				2020-03-01 07:31:54	ANON-YFPW-RWAM-W	2020-03-01 07:31:54	2020-03-01 07:32:07
No		Agree		Add these two languages: Niuean Tokelauan -Citizens of both countries are NZ citizens. If Samoa, Tongan and Cooks are supported why not these as well? -There are lots of young people in our country from these two cultural groups. -Both languages need government support to thrive. -Children can learn these languages in ECE centres so should be able to continue learning them all the way through their schooling.	As above	No				2020-03-01 07:33:23	ANON-YFPW-RWAD-M	2020-03-01 07:33:23	2020-03-01 07:33:30
No		Undecided		Please do not drop Latin and Classical Studies - these are vital building blocks to understanding the multi-cultural society we live in. Latin gives access to other Romantic modern languages, aids English language understanding and is still vital to students wishing to study law, medicine, botanics, literature and historical texts. Studying Classics helps to understand what underpins much of our societies in the modern day in terms of philosophy, democracy, politics, architecture, art, literature and so on and on. Please do not deprive/deny NZ students the opportunity to learn from these subjects.	Study of the ancient world.	No				2020-03-01 07:55:39	ANON-YFPW-RWAX-8	2020-03-01 07:55:39	2020-03-01 07:55:59
Yes		Strongly disagree	The changes reduce the level of specialisation in Science, History, Social Studies, and Commerce available to students at Year 11, while both CIE and IB demonstrate that students at this age are entirely capable of such depth of study. Denying students the option of extending their knowledge of particular areas is an unnecessary and counterproductive limitation upon students' opportunities, and maximising students' opportunities should be a central goal of secondary education. Specialisation should be an option for any student so that they can pursue their own interests and achieve success in areas which matter to them, rather than being forced to compete in normative contexts which cannot suit everyone. Students' opportunities for learning would be increased by having the options of specialising in single subjects or of taking several subjects (for example, Māori Performing Arts, Drama, Dance, and Music) all under collective programmes. Those who wish to pursue an area in detail could do so, while those who wished to gain some understanding could do so without facing assessments of the same depth.	Stippling Classics as a subsidiary field of History will result - as so often under NCEA - in schools opting out of teaching it at all. Dropping Latin, Classics, and Art History means denying students access to the study of much of human history, since History and English both tend to stop in the twentieth century or to delve little beyond there. Latin is highly useful not only for the study of Romance Languages but also for the enrichment of students' English vocabulary and for their understanding of English grammar. Classics and Art History are forms of historical study which broaden students' understanding of the development of human society. To increase students' opportunities for study, it would be better to include more earlier art from more geographical contexts than to reduce the amount available. Including Māori Performing Arts is a great idea.		No	It was not even available when I went to school, but I would submit that Te Reo should be a compulsory core subject from Year 0 to Year 10, giving all students in Aotearoa New Zealand a sufficient foundation in it so that they can then choose whether to specialise in it from Year 11.	Apparently, you mean Question 5.	2020-03-01 07:58:37	ANON-YFPW-RWAA-H	2020-03-01 07:58:37	2020-03-01 07:58:53	
Yes		Strongly disagree	Classics should remain a key subject and Latin should not be removed from the curriculum	Latin/Classics should be maintained as major subjects: education in Classics has greatly benefited and fulfilled me and I believe that students should be able to take these subjects if they wish due to their essential role in the development of fine logic and transferable skills.		No				2020-03-01 08:08:03	ANON-YFPW-RWAN-X	2020-03-01 08:08:03	2020-03-01 08:08:17
Yes		Undecided		I don't think just having Science will prepare students who wish to specialise in the sciences at level 2 and 3	No	No				2020-03-01 08:09:48	ANON-YFPW-RWAK-U	2020-03-01 08:09:48	2020-03-01 08:10:00

No		Strongly disagree		Classics should remain by their own, and Latin should not be deleted from the program.		No			2020-03-01 08:14:08	ANON-YFPW-RWA6-6	2020-03-01 08:14:08	2020-03-01 08:14:22
No		Strongly disagree		Classics and Latin should not be pushed to the side as they have. Limiting students choices in such a way is terrible! Latin is a privilege that we should be working on giving to all, and not taking away.		No			2020-03-01 08:15:51	ANON-YFPW-RWAR-2	2020-03-01 08:15:51	2020-03-01 08:16:06
No		Strongly disagree				No			2020-03-01 08:23:01	ANON-YFPW-RWA7-7	2020-03-01 08:23:00	2020-03-01 08:23:13
No		Strongly disagree		Latin has had a huge impact on my life in many different ways: linguistic advantages, logic, rhetoric, writing, analytical thinking, etc; it would be a real shame to get rid of the classical experience.		No			2020-03-01 08:34:17	ANON-YFPW-RWAT-4	2020-03-01 08:34:17	2020-03-01 08:34:30
Yes		Strongly agree				No			2020-03-01 08:36:03	ANON-YFPW-RWA3-3	2020-03-01 08:36:03	2020-03-01 08:36:21
No		Strongly disagree	Keep Latin and Classics.	Keep Latin and Classics!!!		No			2020-03-01 08:36:43	ANON-YFPW-RWA2-2	2020-03-01 08:36:43	2020-03-01 08:36:54
Yes		Strongly disagree	The new standards are treating level 1 science like all schools current Year 10 programs. Changing the program will lack the detail needed for students to achieve in the specialised areas in level 2 chemistry, biology, physics etc. this would mean teachers would have to spend more time teaching the basics rather than getting more in depth with the subject which in turn affects students going to uni and into the workforce using Science. We want more kids doing science this is needed for our future. This is narrowing students learning and also not helping students who struggle with learning its nice to have options going from over 30 standards to 4 is crazy.			No			2020-03-01 08:40:01	ANON-YFPW-RWAU-5	2020-03-01 08:40:01	2020-03-01 08:40:11
No		Strongly disagree	Latin is a valuable subject and should be taught. Classical studies is also good as its own subject instead of a part of History, as the study of Ancient History is quite different to the study of more modern history.	Keep Latin and Classical studies. They are useful, interesting and provide a large insight into the cultures that lots of our own culture is based on.		No			2020-03-01 08:43:20	ANON-YFPW-RW2Y-T	2020-03-01 08:43:20	2020-03-01 08:43:29
No		Strongly disagree		Latin and Classics should continue to be offered in the curriculum. I studied Latin from Level 1 through to Scholarship level, and beyond learning how to translate a language, it taught me so many skills which I continue to use now. - time management and study skills - being able to think critically, and not linearly - broadening my appreciation for other cultures, and continuing to inspire travel through Europe The teacher I was privileged to learn from remains one of the best and most inspiring I have ever had, and I cannot imagine other students not having the ability to learn from him.		No			2020-03-01 08:43:26	ANON-YFPW-RW2V-Q	2020-03-01 08:43:26	2020-03-01 08:43:43
No	Not until I read this. As a Science teacher I have been focused on the new standards proposed.	Disagree	You say earlier: supports the inclusion of important and rich learning from the National Curriculum, with as little overlap as possible. The extent to which the subject supports coherent and robust pathways into NCEA Level 2 and further study or training. Why does Ag and Hort get to keep its' own single subject but ALL the other sciences (which are quite large) are lumped into one?? I feel like this might be being influenced by industry demands and possibly money??? It is still a Science and we are really emphasising this at our school. Lumping so many individual subjects in Science into one is not providing "important and rich learning" as you have stated above OR "Coherent and robust pathways".	See above.		No			2020-03-01 08:46:40	ANON-YFPW-RW2C-4	2020-03-01 08:46:40	2020-03-01 08:46:50
Yes		Disagree	I think the separate sciences should be retained - and in fact, I think a Human Biology or Health Science should be added. The same 4 new Ach Stds could be used to assess learning but students should be able to pursue a specialist course. There is too much new learning otherwise to push into Level2/3. All students need to be catered for - those who are interested in pursuing sciences and those who want general science. You could have two 'sciences' at level 1 called 'Science' and Science with a speciality.' It is possible with the new stds to focus on one area of the curriculum such as the Material World and this then could form a 'Chemistry' course. I predict that schools will do this anyway - so it might as well be acknowledged.	See above	Health science - although there is provision for this already within science. Human Biology would be a popular and important addition - and is different but would complement 'Health'.	Yes	But not familiar or experienced enough to offer an opinion.	See above	2020-03-01 08:49:38	ANON-YFPW-RW2S-M	2020-03-01 08:49:38	2020-03-01 08:49:54
No		Strongly disagree	Latin is important. It helps to understand any language and you learn to improve your thinking.	Latin is important.		No			2020-03-01 08:50:56	ANON-YFPW-RW28-S	2020-03-01 08:50:56	2020-03-01 08:51:25
No		Strongly disagree	the classics are very important to me and they are very influential of me. i think everyone should have the opportunity to learn latin and greek.			Yes			2020-03-01 09:00:25	ANON-YFPW-RW29-T	2020-03-01 09:00:25	2020-03-01 09:00:41

Yes		Disagree		Latin is removed completely which is not that fair (other subjects are at least incorporated into other subjects). Latin is an important subject as it strengthens problem solving ability and encompasses a broad range of skills; analytical, critical and logic. The variety of the subject means that its removal from the curriculum would be a loss to many students. It is, after all, a language like any other, the only difference being that it is no longer spoken. However, learning a language does not have to be about the practicalities in the real world (how often is a school child going to ultimately need a modern foreign language in their adult life?), but for cultural enrichment and understanding. Therefore, the removal of Latin could be to the detriment of many students so should be kept on as a subject in its own right.		No			2020-03-01 09:28:56	ANON-YFPW-RW2Q-J	2020-03-01 09:28:56	2020-03-01 09:29:14
Yes	- foundational education must include all literacies and media literacy could arguably be deemed the MOST important of all broad and foundational literacies in the 21st century learner.	Strongly disagree	- Clumping all the science disciplines under one umbrella of "Science" cannot ensure that schools offer the broader and more foundational base that has been claimed. Subject preference and teacher expertise will still bias the offerings within this option.	- the assumptions behind omitting Media Studies are not clear. It is NOT adequately catered for as a "possible context for Social Studies". It is NOT a context but a robust and essential learning area for any student to be equipped for the future. - If a school opts to use the Social Studies standards within either a Social Studies or Psychology context then the Media Studies course would be left with no option for even slightly relevant standards. - the key concepts, skills and processes of Media Studies are not adequately covered or embedded within any of the suggested foundational options. - Achievement at Level 2 improved when Level 1 Media Studies was introduced and enabled teacher to set a foundation for these key concepts, skills and processes. - Media Literacy is the most important 21st literacy skill that is not being addressed within the proposal. Information and digital literacies do NOT stand in isolation - media literacy is the about empowerment of students to be critical reader of the most pervasive forms of "information" ever in history. - Media literacy is not limited to a single curriculum but Media Studies is ESSENTIAL as the cohesive foundation of these skills. It is NOT being consistently taught across the curriculum.	No - the focus needs to be on getting Level 1 right. Psychology is an obvious attraction for students but are there sufficient qualified and suitable teachers available? Specialist pathways need to have purpose and staffing.	No			2020-03-01 09:30:43	ANON-YFPW-RW2J-B	2020-03-01 09:21:32	2020-03-01 09:30:59
Yes		Strongly disagree		Why get rid of specialised Sciences? Will make it way harder at year 12 and 13 to cover the amount of content for students to learn the prior knowledge they were getting in year 11. Year 12 and 13 are already really hard years for the students in Science.	No	No			2020-03-01 09:34:43	ANON-YFPW-RW2E-6	2020-03-01 09:34:43	2020-03-01 09:34:55
No		Strongly disagree		The removal of Latin is a terrible shame. Studying Latin is proven to broaden the mind from an analytical, linguistic and broader cultural understanding perspective.		No			2020-03-01 09:37:09	ANON-YFPW-RW2S-P	2020-03-01 09:37:09	2020-03-01 09:37:20
No		Agree				No			2020-03-01 09:46:15	ANON-YFPW-RW2P-H	2020-03-01 09:46:15	2020-03-01 09:46:25
Yes		Strongly disagree	Latin and Art Studies must stay as entire subjects! The knowledge of the human legacy mustn't be relegated as a section. In my opinion, subjects like those are which distinguish a solid educational system.	Latin and Art Studies must stay as entire subjects! The knowledge of the human legacy mustn't be relegated as a section. In my opinion, subjects like those are which distinguish a solid educational system.		No			2020-03-01 09:47:52	ANON-YFPW-RW27-R	2020-03-01 09:47:52	2020-03-01 09:48:17
No		Strongly disagree		Latin and Classics should remain	Ancient Greek	No			2020-03-01 09:48:40	ANON-YFPW-RW2F-7	2020-03-01 09:48:40	2020-03-01 09:49:01

Yes	I have always taught a general science course at Level 1 and see the great benefits of all students learning a bit about all 4 sciences. Otherwise they have almost no knowledge of large areas of science and a beginning knowledge of one or two sciences. As specializing at Level 1 has not resulted in more students taking science at senior level or university, I think we as science educators need to adapt to what our world is and make science more attractive to all students so they become science literate citizens whether they stop after level 1 or continue on.	Strongly agree	Students have been crying out for change, they say they are turned off by science and that it has no relevance to their lives - this is a chance to change that, get people to see the importance of science and how their lives revolve around it. All I know is, that if we dont change - science is doomed - adapt or die people		No	In general across all subject areas, I think a lot more PD is needed especially at high school level - Maori groups I have reached out to for help with science have been resistant as they feel they do not have the knowledge needed at high school level. But we as teachers have next to no knowledge - this is the main area that must be supported - it has to be		2020-03-01 09:49:30	ANON-YFPW-RW21-J	2020-03-01 09:49:30	2020-03-01 09:49:40
No	sensible approach	Agree	Not very supportive of Religious Studies unless it is a broad educational view of different philosophies, similarities and differences and designed to support understanding and appreciation.		No	But very supportive of the inclusion and promotion of this content area.		2020-03-01 09:59:36	ANON-YFPW-RW22-U	2020-03-01 09:59:36	2020-03-01 09:59:42
No		Disagree	I do not think Classical Studies and Art History should be made sub-topics within the subject of History. They encompass too many topics within themselves. Future students studying these subjects at Level 1 would not have as much experience studying them compared to students studying them pre-NCEA reform, and may not enjoy it.	I believe it is important to continue to educate our youth about Classical Studies and Latin. While there may not be as many students taking these subjects, the ones that do are usually focused and fully interested in continuing in further years. We learn: • important historical contexts that directly influence our society's behaviour today • how ancient customs have passed on and changed/remained the same through the ages • the importance of regarding Classical civilisations as examples for humanity today • about the foundations of the Western world, including democracy, literature, music and art.	Yes			2020-03-01 10:03:07	ANON-YFPW-RW2H-9	2020-03-01 10:03:07	2020-03-01 10:03:18
No	This information was not made clear to teacher, parents or the wider community. Very poor communication and lack of transparency.	Strongly disagree	Diverse science strands cannot be grouped together. It jeopardizes senior science subjects.	Senior science subjects require specialist knowledge that has to be taught by building layers of knowledge over years, becoming specialized in year 11. For those students progressing to university, this process is paramount. Many schools already have a 'general' science course for those not wanting to take the university pathway, so these students are catered for already. The proposed change of taking away specialist level 1 NCEA subjects would degrade the science subject at a secondary level and does not add any quality to students learning for those wanting to progress to university or not.	n.	No	I know the English version only.	2020-03-01 10:05:02	ANON-YFPW-RW2B-3	2020-03-01 10:05:02	2020-03-01 10:05:23
No		Strongly disagree	Putting Classical Studies in history and removing Latin is a horrible idea. While Classics and History are similar subjects they are entirely different disciplines. Making Classics a subfield limits that field of education and erases the entire area. More importantly Latin is such an important language that should not be excluded. Its still a very relevant language that has roots in virtually all western language and is important to learn. Even more the exclusion of Latin makes the learning of Latin a privilege to learn rather than a right. The exclusion sets up a system of superiority that some people won't have access to. Simply this plan negatively impacts education access and should not go through.	See Above.	No			2020-03-01 10:29:12	ANON-YFPW-RW2X-5	2020-03-01 10:29:12	2020-03-01 10:29:27

Yes		Strongly disagree	From the NZC on Science pg 29, " Students in years 11-13 are able to specialise in one or more science discipline, depending on the choices offered by their schools. The achievement objectives in the context strands provide for strand based specialisations, but a wider range of programmes is possible: for example... biochemistry, education for sustainability, agriculture, horticulture, or electronics." Currently many schools (Dave Thrasher is working on a project to determine the depth and breath of L1 science course offered in NZ schools, note this is work the MOE should be doing, not full-time teachers.) achieve interesting and varied science based courses by mixing specific standards from 2 or more domains eg internals / externals from Science, Biology, Chemistry, Physics, ESS.	The level one science subjects should be more than just science. 1. Concepts in physics and chemistry follow a spiral where conceptual understanding is developed and built upon over several years. 2. The flexibility to offer courses that reflect student interest / needs is greatly diminished. * Note the general science courses that are common across the country are combinations of subject specific knowledge and content eg the three level 1 science external standards are completely unrelated to one another in terms of content as they specifically assess conceptual knowledge from biology, chemistry and physics separately. 3. the draft level one science standards are light on key conceptual knowledge that is needed for students to carry on in level 2 / 3 if they wish.		No			2020-03-01 11:02:32	ANON-YFPW-RW2A-2	2020-03-01 11:02:32	2020-03-01 11:02:40
Yes		Strongly disagree		History on its own is too large and detailed a subject on its own, trying to squeeze classics in as well will only deteriorate the quality and capacity of both subjects. Adding to that, any history teacher now required to teach classics without having any background or prior knowledge will do the subject a disservice, severely limiting the number of students who go on to further pursue what the rest of the world considers a valuable avenue of study. Alongside these issues is the lack of Latin support. Latin may be a comparatively useless language for day to day discussions, but it is invaluable when dealing with any Roman history. As has been supported by the Maori, language is an intrinsic part of culture, and thus Latin is an intrinsic part of Roman culture. During these developmental years, it is easiest for students to pick up new languages, and so not having even the opportunity to learn Latin at their peak developmental capacity puts students at a severe disadvantage if they wish to pursue a classical degree.	Philosophy and political science, especially in this day and age, provide valuable mindsets for students to acquire and utilize. Proper understanding of the general political landscape greater prepares students when it comes to voting, with youth voting turnout being criticized as overly low year after year. A better understanding of New Zealand's political stances as a diversely multicultural nation ought to reduce xenophobia, as providing reasons and context to policy and action provides a better lens to cultural relations than simple demonstration of traditional cultural practices which tend to lump all those of one culture together. This is relevant at a secondary school level as most xenophobic biases are developed during this period of life. Additionally, in an era rife with misinformation, corruption and questionable morals, philosophy and critical thinking is what prevents mass panic when a single case of a virus is found on our shores. Philosophy and critical thought provides individuals with a far more robust and logical pathway through life, and nay democratic nation ought to desire its populace to be able to think for itself.	No			2020-03-01 11:14:49	ANON-YFPW-RW2K-C	2020-03-01 11:14:49	2020-03-01 11:15:11
Yes		Agree		I don't understand why they would not include Latin. I know that it isn't really useful but it learns you that you need to be well structured and think logical. You learn that it is not your fantasy you need to use but the things you know. I think that it really helps to understand things better and to think more logical.		No			2020-03-01 11:17:20	ANON-YFPW-RW26-Q	2020-03-01 11:17:20	2020-03-01 11:17:36
Yes	However, not enough for content coverage to prepare for Level 2 and 3 Physics.	Strongly disagree	When too broad based, content coverage to prepare for Level 2 and 3 Physics will be very very limited.	I would suggest to have a general Science subject which has separate Biology, Chemistry, Earth and Space Science, and Physics content which contain basic concepts to prepare for Level 2 Biology, Chemistry, Earth and Space Science, and Physics.	Level 2 Biology, Chemistry, Earth and Space Science, and Physics subjects in preparation for Level 3 and University Studies.	No	Not teaching my subjects in te reo Maori at the moment.		2020-03-01 11:20:25	ANON-YFPW-RW2R-K	2020-03-01 11:20:25	2020-03-01 11:20:44
Yes		Strongly disagree	Too broadbased for Science. Need more coverage in Biology, Chemistry, Earth Science, and Physics at Level 1.	Include more content coverage in Biology, Chemistry, Earth Science, and Physics separately at Level 1 General Science.	No	No	NA	NA	2020-03-01 11:26:12	ANON-YFPW-RW24-N	2020-03-01 11:26:12	2020-03-01 11:26:52
Yes		Strongly disagree		It abhorrent that you intend to be getting rid of Latin and Classics. The arts are already undermined in New Zealand and it is laughable that it will still be taught in a History degree.		Yes			2020-03-01 11:37:09	ANON-YFPW-RW2T-N	2020-03-01 11:37:09	2020-03-01 11:37:23
Yes		Strongly disagree		Classical Studies deserves its own subject. It's not just historical it also involves two languages and many philosophies.	Latin, Greek, and the Classics!	No			2020-03-01 11:38:14	ANON-YFPW-RW23-M	2020-03-01 11:38:14	2020-03-01 11:38:32

Yes		Strongly disagree	The removal of Latin and Classics are extremely concerning. (See below for further detail.)	<p>Latin, perceived by many as simply a 'dead language', is in fact a rich learning opportunity. Learning at least one foreign language is important and should certainly be more rigorous; learning Latin in particular provides a wonderful base on which to learn all other "Romance" languages. Having access to Latin literature (translations are always a second work) broadens many horizons. Ironically, while this proposal is being considered an Oxford academic is visiting New Zealand, discussing his research into the influence of Latin on significant NZ poets. I personally discovered that through learning Latin my knowledge of English grammar also improved immensely.</p> <p>Classics is not simply history with focus on ancient Greece and Rome. It is the most holistic subject still taught, encompassing art, archaeology, language, literature, philosophy, and political science. In any other subject the use of so many approaches would be considered 'inter-disciplinary', and is highly unusual. Classics is the one subject that as a matter of course looks at all aspects of society and uses all sources available. If classics is only offered as a 'specialist' level 2 and 3 subject, then history must radically change approach to adopt that of classics, for it is in fact classics that gives a broader understanding of</p>	No				2020-03-01 11:41:11	ANON-YFPW-RWJ2-K	2020-03-01 11:41:11	2020-03-01 11:41:21
Yes		Agree	My support for this change is increasing student agency in designing their pathways of learning.	Students I work with constantly comment on the lack of relativity their subjects have to the real world. It is important the changes have life skills application that prepares them for the evolving world they live in.	I believe trades, performing arts are important to consider.	No		Nga Atua, to broaden our rangatahi's understanding of the world they live in. Including the values and philosophy of Te Aho Matua.	2020-03-01 11:45:53	ANON-YFPW-RW2U-P	2020-03-01 11:45:53	2020-03-01 11:46:29
No		Strongly disagree	I think amalgamating history, art history and classics into one isn't going to be good because they are such distinct subjects. This also reduces options for students who are more interested in arts style subjects.	Removing Latin is also not ideal. I did Latin all through high school. Latin helped me learn other languages, helped improve my understanding of English grammar and is even helpful to me now as I study law at university.	A bit more of legal studies - I find that people really don't understand the basics of New Zealand law and don't know how the government or courts work.	No			2020-03-01 11:50:34	ANON-YFPW-RWYV-1	2020-03-01 11:50:34	2020-03-01 11:50:44
Yes	The timing of the proposed changes was awful. With the volume of information to get through this process should have taken place at the start of the December holidays. Teachers are already over worked and under paid and to through this at us at one of the busiest times of year with a short turn around in time to respond is a slap in the face.	Strongly disagree	<p>Science is a subject that works in facts. You must learn the foundations before you can undertake a research based project. If you don't have the foundations you can easily be lead down the garden path in terms of pseudoscience. Doing project based learning in science should only come once students are equip with the basics.</p> <p>Also these changes will create students not prepared for university where in the first years of a science degree you are tested on fact recall. Projects come in at the masters level and above. We already see a massive disadvantage to students coming from NCEA schools in first year science papers compared to students who have done the Cambridge system at school.</p> <p>All students in New Zealand should have access to the same level of education regardless of the region they live in or their socioeconomic background. With the changes to Science in particular the quality of teaching at one school will differ to the next. The current teacher crisis has lead to many under qualified teachers entering the sciences and issues with teacher bias (1080, vaccine, etc.) will start to emerge more as they have the freedom to do as they wish. The subject needs to be standardised across the country as to not disadvantage students in the poorer</p>	<p>Science is multifaceted and this proposal removes the value of the subject. The next generation will suffer but it appears that your aim is to dumb it down so that any person can teach science to fix the supply crisis we are currently in. This is the wrong approach. We need to pay these highly trained science specialist more as the subject is hard and the students in our country need it. Long term we need doctors, engineers, nurses, etc. that can do their jobs well. We are the ones training them, inspiring them and this will prevent that.</p>	Yes			2020-03-01 11:53:42	ANON-YFPW-RWYV-X	2020-03-01 11:53:42	2020-03-01 11:53:57	

No		Strongly disagree	The level at which you have simplified and 'dumbed down' this curriculum is frankly, horrifying. There is no way in which one individual subject can cover the broad range which you have expected. For example, current history courses at NCEA struggle as it is to confine the time period and topics to focus on so it seems inevitable that with the inclusion of Art History and Classics within the same discipline, they will eventually be put to one side and not taught at all. I believe the removal of both Latin and Classics is the opposite of what trends are showing within the younger population. There is a growing interest in ancient civilisations due to the popularity of these themes in pop-culture and young-adult fiction. Why take away subjects which grasp so much interest? Classics and Latin are the very foundations of English education, all famous scholars who, ironically, we often study in the subject of English, had an extensive background in Classical History. It would be foolish to remove these topics from the curriculum, especially when they offer so much to students.	It seems likely that this simplifying scheme is related to budget, however I think it is important to think about the minds and the education of the next generation first. By narrowing down the options offered, students are less likely to take an interest or find an unknown passion in the subjects which you wish to remove. These topics are incredibly enriching and can provide skills which apply to all academic ventures. I personally found, as a student who studied Latin, Classics and Art History, that this has broadened my worldview, improved my understanding of both the English language and all the Romance languages, given me the upper-hand in my later studies in Law, and provided me with a lens with which to see the world in an analytical way where I can regard the past with knowledge.	No			2020-03-01 11:54:44	ANON-YFPW-RWYC-B	2020-03-01 11:54:44	2020-03-01 11:54:50	
No		Strongly disagree			No			2020-03-01 12:03:02	ANON-YFPW-RWYS-U	2020-03-01 12:03:02	2020-03-01 12:03:10	
No		Strongly disagree		If "not included" means that Latin won't be a subject any longer than yes I have feedback. Latin should stay in the curriculum. Latin is one of the most fundamental languages in the world. If it is abolished, an important and huge part of education will simply be lost.		No		2020-03-01 12:11:19	ANON-YFPW-RWYB-Z	2020-03-01 12:04:19	2020-03-01 12:11:45	
Yes		Strongly disagree		Latin and classics are the future, keep them.	No			2020-03-01 12:14:59	ANON-YFPW-RWY9-1	2020-03-01 12:14:58	2020-03-01 12:15:08	
Yes		Strongly disagree	I think it is appalling that the Ministry of Education is removing the opportunity for early specialisation in subject such as Science and Business studies. What do we look like as a country that offers Religious Studies as a specialised subject at Level 1 but not Biology? Secondly, it limits schools to offering one single course at Year 11 for Science and Commerce subjects. It is absolutely not possible for schools that teach these specialised subjects to give the students the same level of preparation for NCEA Level 2 with the four standards offered in the generalised subject. While one can put the general standards 'into context' one cannot repeat a standard in different contexts. For many schools, one standard in a biology context, one in a physics context, and one in a chemistry context is simply not enough to cover the content required. Nor is there time to cover all the content with what looks to be an enormous assessment load given the over-emphasis on writing reports in the new standards.	Bring back specialist sciences. The new science course is not a science course at all, it is a philosophy course appropriate for much older students. Students need to know some basic science content before they can even begin to consider the standards (other than possibly the investigation one)	No			2020-03-01 12:27:41	ANON-YFPW-RWYG-F	2020-03-01 12:27:41	2020-03-01 12:27:49	
Yes		Agree		For Health and Physical education, I think that we should keep it separated as health is more of a theoretical study of wellbeing. While physical education is more physical and suitable for students looking for competition. If combining these subjects, those students looking for a more concrete theoretical study of health many have trouble in physical ed. - I also think that with social sciences being a subject including psychology and media studies should be changed. I know that media studies branches out towards those who want to commit to film while psychology is of the mind and human behaviour. Both subjects are quite broad and if combined some children may not make an effort of learning context they don't want to.	- TO keep the science subjects separated; biology, physics, chemistry - Include earth and space science - Keep psychology	No			2020-03-01 12:37:21	ANON-YFPW-RWYJ-J	2020-03-01 12:37:21	2020-03-01 12:37:42
No		Undecided		latin is a subject that should be taught in schools due to its rich history and the help it gives with learning foreign languages and your own. learning it in history classes isn't enough for people interested in it and there might become a generation who have no idea about classical cultures		No			2020-03-01 12:39:38	ANON-YFPW-RWYQ-S	2020-03-01 12:39:38	2020-03-01 12:39:55
No		Strongly disagree	Many of these subjects being taken away / decreased are the subjects I took in high school. Classics is such a broad subject and cannot be taught in a history class as there is a vast amount to go over. Classics, while it might not seem important, is highly important to society and many people and stripping it away and stuffing it into history takes away people's opportunity to learn said important topic.	I study Classics at the University of Canterbury, and I have studied classics since I first could in high school. To me and many others, Classics is an important subject that needs to be separate to history. Latin is also an important subject that could be included in classics. Getting rid of Latin is like chucking out half of the English language. Latin is an important factor for classics but also for the world in whole.	Yes			2020-03-01 12:47:28	ANON-YFPW-RWYE-D	2020-03-01 12:47:28	2020-03-01 12:47:51	

No		Agree		I support the idea of combining the commerce subjects at level 1.		Yes			2020-03-01 12:58:22	ANON-YFPW-RWY5-W	2020-03-01 12:58:22	2020-03-01 12:58:43
No		Undecided		Don't get rid of Latin! It's a wonderful subject and people deserve to have the chance to learn it.	No.	No			2020-03-01 13:36:19	ANON-YFPW-RWYF-R	2020-03-01 13:36:19	2020-03-01 13:36:34
Yes		Strongly agree				No			2020-03-01 13:43:49	ANON-YFPW-RWY7-Y	2020-03-01 13:43:49	2020-03-01 13:44:00
Yes	The problem is that the proposed L1 Science standards are a test of literacy. This severely disadvantages many students and is a barrier to their achievement. With this over emphasis on literacy, the assessment can become mind numbingly boring for many students. While literacy is important, it seems that the new standards have elevated the importance of literacy skills above science skills. One can not expect students to cope with critiquing science articles if they don't have a sound understanding of science concepts.	Strongly disagree	We run the risk of having students ill prepared for L2 and beyond. Many students want to have some "meat" in their science courses and not have to write endless reports and portfolios. I want some actual science in the courses. If these changes go ahead, I would not like to be bothered with assessing NCEA at level 1. I would much rather get my students into some actual science and experimentation and prepare them for L2 and 3.	I absolutely disagree with dropping L1 chem, Bio, physics and EASS standards. In the light of the proposed new L1 science standards, individual science standards were our hope for inclusion of some academic rigour and real science content. We have seen NZ's standing drop in international surveys over recent years and the proposed changes will only accelerate this further. PLEASE we need to stop dumbing the subject down!!!!	No	No			2020-03-01 14:13:40	ANON-YFPW-RWYF-E	2020-03-01 14:13:40	2020-03-01 14:13:58
Yes	I do not see enhancement for students, rather penalization, particularly in Science and Business areas.	Strongly disagree	Science subjects and future pathways have little or no overlap in need for Physics, Chemistry and Biology. Narrows not broadens and takes away ability for foundational study in areas of Science.	Science is an area of shortage in NZ. Students don't want to take Physics unless specialists in Engineering or Architecture - very few total national cohort. Allow specialist or combinations of science without physics. Business is integral for general functioning as a human in society so leaving one option is short sighted.	Psychology should be in Science curriculum to replace Physics.	No	Not relevant in my context		2020-03-01 14:23:48	ANON-YFPW-RWY1-S	2020-03-01 14:23:48	2020-03-01 14:24:12
No		Strongly disagree		I strongly disagree with the decision to cut Latin and Classical Studies from the curriculum. I have found that Latin has benefitted me far more in my life after school than any other subject. I use it every day when I can figure out what unfamiliar words mean, or when I need to read a complex sentence. Latin has given me a superb vantage point from which to view the world. I find that I am able to understand a great deal more about current events in the world because I know the ancient origins of many of today's political problems.	I would suggest adding ancient Greek.	No			2020-03-01 14:33:47	ANON-YFPW-RWY2-Z	2020-03-01 14:33:47	2020-03-01 14:34:00
Yes		Disagree	As a media studies teacher, I don't believe the media studies will fit easily within the social studies context. This is especially the case for the production standards that we do.	Media Studies should remain a stand alone subject. I can accept that some of the critical analysis that happens in this subject could fit under a generic Social Science context, but the production stuff (film making, journalism, magazine publishing) would be a difficult fit. As it is, it already sits somewhere between english and technology. The more experience students get at production, the better it is for them in year 12 and 13 Media studies.		No			2020-03-01 14:34:53	ANON-YFPW-RWYH-G	2020-03-01 14:34:53	2020-03-01 14:35:02
Yes	I am making a submission as a parent of a young student currently studying NCEA Level 1. I have taken an interest in the proposed changes because I place a high value on education and believe that the foundation levels are of critical importance.	Strongly disagree	The purpose of any education system should be to foster and encourage purposeful learning in our young people, to help prepare and equip them with the skills which can be enhanced, extended and utilised across a range of situations. By offering a diverse and stimulating curriculum we generate a passion for learning, an enjoyment and satisfaction which encourages young people to give of their best and helps to build a generation who have strong self-worth and self-esteem. I do not support the removal of Latin, Classics and Art History from the curriculum. I do not believe that the proposals outlined for Science and Social Science are positive changes. I do not feel that they will support diverse learners, nor that they will encourage students to move forwards to specialise in individual areas of Science or Social Science. I do not believe that the proposed generalised curriculum areas will offer the foundations needed for students to move forward with confidence.	My daughter's choice to study Latin as a subject at NCEA was an easy decision for her to make and one which she made based on several factors. These included not simply her enjoyment of the subject but also her passion for, and fascination with, History and Science, her love of literature and reading and her desire to know where words 'come from', and her strong self-motivation to learn. Latin has enhanced her learning in all of these and has cemented not only her own personal enjoyment in her schooling but also her determination to pursue her goals. My daughter is a diverse learner, a student with strong observational and critical thinking skills and verbal abilities but who struggles in other areas such as memorising. Knowledge of the Latin roots of words has helped her to make connections and to build her word knowledge by problem solving the meaning of unfamiliar words rather than having to try to memorise definitions. Latin has provided her with an opportunity to make connections, to think logically and to understand the value of being a 'framework' for her learning and has encouraged her to explore the roots of language. This has substantially supported		No	I believe it is fine to offer this as a selective option as I believe choice is the key to success and encourages a love of learning.		2020-03-01 14:41:28	ANON-YFPW-RWYB-A	2020-03-01 14:41:28	2020-03-01 14:41:39

Yes		Strongly disagree	Students already struggle with the jump from level 1 science to level 2 subjects as single sciences (chemistry, physics or biology). These proposed changes will make it even harder for students to access the level 2 content let alone have successes at level 2. The new level 3 science changes sound like a social science curriculum. I am not a social sciences teacher!			Yes				2020-03-01 14:42:16	ANON-YFPW-RWYM-N	2020-03-01 14:42:16	2020-03-01 14:42:24
No	Latin is an incredible language which needs to be kept in schools and universities. It serves as a basis for all romantic languages such as French, Spanish and Italian but also assists with understanding other European languages due to similar grammatical structures such as three genders which is also prominent in russian German languages. It would be tragic to get rid of latin as it's helped me learn 5 other languages besides English and also assisted me with higher order thinking.	Strongly disagree	Latin is an incredible language which needs to be kept in schools and universities. It serves as a basis for all romantic languages such as French, Spanish and Italian but also assists with understanding other European languages due to similar grammatical structures such as three genders which is also prominent in russian German languages. It would be tragic to get rid of latin as it's helped me learn 5 other languages besides English and also assisted me with higher order thinking.	Latin is an incredible language which needs to be kept in schools and universities. It serves as a basis for all romantic languages such as French, Spanish and Italian but also assists with understanding other European languages due to similar grammatical structures such as three genders which is also prominent in russian German languages. It would be tragic to get rid of latin as it's helped me learn 5 other languages besides English and also assisted me with higher order thinking.	Latin is an incredible language which needs to be kept in schools and universities. It serves as a basis for all romantic languages such as French, Spanish and Italian but also assists with understanding other European languages due to similar grammatical structures such as three genders which is also prominent in russian German languages. It would be tragic to get rid of latin as it's helped me learn 5 other languages besides English and also assisted me with higher order thinking. Definitely keep latin and provide students with support	No				2020-03-01 14:51:00	ANON-YFPW-RWYD-C	2020-03-01 14:51:00	2020-03-01 14:51:09
No	I only recently found out about this.	Disagree		It has been said by Rob Griffiths, (president of the New Zealand Association of Classics Teachers), that the reality is that Classics will never be part of a Level 1 History course. If you are to merge history and classics in level 1 NCEA you must give students an insight into the classical world, as people often don't know they are interested/enjoy the subject till they are taught about it. Classics was my favourite subject throughout high school and I have now gone on to get a degree majoring in classics and law and minoring in history. Classics and history are very different things, one must understand the classical period in order to fully grasp how things came to be in our history and even up to the modern day. Many people did not take classics in school as they did not know what it would be like, in this case I think that merging classics with history in level one could be a good way to open people up to the classical world and to learn about, but only if classics IS included with history. Also I strongly disagree with taking away Latin from NCEA as it too has a great influence on our language today and on our history. Knowledge of Latin and Ancient Greek gives insight into the Ancient Greek and Roman world, without these two worlds, the world today would be very different. In conclusion, I believe Classics MUST be included if merging with history, perhaps having		No				2020-03-01 15:10:50	ANON-YFPW-RWYX-Z	2020-03-01 15:07:48	2020-03-01 15:11:03
Yes	Yes but the most important details were left out until recently	Strongly disagree	The proposed changes do exactly the opposite of broadening the curriculum and the opportunities in NCEA. The current standards provide ample scope for the investigative and real time/relevant science. By dropping subject skills and knowledge students are being limited. Level one science is largely to help explain how the natural world operates so they will not be so ignorant of the way their surroundings work. Secondly level 1 keeps their qualification options open and provides a taste of the areas they may work in.	This represents a narrowing and dumbing down of the curriculum as has been done with unit standards, the introduction of unit standards, the previous revision of achievement standards to boost our flagging statistics. Loss of the level one individuals science (Biology, chemistry and Physics) will decrease our societies already waning scientific literacy. Scientific literacy is associated with economic health.	The ministry should focus on providing high quality resources nationally, especially those of and electronic nature rather than limiting schools (eg not allowing students to pay for online work books and resources, and now the \$170 subsidy/shot in the head for teacher resources. (this has turned out to target the more disadvantaged students!) The current Science selection is fine and thorough.	No	Has any ministry initiative ever closed the gap between Maori educational stats and the stats for the general population?			2020-03-01 15:14:29	ANON-YFPW-RWYA-9	2020-03-01 15:14:29	2020-03-01 15:14:46
Yes	Barely found out, did not know if it was a real change or not until now.	Strongly disagree	I do not agree with the statement classics is only useful to history degrees, and only a little useful. Classics is an important class for understanding the founding of democracy and large degrees of our culture. It helps understanding of why things are the way things are, as well as being a highly entertaining course. I have been taking classics through level 1 and level 2 and it has been one of my most enjoyable and interesting classes. The removal of it would be very upsetting. I do not support this change.	Classics should stay included, however I agree with the rest of the classes.	Keep classical studies and Latin.	No				2020-03-01 15:20:41	ANON-YFPW-RWYN-P	2020-03-01 15:20:41	2020-03-01 15:20:54
No		Strongly agree				No				2020-03-01 15:27:15	ANON-YFPW-RWYK-K	2020-03-01 15:27:15	2020-03-01 15:27:22
Yes	I don't believe this is a good idea because with a broad level 1 and a specialised level 2 and 3, how are you going to give a strong foundation? I have already seen this with my school's general level 1 science course and students going into level 2 chemistry. Only two chemistry standards are assessed (acids and bases, chemical reactions) and students come into level 2 with such a small foundation. It's a huge jump for students, many of them find it difficult, decide to not continue to level 3 chemistry and/or fail level 2 chemistry.	Strongly disagree	I think that you're greatly watering down science by limiting it to a general science course, which is going to be very damaging to such a content heavy course. I do believe that we do need to make sure we are developing the Nature of Science skills, but students won't be able to do that well if they don't have the content knowledge to understand the why.	The cuts that you're planning to make are really hurting certain subjects like social sciences and sciences, which should be core subjects. Level 1 is being watered down too much. We should have more confidence and their ability to make decisions on what they want to study.	Earth and Space Science is neglected with limited standards. A lot of junior students express that astronomy is their favourite topic.	No				2020-03-01 15:42:40	ANON-YFPW-RWY6-X	2020-03-01 15:42:40	2020-03-01 15:42:50

No		Strongly agree	If students aren't needing to define which pathway they want to follow until completing NCEA level 1, then they will have a better understanding and less likely to change subjects in NCEA level 2 and 3.	no	no	No				2020-03-01 15:47:58	ANON-YFPW-RWYR-T	2020-03-01 15:47:58	2020-03-01 15:48:04
Yes		Disagree	Had the current standards within the Science learning area been (mostly) retained but placed under the single heading of "Science" I would have no problem with the change. I believe, however, that either: the new standards are implemented under "Science" and other new standards are developed for each of the other four strands OR everything is condensed into one subject but a broad range of standards are still offered. While the new standards are broad in the way they can be contextualised, I do not believe the four of them alone at NCEA Level 1 will provide a strong enough foundation to support success within the sciences at NCEA Level 2.			No				2020-03-01 15:48:07	ANON-YFPW-RWYR-Y	2020-03-01 15:48:07	2020-03-01 15:48:22
No	I'm just here to say you should keep classics as a major!! It is so important and it's impact is found all over the world!	Undecided	I'm just here to say you should keep classics as a major!! It is so important and it's impact is found all over the world!	I'm just here to say you should keep classics as a major!! It is so important and it's impact is found all over the world!	Islamic or middle eastern studies, Egyptology, archaeology, I don't know what levels 2 and 3 mean but these should all be majors - students should have as much opportunity as possible to learn!	No		N/a		2020-03-01 15:55:15	ANON-YFPW-RWY4-V	2020-03-01 15:55:15	2020-03-01 15:55:30
Yes		Agree				No				2020-03-01 16:05:47	ANON-YFPW-RWY7-V	2020-03-01 16:05:47	2020-03-01 16:06:11
Yes	This does nothing for that as far as I can see, it just reduces the detail to which a school-leaver can show their abilities (which, for example in Science, is NOT going to be report writing!). Please remove the specificity of written-assessments for the Science Learning Area, and allow those for whom L1 is going to be their highest level to present their CONTENT knowledge any way they want.	Disagree	You've confused subjects with assessments, and devolved the assessments to the point where huge chunks of learning will not result in any better qualifications in any way for large numbers of students who only want basic qualifications. For those who want to go further than L1 or L2 this will largely not matter, but for those who just want the minimum school experience (or less), and will be the most disruptive on their way to that, this will demotivate them even further. "Subjects to be made available" is still up each individual school. To do: You are going to have to emphasise why there are so many fewer options for types of credits at L1, and that for those going further this won't matter on the long run. You'd better keep at least the same different types at L2 though, since Universities don't have any better information when deciding who to accept in September-November before any exam results are available.	Science-specific - please let students keep the detail of what they're interested in and don't just combine all the assessments into the Nature of Science, with a huge emphasis on written communication! The students who leave after L1 aren't going to use written communication a level of abstraction away from "why does this happen". They're out, they won't be using pens again. Please let them show that they have specific skills in Physics, or in Biology, etc. so that potential employers don't have to waste time asking EVERY single candidate what particular topics they wrote about for their portfolios, or which particular experiments they did, or which socio-scientific issue (?!? This is NZC level 8!!!) they examined.	Do you mean subjects or assessments?	No				2020-03-01 16:13:44	ANON-YFPW-RWY3-U	2020-03-01 16:13:44	2020-03-01 16:13:52
Yes	However I had no idea they were going to gut Science.	Strongly disagree	There are now only going to be 4 standards to support the teaching of science to all our learners. Unless there is a desire to go back to the days of SC when 50% of all learners in Year 11 failed this seems an insane plan.	I was worried when I saw the proposed Science standards. But I had some hope that we would have some choice by there being some socialist specific standards to choose from as well. While I know that there was a huge range of standards to choose from in Science, and this could do with being trimmed, going from 16 Science Standards and 15 Specialist standards (some of which are restricted against each other) down to just 4 standards is a huge reduction in choice as to how we can assess our students. The fact that the 4 standards are all reports and contain no required content and will increase teacher workload and increase the jump to Level 2 for many students just adds insult to injury.	No	No				2020-03-01 16:17:48	ANON-YFPW-RWY2-T	2020-03-01 16:17:48	2020-03-01 16:17:57
No	Latin is part of our history, with already so few persons choosing to study it we shouldn't deny students this option.	Strongly disagree	Latin makes a good base for learning many of the languages they want to offer and over all it helps students to think logically and it improves their analytical skills...	We cannot choose to forget Cicero, Vergil, Ovidius...we can learn so much of them and enjoy the pieces of art they left us. It's not always easy but real students don't step down from a challenge. Numbers have also proven that Latin students are way more successful because they know what hard work is! I can go on and on...	LATIN AND ancient GREEK!!!	No		Latin should be up there and you know it, grec too but babysteps...		2020-03-01 16:22:21	ANON-YFPW-RWY1-W	2020-03-01 16:22:21	2020-03-01 16:22:39
Yes		Disagree		Reducing science down to a single subject with 4 available assessments in short sighted and does not allow for the diverse learners we have in Aotearoa.		No				2020-03-01 16:28:04	ANON-YFPW-RW1Y-S	2020-03-01 16:28:04	2020-03-01 16:28:17

Yes		Strongly disagree	I am a student in America but I strongly disagree with what you have proposed in New Zealand. I have a 7 national awards in the classics and me studying art history through classics gave me a meaning to life when I no longer thought I had any. Latin greatly contributes toward linguistic skills in the Romance languages but also grammatically with any language	For art history, I believe that the history of how people expressed themselves throughout history gives the viewer an insight into a world one would have never known about or could have ever read about. There is not an art history course at my school so every thing I have done has been purely self study for competitions but it has taught me that the greatest people in history expressed themselves and it also gives insight on a whole new world which leads to better enlightened students in global affairs. In regards to the classics program, I believe that Latin is in integral part of society and should be introduced as a valuable option in every school. Latin has been proven to help linguistic skills in medical, forensic, and legal fields to name a few but also the community of classics students has been a group of people that have never put me down. I am president of our school's national latin honor society and jcl and I'm running for a position in the state jcl government. Watching all 16 competitors from my school qualify for state was the best I have felt in my entire life. Knowing that I had brought these kids into something that helped me through the trauma of my father's abuse was incredible. When I thought I no longer had meaning in my life, the classics reminded me that I am worthy and that there have been people like	No				2020-03-01 16:41:14	ANON-YFPW-RW1V-P	2020-03-01 16:41:14	2020-03-01 16:41:27
No	Only found out through the media. Poor communication to affected HODs who have to implement any new ideas.	Strongly agree	With science get rid of the confusion around the specialisation that occurs at Level 1 and give the students a chance to enjoy and experience all that science has to offer then move on to specialise at L2 and L3. Most student that have gone through a general science course have then gone on to become, engineers, doctors and Vets. Doing a level one science course is not a disadvantage like some egalitarian teachers think.	Do not change the current general science course as it offer a good variety of interesting topics that meet the needs of most learners.	No	No, just make sure that the standards line up with Vocational and Tertiary needs, some of them are becoming outdated as technology improves.	What is it? and how does it affect the majority of New Zealanders who do not see Maori Language as a viable option for careers / further education etc. Its nice to honour the treaty but their are two partners in this agreement and both needs must be met not just one.	2020-03-01 16:41:52	ANON-YFPW-RW1C-3	2020-03-01 16:41:52	2020-03-01 16:42:10	
Yes	I agree as too any students are opting out of essential basics to get easier credits. However, Maori performing arts should also be part of dance and specialise at L2.	Strongly agree		I think the changes have been well thought out. I am finding many young people are opting out of some subjects needed in life skills, and know less than prior to L1 specialisation. I also have talked to school leavers who express regret at the doors now shut. I am an ex HOD science at both a Decile 1 and at a Decile 6 school. It was way too broad at L1. But, this will be harder for teachers so give them all an extra hour per week, and sell it to students too so they can take ownership as well as see some success.	I think things are generally well covered, especially for NZ. Web development? Intro to specific programming languages used around the world today.	Yes	Too much for a country specific language. Please don't overshoot and deprive students of international careers.	2020-03-01 17:05:29	ANON-YFPW-RW1S-K	2020-03-01 17:05:29	2020-03-01 17:05:44	

No		Strongly disagree	Does not support students who want to specialise earlier. You are not supporting increased specialisation in Levels 2 and 3, only decreased specialisation for those in Level 1. For students who are not good at particular subjects or know what they want to do, this will only make them dislike school more and make them more likely to drop out as they feel they're not learning anything useful to them. Students should already have gotten a sufficient taste of more specialised sciences, for example, to know whether they want to specialise, not specialise, or not do one at all. Splitting time between all of them means less depth of learning in each field too, in turn meaning that it would be harder or impossible to keep the current curriculum for, for example, Chemistry. Students going from general science already have enough trouble without being expected to know even more things before the school year even starts. Taking away the option to learn classics and Latin at Level 1 is also not a good idea. Classics is an incredibly interesting subject. I myself enjoy learning about the world's history, but only up until about the industrial revolution. As history as a subject covers later than that, I opted to take classics this year and am thoroughly enjoying it.	Ideally, classics and Latin would remain their own individual subjects. If this is impossible, merge them into one studying both Latin, and Ancient Greek and Roman culture. General science should be specialised into Bio, Chem, and Physics. Maori Performing Arts should be integrated into the other performing arts, as I doubt there will be enough students to warrant making it its own class.	Psychology or Neuro-biology Musical Theatre (my school currently does it using a mish-mash of Music and Drama standards) Life Skills courses (taxes, job applications, getting credit cards or loans etc)	No			2020-03-01 17:52:47	ANON-YFPW-RW18-R	2020-03-01 17:52:47	2020-03-01 17:53:02
Yes	I don't think that the current Ach Std assessment needs any changes made to them. Currently in Physical Education (my teaching area), from Level 1 - Level 3, the achievement standards on offer to assess various tasks against offer teachers the scope to develop a teaching and learning program that suits the students, school, community and teachers strengths, passions and interests. Having a number of Ach Stds to pick from does not have to lead to over assessing. Any school with good senior management guidance would have restricted the number of assessments allowed within in subject/course - as we have done at our school. For example; I only offer 16 credits to my Level 3 PE class (4 assessments), which allows them to gain UE. There is a lot of teaching and learning...my programme is not based around the 4 assessments.	Strongly disagree	Combining PE, Home Economics and Health together will 'water down' the specific content that should be taught in each of these subject areas. They are 3 very different subjects, with a lot of content that does not overlap.	Keep the assessments the way they are. Are you making change for change sake. NCEA is working... students who are capable of University study are gaining UE entrance. Those who aren't are achieving to the level they need to attend other tertiary organisations. Students are only be over assessed in schools where there hasn't been some sensible planning and curriculum considerations made. The reason's for making changes to NCEA seem to be for the purpose of managing schools that are not able to manage themselves (re-assessment opportunities, not following correct assessment procedures etc) I would like it to be explained again what are the reasons for these changes. Are they actually necessary?		No			2020-03-01 18:03:22	ANON-YFPW-RW19-5	2020-03-01 18:03:22	2020-03-01 18:03:33
Yes	I understand the need for specialisation, but that is what university is for. NCEA through its broad curriculum showed me things I never thought I would be interested in that I now specialise in at University.	Strongly disagree	Classics, Latin and Art History are beautiful subjects that deepen any understanding of how the world we live in is shaped and functions and WHY	Teach these children the foundation of the Western world. The study of Greek mythology turned my life around from a deep depressive state to appreciating the beauty in every institution and infrastructure	Early civilisations and the connections between modern societies	Yes			2020-03-01 18:09:17	ANON-YFPW-RW19-7	2020-03-01 18:09:17	2020-03-01 18:09:27
No		Strongly disagree	Science has become too narrow despite the STEM focus. It is contra intuitive to any development of student understanding	STEM should not be limited. Some subjects have just disappeared?!	Consult with University and Secondary staff first.	No			2020-03-01 18:48:00	ANON-YFPW-RW19-A	2020-03-01 18:48:00	2020-03-01 18:48:22
Yes	Like this move.	Strongly agree	Good to see some streamlining especially in science and commerce.	I would like to see Latin retained.	No, too many already.	No			2020-03-01 18:51:16	ANON-YFPW-RW19-QH	2020-03-01 18:51:16	2020-03-01 18:51:39
No		Strongly disagree		Health education is of the utmost importance. and should not be merged with any subject as it should be quite complex, especially in the early stages on teenage years. many Level 1 Health kids would not have signed up if they had to do practical - (health issues, injuries, experiences that have made them passionate about Health but hesitant around PE) and lets be honest in the majority of schools it will be taught by just the PE teachers and in those schools that don't have a strong culture of wellbeing then the teachers will just avoid any real Health topics or neglect to do them in the safe and supportive way		No			2020-03-01 18:52:37	ANON-YFPW-RW19-E	2020-03-01 18:52:37	2020-03-01 18:52:59
Yes		Disagree	History is already a broad topic and we are making it even more broad by combining it with classics. That would be so much to cover in just Level 1.		Psychology, Law/Legal Studies further developed, Sport Science, Coaching	No			2020-03-01 18:54:24	ANON-YFPW-RW19-N	2020-03-01 18:54:24	2020-03-01 18:54:36
No		Undecided				Yes			2020-03-01 19:00:08	ANON-YFPW-RW19-PG	2020-03-01 19:00:08	2020-03-01 19:00:25

No		Strongly disagree	Removing both Latin and Classical Studies is, in my opinion, a bad mistake. Restricting the study of the ancient Mediterranean to a "low level" with the entire field of history means quite effectively that it will not be taught. It is hard to understand why one would close the door on this material, especially when New Zealand has a history of excellence.	Removing Latin and Classical Studies is a step backwards. I would point out that Latin is, aside from a language of fundamental importance in its own right, the underpinning of much of not only the Romance languages but of English as well. Training in Latin has improved students' English-language skills and is a resource even for those going into the scientific and medical fields. In addition, New Zealand has a commendable history of allowing students to study these topics regardless of wealth or status. Removing these subjects will return the study of the ancient Mediterranean to only those who can afford it. However conflicted the Classical legacy we have inherited, it will take students trained and trained well to unpack it--the complicated legacies of Athens, of Alexandria, and of Rome. For better or worse they are of undeniable importance to our lives here and I urge you to maintain their availability for students across the country, and not just those who can afford private tutelage. The subjects are popular, and New Zealand has a very strong track record in producing world-leading Classical scholars. This proposal will slice that off at the knees.		No			2020-03-01 19:06:56	ANON-YFPW-RW17-Q	2020-03-01 19:06:56	2020-03-01 19:07:07
Yes		Agree				No			2020-03-01 19:41:42	ANON-YFPW-RW11-H	2020-03-01 19:41:42	2020-03-01 19:41:56
No		Undecided			Nutrition - we all need to eat - every day - so it is relevant to daily lives, but Kiwi are often eating the wrong things and it would help all Treaty Partners. Social and Emotional learning - many students need to learn empathy and stress management to reduce anxiety and the resulting missed educational opportunities.	No			2020-03-01 19:43:41	ANON-YFPW-RW12-T	2020-03-01 19:43:41	2020-03-01 19:45:30
Yes	As an experienced teacher I am certain that Y11 students in New Zealand underachieve in terms of subject knowledge, breadth and depth of study compared to their counterparts in other western education systems. These changes will only continue to broaden this gap.	Strongly disagree	Going from 3D+ Science standards to only 4 very different ones will create an enormous workload for teachers. The report based nature of the new assessments will genuinely disadvantage and disengage students with poor literacy skills (but so does the current nature of exam questions for NZQA in general - a situation that would be very easy to remedy).	The vast majority of students I teach at Burnside High School want and need to be academically challenged in a meaningful and engaging way. The current standards and nature of assessment in Science limits the depth and interconnectedness of knowledge students can reach, and the proposed changes will only make this worse. Delivering what is effectively a philosophy of Science course at Level 1 will not encourage students to continue to study Science at L2 and beyond.		No			2020-03-01 19:51:28	ANON-YFPW-RW11-B	2020-03-01 19:51:28	2020-03-01 19:51:48
No	Seems a good plan.	Agree	Good selection of topics. NO Legal Studies once again which is a shame as these are so accessible to students and very relevant to society today	Legal Studies needs to be in, it provides the only civics based option and is the only clear topic related to rights within the law and understanding many key aspects of being a citizen. As far as I can see there is no other path to success in this area. Particularly at levels 2 and 3 students need a pathway to understanding the law as it relates to them.	yes Legal Studies as above	No	Not enough to comment		2020-03-01 19:52:19	ANON-YFPW-RW11-B-2	2020-03-01 19:52:19	2020-03-01 19:52:52
Yes		Agree	If the aim is to broaden the curriculum delivery so students gain a good broad level of skills it might be useful to consider making more areas compulsory for all students e.g. languages as learning a second language is a skill that needs developing in our multicultural context and globalized world.	Latin: while it is not a living language, it is the language that provides the foundation for many others, e.g. terminology in the sciences. I believe it is very valuable for students to be available.	No, I believe accounting should not be a subject at school as it is essentially a profession and in my opinion too specialized for the school context. As students are limited in their subject choices I believe it is vital that the specialization also focuses on skill development rather than preparation for professions.	No			2020-03-01 19:57:18	ANON-YFPW-RW11-M-D	2020-03-01 19:57:18	2020-03-01 19:57:33
Yes		Strongly disagree	I strongly disagree with removing any options if they are available to be taught at a school and there are specialists available to mark them. I agree with broadening some areas, eg keeping science and not splitting until year 12.	Latin- if a school has a teacher qualified to teach this, why not let it be offered as an option at L1? It is not a dead language, it is the foundation of many other languages and fabulous extension for gifted children. Religious Studies, German - how do these make the cut when Latin does not? I am not suggesting dropping them, but how is German more useful than Latin? People in Germany learn English from a very young age. Media Studies - does not belong with sociology, you will lose interest from those interested in this area, it is not a branch of sociology. More like technology. It is vital for our excellent film industry.		No			2020-03-01 20:03:12	ANON-YFPW-RW11-D-4	2020-03-01 19:57:49	2020-03-01 20:03:19
Yes		Agree				No			2020-03-01 20:12:02	ANON-YFPW-RW11-X-R	2020-03-01 20:12:02	2020-03-01 20:12:14
Yes		Agree				No			2020-03-01 20:31:45	ANON-YFPW-RW11-N-E	2020-03-01 20:31:45	2020-03-01 20:31:53
Yes		Strongly disagree	I do not support the Science subjects being combined together in this way. Students run the danger of not gaining skills and knowledge in some of those disciplines and then struggling when it comes to specialising in Level 2.	Science subjects need to be kept separate or increase the number of standards to ensure students are given the opportunity to cover all areas, and not just a general overview.	No	No			2020-03-01 20:38:25	ANON-YFPW-RW11-K-B	2020-03-01 20:38:25	2020-03-01 20:38:36

No	Surely greater specialisation at Level 2 and 3 will mean we need better prepared students at Level 1 and not "jack of all trades master of none?" No I wasn't aware. The whole change seems to have been so complicated it has hidden the wood from the trees, almost as if it were intentional with a predetermined outcome.	Strongly disagree	All portfolios / reports in Science? All you are testing is literacy skills and a willingness to work. Expect massive increases in gender inequality outcomes, less engagement from boys and more pastoral issues. No externals in NCEA Science in Level 1? Essentially this is no preparation for Level 2 in Chemistry, Physics and Biology. If you are making a change the work has to be worth the outcome. Asking teachers to do a heap of work for outcomes everyone I have spoken to is against is not going to make a system work.	The removal of Biology, Chemistry and Physics from Level 1 is not acceptable. The removal of content from Science is not acceptable. I am Deputy Principal of a school and in conversations with my colleagues around the region we are left with the following choices: 1. Don't do Level 1 as there is no route for academic kids which is a level playing field 2. Do Cambridge, or equivalent, in place of Level 1 for academic students. This will create a 2 tier system and have NCEA as a "backward" qualification.	No. Go back to Level 1. Look at the mess you have made. Listen to teachers and not people sat in Ivory Towers or you will fragment NZ education into a 2 tier system - NCEA for less able and Cambridge or IB for more able.	No			2020-03-01 20:53:16	ANON-YFPW-RW1R-J	2020-03-01 20:53:16	2020-03-01 20:53:24
Yes	I was, but I would like more information on what level 2 and 3 will look like	Agree		I'm not sure how many students take Latin at school, but it seems like a shame to remove this as an option for those who are interested in taking it. Many schools use level 1 Art History and Classical Studies standards, even if they are not taught as whole subjects throughout the year. I worry that asking History teachers to incorporate this into their teaching practice will result in them not being given the depth or expertise they should receive. I do like the idea of allowing students to have a more general overview however, and think the changes to Science will give students more range.		No			2020-03-01 20:53:55	ANON-YFPW-RW1W-Q	2020-03-01 20:53:55	2020-03-01 20:54:06
Yes		Strongly disagree	The new science plan is ridiculous - the students have less opportunity to get credits, there is no structure and it will be extremely difficult for them to do level 2 sciences - it is hard enough at the moment. With the new proposed standards that jump will be even larger. The new standards also require a lot of report writing - which for some students will put them off science - which is a highly practical subject.	as above	no	No			2020-03-01 20:56:03	ANON-YFPW-RW14-M	2020-03-01 20:56:03	2020-03-01 20:56:11
Yes		Strongly disagree	By removing the specialist Science areas and having only 4 achievement standards in Level 1 Science, the Ministry is not meeting the criteria for a "broader, foundational" Level 1 in Science. Currently we run 3 different Science courses for our students - a General Science course, a Physical and Biological Science course and a Biology course. The 3 courses cater for individual student's need and interests and we use Science, Chemistry, Physics AND Biology achievement standards to build our courses. Therefore we will be more limited in what we can offer students.	By removing the specialist Science areas and having only 4 achievement standards in Level 1 Science, the Ministry is not meeting the criteria for a "broader, foundational" Level 1 in Science. Currently we run 3 different Science courses for our students - a General Science course, a Physical and Biological Science course and a Biology course. The 3 courses cater for individual student's need and interests and we use Science, Chemistry, Physics AND Biology achievement standards to build our courses. Therefore we will be more limited in what we can offer students. Therefore, I suggest you put these subjects back on to the list of available Level 1 subjects.		No			2020-03-01 21:13:40	ANON-YFPW-RW1T-M	2020-03-01 21:13:40	2020-03-01 21:14:26
Yes		Strongly disagree	Stopping Latin - the basis of so much English - weakens our language base and the understanding of its historical building blocks Classics is an important subject offered both at Oxford and Cambridge - do we want to become a country just teaching "in vogue" subjects			No			2020-03-01 21:15:34	ANON-YFPW-RW13-K	2020-03-01 21:15:34	2020-03-01 21:15:42
Yes		Strongly agree				No			2020-03-01 21:43:48	ANON-YFPW-RW12-J	2020-03-01 21:43:48	2020-03-01 21:43:57

Yes		Strongly disagree		<p>I come from South Korea.</p> <p>My parents moved here when I was 7 years old, as they believed New Zealand's education system (albeit a bit lacking in competition) was much healthier and inclusive for my younger sister and I. My father gave up becoming a Samsung executive to come and work in a hospitality field, which is tough and difficult for him. For the first few years here, we struggled with worries of future financial prospects like we had never done before.</p> <p>Despite all this, my parents have no regret for their decision to immigrate, and I am now older and wiser to have come to appreciate their sacrifices.</p> <p>The NCEA system is for a lack of better word, underrated. At first, I blamed my parents' choice to come to New Zealand for my failing grades and intelligence, prioritising only numbers and statistics. NCEA's wide range of offered subjects gave me insight about my identity and morals, and strengthened my core values. It taught me independence and decision-making, and I know that the Korean education system, which is notorious for its strict but competent teachings, is lacking in providing the students lessons of</p>	No			2020-03-01 22:23:28	ANON-YFPW-RW1U-N	2020-03-01 22:23:28	2020-03-01 22:23:45	
No		Strongly disagree	While I am not in a position to comment on the other subjects, I think that the removal of Latin from the syllabus would be very sad to the students, teachers and academics that love this subject.	<p>I think that the removal of Latin from the syllabus will be of great sadness to many groups wishing to explore the Roman world through its language. Latin is a vital and foundational language whose importance for an understanding of modern Romantic languages cannot be understated. Learning Latin provides students with the knowledge of grammar that can lead them to grasp French, Italian and etc. with ease. But it also fosters knowledge of Roman culture, social, historical, literary, which was foundational for the development of many aspects of life we see and value in modern society. It is therefore imperative that Latin and Classical History continue to be offered, as they are in England.</p>	No			2020-03-01 23:00:06	ANON-YFPW-RWVY-X	2020-03-01 23:00:06	2020-03-01 23:00:23	
No		Strongly disagree	As an aspiring Classics teacher I am very disappointed in the decision to exclude Classics as a whole subject from NCEA Level 1. Classics is a subject that teaches students about another culture and is especially important since a lot of our westernised traditions derived from the Greeks and Romans. Therefore, I think it should be a subject to be taught by itself, NOT integrated with History.	<p>As an aspiring Classics teacher I am very disappointed in the decision to exclude Classics as a whole subject from NCEA Level 1. Classics is a subject that teaches students about another culture and is especially important since a lot of our westernised traditions derived from the Greeks and Romans. Therefore, I think it should be a subject to be taught by itself, NOT integrated with History.</p>	No			2020-03-01 23:09:46	ANON-YFPW-RWVY-U	2020-03-01 23:09:46	2020-03-01 23:09:58	
Yes		Strongly disagree	<p>I disagree that the proposed changes will show a clearer pathway to further education. Students thrive on knowing what is expected of them, which is often distributed in the form of success criteria or koronga ako. The proposed changes to Level 1 Science are vague and difficult for students to "unpack". Without a well-scaffolded scheme of work, teachers will struggle to teach all the knowledge needed within the curriculum at L1 to allow students to access L2 and beyond and not put them off. Students love their questions answered with facts and knowledge. Students are interested in Pure Science and want to be extended. At L1 they want to learn Bio, Chem, and Phys. Others need structured basics to be able to transition into L2 and 3 – without this, they may fail to have success in L2 and give up.</p>	<p>Below are what my beliefs are on the proposed changes to NCEA Level 1 Science. I am a sixth-year teacher at Macleans College, one of the country's leading schools. I am a TIC of Year 11 Combined Science, which includes five mainstream science classes and three classes for those with ESOL learning needs.</p> <p>I disagree that the proposed changes will make NCEA more accessible. new L1 Science review gives us less content direction. Knowledge in Science is vital. NOS is also important but the foundation of knowledge needs to be put in place before we can explore NOS. Therefore, we need to teach Science knowledge then incorporate teaching of NOS. The new assessment standards give teachers more freedom because they are non-prescriptive in their content. We will be asked as teachers to craft our own curriculum to suit our learners, based around 4 nature of science (NoS) studies, that are up to us. The irony is, that with this increased freedom, comes less freedom.</p> <p>I disagree that the proposed changes will strengthen the literacy requirements. The proposed style of assessments will benefit those who already have high literacy and high cognition with good organisation by letting them produce reports. How will this course benefit those with ESOL</p>	For NCEA levels 2 and 3 Biology, please, be fair in your assessment type. Literacy heavy assessment is not for all students.	Yes			2020-03-01 23:24:23	ANON-YFPW-RWVC-8	2020-03-01 23:24:23	2020-03-01 23:24:28
No		Undecided		Do not remove classics or latin. They are fundamental subjects and are very important	No			2020-03-02 00:03:55	ANON-YFPW-RWVS-R	2020-03-02 00:03:55	2020-03-02 00:04:05	
Yes		Disagree		Please retain Latin and Classics as an option	No			2020-03-02 00:04:06	ANON-YFPW-RWV8-W	2020-03-02 00:04:06	2020-03-02 00:04:18	
No		Strongly disagree	Latin and Classics should be preserved as full subjects	Latin should not be removed	No	Ancient Greek		2020-03-02 00:27:34	ANON-YFPW-RWVG-C	2020-03-02 00:27:34	2020-03-02 00:28:02	

Yes		Strongly disagree		Latin is an essential language for our students to be able to compete and survive on a global scale. It provides a strong foundation for communication and critical thinking. Latin cannot be taken away.		No			2020-03-02 03:08:29	ANON-YFPW-RWVJ-F	2020-03-02 03:08:29	2020-03-02 03:08:39
No		Strongly disagree				Yes			2020-03-02 03:41:06	ANON-YFPW-RWVQ-P	2020-03-02 03:41:06	2020-03-02 03:41:15
No		Strongly disagree		Art history and classics should be subjects of their own due to them being fundamental for the personal development of every student's critical thinking.		No			2020-03-02 03:58:37	ANON-YFPW-RWVE-A	2020-03-02 03:58:37	2020-03-02 03:59:08
Yes		Strongly disagree				Yes			2020-03-02 06:36:18	ANON-YFPW-RWV5-T	2020-03-02 06:36:18	2020-03-02 06:36:25
No		Disagree	I disagree with the removal of Latin. Why keep french, Spanish and English if you want to remove their linguistic ancestor?	You should keep Latin if you hope to foster a love of languages, and ease more students into learning a breadth of languages. Latin enables pupils to spot connections in grammar and vocabulary, easing the process for many.	Arabic and Ancient Greek	Yes	No		2020-03-02 07:50:13	ANON-YFPW-RWV6-N	2020-03-02 07:50:13	2020-03-02 07:50:30
Yes		Agree				No			2020-03-02 07:59:45	ANON-YFPW-RWV7-V	2020-03-02 07:59:45	2020-03-02 08:00:04
No	My understanding was that Level One would become more rigorous not become more light weight.	Strongly disagree	The proposals for Science are absurd. This dumbed down Science course will be unable to provide the necessary foundations for students to start Level 2 Biology, Physics and Chemistry. The course has essentially become Social studies and will only see some schools concentrate on single topics for the year. Students will be unable to develop the necessary skills and knowledge to be able to jump straight to physics, chemistry etc. Dropping Latin is not something a civilised society does. Economics and Business studies could be combined into a commerce course, bit Accounting again needs a specialised course at Level 1. Why have Health and PE been combined? these are totally different subjects.	It is ridiculous that at Level One there are many language options yet for a huge and vast subject such as science the options have been limited. If you are going to propose a general science course then there needs to be something like this AS1 Physics Topic AS2 Chemistry Topic AS3 Biology topic then perhaps a standard which is more generalised. BUT...all students need a foundation in these subjects to be able to make the leap to specialised science.	No our curriculum is already too big.	Yes	I am comfortable with the options as long as a subject such as Maori Performing Arts has rigour.		2020-03-02 08:00:39	ANON-YFPW-RWV8-B	2020-03-02 08:00:39	2020-03-02 08:00:44
Yes		Disagree	Latin should definitely remain in the curriculum. It is the best basis for learning roman languages in general and helps in subjects such as medicine or art history! It would be a loss to the students as well as to the whole system!	Latin should definitely remain in the curriculum. It is the best basis for learning roman languages in general and helps in subjects such as medicine or art history! It would be a loss to the students as well as to the whole system!	No	No			2020-03-02 08:02:22	ANON-YFPW-RWV1-P	2020-03-02 08:02:22	2020-03-02 08:02:35
Yes		Strongly disagree	Latin is a truly important study for all those of European, North African or Near Eastern descent and it should not be removed from the curriculum.	Latin helps with learning other romance languages, it improves vocabulary and has also been proven to render the study of computer science, law and the natural sciences much easier.	Latin and Classics	Yes			2020-03-02 08:10:17	ANON-YFPW-RWV2-V	2020-03-02 08:10:17	2020-03-02 08:10:29
Yes		Undecided		I don't like Home Economics being changed to food science. I don't believe it fairly encapsulates the sociological aspects of senior Home Economics. When people hear science, they think biology and chemistry, not social science, sociology, social anthropology, culture, history, economics etc which is a big part of senior home Ec. Also, where the heck is Outdoor Education?		No			2020-03-02 08:13:28	ANON-YFPW-RWVH-D	2020-03-02 08:13:28	2020-03-02 08:13:41
No		Disagree		Merging Media Studies, Psychology and Social Studies is only going to promote less surety for students regarding which subject they wish to pursue. Merging all three is only going to limit the quality of education of subjects who should not be merged. They are entirely different subjects. The relevance to society may be similar to some extent, but the way in which that relevance is taught, i.e through film or the study of the mind, differ greatly. This difference cannot be ignored else you risk lacking in quality of education.		No			2020-03-02 08:44:46	ANON-YFPW-RWV6-B	2020-03-02 08:44:46	2020-03-02 08:45:00
Yes		Agree		The one that I am confused by is Media studies being pulled into Social Studies. It makes much more sense to bring Media studies into English. I have taught courses like this in the past and it is a natural, easy fit. English already includes a focus on storytelling, camera and film techniques, symbolism etc.		No			2020-03-02 08:51:21	ANON-YFPW-RWVH-J	2020-03-02 08:51:21	2020-03-02 08:51:30
Yes		Strongly agree		Rationalising subjects at Level 1/Curriculum Level 6 makes good sense. A broad offering so that students can then make better choices as to their pathways without specialising too early is a good idea.		Yes			2020-03-02 08:52:01	ANON-YFPW-RWV6-D	2020-03-02 08:52:01	2020-03-02 08:52:08
No		Strongly disagree		Combining all the sciences into one will severely limit the knowledge students will carry into level 2 specialist subjects. It would mean teaching all of that knowledge in year 12, which we don't have time for. I will switch to Cambridge if this goes through.	Engineering?	Yes			2020-03-02 08:53:14	ANON-YFPW-RWVX-W	2020-03-02 08:53:14	2020-03-02 08:53:28

Yes		Disagree		I believe it is important to keep Classics (and Art History?) separate from mainstream History, which tends to be focused on war and conflict. I also believe that condensing all sciences into an umbrella subject at that level will reduce the students' depth of understanding for subsequent years.	Geographical Information Systems Philosophy and Ethics	No				2020-03-02 09:04:08	ANON-YFPW-RWVA-6	2020-03-02 09:04:08	2020-03-02 09:04:21
Yes		Disagree	It is disappointing that students can't opt to study Biology, Chemistry, Physics or Planet Earth and Beyond subjects.	Biology, Chemistry, Physics and Earth and Space Science ought to be included. The subjects light fires in the minds of a certain group of students and gives them something to sink their teeth into.		No				2020-03-02 09:05:54	ANON-YFPW-RWVN-K	2020-03-02 09:05:54	2020-03-02 09:06:26
Yes	The generalisation of science makes the leap to specialized science much larger.	Strongly disagree	The idea is good but it has butchered science and commerce. 2 important growth areas for NZ economy. absolute insanity.	reduce the science matrix but at least keep 1.1 practicals and external exams in some format as there will no way to introduce the important content needed to make the leap to L2 bio/chem/physics.		No				2020-03-02 09:25:37	ANON-YFPW-RWVK-G	2020-03-02 09:23:48	2020-03-02 09:25:53
Yes		Agree		I am a bit worried that Latin is not included. Latin could be important for some Science careers, e.g. medicine. I very often also see a requirement for studying medicine and languages at some foreign universities, eg. Germany. Languages are learned through a long build-up. SO if students see they do not get any formal qualifications till L2, they might not take the subject and later regret it and they won't just pick the language up quickly like some other subjects that you can easily pick up without prior knowledge in L2. I am also a bit worried that Art History is not included, but if it is covered enough under the History umbrella, then it might be okay. (However, a history teacher who is not trained in Art history, would not be appropriate for teaching that subject and if it is only offered in L2 and L3, Art history teachers might not have enough students to teach and therefore new trainee teachers might not choose that subject as a major.)	All subjects on the L1 list or carry on in L2 and L3.	No	I know that currently, their NCEA standards are fairly similar to the languages standards for Te Reo. I also know that there is the subject Kaupapa Maori.			2020-03-02 09:29:40	ANON-YFPW-RWVU-U	2020-03-02 09:29:40	2020-03-02 09:29:55
No		Strongly disagree		There is little logic in a proposal in which sees all branches of science merged into a single 'Science' subject, but keeps FOUR separate technology subjects and FIVE separate arts subjects. Either be consistent with the 'broader, foundational' aims and have single arts and technology subjects which provide foundations leading into specialisations at levels 2 and 3, or expand science back into chem, bio, and physics (Earth and Space Science could be wrapped up into other subjects, if reduction of number of subjects is required).		No				2020-03-02 09:59:25	ANON-YFPW-RWVR-Q	2020-03-02 09:59:25	2020-03-02 09:59:42
No	I was made aware of this that it could be a possibility when the draft level one science standards came out last year, but only found out through the media that this was confirmed.	Strongly disagree	Your new level 1 science standards will not prepare students adequately to complete level 2 science standards as there is an absolute lack of content	You should keep available choice something that was supposed to be inherent in the NCEA system and keep all subjects currently available if schools don't wish to do them then they can make that choice but it shouldn't be made for us.	No	Yes				2020-03-02 10:06:22	ANON-YFPW-RWVV-V	2020-03-02 10:06:22	2020-03-02 10:06:29
No		Strongly disagree				Yes				2020-03-02 10:21:47	ANON-YFPW-RWV4-S	2020-03-02 10:21:47	2020-03-02 10:22:00
No	My understanding is that the standards offered does not fully represent the scope of the curriculum. Students are limited in their learning, not enough knowledge gained that will assist them in their future specialisation and decision-making. For this reason, I was under the impression NCEA would review the current standards and allow for extended knowledge and information that is more authentic.	Strongly disagree	Year 10 and 11 provides the opportunity to provide foundations knowledge to a more specialised subject, year 12 and son on. This is essential as students grasp concepts and definitions that will be used in the further understanding of complex models/ scenarios. Teachers tend to follow the standards instead of the curriculum as guidance. This could prevent students from gaining an understanding of foundation knowledge and add additional pressures re their learning at higher levels as prior knowledge will be needed for their deeper understanding so that can show initiative and solve problems.	Accounting - although processing automated, an understanding of accounting concepts will lead to sound decision making. this will be difficult to introduce at level 2 only. Also students who are academic and enjoy maths, seem to enjoy the subject. their is a high percentage registered for NCEA accounting exams. Why would you just remove it? Having taught economics, accounting and business studies, the content is very different, so is the dynamics of the students who chose these subject. Putting all three under the commerce umbrella, removes choices and prevents students to accelerate in a specific subject that they are really good at.	No	No				2020-03-02 10:35:46	ANON-YFPW-RWVT-S	2020-03-02 10:35:46	2020-03-02 10:36:29
Yes	I don't think it suits the needs of the greatest population of our students	Strongly disagree	in the NZ curriculum it is specifically stated that individual sciences are a choice (see below from NZC) –so I am not sure how this consultation process can legitimately remove it as an option, as it's a review of NCEA not curriculum.	Science cannot be banded together: in the NZ curriculum, it is specifically stated that individual sciences are a choice (see below from NZC) – so I am not sure how this consultation process can legitimately remove it as an option, as it's a review of NCEA not curriculum.	no	Yes	no			2020-03-02 10:50:03	ANON-YFPW-RWV3-R	2020-03-02 10:50:03	2020-03-02 10:50:13

Yes		Agree	<p>Classes need to be streamed. We just moved to Auckland from London. We have 3 children who have been in 3 different London schools. Regarding level, for modern languages (French and Spanish), the NZ curriculum is about 3 years behind (!!). Maths seems broadly on par. Science is less specialised, fewer practical experiments and a bit behind. English is the main concern, which is about 3 years behind on level. We're comparing Westlake Girls High School, which is considered an academic school and it's still behind the good London schools. This is a concern as New Zealand needs to compete on a global scale. New Zealand schools are massively ahead on sports and offering an all-rounded education.</p> <p>The UK exams GCSC (English curriculum) has a very clear curriculum and exam paper examples available to students. We have found gaps in the NCEA support documents and information available.</p> <p>Solution: -Streamed classes adapted to ability - this benefits all abilities. -Good to have fewer subjects to allow for more streaming. -Align more with UK and Australia to share resources available and allow for international studies</p>	<p>Good to drop Latin. More productive to focus on languages being used. Good to narrow down but streaming would be needed.</p>	<p>Maths and Advanced Maths (or streamed Maths classes) Streaming / setting according to ability for English, Science and modern languages</p>	Yes			2020-03-02 10:53:38	ANON-YFPW-RW2-Q	2020-03-02 10:53:38	2020-03-02 10:53:52
Yes		Strongly disagree		<p>There is no educational justification for discontinuing Latin and Classics. These are valuable areas of study that fit young men and women for both work and, more generally, for citizenship.</p> <p>Latin provides the general intellectual benefits of learning a foreign language. One of these benefits is a better grasp of the grammar of one's own native language. Latin actually provides this benefit better than learning living languages since we have nothing but the text. Moreover, the vocabulary of Latin lies at the basis of much technical terminology in STEM fields.</p> <p>Classics is not simply ancient history -- it includes literature, poetry and drama. As such, it is an area study that condenses into one field many humanities disciplines.</p>	<p>Philosophy should be included in the curriculum since there is ample evidence that it benefits secondary school students in their other subjects and in developing the capacity for critical self-reflection.</p>	No			2020-03-02 11:41:34	ANON-YFPW-RW7-Y	2020-03-02 11:41:34	2020-03-02 11:43:06
Yes		Strongly disagree		<p>I do not think we should merge Health and Physical Education. The New Zealand Curriculum for level 6 Health and Physical Education is too large to be squeezed into one subject. If this change is put into place, students will get a course that is rushed, and overlooks the important health related issues in NZ. With issues such as mental health, obesity, cardiovascular disease and diabetes on the rise, I think it is extremely important that we keep these two subjects separate so that students can receive a more in depth education towards these issues, and learn about the importance of a healthy body and mind. I also fear that this would limit the ability to teach Outdoor Education through the same strand.</p>	<p>Outdoor Education! I think we need more subjects that incorporates place-based education that connects learning and communities. It is a subject increases student engagement, boosts academic outcomes, impact communities and promotes understanding of the world around us.</p>	Yes			2020-03-02 11:43:35	ANON-YFPW-RW7V-V	2020-03-02 11:43:35	2020-03-02 11:43:52
Yes		Agree		<p>Keep health and physical education as separate subjects. Many students who choose one do not choose the other. I understand they lead to similar careers and pathways, but many students tend to choose only one or the other</p>		No			2020-03-02 11:47:38	ANON-YFPW-RW7C-9	2020-03-02 11:47:38	2020-03-02 11:47:56
No	Level one is already broad and of such a low level that it does not stretch students or prepare them for Level 2	Disagree	Stop dumbing Level 1 down			No			2020-03-02 12:06:30	ANON-YFPW-RW7S-5	2020-03-02 12:06:30	2020-03-02 12:06:46

Yes		Strongly disagree	<p>I write in connection with the dropping of the study of Latin from your list of proposed languages for study. And I propose that Classical Studies not be downgraded, as proposed.</p> <p>I realize that Latin may seem to many to be an elitist subject, but it can in fact be a most democratic subject when taught in the secondary school classroom. Studies in the US have shown how school performance amongst disadvantaged children has improved markedly when Latin has been included in their curriculum.</p> <p>Through this study students learn much about accuracy and economy of expression; they learn (as many of my own students have assured me) to write well in their own language.</p> <p>Latin and Classical Studies introduce students to a rich vein of cultural tradition which is represented in our judicial and political systems and in myth and storytelling and in art. The classical tradition is not the only tradition, but it is the tradition that underpins Europe and beyond.</p>	Yes. I suggest that Latin be included and that Classical Studies be reinstated as a subject in its own right.		No			2020-03-02 12:27:40	ANON-YFPW-RW78-X	2020-03-02 12:27:40	2020-03-02 12:27:51
Yes		Agree		Surprised Health has been combined with Physical Education considering our growing Health needs in society.	Civics	No			2020-03-02 12:28:47	ANON-YFPW-RW79-Y	2020-03-02 12:28:47	2020-03-02 12:28:52
Yes		Disagree	<p>*a broad foundational selection of subjects students should still provide choice in *choices for subjects available need to reflect our whole diverse student population otherwise the system is not equitable</p>	<p>*Learning Languages should include all languages within the New Zealand Realm - Niuean and Tokelauan aren't on the list - without this opportunity the choices are not equitable.</p> <p>*Learning languages should provide option for diverse student population to develop their heritage languages as heritage language competence is key to strong cultural identity - all curriculum documents, practicing teacher policy promotes that education should be culturally responsive and value the language, culture and identity of all students, current programmes don't allow for this.</p> <p>*Latin is a foundational language for many languages and learning Latin equips students with critical thinking and problem skills across the sciences and humanities.</p>	Gagana Tokelau Vagahau Niue A community/ heritage languages pathway or study option retention of Latin, Classical studies and Art History	Yes	Te Marautanga o Aotearoa should also make sure that its provision of subjects provide equitable choice for the diverse population of students.	No	2020-03-02 12:36:32	ANON-YFPW-RW7G-D	2020-03-02 12:36:32	2020-03-02 12:36:44
Yes	<p>I am pleased that Level 1 has been retained, otherwise 16 year olds in New Zealand would not have the opportunity for sitting external exams the way the rest of the world do.</p> <p>Level 1 is important in itself but also helping students develop the maturity needed for Level 2 by going through the process of having accountable papers they need to sit.</p>	Disagree	<p>Whilst introducing a general Science as a Level 1 option is worthwhile for those who do not wish to specialise, there is no reason not to keep Biology, Chemistry and Physics as Level 1 subjects as well - this gives the wider range of students the wider range of options. To have general Science as the only option limits the knowledge development of those who wish to specialise early with a view to going to University. Someone studying Chemistry at Level 2 will not have covered all of the Level 1 content so will be at a disadvantage.</p> <p>The similar argument can be made for Business Studies. By all means have a generalist option at Level 1 for those who want it, but keep the specialist subject for those who want it. That way you satisfy everyone. Otherwise you are watering down the curriculum for those who wish to be stretched.</p>	<p>I cannot understand the reason for dropping Latin. It would be difficult to pick up at Level 2 if it has not been studied at Level 1. Why not just leave it available for those who wish to do it? It is not harming anyone else.</p> <p>There seems to be no benefit to combining PE with Health as some students may just wish to do PE. Why not have both options plus a combination available for those who want it?</p>		No			2020-03-02 12:39:41	ANON-YFPW-RW7J-G	2020-03-02 12:39:41	2020-03-02 12:39:55
No		Undecided		No	No	No			2020-03-02 12:45:14	ANON-YFPW-RW7Q-Q	2020-03-02 12:45:14	2020-03-02 12:45:27
No	<p>Unexpected - specialisation needs to occur at an earlier level for greater conceptual understanding by students</p>	Strongly disagree	<p>Need to review curriculum document first before deriving courses from it since there is an obvious mismatch between the two.</p>		not at this point in time	No			2020-03-02 12:48:21	ANON-YFPW-RW7E-B	2020-03-02 12:48:21	2020-03-02 12:48:33
No	<p>I totally disagree with this proposal as Level 1 is a diverse and foundation level, already.</p>	Strongly disagree				No			2020-03-02 12:51:32	ANON-YFPW-RW75-U	2020-03-02 12:51:32	2020-03-02 12:51:41

No		Strongly disagree		My son struggles with English but has a real passion for media and the arts which we wish to foster in any way possible. I feel very disappointed that media will not be included as a Level 1 paper as it is a definite career path for him and I would much rather he take papers of interest that he has a hope of passing and which will help lift his confidence in his own unique abilities. I can't see how social studies remotely relates to media studies and am extremely disappointed at this thinking.		No	No - while I very strongly support some Maori being taught at primary school to help children learn about our country's heritage I feel it should be an elective only at College. We are a rich multi cultural country and Maori has limited application for many. We should be able to make our own choices with regards our education outside of core subjects of maths and literacy (and in		2020-03-02 12:55:04	ANON-YFPW-RW7P-P	2020-03-02 12:52:02	2020-03-02 12:55:10
No	That is the stated claim. But having taught Science to actual teenagers, removing content at year 11 from the existing Science standards to produce the more general/content light standards and instead introducing higher-order discussions reliant on specific content knowledge has 2 major issues. 1) At the age of year 11, most students are still developing their ability to critically discuss an issue. Something that massively improves by year 12. 2) Without knowledge, in a factual subject area (Science), unfounded opinionated discussions are regressive and lead back to the concept that unfounded opinions are valid in a factual discussion (they are not).	Strongly disagree	Not so much multiple Sciences to a single Science, while most areas are introducing multiple new options. But, the removal of learning from the existing Science standards to the proposed Science standards.	See above. Also, some understanding of establishing open questioning when asking for feedback would be useful. Rather than writing questionnaires that are worded to presuppose people agree with the changes and are merely requiring clarification.		No			2020-03-02 12:59:30	ANON-YFPW-RW77-W	2020-03-02 12:59:30	2020-03-02 12:59:38
Yes	The ideal of a broad foundation at level 1, is not a bad idea overall. However, the realities of this I think do not allow for a real broad foundation level, simply a deletion of what are deemed 'minor' subjects instead. Media studies for example should instead of being hidden within the realms of senior social studies, which is a more or less non-existent subject in reality, become a must do level 1 course. Media and our interaction with it will dominate our lives, if students do not have a good grounding in Media how are they supposed to become the connected life-long learners that is the vision of the NZC.	Disagree	The NZC calls for students to be effective users of communication tools, active seekers, users and creators of knowledge and international citizens. Along with the rest of the points in the NZC's vision and principles, media studies plays a vital role in ensuring students question the reliability of our connected world, know how to use this resource and keep themselves safe and have a platform to REALLY use and create their own knowledge. Media studies allows students to tell their own stories, to be as creative as they are capable of and use industry recognised tools to really set them up for a pathway post school. Level 1 Media allows a GREAT general foundational understanding of the role of the media in society and students interactions and use of that tool that is essential to the future citizens of NZ they will become. We cannot take part in 'life' without the media and media studies, questioning the media, questioning the relationships media has with society should be front and centre of our curriculum not hidden in a rare subject such as senior social studies. To be the digital citizens we all are, we need to understand what this means. Media studies is the vehicle for this, and level 1 is the chance to gain a broad knowledge before specialising in L2 & 3 into film making and/or journalism projects.	As above - Media studies is an essential component to any modern curriculum, not a hidden 'option' in a rarely run subject option line. The media is front and centre of our lives today - from politics, marketing to our social lives. Students need to better understand it, understand how media influences them and how media is being influenced by others, to ultimately influence them, and why. Students need to become responsible international citizens, and to do this the media needs to be understood and picked apart. The focus of media studies I think needs to change to being a study of the media rather than making a media product. This is fun and useful, however, students need to understand their role in shaping the media of the future and what they want that to look like. Level 1 is a great chance for this fostering of ideas to take place, before specialising in making a media product for example. This is as important as learning how to write a sentence and solving an algebra equation. Media studies is 2020 and beyond...		Yes			2020-03-02 13:06:24	ANON-YFPW-RW71-Q	2020-03-02 13:06:24	2020-03-02 13:06:37

Yes		Disagree	I have always admired New Zealand for the high quality and open-mindedness of its educational system. The proposed removal of Latin from the Level 1 Subject List strikes me as a regrettable closing of minds and a misguided effort that will deprive New Zealanders of an opportunity available to their peers around the globe. From my point of view, both this and the plan to minimize the importance of Classical Studies and Art History in New Zealand's secondary-school curriculum are huge steps backward. Latin, Classical Studies, and Art History are all subjects that broaden students' perspectives, help them see what is distinctive about their own time and place, and give them a chance to engage with ancient Mediterranean cultures through language, literature, social sciences, and the arts. The aim of such studies is not to glorify the Graeco-Roman past or claim that Mediterranean cultures are superior to any other world culture, but rather to ensure that students are informed about the classical tradition and encouraged to examine it critically, comparing/contrasting it with other traditions, particularly those of the indigenous populations in the students' native land.	New Zealand has had a rich tradition in Classical Studies: in fact, some of the most prominent scholars in the field today (e.g. Richard Thomas of Harvard University) grew up and were educated there. Please think twice before eliminating the study of Latin—a pursuit that is not only fun and intellectually challenging but also eminently practical. Latin attracts fewer students now than it used to, not because it has become any less useful, but only because it has to compete with more languages being offered as alternatives. It also suffers from the stereotype of being elitist—which it would not be, if every student were lucky enough to have the possibility of studying it. There are many career pathways for students who study Latin (and Classical Studies/Art History too); among the most popular are library and museum studies, archaeology, journalism, diplomacy, law, medicine, theology, and education. Here in the United States (I am Professor of Classics at St. Olaf College in Northfield, Minnesota, and currently serve as President of the Classical Association of the Middle West and South), we have a shortage of K-12 Latin teachers, so anyone with Latin Education credentials is in great demand, especially for employment in charter (public) schools that emphasize a "back to the basics" approach. It has	If there is no hope for saving Latin at Level 1, I would suggest the compromise of allowing it to be taken at Levels 2 and 3 as an enhancement for specializations in English, the arts, languages, mathematics and statistics, science, social sciences, and technology. The very fact that knowledge of Latin would be an asset (linguistically, literarily, analytically) in any of those seven areas of study should be proof of how beneficial it is for a student to know some Latin. Perhaps Classical Studies and Art History could also be offered at Levels 2 and 3, where they would enhance the specialized courses by providing cultural context and historical perspective.	No			2020-03-02 13:09:41	ANON-YFPW-RW7F-C	2020-03-02 13:02:21	2020-03-02 13:09:57
Yes		Strongly disagree	There seems to be a lack of consistency in approach. The rationale for amalgamating the sciences and commerce subjects (Accounting, Economics and Business Studies), yet not History, Geography and Social Science nor the Arts does not appear to align with the NZ Curriculum nor make much sense, given the very different skills and knowledge of each of the subjects. The existing subject choices at L1 allow students who have strong interest in one of the learning areas, such as Science, or Commerce, to pursue different aspects of that learning area. This gives them the opportunity to see whether those subjects are a 'good fit' for them.			No			2020-03-02 13:17:08	ANON-YFPW-RW7Z-2	2020-03-02 13:17:08	2020-03-02 13:17:27
Yes		Strongly agree	NCEA Level 1 needs to be more streamlined, in order to allow students to keep their future pathways more open until they have a clearer idea of what they should study.	if anything, I would support further condensing of subjects to make Level 1 a more generic, standardised year.	I would like to see a generic 'life skills' unit standard course developed, in order to ensure that students who, for various reasons, have not been successfully guided through academic achievement at school can still be better prepared for life in general - basics of the law, banking, changing tyres, hygiene, workplace expectations, etc etc	No			2020-03-02 13:38:19	ANON-YFPW-RW7B-8	2020-03-02 13:38:19	2020-03-02 13:38:27
Yes	I would have thought that Classical Studies would have been foundational for the study of history and not removed from level 1. The basis of understanding Western civilisation up to the present day would have benefited from Classical Studies. I know students who have studied this subject and have enjoyed it and were keen to go into later historical studies including the Middle Ages. If the intention is to introduce Classical Studies in level 2 then I would feel somewhat happier. If "greater specialisation" means more vocational subjects at the expense of cultural or humanistic subjects then I would have serious concerns!	Undecided	It all depends doesn't it? I think the subjects are all worthy and there is nothing I would remove. I think it a great pity that, for example, Art History is being deleted as an option. I haven't been particularly good at artistic subjects myself but some courses on art appreciation and history have given me a life-long interest that I pursue whenever I am in another country - I arrange my overseas holidays (UK, Europe, Asia) around museums and art galleries. I was fortunate to have my art appreciation history courses more by good luck than anything in our education system. I have studied the Arts in the UK and Europe (a Travelling Fellowship for 6 months) and students - 7 years to 18 years) in those countries have a far richer understanding of art history. We really have nothing to compare - we don't even study our NZ art history. We and kiwis, and NZ curriculum developers, don't seem to appreciate or take part in our western cultural history let alone that of other cultures (e.g. Asia or the Americas). For shame.	I've mentioned my disappointment at the intended loss of Classical Studies and Art Appreciation. Latin - I've never studied it but have quite a few University units in Classical Studies (art, architecture, history and literature in translation) and would have liked to have studied Greek and Latin so I could read in the original language. Not to be. However, the earlier someone starts a new language the more proficient they become. Is, for those young people who want to study Latin it is disappointing that such people will miss out because the Ministry deems the subject apparently obsolete. I suppose those people who decided that have never studied Greek or Latin themselves. Pity they have to deny others the right to study a subject they are passionate about. Latin is well-known for helping its readers and speakers understand more about the English language and the derivation of many words in our language.	Well, at least, seriously consider Latin, Classical Studies and Art Appreciation.	No	Was once but not now in 2020. I am fully supportive of te Reo being taught to young New Zealanders in our schools.	I cannot comment with any sort of authority on table 2, sorry.	2020-03-02 13:40:10	ANON-YFPW-RW7M-K	2020-03-02 13:40:10	2020-03-02 13:40:31
Yes		Disagree	Psychology is extremely different to media and social studies - social studies looks at the interaction of the population - whereas psychology looks at the individual and approaches for understanding why people are the way they are. They both have a lot of content and there is little room for all content to be covered in one level 1 course.	Psychology should still be its own subject. However, if it must be combined with other subjects it would fit better with health or with Science		No			2020-03-02 13:50:52	ANON-YFPW-RW7D-A	2020-03-02 13:50:52	2020-03-02 13:51:11

No	No I was not, until recent announcements; however I am baffled by the removal of vital areas of study in the foundational part of this structure. Unless the compulsory age of school attendance is to be raised by a year, to 17, then the "foundation" that school-leavers of 16 would have attained will be incomplete if the current proposals are adopted. Entire areas of interest have been excluded, or minimised into insignificance if the goal to be aimed for is merely "to a low degree". In your own words, "We received over 16,000 individual points of feedback and heard that students don't always get access to clear, quality pathways through NCEA and sometimes miss out on valuable learning." If you remove some of the broad foundations, the students will miss out on MORE than they already do. "We also heard that students value access to learning across the breadth of the curriculum and not closing doors to pathways too early." So do NOT close those doors to learning pathways. Open them all! "The goal of these changes is to ensure every student gets fair and equal access to the full range of possible quality pathways through NCEA and	Strongly disagree	One of the biggest dilemmas with an education system, and a school in particular, is what to choose to teach to the masses. The powers that be always decide that every selected subject must be relevant to all, or interesting to all, and poor Johnny who loves all things ancient misses out on the stimulus he desires because ancient history is not considered relevant AT all, let alone TO all. More people would be interested in the study of ancient places and languages if they were aware that they exist. When something as important as ancient history or Latin becomes relegated to "a possible context to a low degree" or removed altogether then we might as well write the death certificate right now. In realistic terms it simply will not be taught in most places, and for those few who do teach it, the subject will not be touched on enough to show why it is relevant (and so it becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy that "it is not relevant", when in fact it is still extremely relevant, and interesting, and fun). And for those who DO manage to discover the world of ancient history or of ancient languages, it will be immensely frustrating that they have merely scratched the surface and they have to wait an entire year to be able to delve deeper. If we do not have teachers covering these topics in the foundation year, then who is going to provide the	I would like to declare my interests in advance. I am a mother of three children, and none of them attend a school. I am not a teacher, although I have a degree and would require only a year of teacher-training in order to become a teacher in schools. I am the Principal in charge of my own exclusive academy of learning - so exclusive that the only pupils were born into it. I have been home-educating my children for the past 11 years, officially with an exemption since the eldest turned six. Our style of learning is natural, eclectic, and always vitally interesting because it is based on the individual people and their individual strengths and interests and talents. I find ways to make the boring and dry become fascinating and quenching. I find ways to incorporate the concepts and topics and subjects to which the children are not naturally drawn. Every parent knows how to hide healthy-but-disliked vegetables in food for their children; I know how to incorporate into every activity the topics that are unknown or disliked for the children to discover and develop a liking for. I strew ideas throughout everything I say. I lay welcome mats at the portcullis of history. I utilise the vast extent of my vocabulary and expose the children to the wealth of language that is theirs for		Yes	As I understand it, there is no compulsory subject in the NZ Curriculum. It is the schools that make the choices for compulsory subjects and optional subjects. If that is still the case, then the students should be given the opportunity to state in advance which subjects they wish to study the following year so that the teaching resources can be provided for those specific		2020-03-02 13:52:25	ANON-YFPW-RW7X-X	2020-03-02 13:52:25	2020-03-02 13:52:39
No	The changes don't support a broad, more foundational education at level 1. The potential options actually reduce flexibility we currently have. Not a good idea.	Strongly disagree	The Ministry's proposed changes reduce the potential flexibility we have to give each student an individual programme.	Status quo is far better. Again, the changes would reduce our ability to provide students with individual programmes... bad idea Ministry.	No	Yes	Somewhat.	No	2020-03-02 14:05:26	ANON-YFPW-RW7A-7	2020-03-02 14:05:26	2020-03-02 14:05:43
Yes	I was aware of the changes to NCEA, however, was not aware so many subjects were going to be 'absorbed' into other departments.	Strongly disagree	Being a Media Studies teacher, my Level 1 curriculum is designed to provide a foundation of key media concepts that the students will then build upon over levels 2 & 3. With the only option of having Media Studies being taught through a Social Studies context at Level 1 has me very concerned with this decision. The jump from Level 1 to Level 2 is notoriously large for students, and this change will remove the vital foundation of learning for students moving into Level 2 & 3.	The removal of Media Studies at Level 1 is concerning at a time when our students need critical media literacy more than ever - and that can only be expected to increase. Media of all forms is increasingly becoming embedded into all aspects of life and therefore having Media Studies as a stand-alone core subject seems more important than ever before. In Media Studies, young people are encouraged to engage with texts through different cultural lenses, analyse how media creates meaning around ideology, race, gender and given skills to become active participants and creators. Professionally, I feel that the Media Studies standards should be being looked at and refreshed to provide a greater scope. All major universities offer Media related degrees and careers, such as: - Communications - Marketing - Journalism - Film Making - PR - Advertising - Production To name a few. Media Studies at a college level can provide		Yes			2020-03-02 14:23:40	ANON-YFPW-RW1A-1	2020-03-01 20:20:52	2020-03-02 14:23:48
No	I was aware of proposed adjustments to NCEA L1 with the aim of reducing student and teacher workload only.	Strongly disagree	The loss of academic content is huge and will deter many young people from continuing in Science. This may have a long lasting social impact as well.	L1 Physics, Biology and Chemistry provide a basic, fundamental platform for learning at Levels 2 and 3. Without this sound basis, progression and attaining success will be limited to very few students.	Not at this stage. Lets first settle the debacle around L1 learning!!	No			2020-03-02 14:59:32	ANON-YFPW-RW7K-H	2020-03-02 14:59:32	2020-03-02 14:59:52
Yes		Agree		Materials Technology should be named Design and Materials Technology. There need to be more practical based Standards to enable practically biased students to achieve as many of the generic Technology Standards are essay based. Practical standards are particularly necessary at Levels 2 and 3 as the DVC Standards are decidedly ethereal.		No	Dodgy question, I'm familiar with the NZC in English not in Maori		2020-03-02 15:09:08	ANON-YFPW-RW7N-M	2020-03-02 14:54:24	2020-03-02 15:09:42
Yes	I approve of these changes in theory. However, that has only occurred to a couple of curriculum areas, Science and Commerce. This should have occurred right through out the curriculum not just in a couple of areas.	Strongly disagree	Since this broad stroke has not been implemented across the curriculum, I do not support it. Science and Commerce are very content rich and students going in to the Level 2 programmes will struggle to learn all the content to ensure a successful year in Level 2. The new AS at level 1 are so broad that there is never going to be similar content throughout NZ, so this will cause more content issues. NZ seems to be 'dumbing down' education rather than 'pulling up'.	Either make the whole curriculum broad at level 1 or leave it as it is.		Yes			2020-03-02 15:20:47	ANON-YFPW-RW7G-V	2020-03-02 15:20:47	2020-03-02 15:21:05
Yes	Some staff where not aware of foundational education. Foundational education is a new word for staff.	Undecided			No.	No			2020-03-02 15:34:18	ANON-YFPW-RW7R-R	2020-03-02 15:34:18	2020-03-02 15:34:33
Yes		Agree	Do not agree with new name (Food science) change in Food Technology and what new subject matter will be there in Food Technology.	Unsure about the trades courses which are unit standards.	A separate strand for electronics and robotics (Mechatronics).	No			2020-03-02 15:35:20	ANON-YFPW-RW7W-W	2020-03-02 15:35:20	2020-03-02 15:35:56

Yes	I assumed the science course would include physics bio and chem as compulsory not as a choice so some schools could totally avoid acids and bases or mechanics as seen to be too hard...then an even bigger jump to level 2 and 3 would put them off taking it.	Disagree	NOS would be addressed but school choice could cut out some of the strands we require for further study. eg for biology level 2 would need level one genetics as prerequisite to cope with dihybrid crosses level 2. physics needs level one for foundation. a pick and mix from schools could lead to missing out on the foundations required for further development .	Its strange to consider so many technology subjects retained yet science is reduced to hort or science. i would like human biology included as students relate to the body and need this plus a knowledge of viruses bacteria etc as pathogens so as to be educated in the need for vaccinations. this will stop the pro plague or anti vax group growing. the current corona virus panic shows this with people emptying shelves of anti biotic soap when corona is a virus.	no	No			2020-03-02 15:40:30	ANON-YFPW-RW74-T	2020-03-02 15:35:22	2020-03-02 15:40:39
Yes	I am teacher and was aware of the change and have learnt recently about the specific changes proposed.	Strongly disagree	My particular objection or strong disagreement is about the inclusion of media studies in a general social studies standard. My reasons for the objections are in question 3.	I disagree strongly that media studies be included in the social studies standards. 1. Media studies and media literacy is an area of huge growth and importance today. The issues of misinformation, discerning fact from fiction, and making critical judgements are very significant in today's world. The digital revolution (the next revolution after the industrial revolution) has pushed media studies into the forefront of relevance and importance as deal with critical media literacy. 2. Career pathways are growing in the media and across most industries or sectors. 3. The soft skills in the group work of the productions are what employers and the modern vocational world are after. Media offers students opportunities to learn about and practice these skills. 4. At level one, the foundational skills of the media studies are important for those who wish to study the subject further. It is a challenge to take up L2 media without the skills of analysis, production, media terminology and so on. 5. The subject allows for students to follow their passions and attracts students from priority learners to extension students. It helps retain and keep students at school. 6. It is important to keep the production standard		No			2020-03-02 15:45:11	ANON-YFPW-RW77-T	2020-03-02 15:45:11	2020-03-02 15:45:24
Yes		Disagree	While I support reducing the credit gathering at level 1 I am concerned at the siloed view of subject and learning areas that seems to be occurring. For example, it does seem ridiculous that a level 1 student is entered into over 100 credits at the start of a given year and it would be far better for them to focus on quality over quantity. However, it seems this focus could be achieved with stronger guidelines around the number of credits offered in school programmes rather than collapsing whole learning areas. For example, a given level 1 programme guideline might suggest a total of between 24 and 36 credits and a Visual Arts programme within that framework might offer one art history standard along with one Visual Arts standard? But if whole subjects are gone, this flexibility to develop learning programmes that are tailored to a given community is dramatically reduced.	I think it is short-sighted to treat subjects in silos, it misses the point that some subjects such as Visual Arts and Art History can work together.		No			2020-03-02 15:57:18	ANON-YFPW-RW73-S	2020-03-02 15:57:18	2020-03-02 15:57:23
No		Agree				No			2020-03-02 16:04:32	ANON-YFPW-RW72-R	2020-03-02 16:04:32	2020-03-02 16:04:44
Yes	As part of a Languages Learning Area, the teachers come from all around the world. In many of their countries, it is the norm to have broader subjects up until Year 12. Having spoken with the teachers in the LA, we are strongly in support of this.	Agree			No thank you	Yes	However, not in detail.	No	2020-03-02 16:22:09	ANON-YFPW-RW7U-U	2020-03-02 16:22:09	2020-03-02 16:22:22
No		Strongly disagree	There needs to be content in biology, chemistry and physics not just 'science'.	Keep options for biology, chemistry and physics. Students need the content base from each of the disciplines.		Yes			2020-03-02 16:23:08	ANON-YFPW-RWHY-G	2020-03-02 16:22:29	2020-03-02 16:23:10

No	I was aware that changes to NCEA L1 is likely but I was not aware of the nature of those changes or that the vision is to be changed.	Undecided	I do not see how a "broader, foundational NCEA L1 " is going to be achieved by cutting out Classical studies or Art History, the two foundational subjects that underpin our Western culture and so pivotal in introducing young people to the part of their cultural history that enabled today's societies. NZ is a multicultural country and if we cater for all NZ-ers, then apart from Maori and Pacifica focus, we must safe guard the western/pakeha cultural roots, too. Not to mention, that archetypal lessons that art history and Classical Studies bring into our common human conscience. I also do not see how diluting physics, chemistry and earth space sciences will provide the kind of foundations that later (L2/L3) "specialisation" will need. Instead of amalgamating them, the solution should be to separate them at L1 into their individual fields and each field given appropriate lesson time to be taught by specialised teachers.	see above	That depends what you mean by the word "development". If "development" means to "amalgamate" and re-structure or re-brand with new umbrella name, then no, I do not wish to see them to be considered for further "development".	No	I don't speak Maori and I am not in a maori full immersion school. (i.e.: I am not required to teach my subject fully in maori)		2020-03-02 16:41:58	ANON-YFPW-RWHV-D	2020-03-02 16:41:58	2020-03-02 16:42:14
Yes		Undecided	Some strongly disagree - but some liked cutting some more specialised subjects at Level 1. Some disparity across subjects eg Science from 5 to 1 , others still kept the same number of different subjects mostly eg Social Science still has History/ Geography. Some concern that content lost (especially for Physics, Chemistry, Maths...) - stop students ability to achieve and the effect on learning at Level 2.	Loss of different subjects at Level 1 in Science - Physics/ Chemistry / Biology means there is loss of flexibility and a concern that the way Science will be taught across different schools will be huge. Computer Science is explicit in the curriculum - Yrs 1-10 but put with Digital Tech in Yr 11 and lost as a stand alone subject.	Electronics Tourism	No			2020-03-02 16:52:21	ANON-YFPW-RWHC-T	2020-03-02 16:52:21	2020-03-02 16:52:56
Yes		Agree				Yes			2020-03-02 16:59:58	ANON-YFPW-RWH5-A	2020-03-02 16:59:58	2020-03-02 17:00:54
Yes	It is critical to understand that a 'broad, foundational' qualification does not mean the same thing as a 'generic' one. While I support the idea of a broad qualification, this means ensuring that students have access to the characteristic nature of different disciplines at this level, rather than concentrating on generic skills that attempt to synthesise different disciplines in them. Such an approach misunderstands how people learn, and that ways of understanding the world, expressing this understanding, and producing new knowledge are fundamentally different in different subjects and can not usually be reduced to generic skills. The draft science standards are a case in point. I support a broad, general, concept-rich level 1 science course being on offer to all students, but with standards that include the ideas of science ('content') as well as ideas about science ('nature of science'). I worry that genericised social science and commerce courses will do the same thing to classics, media studies and economics as the genericised science course will do to chemistry, physics, biology and earth and space science: that is, they will remove the most powerful learning and force some disciplines into the background as the subjects that are merged are too disparate to work when combined into a set of generic performance indicators. The Review has missed an opportunity	Strongly disagree	Secondary school students in New Zealand are not disadvantaged by taking a semi-specialised academic programme including subjects such as chemistry, economics or media studies. The equity issue lies in students being inappropriately directed into non-academic pathways with few higher-level options too early in their schooling. In addition, although I am a science teacher, I object to the removal of Latin as an option for New Zealand students. There is no reason why the option should be available to students, even if small numbers are taking it. Frankly, I believe that the whittling down of subject options at Level 1 is not within the mandate of creating a broad qualification, and not what the sector had in mind for this part of the review. It is a solution in search of a problem. A much better way of ensuring broad learning would be to require the achieving of a certain number of credits from the English, Mathematics, Science and Social Sciences domains before an NCEA Level 1 certificate can be awarded.		The development of more foreign language courses would be of benefit.	No			2020-03-02 17:34:39	ANON-YFPW-RWH9-G	2020-03-02 17:34:39	2020-03-02 17:34:47
Yes	We were given the impression that the Achievement Standards would be broadened and workload for teachers decreased. I support the rejigging of the standards and the decreased numbers of them. I also support the broadening of said standards. However, I did not realise that this meant disestablishing subjects such as Latin or merging disparate subjects such as Psychology, Social Studies and Media Studies. I am absolutely opposed to the changes being made to the subjects on offer at Level One.	Strongly disagree	The disestablishing of subjects such as Latin or merging disparate subjects such as Psychology, Social Studies and Media Studies shows a fundamental misunderstanding of how these subjects are implemented, timetabled and taught in schools across NZ. Psych can be taught in Science. Media Studies is often taught as an English subject by English teachers and Social Studies is often taught in SOS departments. These subjects cannot be merged together in a way that is meaningful and goes against your aim of creating coherent and robust pathways into NCEA Level 2 and further study or training. If the aim is to "broaden" Level One you have achieved the opposite, by narrowing subject choices and creating a hierarchy of subjects in the Social Science department. Why is it that Geography is considered broader than Psychology? Why is the importance of Media Studies being decreased in a day and age where the impact of the media (on elections, on body image etc.) is becoming clearer by the day? If your aim is to support the inclusion of important and rich learning from the National Curriculum you are missing the mark. There is little to no overlap between Social Studies, Psychology and Media Studies. The fact that the working group believes you can merge these subjects together suggests that there is no Media Studies, Social Studies or Psychology teachers on the panel and that you are	I also have issues with the fact that you are dropping Latin as a subject at all levels of NCEA and merging Classical Studies with History at Level One. This means that Classics will not be taught at all at Level One as most schools will just adapt existing topics to new standards. It also removes the option of adding in at Level 1 completely. By dropping these subjects at Level 1 or all together you are not supporting the inclusion of important and rich learning from the National Curriculum and you are removing robust pathways into NCEA Level 2 and further study. It also undermines the integrity of NCEA and raises questions of the credibility of NCEA as a qualification overall, especially as an internationally recognised qualification. If these changes go through more schools will drop NCEA and pick up either IB or Cambridge International. What is the point of having a National Curriculum if schools refuse to teach it? You could potentially end up creating a inequitable divide in schools across the country as high decile schools abandon NCEA because of these changes and lean toward international qualifications and lower decile schools get stuck with a supposedly broader but overall weaker qualification therefore cementing the educational divide that often falls along ethnic and socio-economic lines. This does not support the Crown's	I think that Sociology as a subject separate from Social Studies could be an interesting subject at the senior levels of SOS. I also like the idea of Politics or Ethics or Philosophy being taught at those Senior levels.	Yes	I am aware of it from my time teaching in Gisborne.	I don't feel like it's my place to respond to this as I do not work at a Maori Medium school; however, I think some of the ideas would be good to put into mainstream NCEA.	2020-03-02 17:52:07	ANON-YFPW-RWHJ-1	2020-03-02 17:52:07	2020-03-02 17:52:23

Yes		Agree	I think the name Food Science lifts the subject, it's modern and yet can still encompass the health promotion/nutrition as well as the processing/technology aspects of this amazing subject!			No			2020-03-02 17:58:33	ANON-YFPW-RWHG-X	2020-03-02 17:51:55	2020-03-02 17:58:41
No		Strongly disagree	The changes are decidedly unadvised and present further evidence as to the undermining and devaluing of the Arts as a career path. Stop pushing children into STEM!!!!!!	Taking classical studies off the curriculum is not a good idea. Have you considered how this will affect those who have already chosen to proceed with this as a career path? Classics is a valuable thing to learn. It gives insights to both the past and future. In short, put Classical Studies back into the curriculum. Please. I have a BA in this. I wouldn't have one otherwise!	CLASSICAL STUDIES!!!!!!!!!!	No			2020-03-02 18:47:07	ANON-YFPW-RWHQ-8	2020-03-02 18:47:07	2020-03-02 18:47:18
Yes		Undecided		Where does Gateway fit at level 1	What is happening with Gateway	No			2020-03-02 18:50:47	ANON-YFPW-RWHE-V	2020-03-02 18:50:47	2020-03-02 18:51:34
No		Strongly disagree			Latin	No		no	2020-03-02 19:16:43	ANON-YFPW-RWHP-7	2020-03-02 19:16:32	2020-03-02 19:17:06
Yes		Strongly agree				Yes			2020-03-02 20:03:33	ANON-YFPW-RWH7-E	2020-03-02 20:03:33	2020-03-02 20:03:39
Yes		Strongly disagree	As a Science teacher and a parent I am strongly opposed to the large reduction of Level 1 Science subjects. I understand the idea behind more specialisation at Level 2 and 3 but the students are going to enter those subjects with very low level of knowledge, making these challenging subjects even more difficult for them.	Level 1 Biology, Chemistry and Physics still need to be included for students intending to study multiple Science subjects in Levels 2 and 3 and more on to further study in these fields. Four broad internal assessments at Level 1 is nowhere near enough preparation to take all 3 of the Science subjects at Level 2 and will cause of lot of issues for students that attempt this. This will discourage many students continuing with studying these fields long term.	Human Biology at Level 2 and 3 as the current standards, particularly at Level 2, focus on Cells and Genetics.	No			2020-03-02 20:15:53	ANON-YFPW-RWHF-W	2020-03-02 20:15:53	2020-03-02 20:16:04
Yes		Undecided		As a teacher of PE and Health I see both beneficial and Detrimental effects of merging Health and PE at level 1...some standards cross over and opportunities to merge the assessments from both subjects, work well e.g the interpersonal skills standard (1.5 - PE and 1.4 - Health). Others not so much. In our school decile 8 coed, we get very different clientele for each subject, PE typically attracts a student who likes the practical/performance based nature of the subject where our L1 health Tends to attract students who have a strong interest in health promotion/advocacy in and around the mental health field. In many cases these students tend to not pick PE as a subject. I do worry that by merging the two it may not suite our 'typical' health student. However, I don't see there being a dramatic effect on our 'typical' PE student. In short I think our passionate/motivated health students may miss out and get off by the practical nature of health and PE if it were to merge. I also fear students may not gain enough prior learning from a level 1 merge of the two subjects to foster achievement at level 2 and 3 health.		No			2020-03-02 20:46:56	ANON-YFPW-RWH1-8	2020-03-02 20:46:56	2020-03-02 20:47:42
Yes		Undecided		Media Studies is a popular and successful subject from level 1, removing subjects like Media Studies narrows students options.	Psychology Separate Health	Yes		No	2020-03-02 21:21:58	ANON-YFPW-RWHZ-H	2020-03-02 21:21:58	2020-03-02 21:22:17
No		Strongly disagree	The foundation of western culture and civilisation is both Greco-Roman and Judeo-Christian. Christianity itself was shaped in the intellectual and social environment of the Classical World. To cut Classics out of the curriculum is to deprive young people from insights into their heritage.. This includes not only what we are rightly proud of (citizenship, democracy, state of law...) but also the dark sides of how many people unwittingly and unknowingly impose prejudices on the world in which they engage: hierarchy between civilisations, gender, races; instrumentalism towards other human beings (the heritage of slavery) and nature. Latin the common root of many modern languages. It was the intellectual and cultural language for nearly two millennia. We don't need millions of people talking Latin to each other. We do need a wide-spread awareness of these linguistic and intellectual roots of our languages, literature and culture.		Classics, Latin and Greek (see above)	No		no	2020-03-02 21:53:04	ANON-YFPW-RWHB-S	2020-03-02 21:53:04	2020-03-02 21:53:16
No		Strongly disagree	The past is future-oriented and holds problem-solving capacities, at highly underestimated potentials of social relevance. Seemingly small change, as here scheduled for the education on Latin, threaten to close much more doors in this respect, than possibly anticipated.			No			2020-03-02 22:09:57	ANON-YFPW-RWHM-4	2020-03-02 22:09:57	2020-03-02 22:10:19

Yes		Strongly agree			Philosophy	No			2020-03-02 22:11:22	ANON-YFPW-RWHD-U	2020-03-02 22:11:22	2020-03-02 22:11:34
Yes		Strongly disagree	I was extremely disturbed that Latin and Classics were excluded from the curriculum	Latin and Classics are an important part of the secondary school curriculum and should be included. New Zealand has a strong international academic reputation in these fields. Stopping the subjects at secondary school level will seriously damage this academic strength. Moreover, the study of classics functions as important background knowledge to link several of the other subjects in the curriculum.		No			2020-03-02 22:11:47	ANON-YFPW-RWHX-F	2020-03-02 22:11:47	2020-03-02 22:11:56
Yes		Strongly disagree	Keep Latin, Classics, and Psychology at level one!!!! They're not going to be properly integrated into history and social studies, and lots of students who would be taking them will be less likely to. Latin is incredibly useful as a root for learning other languages and as an aid in English. (being the source for around half the words of English as well as the Italian, French, Spanish and other 'romance' languages'; it also helps improve one's literary skills, something vital for all students). Classics is also a very important subject that should remain; it teaches students not only the historical but also the huge cultural impact that ancient civilizations still have on our society today. Classics was one of my favourite subjects when I was at school just a few years ago and has had a profound impact on my life (as a Philosophy and Psychology student, my knowledge of Classics and Classical philosophy and reasoning has been more helpful than perhaps any other subject I took at school). There is also still a high demand for Classics (which will likely only rise in the coming years due to the increase in Classics in pop culture, e.g. the Percy Jackson books). To phase out Classics would be not only impractical but irresponsible, especially given the artistic impact that Classics has had on New Zealand art and Culture	Keep Latin, Classics, and Psychology at level one!!!! They're not going to be properly integrated into history and social studies, and lots of students who would be taking them will be less likely to. Latin is incredibly useful as a root for learning other languages and as an aid in English. (being the source for around half the words of English as well as the Italian, French, Spanish and other 'romance' languages'; it also helps improve one's literary skills, something vital for all students). Classics is also a very important subject that should remain; it teaches students not only the historical but also the huge cultural impact that ancient civilizations still have on our society today. Classics was one of my favourite subjects when I was at school just a few years ago and has had a profound impact on my life (as a Philosophy and Psychology student, my knowledge of Classics and Classical philosophy and reasoning has been more helpful than perhaps any other subject I took at school). There is also still a high demand for Classics (which will likely only rise in the coming years due to the increase in Classics in pop culture, e.g. the Percy Jackson books). To phase out Classics would be not only impractical but irresponsible, especially given the artistic impact that Classics has had on New Zealand art and Culture	Philosophy! It teaches students to think for themselves and make more informed choices in every aspect of their lives, as well as helping students become better people. https://yp.scmp.com/over-to-you/open/article/110525/how-philosophy-and-ethics-can-make-you-better-student-and-person Also, having the aforementioned psychology class (with more of a focus on dealing with mental health issues such as anxiety and depression in a healthy way) would be wonderful.	No			2020-03-02 22:34:23	ANON-YFPW-RWHN-5	2020-03-02 22:34:23	2020-03-02 22:34:41
Yes		Agree	Looks good, but would like more clarity around the Technology subjects. What are the new Technology subjects?	As above, re Technology subjects.		No			2020-03-02 22:40:52	ANON-YFPW-RWHK-2	2020-03-02 22:40:52	2020-03-02 22:43:33
No		Disagree		Latin, Classical studies and Art History are key subjects for students intending to follow a university career in History or, of course, Classical Studies. These subjects are also very important in teaching the students about ethics and morals through the study of ancient philosophers. The key concepts of Classical Studies and Art History are also very important in understanding concepts of later History. Overall these are very important parts of the secondary school curriculum for students all around the world.		No			2020-03-02 22:54:13	ANON-YFPW-RWH6-D	2020-03-02 22:54:13	2020-03-02 22:54:39
No	I cannot consider it an improvement, rather an impoverishment	Strongly disagree				No			2020-03-02 22:55:21	ANON-YFPW-RWHR-9	2020-03-02 22:55:21	2020-03-02 22:55:34
Yes		Strongly disagree	The current subject list ensures students have the opportunity to choose a variety of subjects based on their strengths and interests. This better supports students in their learning from fostering their on-going engagement to deepen their knowledge and skills. For some students, NCEA Level 1 will be their highest qualification that they will gain in their life-time. The current subject list for this level recognises and values a student's particular strengths and interests. It is then also clear for employers what the knowledge and skills actually are of job applicants. This is as opposed to an employer seeing a 'qualification' that just states a pass gained, for example, in 'Science' rather than defining the depth of knowledge and skill the job applicant has within this subject.	The subject list proposed, such as 'Science' and also 'Commerce' are too broad in their content and will not support students in their depth of knowledge and understanding.		Yes		In recognising and valuing Te Tiriti o Waitangi, please consult local iwi and hapu, and of course our Maori students.	2020-03-02 23:47:19	ANON-YFPW-RWH4-B	2020-03-02 23:47:19	2020-03-02 23:47:43
Yes		Strongly disagree		LATIN should not be abolished, as a crucial matter for civilization!		No			2020-03-03 01:04:50	ANON-YFPW-RWHT-B	2020-03-03 01:04:49	2020-03-03 01:05:18
Yes		Strongly agree				No			2020-03-03 03:14:09	ANON-YFPW-RWH3-A	2020-03-03 03:14:09	2020-03-03 03:14:13

No	There should be a choice at schools to offer a foundational subject and the standard science that provides greater content knowledge for those that want to pursue Science in senior years and at University.	Disagree		There should be a choice at schools to offer a foundational subject and the standard science that provides greater content knowledge for those that want to pursue Science in senior years and at University. There is no clear guideline of what this lumping of the Sciences would look like in terms of assessment or portfolio. There has been no consultation or information given as to how this course at level 3 would then prepare students for level 2 and 3. Level 3 is supposed to set students up with foundational knowledge and content that then leads on to level 2 and builds upon that knowledge. There has not been information given that suggests that this would do the same.		No			2020-03-03 06:32:12	ANON-YFPW-RWH2-9	2020-03-03 06:32:12	2020-03-03 06:32:32
No		Strongly agree		No	Sociology	No			2020-03-03 06:41:51	ANON-YFPW-RWHU-C	2020-03-03 06:41:51	2020-03-03 06:42:01
Yes		Agree			Out door education	No			2020-03-03 06:45:13	ANON-YFPW-RW4V-V	2020-03-03 06:45:13	2020-03-03 06:45:34
Yes		Strongly agree		I believe the decision about Science is a positive one. Teachers and students will be able to engage in rich learning opportunities, but will not be driven by assessment. Within our school Science is an area that is hugely over-assessed at present - teaching staff and students seem to have lost their passion for the magic of Science, focusing on assessment and credits, credits, credits rather than having fun and learning cool stuff.		Yes			2020-03-03 08:35:25	ANON-YFPW-RW4C-6	2020-03-03 08:35:25	2020-03-03 08:35:32
No	I had heard some talk of this but until I saw this table I had not realised the likely implications on the continuation of existing subjects or our ability to create local curriculum.	Strongly disagree	We are offering local curriculum as well as traditional subjects. If we have this narrow range of traditional subjects at Level 1 and there are only 4 standards at each, as suggested in models sent our earlier, then we could no longer offer our local curriculum. Whilst we could continue to offer courses such as Te Ao Maori and Measina Pasifika out of two or three of those subjects, we could then no longer offer the subjects themselves. For example, if a student takes Te Ao Maori which has Social Studies, Te Roa Maori and Maori Performing Arts internals, how would they then also take those as subjects? This is cutting down akonga Maori ability to learn as Maori within school to an unacceptable degree.	I think we need to keep a wider range of subjects and a wider range of standards within subjects to allow for local curriculum and student interest in courses. This seems to be a return to an old 'core curriculum' or more traditional subjects that we put all students through as if they had the same interests and needs. We were not consulted on a narrowing of the curriculum before now and have not had the opportunity to look at this as an overall issue, rather than arguing over particular subjects which is what the wording of this question suggests we should be doing.	Pacific Studies Further Pacific Languages	No			2020-03-03 08:48:50	ANON-YFPW-RW4S-P	2020-03-03 08:48:50	2020-03-03 08:49:00
No	I was just informed by the School this week	Disagree	see below comments in Q3	Science - Level 1 Physical Science & Level 1 Biological Science. these current subjects contain more challenging Achievement Standards in Biology, Chemistry and Physics to prepare the students for Level 2 Biology, Chemistry, and Physics. A general Science paper as a change is not going to prepare my child to challenging stuff when she moves on to Level 2. Commerce - Economics not to be offered at Level 1 - instead a general Commerce paper. Again I feel this is not offering enough to challenge my child, to prepare her for Level 2 Economics and Accounting. Technology - Food Processing Technology will be changed to Food Science and be under Health & Physical Education. This changes the emphasis and will affect preparation for Level 2 Food Processing Technology. Again I am not happy about this. Media Studies - Level 1 not to be offered. but		No			2020-03-03 08:50:14	ANON-YFPW-RW48-U	2020-03-03 08:50:14	2020-03-03 08:50:30
Yes	I have read the documents about the proposed changes. I do not think combining all commerce subjects at level one will allow for greater specialisation as students will not go into level two with the same base knowledge.	Strongly disagree	Would mean unspecialised teacher may teach content less familiar with for instance accounting if Economic or Business teacher. Will mean students are less prepared for level two content as only have 1 standard in the discipline.	Combining all 3 commerce subjects will create less prepared students. These changes do not even include adding financial literacy which isn't directly taught in any of the subject areas. Financial independence skills are becoming increasingly important. I would prefer more ability to teach different standards within the subject than combining all 3 areas, which allows staff to create a more engaging course that suits the learners we have.	No.	No			2020-03-03 08:51:24	ANON-YFPW-RW49-V	2020-03-03 08:51:24	2020-03-03 08:51:41
No		Strongly disagree		Please do keep Latin classes! Latin gives access to a real understanding not only of European roots, but also to a profound knowledge of English language and literature.		No			2020-03-03 09:51:02	ANON-YFPW-RW4G-A	2020-03-03 09:51:02	2020-03-03 09:51:14

Yes		Disagree	I don't think Health and Physical Education standards should be put together in one as I believe students enjoy the practical nature of the subject will pick PE and those that prefer more discussion based topics will pick health as may have the interest but no desire for the practical element.	I believe having Health and PE as separate.	Keep Health and PE as separate subjects	Yes		No	2020-03-03 09:55:07	ANON-YFPW-RW4J-D	2020-03-03 09:55:07	2020-03-03 09:55:17	
Yes		Strongly disagree		I oppose the planned elimination of Latin at all NCEA Levels and of Classical Studies at NCEA Level 1. New Zealand has a long history of "punching above its weight" in Classical Studies. We have produced more internationally recognized classicists per capita than any other nation. This is largely due to the strong tradition of Classical Studies, and particularly Latin, in the New Zealand secondary school curriculum. The elimination of Latin entirely from the national qualifications system and the removal of Classical Studies at NCEA Level 1 jeopardizes that tradition. These changes are also inconsistent with the Ministry's stated objectives. The elimination of Latin from NCEA is ill advised. While I can appreciate that the calculus of cultural importance, practical value, and student numbers is complex, I fear that it is not being applied consistently. The elimination of only Latin also leaves the Ministry open to accusations of cynical pandering. For example, although the student numbers for Korean are comparable (and indeed lower) than those for Latin, the Ministry proposes retaining Korean as a subject at all NCEA levels. Korean is offered as a subject at fewer schools than Latin (and not always consistently: of the eleven schools with students taking Korean in			Yes		None	2020-03-03 10:32:50	ANON-YFPW-RW4Q-M	2020-03-03 10:32:50	2020-03-03 10:33:04
No	not until the schools and subject associations told us. there was no apparent consultation in 2019	Strongly disagree	the philosophy of a broad foundational education at Level one is admirable. but the proposed changes, particularly in Science are not going to achieve this. the standards in Science whilst NOS based do not give the hard based science knowledge to ensure the foundation education that is needed for promoting greater specialisation. the loss of earth space sciences is not covered in the new matrix	how can we ensure students who are wanting an academic pathway will have the science knowledge needed to understand or develop a passion for science with the proposed standards. I can imagine that Universities will be developing their own entrance exams. How can we also provide pathways for students wanting a horticultural or technology or apprenticeship farming pathway. the old obsolete unit standards allowed for some flexibility to appeal to student interest and pathway; like the one on the car, or sports science. these options are now all gone replaced by literacy heavy assessments	marine science ,horticulture and farming, forestry, human biology	No			2020-03-03 10:33:04	ANON-YFPW-RW4E-8	2020-03-03 10:33:04	2020-03-03 10:33:22	
Yes	Yes - so it is hard to fathom how the Provisional List of L1 subjects supports that. Only Science and Social Sciences have had any "collapsing" at all with the number of subjects halved in Soc Sc and reduced by 80% in Science. There are still 10 language options and 5 Arts but only one option in science so students could easily choose a course of Eng, 2 Lang + 2 Arts which is hardly a general course but a student who may want to choose 2 Sc subjects is out of luck. This seems inequitable. The issue with science is amplified because the only subject available is actually the Nature of Science which does not cover 80% of the curriculum outcomes and so can hardly be considered to be a "General Science" course.	Strongly disagree	Having only one Science subject available (compared to the original 5 subjects) disenfranchises a large number of students who may already be considering specialising in Separate Sciences in L2 and 3. Even with the existing Science courses based on a selection of ALL of the curriculum outcomes including appropriate knowledge and understanding, most students find it a very big jump to transition to L2 Physics and Chemistry in particular. Going from a L1 qualification based solely on NoS outcomes will make this jump impossible for many and will lead to decreased uptake of Science subjects and increased drop out rates in the later years.	Currently the only Science standards being proposed only cover the NoS strand of the curriculum and the other 4 strands concerning knowledge and understanding in the Physical, Material, Living and ESS worlds are totally ignored. This would be the first and only qualification anywhere in the world that did not mention "conceptual understanding" as an expected outcome. A possible solution is to retain the existing 4 standards but as a subject called Nature of Science. Then introduce two new subjects called Physical Sciences and Natural Sciences which would still mean a reduction in Science subjects of 40% which is still a lot more than the other curriculum areas. Each of these subjects would have 4 standards (2 internal and 2 external) with the first having two standards each assigned to Physics and Chemistry respectively and the latter having the same split between Biology and ESS. This would allow schools and students to select a balanced, general science course that meant their particular needs. Students not intending to progress in Science could focus on NoS outcomes to help prepare them to be scientifically literate citizens whereas those intending to specialise later could be offered a course with a mix of subjects chosen from the full range of 5 curriculum	As we don't yet know which subjects are being proposed for L2 and L3 its a little bit hard to respond to this. But assuming the status quo remains and we still have separate Physics, Chemistry, Biology, ESS, (Psychology?) subjects available then to be consistent with L1 (which according to the curriculum is essentially unchanged) perhaps we should have a Nature of Science subject at these levels two. This would provide options for students who wish to retain a general interest in science but don't wish to specialise. It would also hopefully allow schools to introduce composite science courses such as Environmental science, Climate science etc.	Yes	I know it exists and have read it but do not use it on an ongoing or regular basis.	Not my area of expertise sorry.	2020-03-03 10:40:57	ANON-YFPW-RW45-R	2020-03-03 10:40:57	2020-03-03 10:41:14	
Yes		Undecided	Food science as a title for food subjects may possibly put potential students off as they may not like science and like them together rightly or wrongly. Many of our food students may feel this way. How will hospitality subjects fit into the scheme, under a trades style?			No			2020-03-03 11:18:43	ANON-YFPW-RW47-T	2020-03-03 11:18:43	2020-03-03 11:18:51	
Yes		Undecided				No			2020-03-03 11:19:24	ANON-YFPW-RW4F-9	2020-03-03 11:19:24	2020-03-03 11:19:37	

Yes		Agree		<p>Suggestion related to Technology. Currently there are three subjects in the proposed subject list that fall under technology: DVC, Digital Technology and Materials Technology.</p> <p>The NZ Curriculum document shows five technological areas: Materials Outcomes, Processed Outcomes, DVC, Computational Thinking and Digital Outcomes. Each technological area has been carefully formed to include skills and concepts that when taken together constitute a body of knowledge in technology. The three stands of Technological Practice, Technological Knowledge and Nature of Technology underpin all five of these areas.</p> <p>I suggest that to match the NZC and the intent of the technology curriculum that the proposed subject list include subjects reflecting each of the five Technological Areas.</p>	<p>Thinking further about 'digital technologies'. The progress outcomes for Designing and Developing Digital Outcomes and Computational Thinking for Digital Technologies are not closely related.</p> <p>The knowledge and skills in these two Technological Areas is distinct and in practice (across NZ currently) students have the opportunity to learn in either or both areas.: schools currently teach subjects related exclusively to 'Designing and Developing Digital Outcomes' or 'Computational Thinking for Digital Technologies'. It is my opinion that making Digital Technologies a single subject (and consequently restricting the standards offered for assessment in these two Areas) will not benefit students.</p> <p>I suggest having a subject related to Designing and Developing Digital Outcomes and a separate subject related to Computational Thinking for Digital Technologies available at Level 1.</p>	No			2020-03-03 11:28:22	ANON-YFPW-RW41-M	2020-03-03 11:28:22	2020-03-03 11:28:38
Yes	I think it's a great idea - it keeps pathways open for kids for a longer amount of time. Beginning to specialise at 15 makes no sense.	Strongly agree		<p>Considering Latin has such a small intake already and still requires the same amount of work to implement, removing Latin makes a lot of sense for me.</p> <p>It is increasingly less relevant in the modern and multicultural country we live in where we should be focusing on growing our students as bilingual English/Te reo Māori speakers and encourage picking up third languages that can actually be used in conversation.</p>		No			2020-03-03 11:49:04	ANON-YFPW-RW4H-B	2020-03-03 11:49:04	2020-03-03 11:49:11
Yes		Strongly disagree		<p>Room needs to be made in the Science curriculum at Level 1 for those students intending to go onto senior specialist subjects in Science, particularly those intending to study Senior Physics or Chemistry. Without the opportunity for students to learn and practise the foundational knowledge and skills provided by standards such as Sci 1.1 Mechanics and Sci 1.5 Acids and Bases, not only will the students be disadvantaged when doing Level 2 specialist Science courses, but the level of progress in general will be set back (They generally find it challenging already!). Likewise getting student to a Level 3 standard in such subjects will be much harder. We will probably find that less students will opt to take such L2 and L3 courses at high school. Ultimately, we run the risk of more students coming out of high school who are not adequately prepared for university study in such subjects. In competitive courses such as Health Science, they will be at a distinct disadvantage compared to those who have been through alternative assessment systems such as Cambridge. Please keep subject-specialist standards in Level 1 Science!</p>		No			2020-03-03 11:49:00	ANON-YFPW-RW4Z-W	2020-03-03 11:49:00	2020-03-03 11:49:26
Yes		Undecided			<p>More appropriate work experience that could lead into vocational pathways. Cater to the rangatahi with realistic specialties and careers within the area in which they live</p>	No			2020-03-03 12:05:44	ANON-YFPW-RW4B-S	2020-03-03 12:05:44	2020-03-03 12:06:09
Yes		Disagree	<p>It seems that you're advocating for less knowledge rather than more at Level 1 and then at Level 2 you're introducing a massive amount of learning...</p>	<p>Physical Education and Health should be separate - they don't seem to overlap at Level 1 and both subjects are important FOR LIFE! Everyone must look after their wellbeing!</p>	n/a	No		n/a	2020-03-03 12:50:56	ANON-YFPW-RW4M-G	2020-03-03 12:50:56	2020-03-03 12:51:05
No		Disagree	<p>The depth of Classical Studies would be totally lost if it was going to come under history as a Level 1 History Topic. It would not allow students to fully realise whether or not they have a passion for that particular subject and would not harness their passion if they were to find one.</p>	<p>Keep Classical Studies as a separate topic.</p>		No			2020-03-03 12:56:28	ANON-YFPW-RW4D-7	2020-03-03 12:56:28	2020-03-03 12:56:36
Yes		Disagree	<p>Many General Science courses included a mixture of standards from different disciplines. The ability to design a level 1 course that best suits the students has been taken away.</p>		<p>I would like to see all of the Sciences remain.</p>	Yes			2020-03-03 12:58:52	ANON-YFPW-RW4X-U	2020-03-03 12:58:52	2020-03-03 12:59:13
Yes		Agree				No	<p>What do you mean by familiar? I know of it, but I am not familiar with it</p>		2020-03-03 13:01:25	ANON-YFPW-RW4A-4	2020-03-03 13:01:25	2020-03-03 13:01:35

No		Agree		Tokelau and Vagahau Niue are not on this list of proposed NCEA L1 subjects. Tokelau and Niue are realm nations of NZ and students of these cultures should see themselves reflected in the NCEA curriculum. Students of Tokelau and Niuean descent (from diverse backgrounds) also need an NCEA Pathway option for their languages which is not currently available.	see question 3	No				2020-03-03 13:03:51	ANON-YFPW-RW4N-H	2020-03-03 13:03:51	2020-03-03 13:04:06
Yes	This has been well communicated and the intentions made were clearly signalled.	Strongly disagree	I strongly disagree that you can combine Media Studies into a Social Science 'context' and still expect this subject to be taught well. There are experts in subjects and this proposal diminishes the expertise in schools. Media Studies is one of the most valuable subjects or teenagers, especially at Level 1 as it teaches adolescents how to critically engage with media and to be aware of biases, manipulation and the effect media has on our lives.	I think you should maintain Media Studies as a distinct subject, in addition to social science. Media Studies is one of the most valuable subjects or teenagers, especially at Level 1 as it teaches adolescents how to critically engage with media and to be aware of biases, manipulation and the effect media has on our lives.		Yes	I am, and I notice there are significant differences between the two documents.			2020-03-03 13:28:33 2020-03-03 13:36:20	ANON-YFPW-RW4K-E ANON-YFPW-RW46-S	2020-03-03 13:28:33 2020-03-03 13:36:20	2020-03-03 13:28:43 2020-03-03 13:36:32
No		Strongly disagree				No				2020-03-03 14:07:51	ANON-YFPW-RW4R-N	2020-03-03 14:07:51	2020-03-03 14:08:04
Yes		Strongly disagree		It seems that many subjects that are really important to the young people of NZ today are being folded into broader overall subjects. I'm a Media Studies teacher and I strongly oppose L1 Media being folded into Social Studies. While there is a small scope for crossover in one or two areas (such as the Representation internal assessment), it will mean that students do not get the introduction to the basic skills of planning and production that are needed to ensure that they develop sufficiently for L2 and 3, as Social Studies teachers do not have a Media background, and Media teachers don't have a social studies background in many cases. There will also be a lack of opportunity to introduce and develop their understanding of various media concepts, which are very different from social studies concepts. It's disadvantaging the students. I also do not feel that Classical Studies gels well with being a part of the history curriculum, and I disagree with all the different sciences becoming 'science' as an overarching subject. Doing that will simply mean that they get a taste of each area, but are lacking in any in-depth curricular knowledge for future years. Why not let them choose? By Year 11 students know which areas of science they prefer, so let them choose the one they want, rather than forcing them to do them		No				2020-03-03 14:10:41	ANON-YFPW-RW44-Q	2020-03-03 14:10:41	2020-03-03 14:10:58
Yes	Awareness of the intended changes did not include the deletion of a key core subject in the area of languages, Latin. Latin has, since the beginning of education been the foundation of learning grammar and a major factor in learning other western languages. To delete such a vital language from the curriculum is appalling.	Strongly disagree	The changes currently proposed either delete or "water down" basic curriculum areas needed for university level education both here in New Zealand and for those who wish to study abroad. Current changes are not in the best interest of students seeking high level education and academic excellence.	Yes, Latin must be returned to the curriculum. It is a vital part of a well rounded education and will assist student in mastering English and other foreign languages. Latin also develops critical thinking skills, linear reasoning, attention to detail, builds vocabulary, assist in understanding grammar in all languages and promotes higher performance in English, maths and sciences.	No, but Latin must be returned to the curriculum and NCEA.	Yes	This curriculum area has been well developed, but is not applicable to all students and is not of critical value outside New Zealand.	No feedback.		2020-03-03 14:10:09	ANON-YFPW-RW4W-T	2020-03-03 14:10:09	2020-03-03 14:11:24
No	I have just received an email from the college informing me of the intended change.	Undecided	I would like to know how we compare to other countries like Europe for example, of how the NZ education system rates. Are we keeping the options too broad for too long? Changes can be made in tertiary education facilities too.	I have a concern that the broader range of subjects under one umbrella may discourage students that may well prefer to focus on areas that they enjoy. ie Science incorporating physics and earth and space science. My daughter has just commenced year 11 and is currently engaged with the current format and enthusiastic to achieve.	no comment at this time point	No		do you mean question 5?		2020-03-03 14:38:57	ANON-YFPW-RW4T-Q	2020-03-03 14:38:57	2020-03-03 14:39:08
Yes		Strongly agree		I am absolutely pleased that Māori Performing Arts has been included and would love to see this carried through in Levels 2 and Levels 3. Could Te Ao Māori also be considered in this?		No				2020-03-03 14:53:26	ANON-YFPW-RW43-P	2020-03-03 14:53:26	2020-03-03 14:53:31

Yes	Only through communication from CETA after the review modifications	Strongly disagree	We believe in a broad range of specialist subjects being on offer at Level 1	Accounting, Economics and Business are very individual and differing subjects. We believe that Accounting and Economics are building block type subjects and need the teaching at Level 1 for students to do well at Level 2. The skills taught at Level 1 underpin the foundation of success in Level 2 and Level 3. As a pathway into future success in Level 3 and Scholarship Accounting and Economics, students require knowledge that is embedded during teaching during Level 1. There is a clear future career pathway in all of these areas and they are INDIVIDUAL at University. It appears that Commerce subjects and Accounting in particular will be a step behind with respect to learning as it not able to accessed at Level 1.		No			2020-03-03 15:32:50	ANON-YFPW-RW42-N	2020-03-03 15:32:50	2020-03-03 15:33:01
No		Strongly disagree		I am very concerned about the many disciplines of science being simplified down to a single subject.		No			2020-03-03 15:38:39	ANON-YFPW-RWQY-S	2020-03-03 15:38:39	2020-03-03 15:38:58
Yes		Strongly disagree	The removal of Latin is clearly designed to remove the subject from the curriculum altogether. The removal of Classical Studies in favour of History also suggests that this subject will be removed in favour of History (with no ancient world aspect) at higher levels.	At this time it is important that New Zealanders should be more, rather than less informed on the cultures that have informed modern society. Language choices should be kept as open as possible, since it is not only the primary usage of a language that may be important, but the adaptability to language acquisition in the future. Here Latin, with its links to a significant proportion of modern languages and its long development in linguistic description, remains important. Classical studies, with its emphasis on areas of philosophical thought, legal development, and literary culture that have deeply influenced modern New Zealand writers, also has an important role to play in the understanding of our national consciousness.		Yes			2020-03-03 15:39:59	ANON-YFPW-RWQV-P	2020-03-03 15:39:32	2020-03-03 15:40:22
Yes		Undecided	As a teacher of Economics I am "undecided" at this point. The ability to see which concepts and content are likely to be retained and in what depth would be crucial to having any firm viewpoint either for or against the proposal in this curriculum area. There are currently 12 achievement standards in both Business Studies and Economics at level 1 - to be refined into 4. These subjects are as different as Drama and Dance, which I note are both being retained in the "broad, more foundational" proposed curriculum.	See above.		No			2020-03-03 15:43:59	ANON-YFPW-RW4U-R	2020-03-03 15:37:13	2020-03-03 15:44:14
No		Strongly disagree				No			2020-03-03 16:55:01	ANON-YFPW-RWQC-3	2020-03-03 16:55:01	2020-03-03 16:55:09
No		Undecided				No			2020-03-03 17:22:21	ANON-YFPW-RWQS-K	2020-03-03 17:22:21	2020-03-03 17:22:46
No		Strongly disagree	I don't support removing specialist science subjects such as physics, chemistry and biology. The new proposed standards at level 1 don't offer the opportunity for students to learn specific content needed for level 2 in these subjects. (In particular for chemistry and physics. Less so for Biology) solution is maintain some subject specific standards at level 1 for chemistry and physics.	See comment on question 2		Yes			2020-03-03 17:22:33	ANON-YFPW-RWQ8-R	2020-03-03 17:22:33	2020-03-03 17:23:22
No		Strongly disagree	Latin is integral for understanding English. Especially since English teaches grammar primarily by osmosis.	Include Latin. See above.	Greek	No			2020-03-03 19:30:30	ANON-YFPW-RWQ9-S	2020-03-03 19:30:30	2020-03-03 19:30:42
Yes		Strongly disagree	There does not seem any valid reason to omit subjects such as Art History and Classics. Indeed it seems very short-sighted and ignorant not to value these for they contribute to a broader understanding of life and culture.	Art History and Classics are both excellent subjects for teaching skills that apply in many areas of life. They are both subjects that are rich in content and contribute to a broad, well-rounded education. What a huge loss it would be to lose these. Please leave them as options for the many people who value them.		No			2020-03-03 19:58:18	ANON-YFPW-RWQ6-7	2020-03-03 19:58:18	2020-03-03 19:58:31
Yes		Disagree	I am concerned that there remains too many subject options available.	I believe it is important to ensure that students are focused on the basic and necessary information for them to learn with options for more specialised study at level 2 and 3. It may be helpful to make certain subjects compulsory for all students or simply to reduce the number of available subjects further in Level 1.	I would advocate for the teaching of Civics and Citizenship (or political studies) as a stand alone subject at Levels 2 and 3. This would allow for some of the more nuanced aspects of social studies to be brought out and developed should students wish to have that as an option.	Yes	No		2020-03-03 19:58:24	ANON-YFPW-RWQJ-A	2020-03-03 19:58:24	2020-03-03 19:58:42
Yes		Strongly disagree		Having taught Classics in NZ, I feel it is an essential subject on the curriculum. It allows NZ to maintain its cultural links and heritage with its European descendants as well as providing context about current "western" societal models. It would be a terrible travesty to remove this experience for your students.		Yes			2020-03-03 20:33:21	ANON-YFPW-RWQK-H	2020-03-03 20:33:21	2020-03-03 20:33:35

Yes	General concept OK BUT some of your subject groupings I disagree with Also need to provide the knowledge base at Level 1 to build on this in Level 2. Danger will be will have to cover too much content at Level 2 and 3 as essential skills and content was 'dropped' at Level 1	Disagree	See below	1. Art History should become part of Visual Arts - supports understanding of craft: if have studied various movements, and can gain greater appreciation of style if understand how it was done, and how it reflects historical context of the time. 2. Classic Studies should not be dropped. It's focus is different - not just history, but religion, art, sociology Students should be allowed the choice Essays and source work give another chance to gain literacy credits 3. Latin should not be dropped - in some schools more popular than languages such as Japanese. 4. Media studies and Psychology very different to Social Studies 5. How is Religious studies any more important than other subjects being dropped. Appear to be pandering to 'religious' schools.		Yes			2020-03-03 20:35:30	ANON-YFPW-RWQE-5	2020-03-03 20:35:30	2020-03-03 20:35:43
Yes		Strongly disagree	No opportunity to make courses suitable for individual needs. Not addressing learning needs of our more able scientists.			No			2020-03-03 20:42:33	ANON-YFPW-RWQ5-N	2020-03-03 20:42:33	2020-03-03 20:42:47
Yes		Strongly disagree	PE and Health at Level 1 should be separate as they are completely different subjects and things to learn in the subject.	Level 1 PE and Health should remain separate at Level 1.	No.	No			2020-03-03 20:44:21	ANON-YFPW-RWQF-G	2020-03-03 20:44:21	2020-03-03 20:44:30
No		Strongly disagree				No			2020-03-03 21:26:05	ANON-YFPW-RWQ7-Q	2020-03-03 21:26:05	2020-03-03 21:26:34
No		Agree				No			2020-03-03 21:40:44	ANON-YFPW-RWQF-6	2020-03-03 21:40:44	2020-03-03 21:40:51
Yes	I am unsure that the collapsing of Media Studies and Psychology into Social Science will help with this 'broad, more foundation' approach, especially as changing face of media in the digital landscape is creating more opportunity for society to create content as well as absorb it. The skills and needs that Media Studies teach as a specialist subject impacts a wide variety of cross curricular subjects.	Strongly disagree	I strongly disagree that Media Studies is collapsed at Level 1.	I think that Media Studies as a subject needs to be retained at level 1.		Yes			2020-03-03 21:54:02	ANON-YFPW-RWQ1-H	2020-03-03 21:43:49	2020-03-03 21:54:10
No		Disagree		- In covering the languages, literature, ideas, history and art of ancient Greece and Rome, Classics is a truly wide-ranging, holistic discipline - it is not just history; it is a liberal education in itself and is an ever evolving discipline. - Knowledge of Latin (and ancient Greek) and the richness of Greek and Roman culture develops skills in intellectual rigour, critical analysis, self-expression and synthesising a diverse range of material – all highly prized qualities in the job market today. - Classical Studies remains a popular subject at schools and universities all across the country; for generations Greco-Roman culture has been and continues to be a source of inspiration to NZ artists, writers and performers. - School students have the opportunity to visit outstanding collections of Greek and Roman artefacts held in NZ galleries and museums that continue to enrich the education of young people all over the country. - Latin is the source for around half the words of English as well as being the mother-tongue of Italian, French, Spanish and other 'romance'		No			2020-03-03 22:46:29	ANON-YFPW-RWQH-8	2020-03-03 22:46:29	2020-03-03 22:46:35
Yes		Agree	I agree as long as there is choice about standards that get to be offered e.g I do not agree if in the level 1 health and pe course health standards must be offered if this does not meet the needs of students.	Health and pe are very different as they are now. Like drama and dance. I do not think they should be one subject UNLESS a standard/s was going to be rewritten to retain the essence of both subjects		No			2020-03-03 22:50:22	ANON-YFPW-RWQB-2	2020-03-03 22:50:22	2020-03-03 22:50:35
Yes		Disagree	I believe Latin and Classics are hugely important to the curriculum.	Latin and Classics are highly enjoyable, employable and strongly admired subjects.		No			2020-03-03 23:28:49	ANON-YFPW-RWQM-D	2020-03-03 23:28:49	2020-03-03 23:29:03
Yes		Agree				No			2020-03-04 06:23:31	ANON-YFPW-RWQD-4	2020-03-04 06:23:31	2020-03-04 06:24:13

Yes	Appears to an economics choice, less on offer = less expense. Some groupings make little sense (especially the social science merger of media studies, psychology, and social studies). There is a logic misstep, read this out aloud, "broad, more foundational education at NCEA Level 1, while subjects at Levels 2 and 3 would promote greater specialisation"... is that not the purpose of year 10 as it currently stands? This appears to undermine student choice, and control over learning. In curtailing and generalising their options it will become more difficult for students to leave school and enter the workforce. NSW Australia did this in the scrapping of the School Certificate (equivalent to year 11 NCEA Level 1) and has only increased its slide down the PISA rankings. If your goal is cheaper, crapper, less effective, and strategic education then you're making a great choice.	Strongly disagree	See above comment to point 1.	Psychology is a science and makes no sense from a teaching and learning perspective at merging with Social Studies and Media Studies. Merging the sciences into a generalised course will limit specialisation and knowledge development; students will know less in their chosen scientific field when they arrive at UNI. In doing this I foresee you and universities requiring level 3 standards to make up for the specialised knowledge shortfall which will slow down student workforce entry and decrease income tax revenue. Furthermore universities will need to offer bridging courses to make up for the knowledge shortfall which will be an additional burden. You are robbing Peter to pay Paul.	Why not a hard materials in Maori crafting?	Yes		nil	2020-03-04 07:17:45	ANON-YFPW-RWQX-R	2020-03-04 07:17:45	2020-03-04 07:18:12
Yes	Joining the 3 commerce subjects together does not make sense as these provide both numeracy and literacy credits across the subjects which makes it more accessible for students. Teachers of these subjects will not be able to accurately promote each of these subjects for level 2 and we may see a significant drop off of students taking these subjects in the future.	Strongly disagree	Especially for the large subject areas such as science and commerce.	I am speaking from a sole accounting point of view but I know others in my School share the same sentiment around the fact that some subjects will not sufficiently be able to provide the base understanding for students to be able to jump into level 2. If these changes were to take place there would have to be some adjustment in the difficulty of the L2 and L3 courses. This ultimately dumbs down NZ education. What could happen is that L1 and L2 become 1 qualification so that for each subject it gives students 2 year to get their level 2. This provides more opportunity for students to focus on learning whilst providing a large chunk of content that is not squished together. I feel like this would result in better results as there becomes less pressure each year to jam in content. This is something that should be looked at.	I think the range of subjects provides a lot of opportunity for students as it currently is.	No			2020-03-04 08:19:43	ANON-YFPW-RWQA-1	2020-03-04 08:19:43	2020-03-04 08:19:58
Yes	Yes, the wording is familiar, but I did not for a second think that 'a broad education' meant a narrower range of subjects. This was a surprise.	Disagree	I support some changes, such as the introduction of Māori Performing Arts. I have deep reservations about the condensing of Physics, Biology, Chemistry and ESS into Science. I am very concerned at the removal of Media Studies as a standalone subject, especially given that the narrowing of achievement standards in English (as per the process for all subjects) will reduce the emphasis on visual text studies, an area students have until now been able to engage deeply in through the Media Studies lens. What builds student and teacher confidence is concrete requirements for learning and assessment. I think we need to be very careful that the new subjects and standards aren't so broad and 'contextual' that the language used in them is incomprehensible to 14- and 15-year old students.	As above.	No	No	No	2020-03-04 08:28:41	ANON-YFPW-RWQN-E	2020-03-04 08:28:41	2020-03-04 08:29:32	
Yes		Undecided	I disagree with the removal of L1 Chemistry, Biology and Physics to be replaced with only L1 Science. It was never easy for students going from L1 Science to the L2 Chemistry, for example, since it was a large step in thinking and learning but it did lift their whole Chemistry education to a higher level and the students became aware of what was needed on their part. With this proposal, L2 Chemistry will probably come in at a lower level to make a more seamless join and will content have to be removed to achieve this? Will this have a knock-on effect to L3 Chemistry? Are the present standards going to be maintained? Improved?	I disagree with the removal of L1 Chemistry, Biology and Physics to be replaced with only L1 Science. It was never easy for students going from L1 Science to the L2 Chemistry, for example, since it was a large step in thinking and learning but it did lift their whole Chemistry education to a higher level and the students became aware of what was needed on their part. With this proposal, L2 Chemistry will probably come in at a lower level to make a more seamless join and will content have to be removed to achieve this? Will this have a knock-on effect to L3 Chemistry? Are the present standards going to be maintained? Improved?	No	No		2020-03-04 08:44:09	ANON-YFPW-RWQK-B	2020-03-04 08:44:09	2020-03-04 08:44:19	
Yes		Strongly disagree		Electronics should be included in Level 1 subjects. Physics should be included in Level 1 subjects. Both of the subjects require a year preparation before students can successfully participate in Level 2 courses.	No.	No		2020-03-04 08:44:37	ANON-YFPW-RWQ6-P	2020-03-04 08:44:37	2020-03-04 08:45:03	

Yes		Undecided	Concerned about the merging of Accounting, Economics and Business Studies.	Merging Accounting, Economics and Business Studies is a lot to fit into a one year course, especially for beginners. Most students have never been introduced to these topics before Level 1 and so to merge them together is a very complex situation. Merging accounting and economics which are both heavily 'academic' subjects could be more attainable and leaving Business Studies on it's own as a more 'practical' option. Accounting for a lot of students is not accessible directly at Level 2 and it's necessary that they have exposure to it beforehand.	n/a	No		n/a	2020-03-04 08:50:03	ANON-YFPW-RWQJ-J	2020-03-04 08:50:03	2020-03-04 08:50:12
Yes	for technology it looks similar to what we already do	Undecided		technology unchanged as per subject list	digi tech as ct & dddo separate subjects	Yes	not the content		2020-03-04 08:52:25	ANON-YFPW-RWQW-Q	2020-03-04 08:52:25	2020-03-04 08:52:31
Yes		Strongly agree		Textiles Technology is not listed. Also, there needs to be greater information regarding what the Food Science subject would look like. Would it still incorporate teaching and learning practical food skills or would it be Science based. Also, the word "Science" could put off students who think that this could just be another Science subject		No			2020-03-04 08:59:29	ANON-YFPW-RWQ4-M	2020-03-04 08:59:29	2020-03-04 08:59:38
No		Disagree	I agree with all the subjects offered but disagree with the omission of Latin and classical studies.	I am the holder of a Cambridge classics degree now resident in the United States. I taught classics for 43 yrs at a state university here when classics was eliminated as you propose to do. Since then I have directed independent study in Latin and Greek at a small independent school near my home. I find that students really love these subjects and the opposition is always from adults. The argument that one should study modern languages instead doesn't hold water as students gifted in languages should have the chance to study several. One of my current students is also doing French and Japanese and has been accepted to an extremely competitive American college. I think Latin and Maori would be a brilliant combination as European-descended students wd become aware of their own pre-technological ancestors and learn that technology is not all it means to be human.		No			2020-03-04 09:09:25	ANON-YFPW-RWQT-M	2020-03-04 09:09:25	2020-03-04 09:09:44
No	I was under the impressions standards within subjects were going to become more broad, not the whole Level 1.	Strongly disagree	What is the purpose of this? Students should be able to take subjects that are of interest to them - as they do now. This certainly seems a cost cutting exercise, rather than anything else. Highly disappointing.	Classical Studies: This is currently an optional subject at Level 1, and if students want to take it, why would we restrict their ability to? Classical studies provides the foundation for many other subjects and is the basis for much western history and literature. Students can learn valuable skills from Classical studies and I don't see what value there is in removing it? Latin: Latin is a language that has a rich link to English and by learning Latin students can gain a greater understanding of their own language. It is also the foundation language for the Romance languages - most of which will still be offered, so why not Latin?!		No			2020-03-04 09:11:51	ANON-YFPW-RWQ3-K	2020-03-04 09:11:51	2020-03-04 09:12:05
Yes		Agree				No			2020-03-04 09:23:37	ANON-YFPW-RWQ2-J	2020-03-04 09:23:37	2020-03-04 09:23:47
Yes	However, there was a question mark whether that would result in Biology, Physics, Chemistry and Earth/Space Science disappearing from Level 1. Just 4 standards for Science in Level 1 would be a huge change from the existing list of standards available.	Undecided	Too early to call. I generally like the idea of less assessment though, so probably favourable.	I would like to see support to teach Biology, Chemistry and Physics as separate classes at Level 1. Whilst assessments may not be offered, this should still be an option available to schools alongside retaining NCEA Level 1.	How about Scientific Literacy and Financial Literacy as new subjects?	No			2020-03-04 09:33:55	ANON-YFPW-RWQU-N	2020-03-04 09:33:55	2020-03-04 09:34:05
Yes		Disagree	I strongly disagree on some things - classics being combined with history and media studies being absorbed by social studies. The latter makes very little sense (as someone who took media studies level 1 - 3 in 2013-15 while in high school and is now working in the media space). Media studies in my experience was worlds apart from my social studies learning. I fear it will get lost in the social studies curriculum and become an essay question on an exam when it was the most important subject to me and many of my high school friends who have also gone on to careers in the media.	Media studies is one of the most important subjects in the 21st Century. We want the education system to prepare New Zealand tamariki for their futures, and you'll find technology, media and being able to respond and think critically about the things you see online/media you consume is super important. It spans everything from supporting our democratic system to dispelling the rise of online hate speech and hate groups and just being able to put a critical lens on media consumed to know what is trying to be sold to you. Media studies should be it's own subject.		No			2020-03-04 10:40:44	ANON-YFPW-RWFY-E	2020-03-04 10:40:44	2020-03-04 10:40:54
Yes		Disagree		Media Studies as a "possible context" for Social Studies concerns me. Students highly value the critical thinking skills they develop in Media Studies and their production experiences. The impact of media on society and the need for our young people to accurately deconstruct texts and construct their own narratives have never been greater.	No	Yes			2020-03-04 10:46:39	ANON-YFPW-RWFV-B	2020-03-04 10:46:39	2020-03-04 10:46:52

No		Disagree	There are some I definitely agree with. For example PE and Health combining, and the new Food Science. However there are other that seem very far off to me. Social Studies in particular - Media Studies and Psychology combining. While there is definitely some significant crossover between the two subjects, there are major elements of both that I feel are likely to be lost if combined. Media Studies when I was in high school not long ago also included how to make media, and how to do so responsibly, and well. Making media (especially video content, which is now my profession so I can speak with a greater understanding of this topic than others), can be quite time consuming, and is perhaps one of the most important parts of Media Studies as I know it. Its one thing to be an academic in this field of work, but there are very few jobs in the media that don't require you to actually make it. I worry that if Media Studies is combined with other social sciences that the pivotally important unit of learning to make the content that you are analysing will be lost or be cut down. And if that unit isn't touched, then learning how to analyse it will then suffer. Basically my thoughts are the subject of Media Studies is too large to be combined with other subjects. With more media being created than ever before (and more irresponsible media being made than ever before), it seems to me that it's more important than ever that	I'm not sure if this applies to this question - but there are certain parts of the curriculum that I have always been astounded are missing from compulsory learning. For example learning to do taxes, how to filter political propaganda and the news media responsibly, how to drive. Basic things that I've seen so many people come out of High School not being able to do.	No	There were only a few students in my school who participated in this, and they were separate from everyone else.		2020-03-04 10:52:15	ANON-YFPW-RWFC-R	2020-03-04 10:52:15	2020-03-04 10:52:31
Yes	I knew about the changes to NCEA Science subjects as I am a Science teacher, but not other subjects.	Agree	I am generally happy with the changes to the Science courses at level 1. I don't have knowledge of other subject areas.	I agree with the changes to the Science subjects at NCEA level 1, but I believe that all students need to have this basic understanding of Science in order to function successfully in our society in the future. Therefore Science should be a subject that all students study at level 1. It is also important not to reduce the content in the level 1 Science course so that students are prepared for level 2 specialist courses.	No			2020-03-04 11:30:59	ANON-YFPW-RWFS-8	2020-03-04 11:30:59	2020-03-04 11:31:18
Yes	Unfortunately moving to a single science subject takes away the ability of schools to put together programs that best meet the needs of their student. The list doesn't appear to lead to a very balanced L1 curriculum	Disagree	see above - many choices for languages but not for science and humanities	See above.	No			2020-03-04 11:31:09	ANON-YFPW-RWF8-D	2020-03-04 11:31:09	2020-03-04 11:31:27
No		Disagree		Removing media studies from year 11 should not be considered. It borders ridiculous due to the current political climate and change in arts - media studies encompasses all the critical thinking needed to educate students. In this age of increasing digitalisation, they need to be aware of what they are consuming and change their passive behaviour patterns. If it wasn't for my introduction to media studies at this level, I would not have gone on to set a career for myself. I can also see the different in critical thinking and logical understanding on information, mediums and just general awareness of the reasons to how and why people/brands/corporates operate. With the digital space only eating up more and more space in both professional and personal lives, most discussions shared on many aspects of culture and just about everything else can find some root in all kinds of media. You can actually have so much agency on a range of topics by having an understanding of how media works - why take that away at an earlier age? If this goes through, it's a huge step backwards. Will also probably have overflowing consequences for media literacy because of the potential tertiary ramifications. Not a good branding move for future generations...	No			2020-03-04 11:43:34	ANON-YFPW-RWF9-E	2020-03-04 11:43:34	2020-03-04 11:43:51

Yes	However the extent of broadening is not evident by maintaining some specialist areas and combining others. E.g. Accounting, Economics and Business, which are very different subjects are merged, whilst Classics/History and Geography which are part of Social Sciences in the junior school are able to be specialised alongside a generic Social Studies course.	Strongly disagree	The changes to create a Level 1 Commerce course is based on two incorrect assumptions that need urgent addressing 1. Accounting can easily be picked up at Level 2. Our school as most have L1 Accounting as a pre-requisite to Level 2 Accounting. Those opting for L2 or 3 are asked to complete a number of L1 Achievement Standards prior to any higher level. This is the case in most schools. To make the assertion it can be picked up shows a lack of consultation with school practitioners of the subject. Accounting is like a language where base language and structures need to be learned before they can be applied at a higher level. I challenge the review committee to find the number of L2 students to have successfully completed a L2 course, having not completed Level 1. It will be similar to those that can pick up Spanish at Level 2, having not studied Spanish previously. 2. There are practical constraints to breaking Accounting up. We have a current matrix that works well and flows through from L1 to L3. Accounting would be an ideal subject to use for computer use in an external and it does not take a very creative mind to chunk the subject into bites that would suit a combined course, many schools do this already. The consultation seems to have been very weak in this area. Using "practical constraints" seems to mean we don't want to try.	Commerce as a subject is has a high proportion of students taking Accounting, Economics and Business Studies and there is a growing need in industry and community organisations for students with a commerce skill set. By amalgamating the 3 areas it looks like the Ministry is artificially trying to grow other areas that are currently weak on student up-take and dumb down the knowledge and skills gained through a popular course at school. An example is why merge the three commerce subjects and yet keep the 5 Arts subject separate, or merge Geography in with L1 Social Studies, or have Digital Technology as a stand alone subject, when it is demanded by so few students and integrated already in other subjects.		Yes		I am not fluent enough yet, but am working to be more so.	2020-03-04 13:52:49	ANON-YFPW-RWF-T	2020-03-04 13:47:57	2020-03-04 13:52:55
Yes		Disagree	Well there are some good changes in removing subjects that are of little relevance to students and their lives in the modern world, there are some changes that are poorly thought out.	The reduction and de-emphasis of Media Studies into into a topic area of Social Studies is alarming. These changes completely ignore the rising issue of traditional disinformation being morphing into a much more nasty "fake news" phenomenon that has alarmed the general public global level. Yet these changes means that this education will be compressed and shortened to fit into an already complex and nuanced subject. Doing this would definitely be highly detrimental to the students and to their future New Zealand.		Yes			2020-03-04 13:52:50	ANON-YFPW-RWF5-A	2020-03-04 13:52:50	2020-03-04 13:53:32
Yes		Undecided			would like a general science again at level 2 and 3 which are not just planet earth and beyond focused.	No			2020-03-04 14:26:30	ANON-YFPW-RWF7-C	2020-03-04 14:26:30	2020-03-04 14:26:50
Yes		Strongly disagree	The decision does not take into consideration the importance of being media savvy and media literate. What other subjects critique the media? It's mainly Media Studies	Keep Media Studies. Change elements of the program but keep aspects such as media law, & standards of broadcasting, keep journalism and media production. There are many areas which encourage students to be LITERATE. They need to write film scripts, news articles and reports. Don't lump us together please.		No			2020-03-04 14:29:12	ANON-YFPW-RWFF-U	2020-03-04 14:29:12	2020-03-04 14:29:18
Yes		Strongly disagree		Yes, I think that it would be incredibly beneficial to keep latin NCEA in the school curriculum.		Yes			2020-03-04 15:13:38	ANON-YFPW-RWF1-6	2020-03-04 15:13:38	2020-03-04 15:13:57
No		Strongly disagree	1. Latin is the foundation of English. Without an understanding of Latin, one would struggle to teach English grammar (which is in a parlous state in NZ) 2. When travelling on an OE to Europe, a basic understanding of Classical Studies is immensely helpful.	See above	Philosophy	No			2020-03-04 15:35:53	ANON-YFPW-RWFZ-F	2020-03-04 15:35:53	2020-03-04 15:36:34
Yes		Agree	The proposed changes make sense.	No	Not at this stage.	Yes		No comment	2020-03-04 15:39:04	ANON-YFPW-RWFH-W	2020-03-04 15:39:04	2020-03-04 15:39:24
Yes		Agree		Agree with the idea of broader subject offering for Level 1		No			2020-03-04 15:53:15	ANON-YFPW-RWFB-Q	2020-03-04 15:53:15	2020-03-04 15:53:23
No	Merging courses into a broad umbrella outline was something new and rather disappointing	Strongly disagree	Teaching in context and cross curricular is a great idea. Losing focus and bringing Level 1 to a alternate pathway qualification has lessened the importance of academics	Removing Biology Chemistry and Physics is extremely short sighted. With level 1 being optional how do you honestly think these changes will encourage more schools to offer it?	Is you are going to consider new subjects please leave the existing subjects alone. I will have to teach the content from Level 1 Science to the Level 2 students so they have some background. At present most student taking NCEA Science struggle with the jump in the content to a level 2 course such as Physics or Chemistry. By dumbing down Year 11 it's going to make Year 12 even harder.	No			2020-03-04 15:53:24	ANON-YFPW-RWFM-2	2020-03-04 15:53:24	2020-03-04 15:53:33

Yes		Strongly disagree		I do not agree with doing away with Level 1 Psychology as my experience as a Psychology and Social Science teacher is such that students are highly engaged in this subject and it also allows us to cover topics that are extremely relevant to the experience of adolescence. Our country is currently crying out for clinical psychologists, especially those from a Maori and Pasifika background. Being able to engage students with a subject that not only engages them but has potential to contribute to a range of career choices means that Psychology can be seen as both highly relevant in the present and future lives of our rangatahi. I work in a multicultural high school with students who are literally on waiting-lists for psychology classes. The proposed changes do not make sense to my students or my colleagues.		No			2020-03-04 16:34:57	ANON-YFPW-RWFD-5	2020-03-04 16:34:57	2020-03-04 16:35:16
Yes		Agree				No			2020-03-04 17:20:35	ANON-YFPW-RWFA-P	2020-03-04 17:20:35	2020-03-04 17:21:06
No	No, why is this change not being debated and talked about? The only place I've heard about it from a classics lecturer at UC	Strongly disagree	Don't get rid of classics and latin especially. stop forcing out the arts just because of some bias towards sporty/science/math kids. Kids aren't cut from a cookie cutter so you cant treat them like they are. Classics has literally opened up an entire world for my future and many others I know. removing it from the curriculum would be devastating. you cant just pretend the past didnt exist, the world didnt start with the first rugby game.	Latin is literally the origin of language. If you're going to get rid of a language it could be literally anything else. Just because its a "dead" language doesn't mean its not useful. Also why is classics as a focus area disappearing? It's FAR more important that a lot of the other options and has anyone considered that not all kids excel at science/math and not all kids are sporty so why are we forcing out the arts and everything that caters to creative students? Not everyone can become scientists and rugby players. In my personal experience, studying Classics has been incredibly beneficial towards my legal studies and latin is incredibly helpful in many regards too. STOP FORCING OUT THE ARTS	a class on how to be an adult and do basic life skills is vitally needed yet it will never happen. I left high school 4 years ago and have no idea how to vote, pay taxes, or give CPR. students should be taught this sort of thing while young, including how to drive. ridiculous that theres so much more focus on things no one ever uses until they have kids who ask how to do it for their homework. what is the pythagorus theorem? i have no recollection because i've literally never needed it.	No			2020-03-04 18:46:18	ANON-YFPW-RWFA-3	2020-03-04 18:46:18	2020-03-04 18:46:25
No	Further public education would have been good. Especially for those with younger children who will be effected the most by these changes	Strongly disagree	I strongly disagree to the downgrading of Classical studies.	As we head into a time of change with the rise and fall of some civilisations, history and an understanding of where we have come from is vital to understand who we are today and where we are heading. As we have more information presented to us than ever before, a greater understanding of research, the source of information and purpose of information is also vital to understand. Classical studies offers students this, along with a depth of thinking and understanding. It would be a great sadness to lose that.		No	I am fully in support of the inclusion of Te Reo in education. And this is already happening with ECE's such as playcentre. Further support in ECE would be great.		2020-03-04 18:49:32	ANON-YFPW-RWFK-Z	2020-03-04 18:48:02	2020-03-04 18:49:53
Yes		Strongly disagree	I have strong concerns about the removal of Media Studies.	The essential removal of Media Studies as an individual subject at L1 is in direct conflict of the global call for increased media literacy education for our children. By only making Media a possible 'context' you are minimising the importance of understanding the influence media has on our lives and our society. It also requires specialist teaching and understanding - not every social studies teacher can teach Media. Media should be raised in prominence in our teaching as it has become an increasingly dominant force in modern life.		No			2020-03-04 19:07:57	ANON-YFPW-RWFK-B	2020-03-04 19:07:57	2020-03-04 19:08:08
No	This has been sprung upon the population with very little time for discussion and consideration.	Strongly disagree	The loss of Classical Studies is poorly considered, as this focuses on the foundation of Western civilization. The loss of Latin will affect our future generations of medical specialists, lawyers, musicians, historians, linguists and teachers. The reduction of science is criminal - the dumbing down of a generation.	Of what use are Maori and other island languages to an increasingly globalised world? Maori dance is likewise pointless. I am stunned not to see Indian, Portuguese and Cantonese offered as far more realistic and practical options.	School is not supposed to be about specialisation, and this is highlighted by the fact that, to the best of my knowledge, no University course requires specific subjects for entry. NCEA needs to return to focusing on solid literacy, numeracy and science, backed by regular health and fitness.	No	No, I have no interest in this, like the majority of New Zealanders.	Do you mean Question 5? Perhaps this is why numeracy is important, if the Ministry cannot even count!	2020-03-04 19:20:04	ANON-YFPW-RWFK-7	2020-03-04 19:20:04	2020-03-04 19:20:39
Yes	I think students want to get down to real learning in Year 11. They have just spent Year 10 "cruising" as they put it. We should be encouraging our NZ teenagers to achieve the best academic results they can.	Strongly disagree	Give these students who want to achieve academically the opportunity to.			Yes			2020-03-04 19:47:33	ANON-YFPW-RWFK-C	2020-03-04 19:47:33	2020-03-04 19:47:47

Yes		Strongly agree	I am a secondary teacher and currently teach a variety of Commerce subjects. For students I think that the recommendations for level 1 would be ideal at our school. We have thought about offering a similar course but kept separate subjects mostly based on tradition. A broad Commerce program at Level 1 will enable more students to specialise in following years. Focusing on one aspect of the learning area at level 1 is too restrictive. Many of teachers who oppose these changes do not seem to be focusing on student needs and learning, rather their own jobs and subject areas.	A wide ranging Commerce subject at L1 would allow the subject area to grow. Many students pick Eco/accounting/business without actually knowing the skills and learning styles of each - which are very different. Many of our students have not been able to take junior options due to timetable constraints.	Māori Business	No			2020-03-04 21:12:04	ANON-YFPW-RWF4-9	2020-03-04 21:12:04	2020-03-04 21:12:14
No	While not previously aware of this, I've now seen the material setting out the rationale. While I can understand where this is coming from, I cannot say I wholeheartedly support it. The purpose of education is not only to gain employment. It is to develop the mind. Education that is focused only on employment as an outcome will create workers without a sense of place or a depth of thought that will lead to a less healthy nation overall.	Strongly disagree	In particular, I strongly disagree with the loss of Classical Studies as a distinct area of study. This was a subject that I personally benefited from to a significant extent while at school. It does not fit well with history in the manner it is taught or in its content and it provides a unique area of study that should not be excluded.	I would like to see Classical Studies continued as a distinct subject. It is a valuable discipline and one with a long heritage. It is not compatible with history in the sense that both content and methodology differ to a significant extent. The loss of classics would be a sad one as it would be to jettison a significant foundation of our cultural heritage.	No.	No	I have some familiarity but not an in depth knowledge.	No.	2020-03-05 04:29:29	ANON-YFPW-RWF7-9	2020-03-05 04:29:29	2020-03-05 04:29:44
No		Strongly disagree	please see next box re the exclusion of Latin.	LATIN: New Zealand has an impressive track record of teaching Latin and related subjects to students at all levels - with substantive payoffs in the public and academic sectors. The Humanities, writ large, may perhaps be defined as 'the science of public responsibility'. Latin is a key component of the Humanities. It's influence on our understanding of Law, Ethics, Politics Democracy and Republican Values, Empire (and its dangers!), Public Administration, the Military, and more is key. The influence of Latin on our thought today is no more directly visible to the naked eye (or mind!) than, say, the influence of subatomic particles, gravity or cosmic radiation. But like subatomic particles and so many other 'invisible' aspects of our material world, it is, I would suggest, essential for our existence today and with a view to the future		No			2020-03-05 04:46:01	ANON-YFPW-RWF3-8	2020-03-05 04:46:01	2020-03-05 04:46:17
Yes		Agree			Outdoor education	Yes			2020-03-05 06:10:33	ANON-YFPW-RWFU-A	2020-03-05 06:10:33	2020-03-05 06:10:57
No		Strongly disagree	As a representative of Euroclassica (the federation of European Classics teachers associations) I should support the inclusion of Latin in the list of languages available. In a curriculum which appears to strive for openness and inclusion it would be a positive step if Latin were included as an option. I support the approach of the proposals which seem to wish to emphasise the complex cultural heritage of the make up of New Zealand society but would argue that the European part is a significant part of that. It would be regrettable if in an attempt to rebalance the complexity the legacy from Europe were neglected. In Euroclassica we support the teaching of Latin, Greek and Classical Studies in all countries.	Euroclassica argues for the provision for Latin, Greek and Classical Studies to be available to all pupils in all schools irrespective of ability, class or ethnic background. Latin, which in today's curriculums and programmes is not just language study, feeds into many parts of the cultural capital of all children: language, literature (not just in English), history, religions, art, philosophy and politics. Some offering of the languages and cultures of the ancient world in the Mediterranean and the Middle East would enable children and young people from all backgrounds to understand the origins of the European part of world culture and how they fit into it. Whichever key competence of a curriculum is concerned it is likely that Latin and Classical Studies can contribute to it in some way. Perhaps the image which I saw today in the British Museum's Troy exhibition by Marian Maguire may help to illustrate what I mean: Te Whiti and Titokowaru discuss the question, 'What is peace?', from 'Titokowaru's Dilemma'(see: https://collections.tepapa.govt.nz/object/1730121).		No	Not enough, but I would be interested to know more and to understand how different strands of New Zealand culture and society can fit together to build a harmonious future.		2020-03-05 06:19:48	ANON-YFPW-RWF2-7	2020-03-05 06:19:48	2020-03-05 06:20:16
No	I knew there were Changes but thought it was more to do with scrapping nice level 1	Strongly agree	too many choices just makes things harder for students	no	not at the moment	No	I know it exists to support the language and culture but thats all		2020-03-05 07:10:47	ANON-YFPW-RWMY-N	2020-03-05 07:10:47	2020-03-05 07:11:19
Yes		Agree	With the understanding that a larger range of subjects be available for students beyond level 1 (such as History and Classical Studies being separate) to support those students who wish to study these in their further education such as University	Latin is the basis of so many languages in our modern world and has had a huge cultural impact it seems a shame that we could forget about that.		No			2020-03-05 09:31:55	ANON-YFPW-RWMV-J	2020-03-05 09:31:55	2020-03-05 09:32:05

Yes		Strongly disagree	The school our daughter goes to has explained that the combining of these subjects will reduce their ability to prepare for the Level 2 and 3 subjects, because they will have to cover a greater amount of material more superficially. Effectively dumbing them down.	Science should definitely be split down - I can't imagine how it would be possible to cover all those subjects in any depth together. Wouldn't it seem more logical to split these, perhaps even into the more conventional Physical Science and Biological Science? (My oldest daughter is Year 7 so I don't quite have a grasp of how it works currently, sorry). Media studies I personally can live with being included in the Social Studies paper. I also think the Commerce could be split into Accounting and Economics, with the business component being incorporated into one of these, perhaps Economics?		No				2020-03-05 09:42:35	ANON-YFPW-RWMC-Y	2020-03-05 09:42:35	2020-03-05 09:42:49
No		Agree				Yes				2020-03-05 10:20:27	ANON-YFPW-RWMS-F	2020-03-05 10:20:27	2020-03-05 10:20:45
Yes		Strongly disagree	Reduce assessments but DO NOT combine subjects!!! This is not helpful for the students and their interest areas. e.g. Health a PE combined will not work for students that love PE and not Health, or vice versa.	Reduce credits and assessments but do not combine subjects		Yes				2020-03-05 10:53:21	ANON-YFPW-RWM8-M	2020-03-05 10:53:21	2020-03-05 10:53:29
Yes	I disagree with dropping Latin, Classics and Art History	Strongly disagree		Keep the option to specialise as it is.		No				2020-03-05 11:58:23	ANON-YFPW-RWM9-N	2020-03-05 11:58:23	2020-03-05 11:58:34
Yes		Strongly disagree	I believe that the Ministry's proposal is effectively a 'dumbing down approach' towards education. It's of utmost importance that the students are provided the opportunity to learn specialist subjects from specialist teachers.	I strongly believe that specialist subjects, most importantly biology, chemistry and physics, should not be combined. These are three specialist learning areas, with a depth of knowledge to be obtained in each, by those seeking specialist such as medicine and other specialist science degrees. I also believe strongly that economics and accounting should not be combined! Latin should not be removed.	No	Yes				2020-03-05 12:59:11	ANON-YFPW-RWMG-3	2020-03-05 12:59:11	2020-03-05 12:59:29
Yes		Strongly disagree				No				2020-03-05 13:28:35	ANON-YFPW-RWMI-6	2020-03-05 13:28:35	2020-03-05 13:28:50
Yes		Strongly disagree	combining subjects into more general categories is a step in the wrong direction, Universities and work places place specific emphasis on these specific subjects. Please keep as is. Latin should remain as an option.			No				2020-03-05 13:50:56	ANON-YFPW-RWMQ-D	2020-03-05 13:50:56	2020-03-05 13:51:08
Yes		Disagree	While it is feasible to combine some subjects the idea of reducing an important subject like Media Studies down to a small part of a general social science class does our students a great disservice. Recognizing that the media has become one of the most powerful influences on young people today, the decision appears short sighted. With concerns around increased social media use, the need for fair reporting around elections and pandemics, in addition to the rise of hate speech, and the importance of inclusive representation it is vital students are adequately equipped to safely navigate an increasingly media saturated world. Media Studies ask students to think critically about the world and the way in which people may be represented in the media. It is about allowing students the ability to explore the stories and issues that reflect their identity, language and culture. Taika Waititi highlighted the importance of indigenous youth being able to tell their stories to the world in his Oscar speech. Comments from NAME press release.			Yes				2020-03-05 14:13:30	ANON-YFPW-RWME-1	2020-03-05 14:13:30	2020-03-05 14:13:41
Yes	I disagree with this approach. I see this as a "dumbing down", and narrowing of options at the earliest level, which will limit opportunities for diversity going forward	Strongly disagree	I disagree with this approach. I see this as a "dumbing down", and narrowing of options at the earliest level, which will limit opportunities for diversity going forward In addition, the loss of Latin shows a lack of commitment to foundation languages, and a lack of belief in the "learning" part of school with a focus on the end goals only.	I see this as a "dumbing down", and narrowing of options at the earliest level, which will limit opportunities for diversity going forward In addition, the loss of Latin shows a lack of commitment to foundation languages, and a lack of belief in the "learning" part of school with a focus on the end goals only. I think the loss of Latin is short sighted. I think the integration of the science components is "dumbing down" and limits students opportunities to see these as very diverse parts of science The focus appears to be on "vocation", which will limit the benefits of learning, which is a key objective of school, particularly for 15 year old brains.		No				2020-03-05 14:34:57	ANON-YFPW-RWMS-H	2020-03-05 14:34:57	2020-03-05 14:35:07

Yes		Strongly disagree	Strongly disagree with the reduction in subject options at Level 1.	Strongly disagree with cutting the Science subject options at level one, need to retain current level of specialisation. Similarly the cutting of the commerce subjects. I believe these proposed changes will make it a lot harder for students when they reach Level 2 and start to specialise i.e. create too much of a gap. Also, it will create such a broad topic that will disengage many students. Strongly disagree with removal of Classics and Latin. Students should be provided with these options.		No			2020-03-05 14:48:56	ANON-YFPW-RWMP-C	2020-03-05 14:48:56	2020-03-05 14:49:09
No		Strongly disagree	Strongly disagree with the proposal to remove the study of Latin from Level 1	Studying a classical language enables students to develop a deep cross-cultural understanding. They become familiar with complex linguistic structures and a metalanguage which allows them to apply this knowledge to other languages. Studying Latin increases students engagement with their own culture and they can use the language to examine a culture vastly different to their own and develop an empathetic understanding of diversity. This contributes to students' developing as responsible global citizens.		No			2020-03-05 15:05:09	ANON-YFPW-RWM7-K	2020-03-05 15:05:09	2020-03-05 15:05:24
Yes		Strongly disagree		Dumbing down of specialist subjects into a more broader topic will only encourage more generalists. We need people who can think outside of the norm, not be the norm!	Nope.	No			2020-03-05 15:06:19	ANON-YFPW-RWMF-2	2020-03-05 15:06:19	2020-03-05 15:06:24
Yes		Agree	I think that the sciences should be kept separate but otherwise am happy.	My son's school has Latin as a subject choice surely school can make a decision on this		No			2020-03-05 15:08:30	ANON-YFPW-RWM1-D	2020-03-05 15:08:30	2020-03-05 15:08:41
Yes		Strongly disagree		I whole heartily encourage every word of the recent proposal letter from NAME Press Release March 2020 Proposed NCEA changes disconnect NZ teens New Zealand teens are in danger of becoming significantly disadvantaged in an era of connectivity if the proposed removal of Media Studies at NCEA Level 1 goes ahead. With the Ministry of Education's release of provisional Level 1 subjects for the NCEA review, Media Studies standards will no longer be offered alongside History, Geography, and Commerce. This decision alarms the National Association of Media Educators who believe that Media Studies is a foundational subject for a 21st Century learner. Recognising that the media has become one of the most powerful influences on young people today, the decision appears short sighted. With concerns around increased social media use, the need for fair reporting around elections and pandemics, in addition to the rise of hate speech, and the importance of inclusive representation it is vital students are adequately equipped to safely navigate an increasingly media saturated world.		No			2020-03-05 15:17:21	ANON-YFPW-RWMZ-P	2020-03-05 15:17:21	2020-03-05 15:17:30
Yes		Strongly disagree	The proposal to remove teaching of Latin and Classical Studies from the curriculum is narrow-minded and ill-advised. These subjects allow students exposure to the fundamentals of western education and history, which can have a far reaching influences at all levels of education.	See above. For starters, a major proportion of the English language is derived from Latin or Latin-based words.		No	While I applaud the efforts to foster the continued learning of te reo Maori, it is specious to consider te reo of greater importance on the world language stage than Latin.		2020-03-05 15:19:32	ANON-YFPW-RWMH-4	2020-03-05 15:19:32	2020-03-05 15:19:44
Yes		Agree				No			2020-03-05 15:22:05	ANON-YFPW-RWMB-X	2020-03-05 15:22:05	2020-03-05 15:22:16
Yes		Disagree	Tokelau language should be there.	Many Tokelau students in NZ, and even in Tokelau, a NZ realm country, have the right to study their own language and culture.	Tokelauan	No			2020-03-05 15:30:03	ANON-YFPW-RWMM-9	2020-03-05 15:30:03	2020-03-05 15:30:15

No		Strongly disagree		Removing Level 1 Media Studies undermines the need to prepare learners to be confident, 21st Century citizens. Media Studies ask students to think critically about the world and the way in which people may be represented in the media. It is about allowing students the ability to explore the stories and issues that reflect their identity, language and culture. Taika Waititi highlighted the importance of indigenous youth being able to tell their stories to the world in his Oscar speech.		No				2020-03-05 15:53:41	ANON-YFPW-RWMD-Z	2020-03-05 15:53:41	2020-03-05 15:53:50
No		Strongly disagree	I strongly disagree with the separate strands of science being combined into one subject. I also disagree with the removal of Latin & Art History.	I strongly disagree with the separate strands of science being combined into one subject. I also disagree with the removal of Latin & Art History, which should still be included.		No				2020-03-05 15:53:49	ANON-YFPW-RWMD-M	2020-03-05 15:53:49	2020-03-05 15:54:05
Yes	-I am aware that providing a 'broad, more foundational' education at this level is the professed aim of this policy, but I do not think that the list of included subjects achieves this. -In fact, the exclusion of Latin from NCEA 1 goes directly against the intention to support a 'broad' and 'foundational' education. -Of all the languages currently offered at NCEA level 1, Latin fits these criteria best: it provides learners with the tools for language analysis and usage, thereby improving one's English immeasurably and assisting with the learning of other languages, especially modern European languages but also non-European ones, such as Japanese. -It also has a broad significance historically, in a huge range of fields.	Strongly disagree	-I disagree very strongly with the exclusion of Latin from the list of proposed subjects, especially on the grounds that its exclusion goes against the aim of providing 'important and rich learning' at NCEA level 1. -Latin is historically a hugely important language, as a source language for texts on medicine, law, and many more fields. It provides insight that cannot be gained through study in translation into a culture that informs many aspects of the English-speaking world and beyond. -It is also an academically challenging subject that requires understanding not only of complex grammatical concepts, but also grapples with the question of how to understand a culture that is removed in time and space from 21st century New Zealand.	The exclusion of Latin does not fulfil the MoE's stated criteria, and is not in line with the inclusion of other comparable subjects. In addition to the points I have made to answer questions 1 and 2, I make the following points according to the criteria laid out: -Latin at NCEA level 1 leads straight into NCEA Latin levels 2 and 3, and is foundational for the study of other languages (as I have noted); but also for (ancient) history, classical studies, theology, and many more subjects. -As a career pathway, Latin by itself may be limited, but it is incredibly important culturally for a range of other careers. Students of Latin have gone on to have successful and even significant careers in various fields, including but not limited to law, medicine, science, academia, engineering, computer science, public policy, etc. -In this sense Latin may be compared favourably with other languages whose inclusion in NCEA 1 is supported, such as Tongan and Samoan. -Additionally, Latin assists greatly with effective communication in English, which is essential in any field. -Excluding Latin would be denying schools the very ability to 'create well designed and coherent local	No.	Yes	-	-		2020-03-05 16:34:01	ANON-YFPW-RWMA-W	2020-03-05 16:34:01	2020-03-05 16:34:17
Yes	I was somewhat aware, but not to this extent. I am totally opposed to combining three very different commerce subjects into one class. As an Economics teacher and TIC Commerce I know that Accounting, Economics and Business Studies are three stand alone subjects. The content that students learn in Year 11 is not repeated at any other level to the same extent.	Strongly disagree	Studying Accounting, Economics and Business Studies at Yr 11 gives students a good understanding and they know whether they want to take them further. If they get this mixture that is suggested they are unlikely to take these subjects further. Our economy is crying out for Commerce graduates and I can see this turning them away from Commerce careers.	I believe Economics, Accounting and Business Studies should continue to be offered as separate subjects. Economics is a compulsory subject in many degrees apart from Commerce degrees (eg Social Work, Agriculture and Horticulture), and we will be doing our high school students a disservice in not preparing them with a robust course in secondary school.	I would like the Commerce subjects left as they are at all levels.	No				2020-03-05 17:33:50	ANON-YFPW-RWMD-J	2020-03-05 17:20:50	2020-03-05 17:34:43
Yes		Strongly disagree	The proposed non-inclusion of Latin has me gasping for breath. "Strongly disagree" is just not strong enough.	Sir Ronald Syme, a New Zealander, is without a doubt the 20th century's greatest Roman historian. Without Latin, the country cannot hope to produce another Syme. For so many years, New Zealand has led the way with an EXCEPTIONALLY high standard of Latin teaching and learning. I have before me, for instance, copies of the 2015-2018 Latin Scholarship Question Booklets, together with the responses of the four "Top Scholars". These are all comfortably of world-standard and I suggest it would be desperately inappropriate to deny future students the opportunity to achieve intellectually at such a level. While most students will not have been able to demonstrate such a high level of achievement, I am confident that all who took the subject will have benefited from it, and I suggest that an equitable approach to future generations would require the authorities to identify those who have studied Latin in, say, the last 20 years, and to ask them their views on the proposed abolition. The technology to do so is available; all that is needed is the will to find the truth by asking people who have the experience and can talk about what it has meant to be 21st century citizens who know their Latin in addition to all the other subjects they have taken.	No, thank you.	No				2020-03-05 17:44:06	ANON-YFPW-RWMD-E	2020-03-05 17:44:06	2020-03-05 17:44:26

No		Disagree		Media studies should not be rolled into social studies that is a very broad subject for so many disciplines and will mean very little is covered in that first year - despite media playing a very big role in their lives. Perhaps 1st year could be communications which media studies can form a large part of.	Media studies doesn't currently cover media planning and buying, a key industry in advertising. This area also has an under supply of graduates despite being a huge industry with about \$2.5b worth of advertising bought annually. It's also a great career choice for with new grads starting on around \$45k but within 3 - 4 years being on \$80k and seniors making \$150k+. The art of media planning brings together sociology and data - other key components for other industries as well.	No	Only what I know from Studying media studies when I was at school and asking present students		2020-03-05 19:16:28	ANON-YFPW-RWMW-K	2020-03-05 19:16:28	2020-03-05 19:16:37
Yes		Strongly disagree	outdoor education needs to be included. It's one of the key areas of leading under the health and physical education curriculum area but it is a significantly important one in many schools that offer it in year 12 and year 13 as its own subject	Outdoor education. Reasoning described above. As well as if being a legitimate post secondary school study and economic contribution	outdoor education needs to have its own matrix of achievement standards that are separate from health and physical education. Especially with the review likely to reduce the amount of achievement standards and health and physical education. Currently outdoor education classes use a mixture of unit standards and achievement standards taken from the health and PE curriculum area. With the current system that leaves enough for schools to have some and PE and summon outdoor education. If there are less health and PE achievement standards this significantly threatens outdoor education being able to be delivered. Rather than having it depend on health and PE it needs its own achievement standards	Yes			2020-03-05 20:43:32	ANON-YFPW-RWM4-G	2020-03-05 20:43:32	2020-03-05 20:43:42
Yes		Strongly disagree	Ability to cater to different needs important as is opportunity for high achievers to accelerate and stay challenged. Hence paring back options at L1 such as specialist science and biz to more general not supported	As above	IT	No			2020-03-05 20:48:07	ANON-YFPW-RWMT-G	2020-03-05 20:48:07	2020-03-05 20:48:18
No		Undecided		Arabic language. It is one of the most widely spoken languages in the world.		No			2020-03-05 21:18:43	ANON-YFPW-RWM3-F	2020-03-05 21:18:43	2020-03-05 21:18:58
No	Just came across by chance, reading on our school website. I am grateful for our school (WHS) providing this information.	Agree	Looks fine to me. Makes sense to keep it open in level 1	It would be great to have soft materials included (sewing, cloth designing). I feel this gets neglected nowadays but would help young people to look into that as a career, but also to support themselves and earn some money - or simply being able to provide them with their own clothes. Same would go for gardening. It is sad to see that we deny our matariki to learn about how they can support themselves naturally. Basic gardening skills should be part of the compulsory curriculum - like food technologies. More and more children are not able to live sustainably and healthily - despite being able to speak multiple languages and calculate complicated things. Basic schooling should provide that - the basics! Seeing that mental health is such a problem and rising - how about mindfulness for schools?	Soft materials: (clothes design) Gardening Cooking Mindfulness/Wellbeing for self	No			2020-03-06 06:37:39	ANON-YFPW-RWMU-H	2020-03-06 06:37:39	2020-03-06 06:37:53
Yes		Strongly disagree				No			2020-03-06 07:49:30	ANON-YFPW-RWKY-K	2020-03-06 07:49:30	2020-03-06 07:49:38
Yes		Agree			Philosophy; Civics; Political Science.	No			2020-03-06 07:50:08	ANON-YFPW-RWKV-G	2020-03-06 07:50:08	2020-03-06 07:50:29
Yes	I am writing to you as Vice President of the Society for Classical Studies, the principal society of classical scholars in North America, to express concern about the current proposal to eliminate Latin at all levels of the NCEA as well as Classics at NCEA Level 1. New Zealand has traditionally excelled in these subjects. This change would diminish the pipeline for advanced study in the higher grades and at the collegiate level. There are many strong reasons to continue your Latin and Classics programs, which have a long and distinguished history and retain their appeal to all students drawn to language, literature, humanities, and history. Latin and Classics remain cornerstones of the humanities curriculum and are often excellent predictors of academic success.	Strongly disagree		See above.	Latin and Classics.	No			2020-03-06 09:00:16	ANON-YFPW-RWKC-W	2020-03-06 09:00:16	2020-03-06 09:00:37
No	No I was not aware, but look forward to seeing the progression changes implementing this will have for our future generations.	Agree		No	This is a good start, as the program is implemented no doubt there will be further changes made to improve the learning and understanding for the students.	No			2020-03-06 09:19:34	ANON-YFPW-RWK8-J	2020-03-06 09:19:34	2020-03-06 09:20:02

No	The change of Food and Nutrition / Home Economics from the Health Physical Education to Food Science and in Technology. I dont understand the thinking or has it been explained .	Strongly disagree	I dont. Pat Street sumed up Home Economics as "In home economics students develop an understanding about the factors that influence the well-being of individuals and families within the home and community, and the actions people take to enhance and sustain those environments. In the context of food and nutrition, students evaluate current issues and theories of nutrition, identify and reflect on factors that influence people's choices and behaviours, and use this knowledge to make informed decisions. Through the processes of selecting, preparing, cooking and serving food, students develop their creativity and experience a sense of accomplishment at the same time as they develop personal and interpersonal understandings and skills that contribute to well-being." Does that look like Technology.	Home Economics / Food Nutrition is and should be part of the Health and Physical Education curriculum.	Food and Nutrition in Level 1,2,3 as subject	No			2020-03-06 09:40:40	ANON-YFPW-RWK9-K	2020-03-06 09:40:40	2020-03-06 09:40:57
Yes	Generally, this strikes me as a good idea, though I would be happiest if most schools made NCEA L1 optional and could then focus on appropriate local curriculum and skill-building for their community.	Disagree	It is unlikely that many more schools are going to treat NCEA L1 as optional. An alarming number of schools still structure their "subjects" around Achievement Standards, rather than the curriculum. (I am at a school that treats L1 as optional, and have seen significant advantages to a yr11 skill-building year with tasters of 8-10 senior subjects and I love it. Our neighbouring schools are more conservative and very reluctant.) Without incentivising schools clearly to make NCEA L1 optional, schools will simply remove non-NCEA content from teaching and learning.	In particular, the rolling in Media Studies with Senior Social Studies ignores two strands used to structure the Learning Objectives in the media studies curriculum: making media, and reading media texts. As a former contract Moderator of NCEA media studies, I am VERY concerned. (1) The foundational skills for making media are a critical skill-building step in NCEA L1 Media studies. Removing the opportunity for assessing these skills in L1 is akin to removing "Lab Experiments" from Science, or "Making Art" in Art. (2) The in-depth reading of media texts in the era of Fake News is the SINGLE MOST IMPORTANT issue facing modern society. Yes, including climate change: bad media coverage of climate change is influencing opinions. Rolling this into social sciences separates it from the making media strand, in particular, where students develop the skills of communicating in modern ways clearly and accurately.	Not at this point.	No			2020-03-06 09:40:56	ANON-YFPW-RWKG-1	2020-03-06 09:40:56	2020-03-06 09:41:02
No	My understanding was that the review would look at a possible 2 year level 2 programme which would allow a broader approach to the subject with less assessment. I was not aware that it would mean removing some subjects from Level 1. As a Classics teacher this is a major concern	Strongly disagree	Level 1 Classics was introduced and promoted by NZQA, so it obviously fitted with the NZ Curriculum at its conception- what has changed? Level 1 Classics was used as a pilot for electronic exams- so what has changed? Seems to be a contradiction in approach- specialist science subjects removed at Level 1 for a broader Science approach then subject specialisation at Level 2 and 3. Whereas no broad Humanities/ Social Sciences at Level 1. Be consistent Or is this the beginning of the end for Classics as a subject? Remove it at Level 1, promote History and hope Levels 2 and 3 gradually decline (or are helped to decline?)	Classical studies is THE subject which enables a broad, more foundational approach. It covers art, politics, history, literature, philosophy. It looks at cultures - their structures, values and conventions. How can Level 1 Classics NOT be seen as providing breadth and as a core foundational subject, while subjects such as History and Geography , which are much more targeted and restricted in their foci, are retained? If you really wanted a broad foundational approach you would have looked at Level 1 Humanities/ Social Sciences- which encompasses History, Geography and Classics and then specialisation into the 3 areas at Levels 2 and 3	Philosophy	No			2020-03-06 09:47:39	ANON-YFPW-RWKJ-4	2020-03-06 09:47:39	2020-03-06 09:47:56
No		Strongly disagree	I agree with none of these changes, keep the subjects you are currently getting rid of they are good	psychology, media studies, and social science have nothing in common! media studies should be offered more than it currently is or advertised i don't think a lot of people know what it is, if anything change media studies to film studies so it's easier to understand. also psychology is completely unrelated to media or social science. they all have enough content to have full subjects so don't combine them	there needs to be a compulsory course about how to live in the real world and the future maybe combine that with health	No			2020-03-06 11:34:03	ANON-YFPW-RWKQ-B	2020-03-06 11:34:03	2020-03-06 11:34:37
Yes		Agree	I think this will have a large impact on recruiting specialist teachers for subjects that are being removed at Levels 2 and 3. Some schools will no longer offer those subjects at Levels 2 and 3 as they will not be able to support enough classes to justify hiring a teacher. I agree a broader base is good, but I disagree with the divisions. Some areas of learning seem to be allowed to be more specialised while others do not.	I agree a broader base is good, but I disagree with the divisions. Some areas of learning seem to be allowed to be more specialised while others do not. Media Studies is not always a natural fit with social studies - in fact it often fits more readily with the English curriculum. It is also a shame that the skills and ideas covered by Year 11 Media Studies will be lost to students as this often informs students' success in other subjects.	I would also like to see English divided into more specialised areas in Levels 2 and 3 - there is such a broad curriculum and no ability to do things in depth. A possible division could be Language and Literature or Making Meaning and Creating Meaning.	No			2020-03-06 12:15:42	ANON-YFPW-RWKE-Y	2020-03-06 12:15:42	2020-03-06 12:15:47
No		Strongly agree				Yes			2020-03-06 12:16:47	ANON-YFPW-RWKS-F	2020-03-06 12:16:47	2020-03-06 12:16:55

No		Disagree		As an Outdoor Education teacher, I would have expected this subject to be included. Risk management, sustainability, environmental impacts etc are nowhere in the subjects offered. People need to care about their environment and the best way to do that is to show them the value that they can get from it. They need to learn how to make mistakes in a safe environment so that they can practice risk management before heading out on their own. Environmental sustainability... how is that not in there?	Outdoor Education at both levels	No		No	2020-03-06 12:26:44	ANON-YFPW-RWKP-A	2020-03-06 12:26:44	2020-03-06 12:27:06
No	I did not get asked or know of anyone who was asked. Not sure why it is even necessary? This does not seem very transparent - who were the groups of people spoken to?	Strongly disagree	You do not combine Geography and History and yet combine Accounting, Economics and Business Studies ... all three as different as History and Geography This does not seem very transparent - who were the groups of people spoken to as obviously not secondary teachers. Seems to be dumming down curriculum and making it very narrow.	You do not combine Geography and History and yet plan to combine Accounting, Economics and Business Studies ... all three as different as History and Geography. You would not combine Dance, Drama and Art either. Not a lot of thought or consultation has gone into this - shame CETA representatives were unaware of this change. All three (Accounting, Economics and Business Studies) are popular NCEA subjects and are ranked 9th, 6th, and 13th when looking at the percent of students sitting these external exams. Financial literacy is to be one of the skills students should have and yet this change does not give students a chance to study further into this as little would be covered in Year 1 when combined with Economics and Business Studies. Years 9 and 10 are a good time to give students a chance to study both and most schools offer a course during these years.	Not if this is what you have come up with. How is it that Ceta representatives met with you and this was never mentioned. So no!	No			2020-03-06 12:36:05	ANON-YFPW-RWKF-Z	2020-03-06 12:30:34	2020-03-06 12:36:13
Yes		Disagree	I believe the draft standards have limited the ability of my faculty to design a course that meets the needs of my learners.	Include standards on Biology, Chemistry and Physics. These should focus on the assessment of the curriculum strands of Bio, Chemistry and Physics and NOT be fully focused on the Nature of science as the draft standards are.	no	Yes			2020-03-06 12:53:46	ANON-YFPW-RWK1-B	2020-03-06 12:53:46	2020-03-06 12:53:47
No	It does not make sense to have a change like this. If the idea is to water down the current L1 program then great.....but it will come at a cost. Students will struggle if/when they choose mainstream science courses in L2.	Strongly disagree		Mainstream Science (Chemistry, Biology, Physics) should be offered at L1. If you want students to have the skills and content knowledge to be successful in L1/L2/L3 science courses then this change should not be implemented. How will students be better problem solvers without these content knowledge. Please don't make this a political issue or if the ministry can not secure specialist science teachers.		No			2020-03-06 13:03:33	ANON-YFPW-RWKZ-M	2020-03-06 13:03:33	2020-03-06 13:03:44
No		Disagree				Yes			2020-03-06 13:22:53	ANON-YFPW-RWKH-2	2020-03-06 13:22:53	2020-03-06 13:23:00
No		Strongly disagree	This is a change for the worse.	Removal of Latin is absurd. Latin is a fundamental in the English language. Science, English and Maths have their roots in Latin. Law, Politics and Theology all use Latin language. Latin is the glue for all subjects. The removal of Classics (and Latin) gives me the impression the Ministry would like to erase Western Culture. Science should not be combined at Level 1. There is merit in that up until year 10 but not at level 1. Art History should not be removed. It is vital for those where art is a passion. Media Studies should not be combined with Social Studies. You cannot possibly cover either thoroughly in one subject. All of these changes will result in surface learning of subjects and this should not be happening at Level 1.		No	I think it limiting resources for all students and limiting the quality of their education.		2020-03-06 13:27:46	ANON-YFPW-RWKV	2020-03-06 13:27:46	2020-03-06 13:28:12
Yes		Undecided	Undecided due to Accounting, Business Studies and Economics being rolled into one subject of "Commerce" at Level 1. It is difficult to determine the implications of this without knowing what changes will come in for these subjects at Level 2.	Commerce - the small focus on Accounting will give a disadvantage to this subject over other Commerce subjects. I currently think that Accounting Level 1 creates a good base to build on in Level 2, so it would be a shame to focus less on this. In contrast to this, Economics Level 1 creates zero basis for Level 2. The current focus on insignificant minutiae in the Economics Level 1 course is actually often detrimental to "bigger picture" thinking required in Level 2. This should be taken into consideration when developing the "Commerce" subject at Level 1.	N/A	No			2020-03-06 13:43:54	ANON-YFPW-RWKW-7	2020-03-06 13:43:53	2020-03-06 13:44:19

Yes	Yes, but I don't accept that collapsing the sciences into one subject, getting rid of Latin, Art History and Classical Studies will promote a better general education. Quite the contrary, this move will remove subjects which promote rich, deep learning from Level 1, as students will not take these subjects if there is no qualification at the end of Year 11.	Strongly disagree	The NZ Curriculum is currently a shambles. There is not much content in the curriculum statements, only a list of skills with no meat on which to hang them. Superimposed on these statements is the 'new' digital technologies curriculum which is virtually incomprehensible as it is filled with jargon. and will be out of date by the time anyone implements it.	There is possibly a rationale for not allowing students to do too many commercial subjects at Year 11 (Economics, Accounting, Business Studies) as there is some crossover here. This can be controlled by right-thinking schools by only allowing a choice of a maximum of two or even fewer commercial subjects. They don't have to be collapsed into one NCEA Level 1 subject. Latin and Classical Studies should be retained as they are some of the few subjects which offer rich, deep learning in humanities at Year 11.	No	Yes		Currently most of these are catered for in our Te Reo Maori, MPA and Hauora programmes. Students who have a desire to have a strong showing in this area also need to retain a strong general education as well. This development could lead to a 'ghettoisation' of some students which is not desirable.	2020-03-06 13:54:24	ANON-YFPW-RWKD-X	2020-03-06 13:54:24	2020-03-06 13:54:42
Yes		Agree	Dance is such a valuable subject.	Maori Performing Arts sounds incredible, I would hope there is some sort of training or curriculum issues for teachers wishing to teach it. I would also hope that those teachers are ARTISTS (dance teachers or drama teachers or music teachers or Maori teachers). Specialising in Maori arts takes a lot of learning and respect. Only teachers qualified and understanding of the subject should teach it.	no	Yes		I would like to know more about it and how it would be taught - what students will be learning and how they will benefit from it	2020-03-06 13:55:39	ANON-YFPW-RWKD-J	2020-03-06 13:55:39	2020-03-06 13:55:51
Yes		Disagree	Unclear information about specifications at present. Need more definite picture about what it looks like at the grass roots level - what is the expectation in terms of practical outcomes. Restrictions to general broader based learning is appealing, with specialisation happening later. Timeframe concerns with no option available to opt out. How will endorsement work? Do you have to do all AS? Workload is increased for students and staff with the requirement of 20 credits. Achievement Standards are discrete so schools with less available are time pressured as we cannot double dip. What will endorsement look like? Its difficult to comment when we are unsure what Level 2 and Level 3 look like?	Art History at Level 1. The subject is loved by students that take this.	No	No		New Maori performance subjects are positive	2020-03-06 14:03:12	ANON-YFPW-RWKA-U	2020-03-06 14:03:12	2020-03-06 14:03:36
No		Agree				Yes			2020-03-06 14:10:41	ANON-YFPW-RWKN-8	2020-03-06 14:10:41	2020-03-06 14:10:47
Yes	Your definition of a broad education at NCEA L1 seems to be based on restricting choice for students. Schools can construct timetables that support students having a wide foundation of learning by requiring a subject from Technology or the Social Sciences to be included in subject choice. You are assuming that by collapsing subjects as unlike as Media Studies, Social Studies and Psychology into one course called Social Studies, or Economics and Accounting and calling it Commerce, gives students a foundation is wrong. Schools can construct courses that suit their students from the Qualifications Framework already.	Strongly disagree				No			2020-03-06 14:16:49	ANON-YFPW-RWKK-5	2020-03-06 14:16:49	2020-03-06 14:17:03
Yes		Disagree	I Teach a variety of Technologies and don't understand what is meant by "integrated through new Technology subjects" "Food Science" in Health is a very bad idea. Food Technology and Home Economics belongs in Technology. Where will CAD and CAM fit in? How about a general Technology that could include some or all of the Technologies so that a STEM approach can be used.	see above	CAD and CAM in Technology	No			2020-03-06 14:58:34	ANON-YFPW-RWK6-G	2020-03-06 14:58:34	2020-03-06 14:58:47
No	Some of us understood this others did not. Did not realise it would be so general.	Undecided	There are inconsistencies - in some cases agree but in others not so. IB at Yr 11 is still foundational Why isn't geography part of social sciences? Does not reinforce NZC learning areas. Should be working back from L2 and L3.	Change subjects to domain - have standards broad enough to assess any context Media studies - agree that it shouldn't be taught at L1 Teacher skill and preference may dictate what areas of learning are covered Don't understand why geography and history are included when it should be social sciences.		No			2020-03-06 15:16:27	ANON-YFPW-RWKR-C	2020-03-06 15:16:27	2020-03-06 15:17:10

No		Strongly disagree		It would be a regrettable decision to eliminate Latin and I am appalled that it is being proposed. It will relegate language studies in NZ to a second-rate level. Latin is not only a highly academic subject, but it is multi-faceted. It promotes literacy, precision and general knowledge above all other subjects. Students who study Latin are likely to end up at the top of the academic spectrum when they can specialise in their senior years, but there are benefits along the way for students at every level. Latin students are very passionate about this subject and anything they learn is beneficial to them in whatever path they take in life. The study of Latin on a CV is highly regarded by universities and employers. You will lose experienced teachers who will find work in Australia.	Please allow these students to continue with Latin so that they can read in the original some of the best literature ever written. I would like to suggest the study of Classical Greek, but I suspect that it would not be implemented, if there is no appreciation of Latin.	No			2020-03-06 15:40:14	ANON-YFPW-RWKW-H	2020-03-06 15:40:14	2020-03-06 15:41:18
No	But this is a good approach and has been used in other countries.	Agree	In general the grouping of few subjects into 1 is fine. But it is not clear how to design the teaching content and how to be taught. For example, several science subjects, Physics, Chem and bio, are grouped under Science. So, in terms of time for Science, do you also spend more time to teach? What topic to be included? If the new science spends more time to teach and covers the similar topics from Phy, Chem and Bio, that is not different from current state. So the most important is how to design the new subject content to make it broader education for Level 1.	The language for 'Mandarin' should change to 'Chinese'. If the language subject is to learn both speaking and writing, it should be 'Chinese'. Because Mandarin is just an official speaking language. Chinese implies both speaking and writing.	I am not sure if Mathematics and Statistics covers calculus. If it cover calculus, how much. If not, an advanced math to teach calculus should be added. A subject in law can be added.	No		Not familiar.	2020-03-06 15:49:17	ANON-YFPW-RWKT-E	2020-03-06 15:49:17	2020-03-06 15:49:30
Yes	But I can't believe how you have merged all of the sciences into 'Science'. Utterly ridiculous as this level. My boys (Year 8 and 10) are bored out of their minds at school but I keep telling them "wait until Year 11" but now it's just more generic science.	Agree	But I can't believe how you have merged all of the sciences into 'Science'. Utterly ridiculous as this level. My boys (Year 8 and 10) are bored out of their minds at school but I keep telling them "wait until Year 11" but now it's just more generic science.	Science is a very diverse topic. I think dividing up into biology, chemistry and physics would be expected at this level. At least you have kept History and Geography separate.	Biology, chemistry and physics at NCEA Level 1, continuing at Levels 2 and 3.	No			2020-03-06 15:58:03	ANON-YFPW-RWK3-D	2020-03-06 15:58:03	2020-03-06 15:58:14
No	I only found about this when I saw it on a news forum at Massey University...	Strongly disagree	What was the rationale for removing Latin and Classical Studies as subjects? Have you polled parents and asked for their views regarding the proposed changes?	I disagree with Classical Studies and Latin being removed as subjects. Classical Studies are part of the history of Western civilization. Why have you removed it? Latin is used in science, removing it has an impact on other subjects, WHY on earth have you removed it? I strongly disagree with this proposal.		No			2020-03-06 16:01:48	ANON-YFPW-RWK2-C	2020-03-06 16:01:48	2020-03-06 16:02:09
No	I support the idea of keeping subject areas broad at Level 1 and not specialising too early.	Undecided		I think it would be difficult to support media studies and psychology within a broader social studies subject. They are quite different disciplines. Similarly, I don't see how art history and classical studies could be supported within what I assume is an already full history curriculum. It seems like they are curriculum areas that are already full without the addition of these elements. Questions I have are... Would teachers end up skipping these altogether? If not, do they then lessen the depth to which they teach existing topics? What will be the balance for them between teaching subjects well vs covering all of the material?		No			2020-03-06 16:08:29	ANON-YFPW-RWKU-F	2020-03-06 16:08:29	2020-03-06 16:08:42
Yes		Undecided	"Education for Sustainability" is not included in the current or target lists. Is this because it is currently only taught at levels 2 and 3?	I am concerned about the omission of Education for Sustainability, as I see it as an integrator across Sciences, Economics and other aspects of Social Studies.	I would like the Ministry to consider adding to, or supplementing, the economics curriculum with Ecological Economics; addressing the issues of sustainability and climate change. The current Teaching and Learning guide and Achievement Standards for Economics are very closely focused on business and commerce, rather than issues of public policy. I am the vice-President of the Australia New Zealand Society for Ecological Economics, and would like to engage more fully on this issue, should the opportunity arise.	No			2020-03-06 16:37:36	ANON-YFPW-RWNY-P	2020-03-06 16:36:08	2020-03-06 16:37:44
Yes		Agree				No			2020-03-06 16:40:12	ANON-YFPW-RWNV-K	2020-03-06 16:40:12	2020-03-06 16:40:37
Yes		Undecided	Worried that fewer standards available in individual science subjects will mean less students taking sciences to feed into level 2. Currently students can pick from a range and multiple contextualised courses are able to be built around these. If only 4 standards are available across all sciences except AgHort, I can see less people taking these courses.		Align sustainability standards with Biology standards	No			2020-03-06 19:02:55	ANON-YFPW-RWNC-Z	2020-03-06 19:02:55	2020-03-06 19:03:02

No		Undecided			Philosophy! I feel that philosophy is a subject that should be developed at level 2 and 3, especially now that many students garner interest in it.	No				2020-03-06 19:29:21	ANON-YFPW-RWNS-G	2020-03-06 19:29:21	2020-03-06 19:29:39
Yes		Disagree	The concern will be the time required for teachers to plan and prepare for the changes.	Some changes appear name changes whilst others are a major change in focus and will have huge ramifications for school staffing.		No				2020-03-06 20:43:34	ANON-YFPW-RWN8-N	2020-03-06 20:43:34	2020-03-06 20:43:54
Yes		Disagree	The concern will be the time required for teachers to plan and prepare for the changes.	Some changes appear name changes whilst others are a major change in focus and will have huge ramifications for school staffing.		No				2020-03-06 20:44:26	ANON-YFPW-RWN9-P	2020-03-06 20:44:26	2020-03-06 20:44:31
No		Disagree				No				2020-03-06 20:51:45	ANON-YFPW-RWNG-4	2020-03-06 20:51:45	2020-03-06 20:51:52
No		Disagree	While the overall selection makes sense to me, I don't understand why a single language, Latin, would be omitted. If other languages are included, then this language also should be.	The reason I support the teaching of Latin stems from the interest shown in it by my daughter, now aged 26. She studied Latin and Te Reo from Year 9 and loved them both. Her work as a lawyer is now informed by both languages- she is fluent in Te Reo and as part of Crown Law on the Treaty team, uses her Te Reo. The Latin of course assists her in understanding legal jargon. While low numbers may be at play here, as a former teacher of Japanese myself, I can see that Japanese too is struggling to gain numbers- and so is German. But we should encourage diversity of languages in Aotearoa New Zealand as the number of us who speak more than one is embarrassingly small.	None that I know of.	No				2020-03-06 21:20:36	ANON-YFPW-RWNJ-7	2020-03-06 21:20:36	2020-03-06 21:20:59
No		Agree			Adopting cross curricular project based learning.	No				2020-03-06 23:10:38	ANON-YFPW-RWNQ-E	2020-03-06 23:10:38	2020-03-06 23:10:47
No		Strongly disagree		Please do not cut off NZ students from the opportunity to learn Latin and Classical Studies -- it is not just an excellent discipline itself, but so helpful for a host of other subjects as well as more general linguistic and cognitive skills.		No				2020-03-07 01:54:01	ANON-YFPW-RWNE-2	2020-03-07 01:54:01	2020-03-07 01:54:07
Yes	I have been worried for sometime about the classics. This change seems the death of Latin by a thousand small cuts.	Disagree	Support the new subjects but it should be and not or. All subjects now taught plus the new ones.	It would be sensible to include classical studies with Latin rather than History. A better fit?		No				2020-03-07 11:30:45	ANON-YFPW-RWNS-J	2020-03-07 11:30:45	2020-03-07 11:31:16
Yes		Agree		Latin should be included		Yes				2020-03-07 12:43:12	ANON-YFPW-RWNP-D	2020-03-07 12:43:12	2020-03-07 12:43:21
Yes	With regards to Technology, it is great to see that there are still 4 disciplines at Level One. To try and have just a generic Technology with four standards to try cover the disciplines would lead to a broad approach to assessing the learning area but the standards would have to be so holistic that they would not be prescribed enough and would be very open to interpretation by teachers, markers, panel leaders alike and could lead to a creep in the initial intent of the assessment leading to a massive range of evidence and potentially a strong bias in the assessment. Also great in the respect that just under 10% of students do multiple technology subjects at level one so this keeps their pathways open.	Agree		I see that generic Technology will be integrated across the disciplines. I agree with this as the existing standards were too generic and problematic for many teachers. To contextualize the significant learning will mean teachers and students can be better supported in delivery of a learning program within and across the disciplines within Technology and then design an assessment program to suit the outcomes and better recognize the nature of the evidence being produced within a particular context.	I believe there is a good argument for Electronics to possibly be introduced at Level 2. Could be a good bridge between a materials and a coding based learning program and give flexibility in creating an assessment program that will recognize either a pure electronics learning program or a creative learning program that has elements of mechatronics, robotics and controls. I know Textiles has a SEG panel and would also endorse that being a learning area at Level 2 once again due to the specialist nature of the learning and to give flexibility in the creation of assessment programs that recognize evidence from learning programs that cross multiple subject disciplines under Technology and possibly beyond.	Yes	Familiar but could/should know more.	no		2020-03-07 12:56:58	ANON-YFPW-RWN7-M	2020-03-07 12:56:58	2020-03-07 12:57:46
Yes	However, I am worried that it will result in dilution of academic standards towards preparation for Level 2 subjects.	Strongly disagree	I am afraid that the Ministry will still go ahead with the "broad" based education suggestion even after the survey and not taking into consideration the views of the majority.	I have only read through the subject "Science" proposal, talked with school colleagues and teachers from other schools, and they are not positive at all about the changes.	Yes, Physics at level 2 and level 3.	No	NA	NA		2020-03-07 14:28:09	ANON-YFPW-RWNF-3	2020-03-07 14:28:09	2020-03-07 14:28:29
No		Strongly disagree		Taking away subjects will destroy interest in the subject and decrease future potential students into potential interest into the subject		No				2020-03-07 15:12:51	ANON-YFPW-RWN1-E	2020-03-07 15:12:51	2020-03-07 15:13:02
Yes	As a whole, I think this is a good idea. However, students still need to gain specific knowledge at a base level to be able to build upon in Levels 2-3. I am confused as to how the standards I have heard about will achieve this. I am also concerned that with all subjects having 4-6 credit standards, all the assessments will be due at the same times (whereas now they can be easily staggered more consistently throughout the year).	Disagree	I am TIC Food and Nutrition at a large, integrated Yr1-13 school. I currently teach Home Economics. I can understand the idea to combine Home Ec and Food Technology - when I took over as TIC FNT at my school, the previous teacher had chosen to combine Home Ec and Tech standards which meant pupils could not get endorsements. But I chose to stick with just Home Ec standards at senior level as this is where the need for NZ is (EG obesity epidemic, food security issues and poverty, diabetes, CVD, cancer, wellbeing). The subjects are very different and calling them Food Science is very misleading (this term refers to food development rather than the health and wellbeing focus of home ec). As is the case with most schools, we report on tech standards at Years 7-10, so we fit in with the rest of the technology department. However, the vast majority of each course (Yr 7-13) is focused on Nutrition, Health and Wellbeing (Home Ec concepts like Hauora). It seems counter-productive to be feeding children breakfast/lunch in schools, but not teaching them how to cook their own cheap, healthy food.	Home Economics is not the best term to use as, although it is an internationally recognised term, it has connotations for New Zealand parents and pupils of being old fashioned (like "cooking" from 20-30 years ago and "home science" from even longer) and does not convey the subject accurately. If combined with food technology or not, I suggest names like these would be more appropriate: Food and Nutrition, Food and Nutrition Technology, Food and Health, Food and Wellbeing, Food and Health Science, ...		No				2020-03-07 17:43:34	ANON-YFPW-RWNZ-Q	2020-03-07 17:43:34	2020-03-07 17:43:46

Yes		Strongly agree		Support fully removal of physics, Chem and bio as too soon to specialise Also maths should also be one subject that covers all areas as was the case in school cert	Human biology aimed towards nursing at level 2 Financial literacy at level 2 More subjects at level 3 that are unit standards as many students return for yr13 that are not capable of gaining UE but are forced into academic subjects that they are not going to succeed in resulting in truancy and disengagement	No				2020-03-07 19:57:20	ANON-YFPW-RWNH-5	2020-03-07 19:51:39	2020-03-07 19:57:38
Yes		Strongly agree				Yes				2020-03-07 20:46:11	ANON-YFPW-RWNB-Y	2020-03-07 20:46:11	2020-03-07 20:46:36
Yes		Agree			Don't agree with subjects such as Dance as a whole subject of it's own. Performing welder could be one subject dance, drama, speech, film making etc.	No				2020-03-07 22:24:50	ANON-YFPW-RWNM-A	2020-03-07 22:24:50	2020-03-07 22:25:07
No	School should be compulsory until 18 years of age. But bring a much more trade based vocational training system into schools. So no child is able to leave school without some form of qualification or useful skill to sell in society. Unless they wish to go to university and follow current academic paths. Basic to advance courses should be taught in all manner of skills required for vocations available in society. Hairdressing, barber, mechanics, painters, agricultural fruit picking and processing, cheffing, carpentry, painting, electrical, etc. Especially focusing on the current skills shortage in our society by upskilling our own citizens as opposed to importing the labour from overseas populations. And then supporting a social welfare state of existing able bodied citizens is insanity. Preparing all children for university education when some are clearly not inclined academically or have no interest in academic subjects is a waste of resources, and time, demoralising the child at the same time.	Strongly disagree	This is tinkering with a broken system hoping it will fix the chasms of inequity that exist within it. Tinkering to try and make subtle changes to a system that clearly only serves a small proportion of our youth is a waste of time and resources. Streamlining a few subject areas still ignores the massive tail of underachievement that currently exists and gives no career framework for the most underserved / non academically inclined in our society. The system only caters for learners that can learn in an archaic segmented system that teaches subject areas in isolation. Never in society are these subjects areas segregated in the real world. To be a functioning member of our society you need to be able to resolve conflict, communicate effectively, manage a budget, problem solve when things don't go to plan, understand empathy and use it in previously listed skills, be determined and not give up when things get tough.	Feed back as above. Not included that should be included at level 1 are the following. CIVICS EDUCATION and the ability to get their opinions and voices heard by legislative bodies like councils and government is paramount to engage the massive disinterest in the political system and our poor voter turn out numbers. How can our society be considered a democracy if the majority of people choose to not participate. The largest portion of people in any election are those that can't be bothered voting, as opposed to those that choose to vote for any one political party. This is a tragic indictment on our society and how disinterested and uneducated in civics education our youth are. FINANCIAL LITERACY how to survive on very little and making good choices financially will lessen the burden on our social welfare system. FOOD PREPARATION going hand in hand with financial literacy should be where to buy, how to prepare, store and cook healthy nutritious meals. No child should leave high school without these skills. This will aid in the fight of our obesity epidemic and poverty statistics. EMOTIONAL LITERACY most people go through their whole lives without the ability to recognise what they are feeling and where these feelings	Not included that should be included at level 1 are the following. CIVICS EDUCATION and the ability to get their opinions and voices heard by legislative bodies like councils and government is paramount to engage the massive disinterest in the political system and our poor voter turn out numbers. How can our society be considered a democracy if the majority of people choose to not participate. The largest portion of people in any election are those that can't be bothered voting, as opposed to those that choose to vote for any one political party. This is a tragic indictment on our society and how disinterested and uneducated in civics education our youth are. FINANCIAL LITERACY how to survive on very little and making good choices financially will lessen the burden on our social welfare system. FOOD PREPARATION going hand in hand with financial literacy should be where to buy, how to prepare, store and cook healthy nutritious meals. No child should leave high school without these skills. This will aid in the fight of our obesity epidemic and poverty statistics. EMOTIONAL LITERACY most people go through their whole lives without the ability to	Yes	This document is brilliant and starts with the very important why! But it is falls famously short and serves only a few. It should be the document that governs all learning in all our schools not just maori - medium. Simply replace the term Maori in this document with the word human and we are all able to take a step in a better direction than our current situation.			2020-03-07 22:53:09	ANON-YFPW-RWND-1	2020-03-07 22:53:09	2020-03-07 22:53:29
No		Disagree	Removing Media Studies as a core subject, and embedding it into other subjects, is a fundamental error. It demonstrates an incredible lack of judgment and tone-deafness to the importance of media-savvy students in the modern era. The education system is stretched enough. Trying to integrate it into other courses is idealistic and foolish. I strongly disagree with this approach.	Maintain media studies as a standalone subject for the reasons I provided above.	No.	Yes	I think this is a positive move, one that is largely overdue. It enables students to be come citizens of Aotearoa faster and more confidently.	No, I defer to your learned experts.		2020-03-07 23:32:38	ANON-YFPW-RWNX-N	2020-03-07 23:32:38	2020-03-07 23:32:51
No	Will there be a shift in the NZ Curriculum to allow for only specialising at year 12 and above? The concerns I'm hearing from Science teachers suggest students on't be able to handle the levels required in year 12 Biology etc if this is not a focus earlier. Surely a future focused curriculum should be broader not narrower? One of the hardest things in year 11 is trying to fit students into much more limited subjects, whereas at year 12 the choice currently really opens up. Keeping students engaged is really important at Year 11. I think we should be making it broader then, not narrower.	Undecided		I'd like to see us be more future focused - where is financial literacy going to be offered? What about childcare for future parents? What about tailoring our subjects to be connected and come out of their silos? It still looks very much like an industrial age list.	Combing and integrating subjects so that they make sense for today's world and the future. The list lacks vision?	No				2020-03-08 12:13:26	ANON-YFPW-RWNA-X	2020-03-08 12:13:26	2020-03-08 12:13:33
Yes		Agree	With the proposed changes to Science I would want to be assured the following subjects: chemistry, physics, biology, earth/space and general science are given equal amounts of classroom learning time, so a student is given a taste of each science facet. This allows the student to discover if they enjoy the subject which should result in a good level of achievement. Students can then go on to make an informed choice as to what science area they might like to choose going into NCEA Level 2 & 3 which they can then study in more detail.	What will the proposed changes to Technology be when the Ministry states this will be 'Integrated through new technology subjects'. What are these new subjects?		No				2020-03-08 13:03:02	ANON-YFPW-RWNN-B	2020-03-08 13:03:02	2020-03-08 13:03:28
Yes		Strongly agree	I support amalgamation of subjects into Science. It is really important at age 15 students are still taught about ALL the sciences.			No				2020-03-08 16:26:27	ANON-YFPW-RWNG-K	2020-03-08 16:26:27	2020-03-08 16:26:41

No		Disagree	Re: 'Food Science' This is a very narrow term and does not reflect the essence of the Technology curriculum. The Health and PE curriculum cover well-being, including nutrition and eating well. This is non practical content, and an expected part of 'Health'. Food Technology is about developing food outcomes - essentially food products. It uses knowledge from other areas of the curriculum as do most subjects. 'Food Science' could just as equally be described as Technological Knowledge - knowledge needed to develop food products. Equally the areas of 'Materials Technology', also has 'Materials Science', which is also in the Science curriculum. We use that Science / materials knowledge to develop technological outcomes. This is just the same for Food. I hope there are Food Technologists on the RAS team, not just 'Home Economists'.	Food TECHNOLOGY should be under Technology. We have worked very hard over the last ten years to make this happen. To undo all this national work would be a step backwards.	No				2020-03-08 19:18:53	ANON-YFPW-RWNR-F	2020-03-08 19:18:53	2020-03-08 19:18:58
No		Strongly disagree	The removal of both Classics and Latin for NCEA Level 1 is gravely disappointing.	Classics Classics provide the foundation for the study of a broad range of subjects, including but not limited to History, Geography, Visual Arts, Drama, and Religious Studies. Beyond NCEA courses, Classics is the root of tertiary study in Law, Philosophy, and Medicine, as well as being instrumental in the development of critical thinking and analytical writing. The study of Classics is internationally renowned and held in high regard by institutions worldwide. Latin Latin is the foundational language of all the Romance languages, two of which continue to be language courses. The study of Latin flows into a deeper understanding of English grammar, writing style and more, creating an improvement in both subject areas. Alongside Classics, Latin provides a clear pathway into future studies, including further study in the classics and the aforementioned Law, Philosophy, and Medicine. The removal of these subjects from NCEA Level 1, and as a whole in the case of Latin, is unjust and shreds the credibility of New Zealand on the world	No				2020-03-08 21:42:44	ANON-YFPW-RWNW-M	2020-03-08 21:42:44	2020-03-08 21:42:59
No		Strongly disagree	Classics and Latin must be kept	Classics was extremely educational for me. Giving me a higher understanding of the world we lived in and how society and world grows around us. Knowing about the past is crucial for us to navigate our future	No				2020-03-08 22:31:35	ANON-YFPW-RWN3-G	2020-03-08 22:31:35	2020-03-08 22:31:40
No		Undecided		Keep classics as an individual seperate choice of study. I enjoyed taking Both history and classics as two seperate subjects throughout all NCEA levels as I gained a greater appreciation and better understanding of the two completely different subjects apart. In comparison if the two were to be combined I feel so much more important and interesting information will be lost in both subjects.	No				2020-03-08 22:38:41	ANON-YFPW-RWN2-F	2020-03-08 22:38:41	2020-03-08 22:39:49
No		Strongly disagree		I think that both Classics and Latin should be kept as they are. I never had the chance to take Latin but if I had I definitely would have. I took Classics in year 13 and it is now one of my majors in my BA. I love Classics with a passion and strongly believe that it should be taught at all levels.	No				2020-03-08 22:58:28	ANON-YFPW-RWNU-J	2020-03-08 22:58:28	2020-03-08 22:58:48

Yes	I think this is a good idea in theory, but as a student who has completed NCEA through to Level 3 I found the jump between levels 1 and 2 to be a very large jump in skill level and expectations, and I do not want the proposed changes to exacerbate that.	Strongly disagree	I strongly support the teaching of Latin at all subject levels. I have taken Latin all through high school, and am currently studying it at 300-level at university, and it has enriched my life so much. It is a great language to learn, and I have learned more about sentence structure and grammar than I ever did from English classes which I found to be essentially useless in this regard, or in any other language classes I have taken. It is a subject which, while not taken by many, is loved deeply by those who do, and for good reason. Classics is another subject which is being proposed to be changed, although not completely dropped like Latin. I think classics is also an incredibly enriching subject, and this is one that doesn't lack for students wanting to take it. The study of classics can teach us so much about the way the world works today, as well as being an incredibly interesting topic.	Along with Latin and classics, art history is proposed to be cut. Many educational institutions have already cut art history, or are planning to, and this is a huge loss to New Zealand's cultural identity. Unlike Latin and classics, no one anywhere else in the world will study New Zealand art history, which means that over time, knowledge about it will simply disappear, at which point we will have lost a huge part of our history, as New Zealand art goes back a long way and has an incredibly rich and deep history. I understand that these changes are only proposed for Level 1 of NCEA, but this is a starting point for further changes to the curriculum, and I fear if these changes are carried out, similar changes will follow at other levels, until subjects that contribute so much to New Zealand's cultural landscape and sense of self are not taught at any level.	No				2020-03-08 23:07:38	ANON-YFPW-RWPV-R	2020-03-08 23:07:38	2020-03-08 23:07:46	
No		Disagree		Latin should be included. As much as it is in all respects a foreign language and arguably has no native speakers to communicate with, studying Latin broadens vocabulary, builds a basis for academic language (in both Humanities and Sciences), enables students to access a plethora of texts and ideas and thanks to its structure it makes for a great exercise in logical and critical thinking. Please consider what you'd be renouncing by not including Latin.	No				2020-03-08 23:20:55	ANON-YFPW-RWPV-N	2020-03-08 23:20:55	2020-03-08 23:21:16	
No		Agree		I'd be interested to know about 'History' and it's content, specifically if there will be an important focus on New Zealand's history. I would not agree with all history being lumped into one subject if our own history will be lost in the midst of other country's histories.	No				2020-03-08 23:24:57	ANON-YFPW-RWPC-2	2020-03-08 23:24:57	2020-03-08 23:25:10	
Yes		Strongly disagree			Do not cut out the classics or art history, or combine them into one history class. I was never really passionate about my subjects in school until I took up art history and classics and for the first time I found something academic based that I was passionate about and wanted to learn, rather than a subject I was forced to learn. Combining them into history would lessen this learning experience and provide a low level of knowledge for people and may even deter other people from continuing their study of the subjects, even though they may have grown to love it	Yes				2020-03-08 23:50:33	ANON-YFPW-RWPS-J	2020-03-08 23:50:33	2020-03-08 23:50:46
No		Strongly disagree	Both Classical Studies and Latin should NOT be removed from NCEA.	Level one Classical studies should not be removed from the curriculum. It is an important discipline that gives students the opportunity to learn more about not only history, but also art and philosophy etc as well as improve their writing and research skills. Research being a particular important skill to acquire these days. As well as Classical studies being removed, the proposal to remove Latin from all levels of NCEA is ridiculous and would make New Zealand the only English speaking country not to offer Latin to its students.	No.				2020-03-09 00:15:23	ANON-YFPW-RWPB-Q	2020-03-09 00:15:23	2020-03-09 00:15:42	
No		Strongly disagree	Keep Classics and Latin. Classics prepared me for university more than any other subject at high school.	Keep Classics and Latin. Classics prepared me for university more than any other subject at high school.	No				2020-03-09 01:36:18	ANON-YFPW-RWP9-R	2020-03-09 01:36:18	2020-03-09 01:36:29	
No		Strongly disagree	cutting classical studies and latin language is a big mistake - studying latin give me a better understanding of english grammar and helped me with learning other romance languages as well as offered much aid in learning about medicine, law, and science because of the heavy reliance on latin used.		No				2020-03-09 04:26:12	ANON-YFPW-RWPG-6	2020-03-09 04:26:12	2020-03-09 04:26:18	
No		Disagree		I do not understand the exclusion of Latin. How could you possibly hope to offer a complete, broad education without the language and the culture that shaped western society for centuries? Latin is important to understand english, many foreign languages, history...	No				2020-03-09 04:57:06	ANON-YFPW-RWPJ-9	2020-03-09 04:57:06	2020-03-09 04:57:22	
Yes		Disagree	Strongly Agree with some, Strongly Disagree with others	Keep Latin, Art History, and Classical Studies. They are useful because they incorporate so many different subjects and can help with specialist subjects in the future. Fitting with criterion number 1.	No				2020-03-09 05:33:49	ANON-YFPW-RWPQ-G	2020-03-09 05:33:49	2020-03-09 05:34:29	

Yes		Strongly disagree	Please don't take away latin and level 1 classics. Latin was the only thing that got me through level 1 (socially that is). High school is hard enough without taking away people's passions	Latin is incredibly important. I doubt I'd be at law school right now without it. It is so useful and helps train your brain to think in different ways. I know many of my friends who took latin with me have gone on to do law, politics, medicine, and various arts classes where it has been invaluable. Please don't cut it for the next generation.		No			2020-03-09 06:50:14	ANON-YFPW-RWP5-M	2020-03-09 06:50:14	2020-03-09 06:50:23
No		Strongly disagree	I utterly disagree with the removal of Latin and Classical Studies as options for study. It is the main factor influencing my further study in Latin and philosophy at university, which proved indispensable towards my further and postgraduate study in law. The evidence is clear that learning another language has academic and intellectual benefits. Although Latin is intrinsically not particularly useful (much like Te Reo), it is extrinsically valuable as the basis for the history of the language, culture and history of the dominant demographic in NZ and the developed world. Removing Latin smacks of anti-elitism and tall poppy syndrome.	See above.	No.	No	I have never needed to be familiar with it.		2020-03-09 08:06:02	ANON-YFPW-RWPP-F	2020-03-09 08:06:02	2020-03-09 08:06:12
Yes	While I was aware, I do not believe that the proposed changes truly support further specialisation further along the pathway.	Strongly disagree	The importance of Pacific cultural arts should not come at the expense of traditionally academic subjects such as Latin, Classics, Art History and Psychology. While I agree with making school qualifications more achievable to a range of diverse talents, introducing these at the expense of others does not promote this.	Removing Latin from the curriculum severely hinders students chances to study Classics related subjects at universities overseas. Given the unfortunately narrow minded approach of this and former governments towards tertiary study, namely that there is limited support for those not following vocational pathways, many students in this area are forced to look abroad and this really limits their ability to do so. Ancient Western societies have contributed massively to our culture and to undermine this by refusing to allow students to learn it is in direct contravention of the Treaty of Waitangi. It also maintains the issues of the New Zealand centric History curriculum which does not make our young people educated with a suitably broad world view for international citizenship as the modern climate requires from those who are to be successful. As someone who has two degrees from overseas universities, the academic rigour of the NCEA system is lacking and geared towards rewarding perennial under performers. Having subject specific teaching was the only reason I succeeded, and removing that will serve to damage and invalidate the achievements of our brightest young people while giving those whose strengths lie outside of academia false optimism.		No			2020-03-09 09:45:29	ANON-YFPW-RWP7-P	2020-03-09 09:45:29	2020-03-09 09:45:48
Yes		Agree				No			2020-03-09 09:55:22	ANON-YFPW-RWPF-5	2020-03-09 09:55:22	2020-03-09 09:55:30
Yes	Classics is a multi-disciplinary subject, which introduces students to history, art, literature, philosophy religion and more in one course. Latin is a foundational language for many European languages, but has even wider implications for students' knowledge of English grammar, writing style and much more.	Strongly disagree	If New Zealand were to lose Latin, we would be the only English-speaking country in the world not to offer it to school students.	The study of Latin and Classics flows into study at Universities throughout the world. Furthermore, it has deeply historical links to the study of tertiary specialisations like Law, Medicine and Philosophy. In New Zealand, the curricula for Latin and Classics are well established, and the pathways are clear.		No			2020-03-09 09:57:33	ANON-YFPW-RWP1-G	2020-03-09 09:57:33	2020-03-09 09:57:41

No		Disagree		<p>Latin should not be removed from schools as over half of our language comes from it. Latin is a foundational language for many European languages but has even wider implications for students' knowledge of English grammar, writing style and much more. Students who learn Latin benefit from greater mastery of the English language, which is sorely lacking in this age of technology.</p> <p>Classics should be kept in level one as it is a multi-disciplinary subject, which introduces students to history, art, literature, philosophy religion and more in one course. History does not encompass all that Classics is. One can not simply condense an entire culture that still influences us today into a single assessment.</p> <p>These subjects support coherent and robust pathways into Level 2 and beyond. Both these subjects lead directly into Level 2 and 3 courses and follow into study at Universities throughout the world. Furthermore, it has deeply historical links to the study of tertiary specialisations like Law, Medicine and Philosophy.</p> <p>Currently, many schools have not yet introduced Level 1 Classics as it was only recently added.</p>		No			2020-03-09 10:10:56	ANON-YFPW-RWPZ-5	2020-03-09 10:06:40	2020-03-09 10:11:02
No		Strongly disagree	Don't get rid of classical studies and Latin!!	Classical studies and Latin are extremely important! Dont get rid of them!	No.	No			2020-03-09 10:29:58	ANON-YFPW-RWPH-7	2020-03-09 10:29:57	2020-03-09 10:30:05
Yes		Strongly disagree		Latin, Art history and classics should all be reinstated	Art History and Latin	No			2020-03-09 10:39:52	ANON-YFPW-RWPB-1	2020-03-09 10:39:52	2020-03-09 10:39:59
Yes		Strongly disagree	I cannot understand the rationale for deleting certain subjects (eg Latin) or subsuming them into others (eg Art History). As for the changes to Science - and their inevitable consequences - how was this decision arrived at?	<p>The English language is rooted in Latin. Relegating Latin to the "unnecessary basket" is criminally short-sighted and shows no understanding of people's right to know where their language comes from. Obviously also, it means that it is unlikely that Latin will be considered an important subject at Level 2 and 3. Hence, a truly dead language - but only in New Zealand! European countries value their languages and their roots. Art History is NOT part of history and I cannot see it being effectively taught by History teachers. It is an entirely different specialisation.</p> <p>As to the proposed changes to Science, I cannot understand how anyone could think it a good idea to generalise this to the point of general ignorance. Media Studies out too? Why? In this age where the media are more prominent than ever before ...</p>	No, but Level 1 should provide a solid knowledge base (emphasis on the word knowledge) for further study.	No			2020-03-09 10:41:29	ANON-YFPW-RWPM-C	2020-03-09 10:41:29	2020-03-09 10:42:01
Yes	NCEA Level 1 is to be 'broad' and 'foundational' with specialisation at higher levels. Classics is a easily a broad and foundational multi-disciplinary subject, which introduces students to history, art, literature, philosophy religion and more in one course. Latin is a foundational language for many European languages, but has even wider implications for students' knowledge of English grammar, writing style and much more. And this is without even considering what learning a second or further language does for appreciating the grammar of one's mother tongue, and the structure/syntax/mechanics of subsequent languages, or even codes (my students have told me knowing Latin and Greek helps them understand how syntax works in computer code!).	Disagree	If you are removing Classics at Level 1 and Latin at all levels, you are removing subjects that not only complement other subjects, in being foundational for those subjects as well as importantly helping students 'learn how to learn', you are removing subjects that add rich context to the more topical, seemingly modern subjects that are retained. The selection risks being short-term rather than having a long-term view of how students learn and what rich, important subject matter they want and need to learn.	Latin and Classical Studies support coherent and robust pathways into Level 2 and beyond. Both of these subjects lead directly into Level 2 and 3 courses, and follow into study at tertiary institutions and higher learning throughout the world. Furthermore, Classical Studies and foundational languages like Latin have deeply historical links to the study of tertiary specialisations like Law, Medicine and Philosophy.	I'd love to have some of the STEM subjects developed to be more STEAM (ie to have a communication component, so that students are encouraged to think about their message, their medium, and their audience, considering how STEM subjects are employed in the workplace - which is where a small component of the Arts or Humanities can be useful).	Yes			2020-03-09 10:52:16	ANON-YFPW-RWPD-3	2020-03-09 10:52:16	2020-03-09 10:52:27
No	Although broad, many students would miss out of the fundamental skills which I personally developed doing classical studies and history. Studying classics has helped me develop crucial writing and thinking skills. It's absolutely tragic that these courses are under threat. Especially with how biased these questions are. I'm studying classics at University and it is an incredible opportunity, I'm so lucky that I was able to study these subjects in 2nd and 3rd level NCEA.	Disagree	Knowledge of Latin and Ancient Greek culture expresses the richness of said cultures. I have developed many skills in intellectual rigour, critical analysis, and self expression. These are all sought after traits in the job market today.	<p>Classics: Classics is an incredibly popular subject at school and universities across the country. It continues to be an inspiration to music, arts, and culture even today.</p> <p>Languages: Language is SO important in today's growing world, it also helps us understand our own language.</p>	Classics	No			2020-03-09 11:14:46	ANON-YFPW-RWPX-Q	2020-03-09 11:14:46	2020-03-09 11:15:17

No	I am disappointed that there is a broadening of the curriculum at a time when specialisation is required. This is the 11th of 13 years education. Greater emphasis and ability to drill down on subject detail is required during these final years of education.	Strongly disagree	The loss of Art History, Latin and Classical Studies is hugely disappointing, these are subjects which have been lauded as corner stones of education for millennia. To move to a more basic predictable, useful education is short sighted. Secondary education is an opportunity to gain knowledge and wisdom in areas that students may not have the opportunity to return. It keeps this information alive within a community. The loss of this opportunity will be to the detriment of society as a whole.	Science should not be combined. History, Latin and Classical Studies should be continued to provide reassurance that the education system is not looking to develop a utilitarian system, but one that celebrates knowledge and learning in all areas, particularly those for critical thinking, wisdom and reflection.		Yes	Teo should be compulsory for all students, particularly in late primary and early secondary education. It is the responsibility of the government, as directed by the Privy Council, to resource this language. The education system should be fundamental to this responsibility.		2020-03-09 11:39:55	ANON-YFPW-RWPA-Z	2020-03-09 11:39:55	2020-03-09 11:40:05
No	By reducing exposure to different subjects, students will be less likely to seek out the subjects at a higher level.	Strongly disagree	While some of the additions to the curriculum are welcome, by consolidating several subjects under branches that are not even relevant, or consolidating subjects under a broader subject that will not actively involve any specific teaching of the initial subject, there is a huge gap within the education system.	Classics, Art History, Latin, Media Studies - essentially all of the paired down humanities subjects should not be excluded from the new curriculum. Considering the vast knowledge base associated with these subjects, as well as the foundational support humanities gives to all students to make them more well rounded, by excluding them from the new curriculum it vastly disadvantages students for further on in their education. Similarly, consolidating the Sciences will not grant any benefit to students preparing for higher education where specific fields, such as physics, chemistry, and biology, are integral. With the consolidation of all of the sciences under a 'Science' umbrella, none of the subjects could possibly be covered competently or thoroughly enough to help students in the long run.		No			2020-03-09 11:43:59	ANON-YFPW-RWPN-D	2020-03-09 11:43:59	2020-03-09 11:44:05
No		Agree				No			2020-03-09 14:11:50	ANON-YFPW-RWPK-A	2020-03-09 14:11:50	2020-03-09 14:12:15
Yes		Strongly disagree		Currently students finishing Level 3 in any STEM subject at the top of their cohort are already significantly behind the top of the cohorts of other countries. Generalising science to the end of Level 1 will damage the brightest students in STEM pathways as this would enable schools to limit the teaching time and content that can be taught as what originally counted as five separate subjects now counts as one. Many tertiary STEM pathways require separate Level 1 or equivalent Science qualifications and to deny the brightest students the opportunity is blatantly absurd. These changes seem to be aiming to make the curriculum more inclusive of those currently not succeeding at a large and real risk to those who are. It is punishing the brightest young academics in the country because their compatriots can't or won't keep up. New Zealand cannot expect to compete internationally if the government shows such reckless disregard for our future leaders and the opportunities that should be afforded to them in a developed country in broadening their educational horizons.		No			2020-03-09 14:28:03	ANON-YFPW-RWPG-N	2020-03-09 14:28:03	2020-03-09 14:28:10

No		Strongly disagree		Classics and Latin are a vital part of the world's history. These two things have influenced moments such as the renaissance and reformation as well as world leaders. Classical stories such as Homer's Iliad as aided in war veterans coming back home after a traumatic experience. Remembering the past is vital in understanding more of earlier history. Learning latin and classics at in level one inspired me to continue the deeper study of it later on in my life. When people get to level 2 and 3 they tend to focus solely on what they did in level one and stick to it. If classics is easy to mix with history, you could easily have a history class that contained classics as well. Latin however is a language and the early you learn the easier it will become in later years. Furthermore, no smart NCEA student will sign up for a language in level 2 ncea. There is already pressure to pass and learning a difficult language that far along in their ncea career is not wise. Latin in university is important because it aids in a greater understanding of literature studies. I was constantly making connections between the different transitions that could be used with the different perspectives of history to show that history is all about perspective. Also considering there is thousands of untranslated latin material, this could pose a great career for someone who	Anthropology is a great subject that I enjoyed at university and would have loved to study at my high school. It involved leaving the class room and exploring and experiencing the world and learning about different cultures.	No				2020-03-09 14:40:29	ANON-YFPW-RWPR-H	2020-03-09 14:40:29	2020-03-09 14:40:48
Yes	Removing some specialist subjects like Latin, Art History and Classical Studies at this level is, in my opinion, ill advised. They may not be the most widely subscribed to subjects, but the do form an important basis of education for those who might pursue a more academic career. I write as one who has been involved in education all my working life, but hasten to clarify they were not my teaching subjects. I have come to appreciate them and respect them.	Strongly disagree	For brighter, more academic students this is taking away choice. The academic student must not be discriminated against.	Latin, may not be a spoken language, but it is not 'dead language as some would argue. It is the basis of key existing languages including, English, french, Spanish and Italian, as well as other European languages. Classical Studies gives us an understanding how democracy, government, philosophy and even science came to be part of our lives. Art history provides a background to our creative instincts.	No	No	Though I have yet to be made acquainted, I have no problem with a Te Reo version of the Curriculum	No		2020-03-09 16:01:08	ANON-YFPW-RWP4-K	2020-03-09 16:01:08	2020-03-09 16:01:20
No	Details about narrowing down subjects e.g: Science, Commerce, Health and PE, was not mentioned in the roadshows.	Strongly disagree	Until we see more detail please	We are concerned that there is no backmapping from L3 to make any comment about current proposals at L1.		No	What is the difference between this and the English version?			2020-03-09 16:10:17	ANON-YFPW-RWPT-K	2020-03-09 16:10:17	2020-03-09 16:10:36
Yes		Disagree	I am concerned that by limiting the number of standards available, it reduces the pathways available for students to progress to higher levels of education. Level 1 NCEA could become a hurdle or barrier rather than providing pathways, especially if there is a greater emphasis on external assessment. This could reduce the numbers of students progressing to higher levels.	I am very concerned about lumping all the sciences together, especially considering that we are trying to encourage students into science and technology careers.		No				2020-03-09 16:23:21	ANON-YFPW-RWP3-J	2020-03-09 16:23:21	2020-03-09 16:24:15
No	We heard there'd be less credits/standards, but not less subjects.	Strongly disagree	There are specialist teachers who teach specialist subjects that are being done away with and joined with other areas. Ultimately, the students are being disadvantaged as they are being taught subjects and topics that they have no training in. There are also entire departments that stand alone from other subject areas or in different deviations from the way this proposal has categorised and joined subjects/departments together. Furthermore, it gives students less choice. They have limited choice as to what they study, or they'll be forced to sit through content they do not want to learn, to learn a small chunk of content that interests them. It seems ridiculous and backwards.	Yes, Media Studies is not often joined in with the Social Sciences in most schools. It comes under multiple departments, is often stand alone, and can come under English, Technology, or Social Sciences. Subject such as this, as well as the Sciences being lumped together, give students limited choice and forces them to do content that does not interest them. The whole curriculum/content of Media Studies cannot be squeezed and lumped in with other social science topics. The content is too specialised. It ultimately is to the disadvantage of the student/s that you force them to miss out on opportunities and specialising in certain content (like Media Studies, Chemistry, Bio, Physics).	Yes, don't lump subjects like Media Studies into topics that would ultimately limit student choice and that are vastly different from each other, e.g Psychology, Social Studies and Media Studies. They are hugely different, and there are many students who wait with bated breath to take these subjects separately. And, talk to those people on the grass level who have experience, rather than just box ticking to get a variety of voice.	Yes	Maori Performing Arts is an interesting idea that would serve the box ticking idea, however, what about other students who want to look at the technical side of performance, and art (like photography and media studies).			2020-03-09 16:32:13	ANON-YFPW-RWP2-H	2020-03-09 16:32:13	2020-03-09 16:32:27
No		Strongly disagree	It's ridiculous and has not followed due consultation from those on the ground doing the work.	Yes, there are topics such as Media Studies being joined with Psychology and Social Studies. Clearly, whoever decided this has no idea what these subjects teach as they are vastly different. That would be the equivalent of joining German with Japanese. It's the same thing, two vastly different subjects being lumped together with no consultation and understanding of these courses.	Yes, see above.	Yes		No		2020-03-09 16:36:14	ANON-YFPW-RWPU-M	2020-03-09 16:36:14	2020-03-09 16:36:27

No		Disagree	Art History, Classical Studies and Latin should be included.	Art History, Classical Studies and Latin are subjects I have endeavoured to master as an adult. How much easier for school students! These subjects would be of so much benefit to young New Zealanders, in giving them a perspective on the world. If Italian were included, it would help with the learning of music. New Zealand could be a world first in this field, if from year one, it was compulsory for students to read music, to play an instrument and to sing. Following on from this would be composition of tunes and writing of lyrics, for groups small and large. New Zealand, the country where they all play instruments and sport! Making music leads to social bonds, increases self esteem, is a solace in difficult times, gives one pleasure whether alone or in a group. Moreover, it is a field in which Maori and Pasifica excel. It has kept me sane!	Italian Music Composition and lyrics writing Latin Art History Classical Studies	No	I studied Te Reo at University for many years. I don't look like someone who would know anything about Te Reo or Maori culture, I live in a place with 25% Maori population. On many occasions I have had cars driven by Maori trying to run me over on a pedestrian crossing, smashing into my car as I pulled out of my property, swerving towards me as I walk along a narrow road.	Do you mean question 5?	2020-03-09 16:43:00	ANON-YFPW-RWSY-W	2020-03-09 16:43:00	2020-03-09 16:43:29
No	Very little consultation across schools done in my opinion	Strongly disagree	Think it is narrow minded in options available for students and will impact on their subject choices later in level 2 and 3. What four papers are on offer and do schools get choice in what 4 papers they do? Can't seem to see that information anywhere. (For pe and health)	Why does religious studies get to be a stand alone subject when it could easily be incorporated into social sciences/studies? So many schools don't offer it currently as a subject. Health and pe students are quite a different cohort and normally don't do both subjects. Would hugely impact the numbers choosing it if they had to combine the health and pe. Would also have an impact on specialist health teachers losing hours and potentially a job!	Think it's fine as a wide range offered and think most of the confusion is over people who don't understand NCEA	Yes			2020-03-09 17:46:34	ANON-YFPW-RWSV-T	2020-03-09 17:44:49	2020-03-09 17:46:45
No	As a history major, I'm absolutely palled that this is considered something not appropriate for education. As a history major who speaks many languages other than Latin... How do you expect to progress as a civilization and society without one of the most cultural languages in the world? So many cultures did not have a written language, thanks to laugh we have a description of so many other cultures. If you are not ensuring higher education, the lack of Latin in the school system ensures that the youth will not understand the past; and allows them to re-create it.	Strongly agree				Yes			2020-03-09 18:26:13	ANON-YFPW-RWSC-7	2020-03-09 18:26:13	2020-03-09 18:26:41
No		Strongly disagree	Do not cut Classical studies as a subject. Having recently graduated with a first class BA (HONS) degree in Classics from Otago University and having studied Classics at Bristol University in the UK, I am horrified to hear that you are planning to cut Classics from the curriculum. It is a subject which equips students with vital analytical skills to a high degree. It is also the foundation of our society and an understanding and appreciation of classical history, literature, and art is essential for maintaining an educated and functioning society. Losing classical studies from school will negatively affect NZ as a whole.	Do not cut Classical studies as a subject. Having recently graduated with a first class BA (HONS) degree in Classics from Otago University and having studied Classics at Bristol University in the UK, I am horrified to hear that you are planning to cut Classics from the curriculum. It is a subject which equips students with vital analytical skills to a high degree. It is also the foundation of our society and an understanding and appreciation of classical history, literature, and art is essential for maintaining an educated and functioning society. Losing classical studies from school will negatively affect NZ as a whole.		No			2020-03-09 18:51:48	ANON-YFPW-RWS5-Q	2020-03-09 18:51:48	2020-03-09 18:52:00
No		Disagree		Keep Latin and classics		Yes			2020-03-09 19:03:26	ANON-YFPW-RWS8-V	2020-03-09 19:03:26	2020-03-09 19:03:36
Yes		Disagree	I do agree that Latin is no longer a requirement in todays world.	By having a broader range of science subjects for example, how to the students delve deeper in to their specific subjects. Surely Level 2 and 3 will have to be far more detailed than before in order to cover all the necessary curriculum.	No	No			2020-03-09 19:38:39	ANON-YFPW-RWS9-W	2020-03-09 19:38:39	2020-03-09 19:38:55
Yes		Undecided	Need more information on content	Where has Home Economics gone? I can't see where sustainability, determinants of health, food insecurity, food on a budget, meal planning and hauora fits into Food Science. These are invaluable skills that our students need	Home Economics/Food and Nutrition	No			2020-03-09 19:55:28	ANON-YFPW-RWSG-B	2020-03-09 19:55:28	2020-03-09 19:55:58

No		Strongly disagree		<p>Re Proposed change of Home Economics to Food Science</p> <p>1. Who was consulted in regard to changing the name Home Economics to that of Food Science? What evidence was this decision based on? Was there any consultation with subject experts?</p> <p>2. Food Science' already exists at the tertiary level (Otago BSc majoring in Food Science as an example) and implies links to biology, chemistry, marketing and product development, to name a few. Why use the same name that already has connotations or understandings for our students and parents? Unless this is what's expected by NCEA's 'Food Science'. If so, this is clearly lacking in the essential learning concepts around the key concepts in Home Economics - hauora, determinants of health, social justice, sustainability and health promotion.</p> <p>3. Will Food Science retain a curriculum content that provides students with the opportunity to improve their food literacy and to think critically about the political, social and cultural forces which determine their access to food and shape their food choices all of which impacts on their well-being?</p> <p>4. The title 'Food Science' looks and sounds like 'Reductionist Nutrition Science', which takes individual entities out of their context and then</p>		No				2020-03-09 20:06:27	ANON-YFPW-RWNK-8	2020-03-08 15:30:40	2020-03-09 20:06:34
Yes	I believe combining some subject areas would be beneficial to students as it would enable them to take more variety of subjects in level 1 and then specialise at level 2. IN my current school, students believe science to be a very important subject and so often select all science options available to them and if they do not do well in 3 of their 6 subjects then they are limited when moving forward. I also think it could give schools a chance to set up a semester timetable at level 1 to provide even more opportunities.	Undecided	I like the idea (for reasons listed above) but still worry for Physical Education and Health, ideally it would be given the same timetabled hours as other subjects, where (in my experience) it doesn't always. this would continue to disadvantage students in level 2. My second concern is Health and PE are very different. Students who enjoy Health are not always practical students, and may be put off by the combination (especially since their experience at year 10 is largely practical)	Nil	Nil	No				2020-03-09 20:15:41	ANON-YFPW-RWSJ-E	2020-03-09 20:15:41	2020-03-09 20:15:47
No		Strongly disagree		Media Studies as a part of Social Science and Health as part of PE. These are much more specialised subjects and need to stay that way for students who are specifically interested in these pathways as PE may be of no interest to them but Health is and Social Science is not a major component with the work undertaken in Media Studies		No				2020-03-09 20:23:54	ANON-YFPW-RWSQ-N	2020-03-09 20:23:54	2020-03-09 20:24:03
No		Undecided		Incorporating both Health and Physical Education together is an interesting idea. Whilst it allows both elements to link together it could lead to boy's education suffering further. Amalgamating the two subjects and requiring students to address Health concepts within Physical Education contexts would be a discouraging factor for most boys. It is important that, while students gain a general knowledge in Level 1, we don't limit some of the opportunities available and therefore constrain them. Surely there is sufficient ground to cover for students without combining both Health and Physical Education?	- Health - Physical Education - Outdoor Education	No				2020-03-09 20:26:32	ANON-YFPW-RWSE-9	2020-03-09 20:26:32	2020-03-09 20:26:45
No	It wasn't very clear to me.	Disagree		Especially for Latin: It's a shame that pupils won't get that choice anymore. Latin is a lovely subject where you can do so many great stuff! Cutting in hours... Maybe. But leaving it out as a whole? No, I don't stand behind that decision.	I would like to see Latin included. Also, at a higher level, the science subjects should be divided again and have their own focus.	No				2020-03-09 22:10:20	ANON-YFPW-RWS5-S	2020-03-09 22:10:20	2020-03-09 22:10:33
No		Strongly disagree				No				2020-03-09 23:05:26	ANON-YFPW-RWSP-M	2020-03-09 23:05:26	2020-03-09 23:05:40
No		Strongly disagree				No				2020-03-09 23:14:38	ANON-YFPW-RWS7-U	2020-03-09 23:14:38	2020-03-09 23:14:51

No		Strongly disagree	I strongly disagree with the exclusion of Classics/Classical Studies/Latin from Level 1.	I strongly disagree with the exclusion of Classics from Level 1. In other educational systems Classics subjects have recently been renewed and re-invigorated - for example in Ireland, where a new Junior Cycle specification was introduced with strong support of schools, teachers' unions, parents and government - see https://www.curriculumonline.ie/Junior-cycle/Junior-Cycle-Subjects/Classics/ The new specification allows schools to teach the subject with or without a language component. The specification contains structures, areas and learning outcomes from a large number of different disciplines (foreign languages, history, creative arts, English, geography, philosophy) providing a holistic approach to cross-cultural and linguistic competency building. With the right approach and course content, Classics offers a non-hegemonic space for cultural reflection and cultural education, and abolishing it is short-sighted.		No			2020-03-09 23:16:16	ANON-YFPW-RWSF-A	2020-03-09 23:16:16	2020-03-09 23:16:31
Yes		Strongly disagree	Classical Antiquity is the base of our civilisation			No			2020-03-09 23:20:11	ANON-YFPW-RWS1-N	2020-03-09 23:20:11	2020-03-09 23:20:24
No		Strongly disagree		I strongly disagree with deleting Latin and Classical Studies from the curriculum, for several reasons. First, as a country in which most people originate from Western Europe and which culture is for a significant part based on western culture, Latin is essential in understanding and appreciating that heritage. Second, studies have shown that pupils who studied Latin had a greater understanding of languages, and complex and abstract concepts as they were capable of seeing relations more easily and more quickly compared to those pupils who did not get classes in Latin. As such, Latin is an essential part of any core curriculum both for its particular values and for its greater educational competencies.		No			2020-03-09 23:28:50	ANON-YFPW-RWS2-X	2020-03-09 23:28:50	2020-03-09 23:29:08
No	This is surprising and horrible news. It is a grove miscalculation of what is needed at NCEA level 2 and 3.	Strongly disagree				No			2020-03-10 00:11:12	ANON-YFPW-RWSH-C	2020-03-10 00:11:12	2020-03-10 00:11:36
Yes		Strongly disagree	The removal of Latin weakens the program as a whole. It is a useful language that leads to a better comprehension of Romance languages and indo-european languages as a whole.	The removal of Latin should be reviewed as it is a useful language to learn that leads to much more than a simple reading of the Aeneid.	Latin.	No			2020-03-10 01:33:42	ANON-YFPW-RWSB-6	2020-03-10 01:33:39	2020-03-10 01:33:56
No		Strongly disagree	Studies of Latin and Classics is a very helpful study for any students studying in fields of Arts, Laws, Medicine or Philosophy in their tertiary pursuits.	Studies of Latin and the Classics should remain a viable option for secondary students.	Please retain Latin and Classics studies.	No			2020-03-10 01:57:46	ANON-YFPW-RWSM-H	2020-03-10 01:57:46	2020-03-10 01:58:11
No		Strongly disagree				No			2020-03-10 02:50:08	ANON-YFPW-RWSD-8	2020-03-10 02:50:08	2020-03-10 02:50:17
No		Strongly disagree	It is a poor thing for schools in whichever kind of subject to abolish the possibilities children are offered. Students should be able to make choices as to what they would like to learn and specialise in and any degradation of possibilities takes away more of students' motivation and even potential. In this case, Latin teaching may well get student driven for a subject and may thereby get them to grow, academically and personally, to attain their highest study-levels, and it would be a waste to cast this off.	See the above	-	No			2020-03-10 02:56:08	ANON-YFPW-RWSX-V	2020-03-10 02:56:08	2020-03-10 02:56:29
No		Strongly disagree	Latin and Classics are the bedrock of Western Civilization. And this continues in areas like Philosophy, Theology, Law, Medicine- pretty much everything! Notables like Mark Zuckerberg (the founder of Facebook), himself a Harvard Graduate, praised Latin for its ability to teach logic and assist with computer programming. Does New Zealand want to head in the opposite direction? That would be foolish in the extreme.	Notables like Mark Zuckerberg (the founder of Facebook), himself a Harvard Graduate, praised Latin for its ability to teach logic and assist with computer programming. This is in the 21st Century! I myself benefitted from studying Latin and French in High School and University. It helped me with legal concepts such as "Res Ipsa Loquitur ". Furthermore the Roman Law principle of " Contra Preferentum " could prove key in resolving Treaty of Waitangi disputes. Of course Latin also improves one's English. As well as assisting the comprehension of other Romance languages such as French, Spanish and Portuguese. Overseas, especially in the United States, top Universities like Harvard, Yale and Princeton look for Latin on applicant's CV's. Does New Zealand want to head in the opposite direction? That would be foolish in the extreme.	Greek language and culture. Ancient History. Russian language and literature (Reading it requires knowledge of the Greek Cyrillic Alphabet). Portuguese. Art History (to inspire students to carry it on at University).	Yes	I can speak Te Reo Maori. Nga mihi.	2020-03-10 05:54:20	ANON-YFPW-RWSN-J	2020-03-10 05:54:20	2020-03-10 05:55:14	

No		Strongly disagree	The exclusion of Latin is a very poor decision, for reasons which I have made clear in a letter to Rob Mill. This will mean New Zealand is the only English-speaking country not to offer Latin as part of its school qualifications.	The exclusion of Latin and the downgrading of Classics will lead to cultural isolation and impoverishment for New Zealand.	Classical Greek.	No			2020-03-10 06:00:25	ANON-YFPW-RW56-T	2020-03-10 06:00:25	2020-03-10 06:00:47
Yes		Strongly disagree		New Zealand has a strong tradition of classicists – especially Latinists and Roman historians such as Ronald Syme, Ernst Badian, Denis Feeney and Richard Thomas. New Zealand Classicists like them provide unique approaches to an international discipline. This strength is also perceived and appreciated from abroad. The proposal to abolish Latin as a subject at all levels of NCEA would damage the country's international reputation in the field of humanities.		No			2020-03-10 06:28:33	ANON-YFPW-RW5R-P	2020-03-10 06:28:33	2020-03-10 06:28:52
Yes	I feel that the preparation that the students will be getting in Level 1 is going to set them up to fail Level 2 in the Sciences. It is hard enough with the content we are teaching at the moment for the boys I teach to comprehend the fundamental skills and knowledge needed to do well in Level 2 and Level 3. We already have the flexibility to tailor the course to different learners, regions and ethnicity. This will be taken away with the proposed changes.	Strongly disagree	They are horrible	I am a Science specialist and there is huge concerns with these changes from every single colleague that I have spoken to. What is frustrating is that there is no evidence or discussion based on what does work with the old system and why there is a reason for change. We already have learners coming through our school system who do not have the skills to learn for themselves and this is going to make that worse. Contrary to belief students do not enjoy research and they do not always want to be on their devices. Removing the practical internal assessments is going to have a huge influence on male learners.	Just leave them all alone	No			2020-03-10 07:51:32	ANON-YFPW-RW5W-U	2020-03-10 07:51:32	2020-03-10 07:51:43
Yes		Agree			Environmental Education / Education for Sustainability is still lacking. Sustainability / using an 'environmental conscience' is a key concept that our students MUST utilise in the future. This concept should / could be overarching many different subjects when justifying / making decisions. I would like to see this as a key focus on NZ's education.	No			2020-03-10 08:26:39	ANON-YFPW-RW54-R	2020-03-10 08:26:39	2020-03-10 08:27:03
Yes		Agree		I think it is a good idea to provide broader understanding of subjects at level 1. This gives children a chance to better learn what subjects they want to do and consider future directions. It also helps to scaffold learning for papers in the future.	I note that psychology is included in social sciences with other topics at level 1. I think this could be offered as a specialist subject at level 3 and perhaps level 2.	No			2020-03-10 09:08:15	ANON-YFPW-RW5T-R	2020-03-10 09:08:15	2020-03-10 09:08:22
Yes		Undecided				Yes			2020-03-10 09:32:06	ANON-YFPW-RW53-Q	2020-03-10 09:32:06	2020-03-10 09:32:30
No	I had to find out from my old Latin/ classics teacher. The announcement was not very well advertised.	Disagree	I think removing subjects such as Latin is a bad idea. Latin helps you understand how language is formed and while it's not a spoken language, it is still heavily used in careers based in history such as archeology, medicine and education. I also think combining classics and history is a bad idea. I felt that history already had a tough enough time getting through the topics as there is so much to cover. Adding classical history makes that even harder. It is also a very different type of history and has to be approached very specifically. You cannot teach students about topics such as Octavian, Julius Caesar and The Aeneid, the same way you approach the Vietnam war. It does the topic a disservice.	I think combining classics with history is simply a bad idea. They are two different sorts of history and need to be approached and taught in different manners. History focus on modern history and looks at the morals and reasoning behind it. It is a serious look into how to avoid future global mishaps. Whereas classics focuses more on the understanding of how ancient civilizations have impacted our modern world. How the actions of people such as Octavian, Claudius and Julius Caesar impacted the the civilizations after them. You cannot teach both subjects together, and expect the teachers and schools to be able to correctly give each topic the correct respect.		Yes			2020-03-10 09:33:30	ANON-YFPW-RW52-P	2020-03-10 09:33:30	2020-03-10 09:33:43
No		Strongly disagree		This proposal removes all science from the science curriculum and replaces it with politically motivated social engineering. I think this is a bad idea.		No			2020-03-10 09:41:31	ANON-YFPW-RW5U-S	2020-03-10 09:41:31	2020-03-10 09:41:38
No		Strongly disagree	As a Language teacher, it is disappointing to see Classical Languages being removed from the subject lists. As being part of school community that integrates Classical Languages amongst their subjects, there is still a place for them amongst the wider curriculum as I can't imagine Latin or Greek being integrated into a conventional History course. I think in this age where literacy skills are systemic issue in schooling, having languages that explicitly teach grammatical features thoroughly supports this initiative particularly with ESL/EALD students.			No			2020-03-10 10:19:51	ANON-YFPW-RW3Y-U	2020-03-10 10:19:51	2020-03-10 10:19:59
Yes		Strongly disagree		Don't get rid of Classical Studies. Just because it's not New Zealand related does not mean students don't want to learn about the Classical world. There is a difference between history and classical history.	NOOOOOO	No		Nope.	2020-03-10 11:36:28	ANON-YFPW-RW35-N	2020-03-10 11:36:28	2020-03-10 11:36:41
Yes		Strongly disagree		Dont get rid of classical studies. Just because it covers another countries history doesn't mean it isn't important and interesting.	no.	No		no?????	2020-03-10 11:36:26	ANON-YFPW-RW3C-S	2020-03-10 11:36:26	2020-03-10 11:36:49

Yes		Disagree		I feel that some subject areas, while they may be connected in many ways, by joining them together students may be disadvantaged as they will not gain the same depth of understanding to set them up for when these subjects are once again separated in Level 2. If the standard of assessment/understanding in Level 2 is to be lowered then this may be possible. EG - for PE and Health, while some contexts cross over, if PE students do not have the opportunity to gain a significant understanding of biomechanical principles, then they will likely find Level 2 more stressful as they are needing to play catch up in order to achieve highly in the next level up. Teachers would likely have to choose to split the teaching between both subject areas which means that prior learning for some areas would be missed going forward.		Yes		No feedback	2020-03-10 11:37:46	ANON-YFPW-RW38-T	2020-03-10 11:37:46	2020-03-10 11:38:00
Yes	Disagree however with the lack of vision around the strength and skills needed for different subjects	Strongly disagree	The removal of accounting at level 1 and clumping accounting, business and economics together shows no knowledge of the curriculum areas and the different skills that each require. In addition condensing down sciences shows no understanding/knowledge of the course requirements and further study. It appears to be a way to reduce marking costs and put all the responsibility back onto teachers	See above	no	No		no	2020-03-10 12:04:33	ANON-YFPW-RW3G-9	2020-03-10 12:04:33	2020-03-10 12:04:41
No		Undecided				No			2020-03-10 12:12:05	ANON-YFPW-RW3J-C	2020-03-10 12:12:05	2020-03-10 12:12:13
No	No. While I had heard the words, the extent of what was intended was not clear. We had received the message that the decision as to whether or not level 1 Biology, Chemistry, Physics, and Earth & Space science would exist as separate subjects was to be made by the individual subject expert groups. These groups have only just been formed, and certainly have not begun their work. So the announcement that subjects were to be cut was a very large and unpleasant surprise to the teaching community. The fact that [at least some of] the group that prepared the draft science standards were unaware of the decision that individual level 1 sciences were not going to continue is extremely disturbing. The bizarre timing of the announcements and timelines for feedback on standards and subject lists, the fact that we are being asked to comment on the suitability of level 1 with no information on what levels 2 and 3 are to look like all have the science teaching community wondering if the different groups working on these areas have any idea what the other/s are doing. Criteria 7 aims to support "the credibility of NCEA as a qualification overall among stakeholders, including its credibility as an internationally recognised qualification". However, this entire saga is heading towards a crisis of confidence and	Strongly disagree	It is impossible to comment on the subject list without also commenting on the proposed level 1 science standards as the two are inextricably linked. The two goals stated in criteria 1 of "a broader more foundational NCEA Level 1" and "increasing specialization at Levels 2 and 3" are fundamentally incompatible in the sciences with a single subject and a single set of four one-size-fits-all standards at level 1. For students who do not study science beyond level 1 the single subject and proposed standards may well be a good fit to set them up as scientifically literate citizens. However, the proposed standards do not offer any credits for the four contextual strands of the science curriculum. For students who want to study sciences at higher levels this foundational contextual knowledge is essential. Criteria 3 aims to support "coherent and robust pathways into NCEA Level 2 and further study or training", but the proposed standards and subjects will not achieve this. If we are to offer students the grounding they require to prepare for "increasing specialization" we will not have time in our courses to also cover all of the proposed NCEA level 1 science standards. This must surely result in fewer students continuing to study sciences at higher levels. Another issue exists for students with learning or language barriers. The proposed standards are all	The NZC contextual strands of biology, chemistry, Earth & space science, and physics must be included in some form. Either as separate subjects, additional standards within science, or as amalgamated subjects. Possible combinations could be: •Separate science, biology, chemistry, Earth & space science, and physics subjects •In addition to science, a "physical sciences" subject incorporating foundational chemistry and physics standards, and "natural sciences" incorporating foundational biology and Earth & space science standards •Keep the single science subject but rework the standards to have two NOS style standards (possibly internals) and two content standards along the lines of the physical sciences and natural sciences (possibly externals) outlined above As pointed out in the previous section, standards assessing the scientific contextual strands of the NZC are essential to allow schools the flexibility to design courses to cater for a wider range of learning needs. Criteria 4 aims to support "schools to create well designed and coherent local curricula, which support pathways for individual learners". Only by having the option of using a combination of science, biology, chemistry, Earth & space science, and physics standards will	I cannot say because we have no information about what subjects are going to exist at NCEA levels 2 and 3. At this point the confidence of the teaching profession in the NCEA review is badly shaken and many of us feel that all bets are off. Biology, chemistry, Earth & space science, and physics MUST appear in the subject list for NCEA levels 2 and 3.	No			2020-03-10 12:38:04	ANON-YFPW-RW3Q-K	2020-03-10 12:38:04	2020-03-10 12:38:22
Yes		Undecided		I think you have cut some subjects that offer students the chance to learn about a variety of areas. Classics is the easiest example, they learn about ancient history, myths & legends, and they study ancient art history. Moreover, Classics promotes an interest in languages and other areas of study relating to ancient history such as anthropology.		No			2020-03-10 12:47:57	ANON-YFPW-RW3E-7	2020-03-10 12:47:57	2020-03-10 12:48:17
Yes	People's perception of what a "broad, more foundational education" means could vary. I did not expect that whole subjects would be removed from Level 1 or crammed together with others. The skills and knowledge in these subjects are all very different and provide foundations for success at Level 2 and above. Introducing subjects in Level 2 is hardly "specialising" as the basic foundations would have to be taught from the beginning and in-depth learning would be greatly hindered.	Strongly disagree	There is no clear justification as to the reasons why some learning areas have been amalgamated while others have not. Many subjects that have lower student numbers have been retained eg many languages, arts subjects, while others have been diminished. Combining subjects that are hugely diverse into one, such as "Commerce" devalues those subjects and makes it extremely difficult for students to "specialise" and succeed at Levels 2 and 3 without a sound foundation to work from. This approach is myopic and it reduces the opportunities that many students have to develop broad foundations at Level 1, eg Accounting at Level 1 currently is broadly focused on personal and community based study.	Accounting, Economics and Business Studies are three diverse subjects and they do not "overlap". Combining them into one rudimentary subject at Level 1 does each discipline a disservice, as well as the students who would like to take them. Parents would expect these subjects to be taught; they are relevant to the real world, and there is a clear pathway for a career and further study at university. Nationally, student numbers in these subjects are increasing or being maintained. More affluent schools will be able to switch to the Cambridge system and continue to offer these subjects, thus widening the gap between the "haves" and "have nots" and contributing to a two-tier system. This is unfair.		No	I do not speak te reo Maori.	There is very little room on your questionnaire to write an in-depth submission. It appears that you have already made your decisions and that the process of making submissions is merely a formality - especially as you have planned the next phase to begin in April, immediately after the submission date closes.	2020-03-10 12:51:29	ANON-YFPW-RW35-Q	2020-03-10 12:51:29	2020-03-10 12:52:08

Yes		Agree	The proposals seem to streamline learning areas and provide a good balance of subjects.	For my area of technology we have both electronics and digital/computing overlapping for the use of digital technology assessments as with hard materials where we have both wood and metal technology subjects, with the same students taking more than one subject.	Materials technology could be split to cover hard material workshop subjects and soft material subjects like textiles.	No			2020-03-10 13:04:47	ANON-YFPW-RW3P-J	2020-03-10 13:04:47	2020-03-10 13:05:05
Yes	Somewhat aware.	Disagree		It is really disappointing to see Media Studies removed from NCEA Level 1. The Level 1 course is an important chance for students to explore key media concepts before making the choice to specialise in Level 2 or 3. That is my major concern - that students are going to lose that chance to try the subject out and discover what it is all about before that specialisation begins at Level 2 and 3. This could be devastating to Media Studies as a subject overall. What is the Ministry's plan for creating a pathway to ensure this doesn't happen? I also believe that it is an incredibly important subject and that students are incredibly well-served by beginning it in Year 11. Such a huge amount of what we do today is mediated by the media. With information being our economy and very much being power these days, Media Studies helps give students the tools to be critical consumers of the media's wares. The project-based learning that students engage in at Year 11 is important. It sets them up for the more complex level this evolves into at Level 2. Without Level 1, we are going to be spending huge amounts of time catching our students up on this and come out with lower quality products as a result. Level 1 Media Studies provides for a lot of our students, an alternative to many other courses	NA	No			2020-03-10 15:05:22	ANON-YFPW-RW3I-K	2020-03-10 15:05:22	2020-03-10 15:05:31
Yes	I was aware but was hoping for better.	Strongly disagree	The joining of the Sciences for L1 is unacceptable. Science students are able to have a broad course by schools selecting papers from a broad selection of the Sciences, I am very concerned by this.	Sciences need to stay separate. Why combine the sciences and not the social studies, or arts, or languages?! I am concerned about the preparation of the students for L2 and L3 and university/further study. I would be horrified if the same changes come through into L2 and L3. Reports as the only assessment tool is very narrow, and disadvantages our lower literacy kids. The students (and teachers) enjoy a range of assessment types. I am also concerned with workload issues for teachers as the standards sit.	Do not change L2 and L3 Physics.	No			2020-03-10 15:21:47	ANON-YFPW-RW3Z-V	2020-03-10 15:21:47	2020-03-10 15:21:59
Yes		Agree				No			2020-03-10 15:35:43	ANON-YFPW-RW3H-A	2020-03-10 15:35:43	2020-03-10 15:35:55
No		Agree			*political and government education how our NZ system works, councils, voting and worldwide differences *life after school. Career pathways. Financial responsibilities such as tax system, rates, medical costs, insurance, household management to prepare for leaving home and further education	No			2020-03-10 15:56:30	ANON-YFPW-RW3B-4	2020-03-10 15:56:30	2020-03-10 15:57:05
Yes		Strongly disagree		The rhetoric of this and previous governments concerning the 'brain drain' and New Zealand's place in international academic circles is completely at odds with the proposed changes. Continuing to generalise later into education does not allow for suitable depth of knowledge to be attained to compete internationally. Furthermore some of New Zealand's most celebrated academics both domestic and international are in the subject areas that are most likely to be irreparably damaged - Ernest Rutherford for example, or Ronald Syme, the pre-eminent Roman historian of the early 20th centuries who wrote the definitive book on the early Roman Empire that is still actively contributing to the field internationally almost a century later. If this government wishes to create more role models like these to inspire our brightest children, diversifying the already diluted creative arts fields at the expense of the sciences and humanities is an incomprehensibly stupid idea. The University of Otago has recently been named in the top 50 international departments for Classics and Ancient History, clearly showing that there is genuine appetite in this country for a classical education and results such as these which drag New Zealand towards other developed countries tertiary education levels should be		No			2020-03-10 16:52:04	ANON-YFPW-RW3M-F	2020-03-10 16:52:04	2020-03-10 16:52:08
Yes		Strongly agree		Yes, it would make people idiots.	Latin.	No			2020-03-10 19:24:39	ANON-YFPW-RW3D-6	2020-03-10 19:24:39	2020-03-10 19:24:56

Yes		Disagree		I find it utterly ridiculous that Latin, still a popular school subject among many schools in New Zealand, is being scrapped. Latin is an incredibly important part of our cultural heritage as a former colony of England. It is also an important and precious link to the foundations of the English language. Beyond that, it is still being taught at many schools in New Zealand. While many consider the language to be part of the old fashioned form of teaching of yesteryear. I see it still as a vital element of school curriculum.	Further development of computer science at high school level could be important.	No			2020-03-10 20:17:09	ANON-YFPW-RW3X-T	2020-03-10 20:17:09	2020-03-10 20:17:17
Yes		Strongly disagree	Limits the students ability to be able to do Level 2 in the future. Will reduce the engagement of students into the Sciences.	By reducing the options for Science you will reduce the ability of students to be able to gain the knowledge that they need to be able to complete level 2 sciences which are specialised areas of chemistry, physics, earth and space science, biology and general science. this will limit / reduce the number of students taking the level 2 options in science domain. this will reduce the number of students who would move into the science fields at University.		Yes			2020-03-10 20:51:25	ANON-YFPW-RW3A-3	2020-03-10 20:51:25	2020-03-10 20:51:42
Yes	I was aware and I understand the rationale for moving to a more broad range of subjects at level 1. What I do not agree with is anything that will drop the standards within our education system any lower. I also question the rationale of going to larger standards of higher value. This will become a much greater risk for the students.	Agree	Personal I have concern over the Technology area, i.e. 1. Technology: Integrated through new Technology subjects. Does this mean you have the list below, i.e. Materials Technology, DVC etc. I returned from teaching in the UK for 12 years 3 years ago and the area of Technology is so far behind where it should be. The materials technology course should become materials technology or even product design with an emphasis on not only materials and processes but also innovation and creativity. This is currently lacking with the emphasis being report writing.	See above.	Robotics.	No			2020-03-10 21:16:01	ANON-YFPW-RW3N-G	2020-03-10 21:16:01	2020-03-10 21:16:22
Yes		Strongly disagree		Cutting Latin from the curriculum seems like a foolish way to broaden education when Latin offers students a foundation upon which all Romance languages can be learned (including some not included on this list) as well as excellent training in grammar and vocabulary building. This is a subject that is already well-established and taught in many New Zealand schools (criterion 5). Studying Latin and Classics offers students a broad interdisciplinary competence in literature, history, philosophy, and archaeology. Students who learn Latin have an advantage when pursuing advanced degrees in Law and Medicine. Cutting Latin would make New Zealand the only English speaking country in the world not to offer it to their school students.		Yes			2020-03-10 21:18:41	ANON-YFPW-RW3K-D	2020-03-10 21:18:41	2020-03-10 21:18:53
Yes		Strongly disagree	Latin should be included. In the Belgian educational system it is included and this system has greater specialisation at levels 2 and 3.	Why not include Latin: Classics is a multi-disciplinary subject, which introduces students to history, art, literature, philosophy religion and more in one course. We should put this broad nature of the course at the forefront of our submissions. Likewise, Latin is a foundational language for many European languages, but has even wider implications for students' knowledge of English grammar, writing style and much more.	Latin obviously	No			2020-03-10 22:02:23	ANON-YFPW-RW36-R	2020-03-10 22:02:23	2020-03-10 22:02:48
No		Disagree				No			2020-03-10 22:06:23	ANON-YFPW-RW3R-M	2020-03-10 22:06:23	2020-03-10 22:06:55

Yes	I feel students should have already been exposed to a broad variety of subjects by the time they reach NCEA.	Strongly disagree	I feel students should have already been exposed to a broad variety of subjects by the time they reach NCEA and that NCEA should give them the opportunity to begin to pursue things that interest them as a career. Whilst the above is more a matter of personal opinion, I do have a particular concern over the combining of the 3 major sciences into a general science course. I fear that this is simply an excuse to dumb down the New Zealand curriculum further and to make it easier to shuffle students through NCEA without teaching them much of substance. (apologies for any spelling and/or grammatical mistakes)	I would very much like to see the introduction of the history of ideas into the curriculum at all levels beginning with primary age children and continuing into NCEA. By the history of ideas I mean tracking through the various works of political philosophy, sociology, etc (The ancient philosophers, Enlightenment thinkers, Marx and perhaps some more contemporary thinkers) in order to teach children about the way our society and others all over the world have come about, changed over time and may change in the future. I see this as potentially being linked into a civics program, which would involve teaching students how our government functions and a history of government action in New Zealand (this would be an excellent opportunity to introduce students to pre-European Māori social/political relationships, and to critically analyse documents like the Treaty of Waitangi and determine their worth for New Zealand now and into the future) This sort of education is necessary in developing an empathetic and enthusiastic populace that is capable of actually undertaking democratic action rather than being spoon-fed politics by the powers that be.	Having philosophy as a standalone subject at levels 2 and 3 would complement the ideas I have laid out above.	No				2020-03-10 23:43:14	ANON-YFPW-RW3W-S	2020-03-10 23:41:53	2020-03-10 23:43:22
No		Strongly disagree		Latin is vitally important to a genuine understanding of the western (and greater) world, let alone its literature, further arts and sciences. Without learning Latin, future generations will be stuck relying on outdated, biased translations, not mention unable to translate new works that are being unearthed, a recent example being Sappho's 'Brother's Poem'. All the thought and work that will be lost is immense. New Zealand will become irrelevant to international classical Academia. New Zealanders will be shut out completely from this arena.		No				2020-03-11 02:18:02	ANON-YFPW-RW34-P	2020-03-11 02:18:02	2020-03-11 02:18:15
Yes	But wasn't aware that level 1 media studies would be removed.	Strongly disagree		Extremely disappointed that level 1 media studies is not included. Regard level 1 media as an essential foundation course for levels 2 and 3. Students learn invaluable media literacy skills as well as critical thinking skills that serve them well when they under further study in this subject area. I think it is extremely short sighted to remove level 1 media. Our lives are shaped by the media and I consider it be one of the most relevant subjects that a student could study.		No				2020-03-11 07:57:47	ANON-YFPW-RW33-N	2020-03-11 07:57:47	2020-03-11 07:58:03
No		Strongly disagree	The subject themselves are not the issue, the marking schedule is the issue as it is inconsistent.	Media studies is not social studies and should not be taken out. Any attempt to do so shows the lack of understanding surrounding what actually goes on in a media class.	Journalism	No				2020-03-11 09:46:41	ANON-YFPW-RW32-M	2020-03-11 09:46:41	2020-03-11 09:46:49
No		Strongly disagree		Science is an enormous issue. The step up from L1 to L2 in the sciences is already very problematic.	No	No				2020-03-11 10:02:40	ANON-YFPW-RW3U-Q	2020-03-11 10:02:40	2020-03-11 10:02:48
No		Agree				No				2020-03-11 10:19:50	ANON-YFPW-RWDV-C	2020-03-11 10:19:50	2020-03-11 10:20:09
No		Strongly disagree	Otago University placed 47th in the world in QS rankings this year for its Classics and Ancient History programme. Latin and the Classics are alive and well in Aotearoa. Please do not deprive young people of the opportunity to learn about some of the greatest literature, art, and philosophy in the world. There is a reason these works have survived for thousands of years. The Ministry needs to do a better job of attracting talented teachers of Latin and Classics at the High School level.	Latin and Classics should not be dropped at Levels 1 and 3 respectively. Classics as a subject covers art, literature, philosophy and history. It's richness and depth is a strength few other subjects can boast.		No				2020-03-11 10:47:32	ANON-YFPW-RWDV-9	2020-03-11 10:47:32	2020-03-11 10:47:48

No		Strongly disagree	The removal of Latin and potential beginning of the slow erosion of Classical Studies is a mistake.	I fear that removing Latin entirely could be a grave error, considering the importance of the language in our society. While it is true there are not many chances to use it as a spoken language, the impacts of the language are felt elsewhere. Latin can help with enhancing understanding of the grammar of one's own language, in addition to the sheer number of words in English that are derived from Latin words, the study of which can help students to understand if they have never seen those words used in English. The act of translating Latin is also an act of analysis, as one must understand the forms of words to understand it as word order is less important; this means students look at words in different ways and leads to greater understanding. Not to mention the fact that Latin is the language of our legal terminology, as well as a great deal of medical terminology. Latin can also help when learning the romance languages, as much of their vocabulary and grammatical structures have a root in Latin. It also helps one to understand English grammar at a higher level. Classical Studies is a multi-discipline subject, and to remove it is to ignore the cultures that are at the origin of our societal and political systems, as	No	wish I had been encouraged to become more familiar through my schooling. It is something of great importance to our nation and should be made more prominent.		2020-03-11 11:10:08	ANON-YFPW-RWDC-P	2020-03-11 11:10:08	2020-03-11 11:10:30
No		Strongly disagree		One subject that is being gotten rid of in this plan is Media Studies. As a year 13 who is taking media studies for the third year in a row I have found this subject immensely beneficial for not just my knowledge with media but also for my ability to write effectively and work to deadlines. Media studies furthers understanding of society and makes you think about why the media does certain things. Being aware of what the media does and being able to understand it is a very important skill in todays society.	Media studies	No		2020-03-11 11:45:13	ANON-YFPW-RWD8-B	2020-03-11 11:45:13	2020-03-11 11:45:25
No	I'd heard rumours about a reform, but I had no idea that it was actually in the works or the proposed changes.	Agree		I disagree with how Media Studies is shuffled into Social Studies. I am currently taking NCEA level 2 Media Studies and I also took it in level 1. I not only enjoyed the course, but felt that it supplied me with knowledge that was not even hinted at in Social Studies the previous year. At that point, Social Studies was synonymous with History and maybe some current events. This would deter students interested in Media Studies from taking Social Studies as a substitute, as they seem too different. There are specific parts of Media Studies that are completely unique from every other course - that being the opportunity to work with high quality cameras, use editing software, write film scripts, organise a feature article through print software, and a number of other actions related to creating media. While I think that a lot of the tenants of the current Level 1 Media Studies curriculum can be divided between English and Social Studies (though to the detriment of how much can be learned), I don't think this practical experience can. With Level 1 Media Studies removed, there isn't a great segway to those experiences if the subject is to remain in Level 2 - which it definitely should. I think that experience is important to students who want to go into film, print, or any other kind of media creation - especially those who would otherwise have	No.	No		2020-03-11 12:33:18	ANON-YFPW-RWD5-6	2020-03-11 11:34:50	2020-03-11 12:33:27
Yes		Undecided	There is limited information on what these subjects are going to look like e.g. Technology is going to be covered by 'new Technology subjects'. It would be good before the proposed subjects come out that we get more information around them.	I'm a materials technology teacher and at the moment I don't really have information on how the subject is going to look and what these new technology subjects are. If the idea is to combine the materials technology together to allow students more choice in what materials they can work in then this is a good idea, however, it comes with a cost. We tried this 15 years ago with Fabric, Digital, and Materials and gave them a context/issue which they needed to solve. The students could choose which area they wanted to solve the issue. This meant that 3 teachers were assigned to the class. More explanation of the subjects would help decision making and feedback.		Yes		2020-03-11 14:18:19	ANON-YFPW-RWD9-C	2020-03-11 14:18:19	2020-03-11 14:18:39

Yes	But not to the extent I should have been due to lack of specific information until recently	Strongly disagree		<p>Art History Level 1: The many and varies uses of Level 1 Art History standards amount to a strong case for retaining the subject.</p> <p>* There are also cases of schools that use Level 1 Art History within their Level 1 Visual Arts programmes because they prefer the Art History research standards to those in Visual Arts.</p> <p>* There are schools which use Level 1 Art History to achieve Literacy credits e.g. a school which requires every subject to address literacy</p> <p>* There are teachers who use these standards to promote Art History (and Classics) to build up a clientele for future years</p> <p>* The National Statistics for several of the Level 1 Art History Internals (91016, 91017, 91018) show significant growth in the number of students sitting these standards since 2012 and should not be ignored</p>		Yes			2020-03-11 15:10:23	ANON-YFPW-RWDG-T	2020-03-11 15:10:23	2020-03-11 15:10:48
Yes		Undecided	There doesn't seem to be a huge difference between what will be offered and what is currently available.	<p>Removing Latin - fine to remove conversational Latin, but comprehension is still important with regard to how this applies to science subjects and the nomenclature of plants and animals.</p> <p>Inclusion of food science - this needs a broader explanation. Is it just cooking with a fancy name or will it be actual food science which would typically also be associated with chemistry, microbiology, statistics etc.</p> <p>Pleased to see the inclusion of Maori Performing Arts. Would like to make sure this is made available to all students.</p>	<p>I hope that NZ History will be included in History if it is not already.</p> <p>Increase of science and technology based subjects.</p>	No	Would like to know and understand more. My children all whakapapa back to Ngati Tuwharetoa so it would be good to understand how this could affect or be applied to them.	2020-03-11 16:09:07	ANON-YFPW-RWDG-W	2020-03-11 16:09:07	2020-03-11 16:09:22	
No		Strongly disagree	Media studies should be offered at level one.	<p>Media studies should stay as a level one option. I believe this is an essential one of the options level one students should be provided. Media studies provides insight into the media and world that everyday children are exposed to daily, this is something that I (as a level 2 student) did not find in any other level one subject. These skills can be transferred to the outside world. A skills learnt in Media Studies that I feel isn't found in other subjects include allowing the student to become much more aware of how they can be manipulated by the media, whether that be social networking apps or the nightly news to what is seen in magazines and newspapers. I feel this is vital to students at a level one level as they are exposed to this manipulation on the daily and although learning about it isn't going to make it go away, the students become much more aware of the effects that it has on them. This is a skill that will apply throughout their childhood and adulthood, it isn't just something that students learn about in school and forget, it allows them to use this information in their daily lives for the rest of their lives. This skill is something that cannot be found in other subjects at level one. Another important skill taught in media is it teaches the students how to form their OWN opinions on matters. The importance of this is that students</p>		No	No but I believe offering that is a great idea if it isn't already offered.	2020-03-11 17:10:17	ANON-YFPW-RWDQ-4	2020-03-11 17:10:17	2020-03-11 17:10:35	
Yes		Strongly agree				No		2020-03-11 17:15:52	ANON-YFPW-RWDE-R	2020-03-11 17:15:52	2020-03-11 17:16:03	

Yes	Yes, I believe that this change is good but the targeted subjects are not quite inline with this philosophy. Latin should be included in the targeted subjects.	Strongly disagree	Latin should be included as a target subject at NCEA Level 1.	Latin should be included in the targeted subjects at NCEA Level 1. It is a 'broad' and 'foundational' course that has widely helped me, a previous student in my acquisition of other languages such as Spanish which I am still studying today. Additionally, the rigidity of the grammar has enabled my skills, and those of my peers, to be improved in English. I am more eloquent in my analysis of literature in many languages due to my study of Latin, which would not have been possible if I couldn't take NCEA Level 1 Latin. The NCEA Latin course continues into well-developed Level 2 and 3 courses which become more specialized and are relevant and helpful to future career pathways whether that involves the study of Latin and Classics at a tertiary level or in the fields of Law and Medicine. Latin is relevant today and it wouldn't be right for us to be the only English speaking country to not teach Latin at this level. There are sufficient teachers of the subject, links to other subject areas and importance culturally of maintaining understanding of times before us.	Latin should remain in the curriculum at NCEA Level 2 and 3.	No			2020-03-11 17:37:52	ANON-YFPW-RWD5-8	2020-03-11 17:37:52	2020-03-11 17:38:12
Yes		Strongly disagree	I feel the decision to abolish Latin and downgrade Classical Studies is shortsighted and removes opportunities for NZ children.	I am strongly opposed to the decision to remove Latin and incorporate Classical Studies into History. I believe this denies students the opportunity to study a subject and culture that are the bedrocks of modern civilisation, and lead to a greater understanding of how our societies are formed. In these times a deep understanding of where we have come from - from both indigenous and wester origins - is more important than ever. Allowing these subjects to continue takes nothing away from any students; taking them away removes an opportunity for students to learn a society and culture that underpin one side of modern New Zealand. I write this from Australia; if the concern is teacher support then be assured that there is a strong cohort of Latin teachers in Victoria more than willing to work with you (Latin is the success story of languages in Victoria - it is now in the top ten of languages learnt in the state). I would be happy to discuss further if you wish - Dr John Tuckfield jwt@cgs.vic.edu.au.		No			2020-03-11 18:51:11	ANON-YFPW-RWD6-3	2020-03-11 18:51:11	2020-03-11 18:51:23
No		Disagree	While I agree for the need for the proposed subjects to be reviewed, I do not support the exclusion of Latin from the new list.	The list of languages on offer is extensive, as to be expected and encouraged, as we should desire the next generation of New Zealand citizens to have an awareness of other cultures. However, the exclusion of Latin from this list fails to acknowledge the importance of Latin as a root language for modern languages. Further, the skills required for Latin translation and analysis are universally applicable to other key areas in the subject list, not just languages. Latin requires students to have an understanding of the fundamentals of any language, including English, and provides students with a foundation so that they could choose to learn another modern language in the future as a result. All subjects should consider the future learning of students after they leave formal education.		No			2020-03-11 18:51:30	ANON-YFPW-RWD7-A	2020-03-11 18:51:30	2020-03-11 18:51:47

Yes	Whilst this move is intended to explore a broad foundation, it neglects the mental health crisis we are experiencing with our rangatahi. Health education is sidelined and marginalised, yet this powerful subject has the capacity to build resilience, healthier decision making, critical thinking skills and insight into wellbeing for our students. These skills are vital for them to manage themselves now and into their future lives. We are dismayed that this crucial curriculum area has been silenced at the most relevant time in the development of the lifespan. Health will be swallowed up by PE, yet PE delivers only a quarter of the strands of the Health curriculum. This is a seriously stupid move, made by ill-informed people who are ignorant of the real issues facing 21st Century education.	Strongly disagree	The curriculum has been severely narrowed, and does not reflect the needs of 21st Century students in their current and future lives. The proposal looks very rigid and takes our education back to the 1970s in the simplistic range of subjects.	Health Education will be consumed by PE. Currently it is already delivered by PE staff who mean well, but who generally lack the perception, insight and critical analysis skills required to deliver it effectively. PE teachers have a PE bias due to the nature of their training, which largely focuses on Strand B - the physical activity focus. Specialist health teachers deliver this curriculum with deeper engagement and connection with students. The learnings are 100% relevant to students as they negotiate complex decisions around their sexual health, alcohol, substances, relationships, nutrition, marketing of products to them as consumers, goal setting, and wellbeing. I am very concerned that students will be more vulnerable without these skills to empower themselves to make healthier lifestyle choices. This will also be reflected in negative health statistics societally, which ultimately creates increased burden on taxpayer dollar.	I am advocating for Health education to remain at Levels 2 and 3. Also for this subject to be recognised at Scholarship level, instead of remaining married to PE.	No			2020-03-11 19:08:33	ANON-YFPW-RWDF-5	2020-03-11 19:08:33	2020-03-11 19:08:44
Yes	Yes, was notified by teachers at school about this change. However did not know what subjects would be combined eg. Psychology and Media Studies	Disagree	Taking Level 2 Psychology at a school offers all level 1, 2 and 3 Psychology I feel as if this subject is significant enough to be its own from Level 1. I feel as if blending it together will mean media studies will decrease the amount of people that will take the subject due to the vast difference in the subjects.	Personally taking Psychology, that is the main issue I have. The teachers have fought really hard in the past to make the subject University approved and now I feel as if it is a waste to undo that work and fuse L1 Psychology with Media Studies. Ultimately I feel as if less students are likely to take either subject in years 12 and 13 due to the unusual mixture in year 11.	No, not at the moment. However I would like if the subject of Art History was prioritised more than it is now. Not many schools offer that and I feel like it would be a popular subject if offered.	No			2020-03-11 19:50:01	ANON-YFPW-RWD1-4	2020-03-11 19:50:01	2020-03-11 19:50:24
No		Strongly disagree				No			2020-03-11 21:52:16	ANON-YFPW-RWDH-U	2020-03-11 21:52:16	2020-03-11 21:52:40
No		Strongly disagree	I have a huge concern with the merging of PE & Health. In a blunt statement, Health is the one subject right now in the curriculum that can deal with societal issues we are facing. Where else can you talk about sexuality education, bullying, grief, loss, change, positive relationships, anxiety, stress, resilience etc. There is still a strong focus by PE teachers on the physical & not on the total wellbeing of a person. My worry is that the merging of these two areas means that health will not be valued as highly & will not be done as well as the physical aspect of PE. There has been a call for less Achievement Standards (credits) per subject be made available for students at Year 11 so they are not stressed (the exact thing that Health can teach & yet there is the potential to diminish this subject). So with this in mind, course outlines, are likely to only include one Health Achievement Standard & the rest be PE orientated. I hope I am wrong about this & I am more that happy to be proven wrong. I am passionate about PE & Health			No			2020-03-11 21:51:45	ANON-YFPW-RWDZ-D	2020-03-11 21:58:41	2020-03-11 21:52:47
Yes		Disagree	By streamlining the subjects that exist in NCEA level 1 it diminishes the quality of the teaching that comes with each of those specific subjects. For example for science if a student wishes to study only one science, ie biology, then to get to a stage where they would be able to study it they would first have to spend the majority of the year focusing on other sciences and each of those sciences would be covered in a very bare-bones state. This same example can then apply to the social studies section with psychology, media studies and social studies, all three of which are diverse enough that only getting some time in the year to study each part of them it weakens the skills and information that can come from studying them.	The biggest issues that come from this change are the sciences and the social sciences. Because these two are the most streamlined in this proposed change. However, this streamline would weaken the information of the individual subjects. Because while they are correctly categorised as sciences or social sciences putting them under the umbrella of 'science', 'commerce' or 'social studies' when they already have enough distinct curriculum which can exist as separate subjects and make it easier for students to learn the more specific elements of each individual subject, for example under the social studies umbrella there is psychology and media studies, media studies has a heavily focus on creating productions, which in no way correlates with psychology - being the study of the mind.	While nothing specific, perhaps looking into what universities and other tertiary education providers have as courses and adding subjects into the curriculum that don't quite link with what is being taught at tertiary education.	No			2020-03-11 21:59:59	ANON-YFPW-RWDB-N	2020-03-11 21:59:59	2020-03-11 22:00:16
Yes	Yes but, "broad" apparantly means different things to different people. I interpreted breadth as width, as in many subjects across the NZC not as breadth as in narrow the 5 sciences down and reduce it to 1 science.	Strongly disagree	Science cannot be compressed into 1 general subject. Retaining a broad set of content knowledge from all disciplines (Chemistry, physics and biology is key to supporting the 50% of students who move through to level 2 sciences	Add back some sciences. We desperately need scientists. Removing opportunities is a bad idea. Given that our only L1 standards do not specify content knowledge, and you remove the other L1 sciences. You have Removed common content knowledge. This Change is unsupported by international studies. Lack of common content knowledge in a proposed assessment system/ delivered curriculum and instead having inquiry based approach is negatively correlated with achievement. (Pisa). Why on earth would you make a change that is negatively correlated with achievement?. Its complete insanity.		No			2020-03-11 22:16:31	ANON-YFPW-RWDM-Z	2020-03-11 22:16:31	2020-03-11 22:16:37

Yes		Disagree		<p>I agree that Māori performing arts should be included but I think it is a shame that Art History and Latin are being removed. These subjects were and still are valuable to me and take years to master. The younger we are able to enable students to begin learning these subjects, the better.</p> <p>I had a tumultuous time in year 9 and 10, and beginning to learn subjects that I was actually passionate about in smaller classes helped give me focus and strive to do my best. I did Latin at stage one (which improved my English vocabulary and ability to read early English texts), I did Art History from stage two but wish I had been able to learn it earlier as it provided the best and only tangible way at the time for me to learn about history, culture and politics. These things all seemed so abstract in other disciplines but Art History helped help me see societal conditions as a cause of something else.</p>		No			2020-03-12 00:22:12	ANON-YFPW-RWDD-Q	2020-03-12 00:22:12	2020-03-12 00:22:37
No		Disagree		<p>Latin and Classical Studies are extremely important. They give a background to the language and culture of so much of the world. The skills developed can be applied to every job in every industry. It is vitally important this remain open to pupils.</p>		No			2020-03-12 04:05:48	ANON-YFPW-RWDX-B	2020-03-12 04:05:48	2020-03-12 04:06:03
Yes	<p>I was dismayed when I read about the proposed changes as it appears to me to be dumbing down the NCEA1 curriculum - generalists are not of any use in the world we are going into indeed quite the opposite. I believe that science streams with specialisation is vital as are cultural and arts programmes and languages like Latin that promote thinking in a way that is unique. I am a parent of girls aged 9 and 11 and find these changes very very odd</p>	Strongly disagree	<p>As mentioned above, the breaking out of Science into Biology, Chemistry, etc is vital in my opinion to expose children early to the differing strands of science - "science" as a single subject is too broad and I feel will lead to less engagement in the subject as a whole than if we kept the strands separate. Drawing on my own experience I loved Physics and hated Chemistry - under a combined banner I would have been likely to have disowned the entire subject rather than pursuing Physics which has been integral to my career/thinking</p> <p>Latin - I can understand the thinking that Latin is a "dead" language and has no relevance, but I fear it is misplaced. Latin as a subject is much more than a language, it is history, culture and more - this in addition to the fact that over 60% of English is derived from Latin or Greek roots means it is VITAL to understanding our English grammar. I only know about conditional, gerunds etc in English because of Latin.</p> <p>In addition, Latin allows for VERY easy learning of French, Spanish, Italian etc languages so if you are still offering these, you HAVE to still offer Latin - it gives these languages context.</p> <p>In my own life (I am 50) Latin has allowed me to :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 - develop a huge passion for Italy, Italian history and language 2 - be a basis for my speaking of (some) French and 	None at this time that I can think of	No	<p>As mentioned above, the breaking out of Science into Biology, Chemistry, etc is vital in my opinion to expose children early to the differing strands of science - "science" as a single subject is too broad and I feel will lead to less engagement in the subject as a whole than if we kept the strands separate. Drawing on my own experience I loved Physics and hated Chemistry - under a combined banner I would have been likely to have disowned the entire subject rather than pursuing Physics which has been integral to my career/thinking</p> <p>Latin - I can understand the thinking that Latin is a "dead" language and has no relevance, but I fear it is misplaced. Latin as a subject is much more than a language, it is history, culture and more - this in addition to the fact that over 60% of English is derived from Latin or Greek roots means it is VITAL to understanding our English grammar. I only know about conditional, gerunds etc in English because of Latin.</p> <p>In addition, Latin allows for VERY easy learning of French, Spanish, Italian etc languages so if you are still offering these, you HAVE to still offer Latin - it gives these languages context.</p> <p>In my own life (I am 50) Latin has allowed me to :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 - develop a huge passion for Italy, Italian history and language 2 - be a basis for my speaking of (some) French 			2020-03-12 08:22:44	ANON-YFPW-RWDA-M	2020-03-12 08:22:44	2020-03-12 08:22:51
Yes		Strongly disagree		<p>I am deeply disappointed to see the proposed discontinuation of Latin at NCEA level 1. As Ministry staff and teachers will be aware, not being able to take Latin at Year 11 level will severely impact upon the number of students who choose to take it at Years 12 and 13, when students wish to consolidate interests developed in their earlier years of schooling. Discontinuing Latin at Year 11 is effectively a death knell for this subject.</p> <p>This is deeply concerning for a number of reasons. Anyone who has gone through the New Zealand education system over the past thirty years will be able to tell you how little students are taught about the grammatical and linguistic structure of the English language. It is often only through learning foreign languages that native English speakers in this country are given the terminology and grammatical toolkit to be able to recognise how their own language is constructed. Latin is the language par excellence in this respect, and is also a deeply important part of our linguistic history. As we come to talk about valuing history more in this country, why are we devaluing the history of the language in which we are learning about the past? Latin has shaped how we think and how we express ourselves in the English language, and for</p>		No			2020-03-12 11:30:03	ANON-YFPW-RWDX-X	2020-03-12 11:30:03	2020-03-12 11:30:20
Yes		Agree				No			2020-03-12 11:48:25	ANON-YFPW-RWDE-9	2020-03-12 11:48:25	2020-03-12 11:48:34

Yes		Disagree		I am very disappointed with the name change from Home economics to food science. I consider that the name "food science" has connotations with food technology not food and nutrition which looks at the health determinants, social, environmental issues we are facing as a nation. I would like to know whether anyone has actually looked at the Home economics curriculum and considered what we do as a subject. I am all in favour of changing the name Home Economics as it is an old fashion term for this subject. I think the name food and nutrition is a more appropriate name. I would like to ask the people who renamed this subject "food science" what they exactly mean because as a teacher of this subject it does not reflect what we teach to the students. We have an epidemic crisis in New Zealand regarding obesity. Surely this subject has some value educating our future adults on how to cook and make healthy choices regarding food. Isn't this part of our well-being. Change the name please and have a look at our curriculum.		No				2020-03-12 12:12:22	ANON-YFPW-RWDR-5	2020-03-12 12:10:38	2020-03-12 12:12:34
No		Strongly agree		Looks good to me. Return to less complex structure	no	No				2020-03-12 12:40:52	ANON-YFPW-RWDW-A	2020-03-12 12:40:52	2020-03-12 12:41:17
No		Strongly disagree	By removing Latin and Classical Studies as separate areas of study the curriculum is removing one of the underpinnings of a broad education. While NZ is a country firmly placed in a Pacific context and a deep connection to Maori language and culture - it is also part of the wider world and that is why these subjects remain vital. Latin is a key component of an understanding of English as a language and the modern world - because of its role as the language of academia for so many centuries. Classical Studies focuses on texts which trace the beginnings of theatre as we know it; the art of western Europe; lyric poetry; history writing (that's why Herodotus is called the Father of History) and much more. NZ is uniquely placed to be a nation which is able to live in its Pacific context but recognise the wealth of art and literary heritage from the rest of the globe.	Please see my response above for comments on the need to retain Classical Studies and Latin as key parts of the Level 1 curriculum. Further to this - I have experience teaching Classical Studies in the Australian context where strong parallels can be drawn with the ANZAC experience and where early twentieth century commentators made explicit connections with Homer, Troy and the ideas of Athenian democracy. This is implicit in many of the monuments of the First World War in Australia and in New Zealand too. The lessons from Reception Studies about how the ANZAC story has helped shape the sense that both countries had (and I would argue have) of themselves as nations come through an understanding of the Classical World. I think that's one small example of the continuing relevance of Classical Studies in contemporary society.		No				2020-03-12 13:09:00	ANON-YFPW-RWDN-1	2020-03-12 09:25:57	2020-03-12 13:09:14
Yes		Disagree	Commerce subjects have been unfairly targeted, combining them while other subjects (the Arts for example) remain stand alone subjects.	Have a real concern as to what students will be expected to do in Level 2 and 3 Accounting. The few students who pick it up at Level 2 now really struggle. Surely under this proposal the quality of what we can deliver at Level 2 and 3 will be compromised. Financial capability is supposed to be being pushed. I can't see where this will be taught in smaller schools that have no finance/commerce in the junior school unless Accounting is a subject in its own right. Accounting nos. are currently v high at Level 1 and the cash management std is very important in teaching financial capability. Similarly the community organisations and decision making stds give students skills for life, not just a career path. Many of these students have no room for Accounting beyond Level 1 due to the Sciences being split and University prerequisites in Science.	No	No				2020-03-12 13:15:47	ANON-YFPW-RWD4-7	2020-03-12 13:15:47	2020-03-12 13:16:13
No		Strongly disagree		Latin should remain in the curriculum	Latin should remain in the curriculum	No				2020-03-12 13:25:23	ANON-YFPW-RWD7-7	2020-03-12 13:25:23	2020-03-12 13:25:36
Yes	However the end results still came as a surprise!!	Disagree	Health Education and Physical Education need to remain as two distinctly different and separate subjects,	Health Education and Physical Education need to remain as two distinctly different and separate subjects,	Outdoor Education.	No				2020-03-12 16:44:22	ANON-YFPW-RWD3-6	2020-03-12 16:44:22	2020-03-12 16:44:32
Yes		Disagree		Foolish to get rid of Latin at NCEA 1. Still a useful subject and fewer pupils will take it in years 9 and 10 if they cannot continue straight through. Latin is not an elitist subject. It is a useful aid in developing complex English skills, and in learning a variety of European Romance languages. It also gives cultural insights into a period which shaped European history. In the schools which teach it, Latin classes flourish. Removing it will isolate us still further from an important European mainstream.		No				2020-03-12 17:28:21	ANON-YFPW-RWD2-5	2020-03-12 17:28:21	2020-03-12 17:28:34
Yes		Strongly disagree	The preservation of Latin is very important from a literacy angle, honing writing skills, learning other European languages and general intellectual formation.	I think it vital to keep Latin for reasons stated in previous answer.	None other than Latin .	No	Not in detail but yes in principle .			2020-03-12 18:37:20	ANON-YFPW-RWRV-T	2020-03-12 18:37:20	2020-03-12 18:37:39
Yes		Strongly disagree				No				2020-03-12 18:55:04	ANON-YFPW-RWRV-Q	2020-03-12 18:55:04	2020-03-12 18:55:11
Yes		Agree				No				2020-03-12 19:40:18	ANON-YFPW-RWRC-4	2020-03-12 19:40:18	2020-03-12 19:40:25

Yes		Strongly disagree		Media Studies is now not included in NCEA Level 1. It saddens and shocks me immensely to hear this, and even more to see that it is now being grouped together under the umbrella of "Social Studies", where I doubt it will be focussed on in depth or properly at all. As a recently graduated high school student who did Media Studies all the way from year 10 to NCEA Level 3, Level 1 Media was the essential year where I decided that I was passionate enough about the study, creation and production of media to carry on with it until I had finished NCEA, as it introduced me to a more genre-, representation- and technicality-based experience in the study and production of media, and really gave me a perfect introduction into what I was about to delve into critically and more seriously in my later years of study at college. I see this year of media studies as essential and utterly important in giving students the best opportunity for seeing the joy, critical thinking and creativity that Media as a subject can provide a student with, and I hope that this will be reconsidered.	No. Simply to bring back 1MED to give students the opportunities for consideration and creating a strong base level of understanding in the subject that is absolutely required for further investment in the study of this subject.	No	I believe it should be made more clear that this is an opportunity for students who are interested in pursuing this for the sustainability of our indigenous culture.		2020-03-12 20:24:14	ANON-YFPW-RWR5-M	2020-03-12 20:24:14	2020-03-12 20:24:40
Yes		Strongly disagree		Both Latin and Classics are a very important part of any secondary school curriculum because they help to train young people's minds in the still valuable beauties that human creativity has brought forward (texts, language, historical insights, philosophical thoughts); secondly, the students will be able to understand the mindset of people of the past and learn to understand their achievements and errors, which, notwithstanding technical improvements, tend to be the same or similar nowadays.		No			2020-03-12 21:47:52	ANON-YFPW-RWR8-5	2020-03-12 21:47:52	2020-03-12 21:48:27
No		Disagree	I would like to add my support for retaining Latin as a subject. I was a Latin teacher and have recently transitioned to a new career as a software engineer. Latin has been invaluable for learning how to code. I did a tech talk on this recently: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=54F311VeMWk			No			2020-03-13 01:52:22	ANON-YFPW-RWRG-8	2020-03-13 01:52:22	2020-03-13 01:52:42
Yes		Strongly disagree	The decisions to exclude Latin and to include Classical Studies only to a limited degree within History seem to me mistaken and regrettable.	As the ancestor of the Romance languages, Latin is surely foundational, as it is also as an accessible example of the syntax and grammar of an inflected language, and so a model for later learning of both natural and programming languages (classical languages are well-known as a good preparation for the latter); furthermore because of its importance for later western cultures, Latin is also important in providing access to materials for the study of e.g. Theology and mediaeval History. For all these reasons, to remove it from the curriculum will inevitably reduce the foundations on which later specialisation can rest. The latter point also applies to classical studies, given the vast influence of the classical past on history, art and architecture, music, theatre and literature (not a comprehensive list) which continues today, and not only in the western world.	No	No			2020-03-13 05:06:46	ANON-YFPW-RWRJ-B	2020-03-13 05:06:46	2020-03-13 05:07:02
Yes		Strongly disagree	Science and Commerce subjects are all diverse but have been lumped together, but not for other learning areas??? So the intention appears to be that for some learning areas keep it broad but for the other learning areas continue to keep it specialised. Doesn't make sense			No			2020-03-13 07:46:40	ANON-YFPW-RWRQ-J	2020-03-13 07:46:40	2020-03-13 07:46:47
Yes		Strongly agree		Makes sense to develop home ec. & food tech into a Food Science (applied) subject. Can I suggest that it needs to be equally "hands-on" as it is theory if it has "Food" in the subject title.		No			2020-03-13 08:38:03	ANON-YFPW-RWR6-6	2020-03-13 08:38:03	2020-03-13 08:39:03
Yes		Agree				Yes			2020-03-13 09:22:08	ANON-YFPW-RWR5-P	2020-03-13 09:22:08	2020-03-13 09:22:14

No	I have been made aware of these intended changes recently. I'm always surprised when Government decides to implement major changes to the educational system without consulting directly with educators at all levels. University lecturers see all of these students after Level 3, we're the ones who actually know what students are getting and what they need in order to succeed in their chosen areas of study. For what it's worth, it seems as if NZ Education Inc could make more use of the wide body of academic research into pedagogy - what works, what doesn't, and what actually benefits students in the short- and long-term - in making these decisions for the country. Tell the Beehive you want to follow research-based practice, they may understand that.	Strongly disagree	These decisions seem to be made in the interest of bureaucracy, not at all in the interest of students and their actual intended pathways for future study, in school and then in University. If NCEA had a set history curriculum that did a decent job providing a broad foundation in World History, then getting rid of the specifics (Classical Studies or anything else) would make a kind of sense. As it is, eliminating Classical Studies (and Art History) from the curriculum reduces student choice from day 1. "We also heard that students value access to learning across the breadth of the curriculum and not closing doors to pathways too early" - obviously you heard but didn't listen. Eliminating these subjects will discourage students from pursuing them or anything similar at Levels 2 and 3. Same for what you're proposing with Social Studies and Commerce, but others will speak for those. If there is a real (stated) goal to homogenize the student body, then such changes are exactly in line with that policy. But I question whether the world really needs more bland generalizations without allowing students to delve into the particular subject matter that interests them.	As a University lecturer, I have dozens of students every year who choose to study Classics or History or Archaeology precisely because some school teacher at Level 1 or Level 2 or Level 3 captured their imagination with Classical Studies and/or Latin. Classics attracts students from all across the board, because despite its apparent specificity, the discipline actually encourages a comprehensive approach to the study of humanity - languages, history, culture, philosophy, archaeology, literature, law, religion, medicine, art, psychology, mathematics, anthropology, science, politics, geometry, etc. Classical Studies offers a gateway to all of these. Fighting for Latin feels like a lost cause at this stage, because the numbers are low and it's an easy target. But even that dead language has a proven correlation to better maths scores, language comprehension, critical reasoning skills, and even music performance. If you want to produce more successful medicine students, make your high schoolers learn Latin and watch all their memory retention and test-taking skills skyrocket. Leaving aside the obvious benefits of Latin, Classical Studies is an excellent way to liven up a history curriculum that is too often viewed as stodgy and boring by entertaining students long enough that they (almost by accident) learn more about what	No	I am not fully familiar with the content of Te Marautanga, but I support all language learning, the earlier the better, for the improvement of all of society.		2020-03-13 11:24:35	ANON-YFPW-RWR7-R	2020-03-13 11:24:35	2020-03-13 11:24:50	
No		Disagree	As a teacher of Classical Studies and Latin, I feel that the omission of these subjects diminishes the "rich" curriculum aim of the new list	as above - students' access to rich curriculum is diminished by the omission of the two subjects.	No			2020-03-13 11:51:38	ANON-YFPW-RWR7-F	2020-03-13 11:51:38	2020-03-13 11:51:58	
No	This hasn't been made very clear to schools as yet. Communication with any change should be paramount. When was this decided? Who decided it?	Strongly agree	I agree with the majority of new subject headings.	Media Studies deserves a place in its own right at all levels as this leads to a number of different career pathways. Leaving it as a possible context to study in Social Science does not do it justice! Perhaps you could rename it, Journalism studies or something? As a History/Classics Major and trained Social Science teacher, I find that our knowledge as staff of the intricacies of Media Studies as a subject are lacking. We would severely be disadvantaging students who wished to study a Media Studies pathway as we are not equipped to teach it to the level of current Media trained teachers. This needs further consideration! Likewise, Media Studies teachers would not be equipped to teach Social Science as would likely happen in every small state school where one teacher would be lumped with a number of areas to teach. It needs to stay a subject in its own right!	No			2020-03-13 12:03:42	ANON-YFPW-RWRZ-U	2020-03-13 12:03:42	2020-03-13 12:03:56	
Yes		Strongly disagree	Submission from Social Sciences Faculty - St Paul's Collegiate From the Curriculum Document Learning in years 11-13 The New Zealand Curriculum allows for greater choice and specialisation as students approach the end of their school years and as their ideas about future direction become clearer. Schools recognise and provide for the diverse abilities and aspirations of their senior students in ways that enable them to appreciate and keep open a range of options for future study and work. Students can specialise within learning areas or take courses across or outside learning areas, depending on the choices that their schools are able to offer. The proposed changes to Level 1 narrows the curriculum, in particular Social Sciences from 10 subjects on offer to 5. This takes agency away from Kura's (schools) to meet the learning needs of their ākonga. The proposed changes are also a narrowing of assessment styles, focusing purely on report writing - as can be seen from the Science drafts - which is not equitable, nor will the ākonga be prepared in an equitable way around New Zealand. It	The comprehensive submission above details our strong opposition to the proposed changes to creating one commerce subject at Level 1	Financial capability	No			2020-03-13 12:19:59	ANON-YFPW-RWRH-9	2020-03-13 12:15:18	2020-03-13 12:20:30

No		Strongly disagree		I don't believe Classical Studies and History can be taught under the same spectrum, and if it does us teachers cannot go into depth with any of the topics as there would be a little amount of time throughout the year. I also strongly don't agree with Media Studies under social studies, one is about the society and how actions of people affect communities and media studies is about film techniques which might fit better under English.	Political Studies would be great as it'll help shape young minds.	No				2020-03-13 12:27:15	ANON-YFPW-RWRB-3	2020-03-13 12:27:15	2020-03-13 12:27:29
No		Agree				No				2020-03-13 13:25:32	ANON-YFPW-RWRM-E	2020-03-13 13:25:32	2020-03-13 13:25:36
No		Strongly disagree				Yes				2020-03-13 14:22:34	ANON-YFPW-RWRD-5	2020-03-13 14:22:34	2020-03-13 14:22:40
No		Disagree		Media Studies at Level one should not be taken away, as it has provided several students such as myself with the opportunity to channel my creativity through visual content. Media studies is not just about creating videos, but understanding how our society works and communicates through different forms of media (this would be very convenient considering the current COVID-19 outbreak, which could lead to interesting studies regarding the reaction of the media and how they have had a serious impact on how the world is perceiving things). Unlike subjects such as drama and visual art which requires characteristics not all students possess, media students should be able to have the opportunity to seek out their creative abilities in another way, especially in such an important time for film, news and communication.		No				2020-03-13 17:28:21	ANON-YFPW-RWRX-5	2020-03-13 17:28:21	2020-03-13 17:28:34
No		Strongly disagree	Bad idea to abolish Latin and Classics.	Please do not abolish Latin and Classics. They provide valuable cultural and linguistic context to western cultures.		No				2020-03-13 18:52:02	ANON-YFPW-RWRA-2	2020-03-13 18:52:02	2020-03-13 18:52:18
No		Strongly disagree		Latin, Greek and Classics are the foundation of education. Without them, the schooling of children in New Zealand will be seriously impoverished. They are enjoyable subjects that children normally respond to positively as is illustrated, to take only the most egregious example, by the Harry Potter novels. Children have lively imaginations. To confine them to the here and now seriously stunts their intellectual development.		No				2020-03-13 19:51:39	ANON-YFPW-RWRN-F	2020-03-13 19:51:39	2020-03-13 19:52:10
Yes		Undecided		Disagree with classics being removed as an individual subject -classics provides a framework in which to understand past and current civilizations -because it incorporates both history AND mythology, I feel that what one is supposed to gain from learning from classics would be largely overshadowed -the humanities system is broken as is. Why break it any further?		No				2020-03-13 22:28:37	ANON-YFPW-RWR6-Q	2020-03-13 22:28:37	2020-03-13 22:28:52
No		Strongly disagree	The combination of History and Classical Studies will result in a loss of the broad scope that Classical Studies itself offers. Having studied both of them at high school, Classical Studies covered a broad range of subjects such as literature, history, politics, philosophy, religion, art, architecture, and international relations allowing me to develop a deep intellectual curiosity and critical thinking and evaluation skills. History on the other hand taught me the same things repeatedly over three years. No subject at high school has helped me more as a member of a modern society than Classical Studies which while ancient can have such reliance to today.	Latin should not be dropped as it is far from a dead language (modern books such as Harry Potter still get published in it) and can offer so much to its students. There are many technical aspects to Latin that once are mastered are a great help when learning other languages, particularly those that have either developed or borrowed from Latin itself.	Anthropology within social sciences as it is the study of people and cultures that span societies in the past to societies today and understanding cultures should be fundamental in a country that incorporates a diverse range of cultures.	No				2020-03-13 23:07:34	ANON-YFPW-RWRR-K	2020-03-13 22:51:55	2020-03-13 23:07:58
Yes		Agree				Yes				2020-03-13 23:27:15	ANON-YFPW-RWRW-R	2020-03-13 23:27:15	2020-03-13 23:27:25

No		Strongly disagree		I strongly recommend a re-evaluation to be conducted, especially towards the decision of cutting Latin from the national curriculum. This generalization that Latin somehow does not support 'important and rich learning' is a ridiculous one. Yes, there is not a high demand for Latin, but this is attributed to an overall ignorance and poorly-informed understanding of what the study of Latin provides for individuals who have sadly not had the opportunity to partake in such. Many label Latin as a 'dead language', a language that 'can't be spoken'. But there is a reason that Latin has stood the test of time and remains ubiquitously, the language of academia. The beautiful nuance and challenges of this language allows us to peer into Roman culture in ways that a dense historical text cannot. We come to understand and even adopt into our own lives the skilled rhetoric of Cicero, the compelling philosophical questions raised by the works of Horace, the rich historical narratives that the Romans built through Vergil's Aeneid and even the crazed passions of Catullus. Latin may not be evidently applicable to everyday life beyond secondary education, but the nuanced understandings of humanity, philosophy and language are forever enduring and life-altering to one's perspective. The very essence of education	No	No				2020-03-13 23:51:31	ANON-YFPW-RWR4-N	2020-03-13 23:51:31	2020-03-13 23:51:40
No	Just knew changes were being considered	Strongly agree	Currently something is not working for NCEA. Students are stressed with constant deadlines.			Yes				2020-03-14 07:21:08	ANON-YFPW-RWRT-N	2020-03-14 07:21:08	2020-03-14 07:21:41
No	We have no idea what the Level 2 or 3 changes are going to be. What does greater specialisation mean? - More subject choices or more standards to choose from or both? Impossible to comment on the Level 1 subjects until we know how it will integrate with Level 2 and 3.	Strongly disagree	Cutting out all the sciences into a single science is not satisfactory. For most students by year 10 they know what sciences they like - allowing them to specialise earlier gives them a better grounding and produces better Level 3 results.	Bring back Human Biology. There are a lot of students who are fascinated by how their body works. When we had this subject prior to NCEA many students took it. This was a great course. It gave those students heading into the human health industries/professions (physiotherapy, nursing, doctor, dentistry etc) a really good course to take. It should actually be expanded into Level 2 and 3.	As in Q3, provide Human Biology at L2 and 3. There are many students interested in the health industries/professions. It would help those vocations if students had a better grounding at the secondary level prior to tertiary education.	No				2020-03-14 15:37:04	ANON-YFPW-RWR3-M	2020-03-14 15:37:04	2020-03-14 15:37:17
Yes		Strongly disagree		Classics should be retained as a separate and distinct subject. It is possibly the broadest, foundational subject you could find. It teaches students about history, politics, mythology, religion, society, culture, literature, art & architecture, philosophy, and language. It opens students up to ideas about the nature of the human condition, in all societies, not just those of Ancient Greece and Rome. It is not the same as History, which is, in comparison, a very narrow subject. Classics students are not always History students, particularly as History has the insistence on 'significance to NZ'. To be serious about preparing our students to be players in the global environment they need to have knowledge of that world, not just of NZ. Sometimes, knowledge for its own sake should be enough. One only has to look at the way that the ideas of the ancient world are played out and reused over and over again in modern literature, art, film, and politics, to realise the continuing relevance of those ideas. Moreover, widening of the idea of the Classical world to include ancient Asia and the Middle East would deepen students' knowledge and understanding of the wider ancient world. And rewriting of the assessment standards at all levels to allow for links and comparisons to be made, rather than looking for influences from the		No				2020-03-14 16:30:07	ANON-YFPW-RWR2-K	2020-03-14 16:30:07	2020-03-14 16:30:33
Yes		Undecided		Yes I am a bit concerned about how the technology subjects are being visualised within the new subject list. I am not sure what is meant by the statement "technology - integrated through new technology subjects". I am also concerned that most teachers of food tech / home economics do not have food science backgrounds (I have some food science in my nutrition degree). Will there be extensive PLD in this? Food science is a 4 yr honours degree (graduates complete papers in all 3 sciences). How are you anticipating attracting such expertise to teaching? (Those I know who complete this degree are snapped up by our burgeoning food industry.) My other degree is in clothing and textiles - I also teach in this space - where is this envisioned in the new plan? If at all?		No				2020-03-14 19:39:08	ANON-YFPW-RWRU-P	2020-03-14 19:39:08	2020-03-14 19:39:33

No		Strongly disagree	Do not remove Latin from Level 1.	Latin should be retained at all levels. Latin exercises the mind by being more grammatically and linguistically complex than most languages, including English. It also introduces students to a world of wisdom of philosophy and poetry and studying the history of ancient Rome gives us invaluable insight into the problems plaguing our contemporary world, as it allows us to discuss societal issues without having vested interests.		No				2020-03-14 22:32:58	ANON-YFPW-RWGF-F	2020-03-14 22:32:58	2020-03-14 22:33:21
Yes		Strongly disagree	Unfortunately, you haven't provided a matrix answer option. I strongly agree on some and strongly disagree on others	Latin- This should be retained. My child is studying both Latin and Te Reo Maori. Learning more than one language helps identify patterns in other languages. Conversely Latin is also an example of students studying something because they want to not because it is "useful". Latin should be retained. Classical studies should also be retained. It gives a wider scope to history. Art history- agree- it can be lightly covered in art or history or picked up in year 12 Maori Performing Arts- support this being added. Health and PE- support the merger. Science- Support the merging of multiple subjects to a basic science to a certain extent. However some of the extra standards should be available so that schools can do basic science with a physics emphasis or space science emphasis if they choose to. However the basic science must enable students to pick up any of the specialties in year 12/level 2 Happy to merge media studies and psychology with social studies. I'm surprised psychology even	Ensure you retain Latin at level 2 and 3	Yes	Somewhat. It is a pity that schools can't implement Te Marautanga o Aotearoa in English as it provides a more balanced curriculum than the NZ curriculum	I support more subjects being available especially regional language and tikanaga variants		2020-03-15 10:51:21	ANON-YFPW-RWGV-C	2020-03-15 10:51:21	2020-03-15 10:52:05
Yes	There is an obvious inequity in 'breadth', with some subjects that exist presently at Level 1 being subsumed into a 'core' subject that very few students actually take. Media Studies and Psychology are being integrated in to Social Studies. This approach is not consistent, as subjects such as Religious Studies and Agricultural and Horticultural Science continue as 'full subjects' This means that student engagement in some subjects will be diluted and courses at years 9 and 10 in subjects that are affected by the broad brush approach are very likely to be removed from options that are currently offered at years 9 and 10. Foundation skills will be lost for students who presently engage in these options. This is unfair to both students and teachers alike.	Strongly disagree	The proposals support the currently 'trendy' STEM subjects and diminish the Humanities subjects.	I strongly believe that the proposed changes are inconsistent in the way that they impact on some curriculum areas. Perhaps no change is the fairest option to students, as they are most disadvantaged by the reduction in choice that will occur.	Not yet.	Yes		Not yet		2020-03-15 17:36:10	ANON-YFPW-RWGC-S	2020-03-15 17:36:10	2020-03-15 17:37:38
No		Disagree	I disagree with the way Latin and Classical Studies would be handled by this overhaul.	As a former Classical Studies student, I believe that both Latin and Classical Studies are necessary and unique subjects that teach us about the foundations that our society as a whole (and others around the world) stands on. They do not deserve to be dropped at Level 1 and submerged into one subject.	No.	No		N/A		2020-03-15 19:41:22	ANON-YFPW-RWGS-9	2020-03-15 19:41:22	2020-03-15 19:41:46
Yes		Strongly disagree				No				2020-03-15 23:39:45	ANON-YFPW-RWG9-F	2020-03-15 23:39:45	2020-03-15 23:39:58
No		Strongly disagree		Classics, apart from apart from its beautiful heritage, are vital for any understanding of today's world.		No				2020-03-16 01:49:25	ANON-YFPW-RWGG-W	2020-03-16 01:49:25	2020-03-16 01:49:34
No	why is this not being publicised properly - this is not broad, this is targeted to make generalist approach rather than focus areas.	Strongly disagree	why are focus on non essential skills - maths should be broken into stats and calculus. Health and PE should be kept separate. Science - to replace all the other area such as physics , chemistry etc - this is non sense. Commerce - to replace Accounting , Economics, Business Studies - not acceptable at all. This has been drafted by someone who is not concerned about the future at all.	please do not change anything for Science and Commerce, keep it as they are with individual subjects. i don't want my children to lose interest. A humble plea.	Yes- Mathematics to be broken into - Stats, Calculus	No	i have not been given opportunity to learn this.	n/a		2020-03-16 06:19:42	ANON-YFPW-RWGJ-Z	2020-03-16 06:19:42	2020-03-16 06:19:59

No		Disagree	Latin and Art History should be included as these are fundamentally important arts subjects to offer young people. Personally, I studied Art History and Latin at School and they were fundamental for my interest in studying and learning. They taught me how to think in a different way and learn about the root of art and language.	Include Latin and Art History. Latin teaches students the fundamentals of language and a sense of longevity of the world in a living breathing context. It is intellectually challenging and provides a huge benefit by allowing students like me to go on and have good grounding to learn another language. I studied Latin at high school at Queen Margarets and then at University I decided to pursue Italian. I couldn't have learnt this language without the help of my Latin teacher who made me think all things were possible and gave me universal foundations for language via Latin.	Art History, Italian and Latin!	No			2020-03-16 08:16:32	ANON-YFPW-RWQG-7	2020-03-16 08:16:32	2020-03-16 08:16:37
Yes		Agree		I am interested that both Classical studies and Media studies have only become context areas for broader base subjects. In my experience both of these subjects are popular and Media studies in particular is very relevant to young peoples' lives today.		No			2020-03-16 10:11:23	ANON-YFPW-RWGE-U	2020-03-16 10:11:23	2020-03-16 10:12:00
Yes	I was aware. That said, I am disappointed that many subjects have become 'specialist subjects' that can only be picked up at level two. Many of these subjects are difficult to learn in a 3 year period, let alone a 2 year period	Strongly disagree	Physics, chemistry, Biology, Classics, History, Media Studies, are all subjects that are difficult to study over only two years.	as above - Physics, chemistry, Biology, Classics, History, Media Studies, are all subjects that are difficult to study over only two years.	No. As you have pointed out, we are trying to limit the list, it would be a bad idea to add to it.	No			2020-03-16 10:46:46	ANON-YFPW-RWGS-B	2020-03-16 10:46:46	2020-03-16 10:47:01
Yes	I believe that Latin and Classics especially should be valued much higher than they currently are on this list. Latin is a foundational language taught across the world not just for its historical and linguistic significance, from modern government to dozens of languages in common use today, but also for what it can do for a student's knowledge on proper English grammar and writing as a whole. Classics, on the other hand, helps introduce students to dozen of fundamental topics throughout academics and the human experience as a whole, from art and religion to literature and philosophy. Valuing these subjects so little will only prove to be detrimental to a student's success.	Disagree	According to the National Curriculum, any subject on this list must support "important and rich learning" to some degree. As shown in my previous comments, what one can learn from these topics have shown just how important and rich they are for a student's overall education and understanding of the world.	I suggest that the subject supports coherent and robust pathways into Level 2 and beyond. Both Latin and Classics lead directly into Level 2 and Level 3 courses, and follow into various modes of study in colleges and universities on a global-scale. Furthermore, both subjects have very deep historical links to common tertiary specializations such as law, medicine, and philosophy.	I believe both Latin and Classics should have well-designed local curricula with support pathways for individual learners. The curricula for both subjects are already well established, and pathways stemming from them are very clear.	Yes	Yes— it's the consideration of demand for the subject and capability to deliver it. As it stands in the present, due to the fact that Level 1 classics has only just recently been added, many schools have yet to introduce the subject into their curricula. As such, there is and will be much more demand for it for both students and teachers alike, and in regards to Latin, there are no lack of	The subject should support the Crown's obligations under the Treaty of Waitangi. These obligations extend to protecting and upholding the cultures of both partners to the Treaty, especially the cultural heritage and languages that have been integral to their development.	2020-03-16 11:01:39	ANON-YFPW-RWGP-6	2020-03-16 11:01:39	2020-03-16 11:01:50
No	As a student who finished school about 1 and a half years ago, I didn't know about this change until I heard about it from one of my old teachers.	Disagree	While wanting to change to support more broad and foundational education may have some highlights, in this sense, subject are also having to be left out to fit this more broad range. When this happens, subjects that students might really want to do are removed and take away the option to be able to do them, even by correspondence. That doesn't seem like a fair way to do this as if there is still people wanting to do a subject, why should the option be taken away?	My main focus in on Latin being excluded from the new curriculum as they are both subjects I care about. Latin is a subject that acts as a building block for many different subjects and languages with it being a foundational language. Students still have an interest in the subject, even with having to do it through correspondence and we have had a number of exchange students study it with us because of it being a requirement in their country. The use of Latin as a crucial subject for learning even crucial skills in language use and being such a rich and important learning experience makes it an important subject.	A lot of students at my school were interested in Classics as a subject because of the way it ties in with the interest in the history and culture it focuses on. While History may focus on a more broader range of history, it tends to stick with war and political history whereas Classical History has a wider range of history that it focuses on with introducing students to the social and political aspects of Greek and Roman history and what things were like in a time different to our own. For students interested in history but not wanting to focus on modern wars, this provides them with a similar content but on a more focused interest.	No			2020-03-16 11:30:06	ANON-YFPW-RWGD-D	2020-03-16 11:30:06	2020-03-16 11:30:22
No		Undecided		in my opinion I don't think that psychology, media studies, and geography should be combined as the subjects are very particular to what you want to learn. all three are too diverse to fit together.		No			2020-03-16 11:56:48	ANON-YFPW-RWGF-V	2020-03-16 11:56:18	2020-03-16 11:57:18
No	This is unfair to those whose subjects are being cut, specifically the languages that are at risk of getting cut.	Undecided		PLEASE keep Latin, as a person who does not take Latin, I can say that I have an unbiased opinion. Personally, I've seen the people who take Latin at my school and they are extremely passionate about this amazing language, if you take Latin away from the school curriculum, you will take away the passion that they so desperately desire. Plus, Latin has a lot of influences from English, therefore making it the easiest language to pick up for native english speakers. Also, literally more than half of NZ have English as their native language, meaning that you are limiting their options in terms of allowing a derivative of English to be used.	Te Reo Māori. I completely understand the shortage in teachers. However, for the junior year levels (year 9-10) we don't need super fluent speakers. For the year 9's and 10's, it is incredibly important that they learn the basics. If we teach some of the teachers who are interested in speaking Te Reo, then we could allow for them to learn the basics so that they are able to teach the juniors how to speak the simple parts of the language.	Yes		You should allow Te Reo Rangatira to be an option for those from mainstream schools who are able to speak the language fluently.	2020-03-16 13:24:11	ANON-YFPW-RWGG-G	2020-03-16 13:24:11	2020-03-16 13:24:21

Yes		Strongly agree	At our school we have always taught Health separately from PE. I think this probably has been because of our purist Physedders on our staff. Although they teach Year 9 and 10 Health and do a fantastic job I still have felt that this subject has lost support from my whole department. Health as a stand alone subject has struggled to maintain numbers especially as our school role is about 850 from Year 7 to 13. Support for senior classes has meant that I now teach Year 12 Health and Year 13 Health at the same time because if I didn't there would be no Health. Also we have reduced the number of subjects taken in the senior school. Combining Health and PE at Level 1 I believe would improve the overall well-being of Health for all. It would be even better if this was compulsory for all Year 11s.	Great to see PE and Health combined at Year 11. Nutrition is a big part of our Health programmes just would not like to see Food science overlap with content. Would like to see Food science be heavily practically based so that pathways link to tourism industry and directly to jobs.		Yes			2020-03-16 15:59:20	ANON-YFPW-RWGB-R	2020-03-16 15:59:20	2020-03-16 15:59:49
Yes		Undecided				No			2020-03-16 16:00:43	ANON-YFPW-RWGM-3	2020-03-16 16:00:43	2020-03-16 16:00:49
Yes		Strongly agree		Te Reo Māori taught in Kura Auraki vs Kura Kaupapa. There needs to be a distinction/level/grade/division to cater for those two very different schooling systems. This would support the teachers of Te Reo whose students only have input/output in that one class.		No			2020-03-16 16:02:26	ANON-YFPW-RWGD-T	2020-03-16 16:02:26	2020-03-16 16:02:36
Yes		Undecided	Don't know enough about what will actually change for Japanese. I am more interested in what the standards will look like. Will they be fair? Or will they still be wishy washy and assessor makes it up on the day what info is considered Excellence, Merit etc.	Set curriculum for Languages. Do you know it or don't you? I have students from other countries who English is a 2nd language and so is Japanese. Their Japanese can be EXcellent but their answers on External exams in English, while adequate, rarely get Excellence despite them knowing 100% what has been said or written.		No			2020-03-16 16:05:12	ANON-YFPW-RWGX-E	2020-03-16 16:05:12	2020-03-16 16:05:32
No		Strongly disagree		I run a two lined science course called the Health Science Academy. Where we use both science standards and Biology standards. With the removal of the biology standards, the course will not be able to run. This is very upsetting, it provides lower level students who are keen to go into the Health Sector a much more detailed background to leap into year 12 specialist sciences. We use it almost like a foundation course for the senior sciences.	Human Biology	No			2020-03-16 16:08:00	ANON-YFPW-RWGA-Q	2020-03-16 16:07:07	2020-03-16 16:08:08
Yes	Overall we had heard about these changes but did not realise the full ramifications of this. Looking at the RAS site - this had been going on since 2018. It was only in 2020 that the realisation of the changes for Media Studies was apparent. This was alarming!	Strongly disagree	This effectively does not allow Media Studies to be explored fully as a subject at Level 1. It's merged with Psychology and Social Studies and 'how' this will be taught within this collective has not been explained. There are no pilots provided for this. Media is a such a powerful factor today and moving ahead that students need to be critical of. Integrated programmes merely refer to 'the media', do not include media literacy as such and only use a media product as a summative assessment (not a fully realised progressive learning platform/ experience). The skills in Media Studies both practical and theoretical will be lost.	Level 1 Media Studies needs to be kept in the curriculum. This is the way forward and students need to be taught to be media literate and critical of mass media communications in today's society and political climate. Further amendments to courses could be made or to standards but to eliminate it would be remis. Level 1 is a building block to difficult media theories and content in L2 & 3. Productive skills and experience are all benefited from this introduction to senior school. Removing Level 1 may remove the opportunity or even understanding of what 'Media Studies' is and its value. Students may not have the option or realise the benefits or the potential industries they could be a part of if it is removed. So many industries require skills contained within Media Studies: Communications, Commerce, Law, Social Media, TV, Broadcasting, Journalism, Film, Music & Gaming.	Not at this point. We want to retain Media Studies foremost.	No			2020-03-16 16:09:17	ANON-YFPW-RWGN-4	2020-03-16 16:09:17	2020-03-16 16:09:33
Yes	Note: There are six of us working on this feedback/survey response together. We were aware of the intention to change but not the specifics of what subjects would be affected and how. It could give students a better grasp on the skills of the nature of science/capabilities. We find it hard to discuss other subjects without the knowledge of what those standards will look like. Gives us less ability as a school to craft our own courses to suit our students needs. It's concerning that students won't be able to gain the same understanding of what subjects such as media studies, psychology, and accounting are actually about as they aren't potentially able to be covered in the L1 current proposal.	Undecided	We don't feel we know enough to know if we support this proposal or not. We are concerned that bigger standards may make them harder/less accessible for our students to achieve. We are concerned that bigger standards give us less flexibility to design courses that suit our learner's needs. We are concerned that we have no idea of what will be expected at L2 or L3 but are being asked for feedback on L1 without knowing what it will lead into. We like that it's being simplified to 60 credits at each level with literacy/numeracy as a stand alone. We are concerned that the higher credit standards could make it much harder for students to personalise their programmes if they are absent for a chunk of time - potentially risking a lot more credits if they are unable to catch up on the learning. Currently there is more flexibility around what they can do if they miss a chunk of learning.	We find it hard to give feedback on L1 when we are unsure of what L2 & L3 will look like in terms of the standards that will be offered at these levels. Its seems hard to see how Media Studies and Psychology relate to Social Studies. It would appear to make more sense to have these as stand alone subjects.		No			2020-03-16 16:15:12	ANON-YFPW-RWGX-1	2020-03-16 16:15:12	2020-03-16 16:15:25

Yes	Yes we had generally heard about it, but didn't really understand the specifics/implications that it would have for our subject until now. We did not think that Media Studies would be on the chopping block here.	Strongly disagree	I particularly have issues with the removal/amalgamation of Media Studies into Social Studies. I believe the skills and knowledge required for this subject are quite different to Senior Social Studies - particularly the production side of things. It will be detrimental to the subject as a whole because it is showing students that what we do isn't valued enough to keep it at Level 1 and will have implications for our junior courses also. Yet, in our media saturated world, I believe that it is so vital to keep these courses in order to improve media literacy and encourage critical thinking. Also, Kiwis are doing so well in the industry at the moment, it would be remiss to cut the subject out now. You're not merging music and drama into an 'arts' course at Level 1, so I don't see the logic in disbanding Media Studies.	I think Level 1 Media Studies should stay as it is and not be cut out. It provides important foundational knowledge and skills which are then built upon and developed in later years. Media literacy is vital in this age of demagogues, misinformation and moral panic. Also, the production skills covered by this course and at Levels 2 & 3 take a few years to develop - the more experience they gain the better. Watering the subject down by combining it with others will be detrimental in this sense. There are many varied pathways/careers that benefit from students' having media skills/knowledge and it is important to keep the foundations taught at Level 1 - the knowledge is applicable to many aspects of their lives.	No - we just want to keep Media Studies.	No			2020-03-16 16:17:52	ANON-YFPW-RWGG-C	2020-03-16 16:17:52	2020-03-16 16:18:05
Yes	NCEA REVIEW DISCUSSION - please note that this response is based on 8 teachers from different teaching areas: Management, Science, Maths, Social Sciences, Arts, HPE, Design and Techn.	Disagree	HPE - Want to have an option on workshops T1, T2, T3, T4 - with all of our options represented. Science - takes away choice for both teachers and students. Social Sciences and Arts - Need further information to make a comment - especially on the speciality of Level 2 and Level 3. Arts Making Option Level 3? Put a Level 1 assessment into Year 10 currently - has had a positive Social Sciences Supportive of changes - disappointing about HPE Increasing disengagement with Level 3. 130 CR at the end of Level 3 - good push for a change with the current proposal. Design and Techn. Need more information, streamlining has positives.	See comments in Q2.	No, the mix seems right. However, those students who are not opting into an academic program need an alternative way of achieving Level 1.	No			2020-03-16 16:17:59 2020-03-16 16:19:58	ANON-YFPW-RWGR-8 ANON-YFPW-RWGW-D	2020-03-16 16:17:59 2020-03-16 16:19:58	2020-03-16 16:18:09 2020-03-16 16:20:10
No	1. Were you aware about the intended change to support a broad, more foundational education at NCEA Level 1, while subjects at Levels 2 and 3 would promote greater specialisation? (what are the +/- of this) Science 30 standards down to 4 - means that it becomes very directive. Flexibility within the standards provided. Nature of Sciences based, rather than Subject based. Arts They have a whole year to submit: produce a body of work, that covers various parts of practice. Creates further risk and reduces choice. Math Big broad standards - how will you know what students are good at? Supported learning - four years in a row:	Agree		Not really as all new subject allocation looks good and seems to be had good thought process been put behind it.	Robotics & software development	No	Well it be helpful to restructure for better development .		2020-03-16 16:30:05	ANON-YFPW-RWG4-A	2020-03-16 16:30:05	2020-03-16 16:30:28
No		Disagree	I think leaving opportunity to specialise later is great but I do not see how a Level One course can cover everything required if subjects are combined. E.g. all the sciences are different, History and Classics are different...	Latin should be included.		No			2020-03-16 16:33:34	ANON-YFPW-RWGT-A	2020-03-16 16:33:34	2020-03-16 16:33:42
No		Strongly disagree	Latin should not be dropped from the subjects for level 1.	I think that Latin should remain part of the curriculum. Latin may not be a "living language" but it is still useful and relevant in the 21st century. -More than 50% of English words come from Latin, which means that Latin is a useful subject for learning about English etymology and increasing student's vocabulary and reading comprehension. -Latin is even more helpful for learning romance languages like French or Spanish because romance languages come directly from Latin and share a lot of grammar and vocabulary. -Latin, being a very grammar-heavy language, teaches students grammar rules that are also useful in other subjects. -Latin is a very good preparation for Level 2 and 3 Classics. Learning about the Roman's language Latin and studying works like the "Aeneid" in Latin gives students a greater understanding of Roman culture and society than just studying Roman literature in translation. -It would be a break with tradition to remove Latin from the curriculum-Latin has been a key subject in the West for hundreds of years, and this move would make New Zealand the only English speaking country that doesn't offer the subject. -Year 9 and 10 Latin allows students to study	Latin should also be offered at NCEA Levels 2 and 3 so that students can continue studying it throughout their time at secondary school.	No			2020-03-16 16:41:32	ANON-YFPW-RWG3-9	2020-03-16 16:41:32	2020-03-16 16:41:39

No	My understanding was that they were looking to see the validity of Level 1 NCEA.	Strongly disagree	Combining such a large amount of subjects to one combined subject means we are not catering a large variety of students. This means students who have particular strength lack opportunities to flourish and experience success.	Combining Health with Physical Education will not allow for students of different interests and abilities to get the most out of the subject. We are more likely lose students to the subject as they are reluctant partake in all aspects of the course. Since changing our Health curriculum to all health standards and not using any PE standards. Our numbers in Health have doubled and our Sport science and Outdoor Ed subjects have not decreased at all.	No	No			2020-03-16 16:56:03	ANON-YFPW-RWG2-8	2020-03-16 16:56:03	2020-03-16 16:56:32
Yes		Disagree		Do not combine Health and Physical Education because this affects student ability to have two domains to select standards from	No	No	Te Reo Maori has its place and some subjects can make links to content. But this needs to remain optional	No	2020-03-16 17:41:30	ANON-YFPW-RWGU-8	2020-03-16 17:41:30	2020-03-16 17:41:46
No		Strongly disagree		It is very disappointing, in fact dire, that Latin is not included as a language. Latin is the foundation not only of many modern languages (including English) but more importantly, is a study that teaches students to be able to have the skills to directly interact with documents that have shaped western culture. If Latin is removed from the curriculum, it is denying students the opportunity to read authors like Cicero, Virgil and Horace whose impact on Western ideas (spanning philosophy, politics, ethics, social structure) cannot be overestimated. Once removed, it is likely that this subject will disappear for a significant amount of time and be difficult to be reinstated.		No			2020-03-16 18:19:57	ANON-YFPW-RWTY-V	2020-03-16 18:19:57	2020-03-16 18:20:09
No		Undecided	I think that some of these are a good idea such as Maori performing arts. I also think that some of these changes are not very good ideas such as merging Psychology, Media Studies and Social Studies.	I don't think that Media Studies, Social Studies and Psychology should be merged. I am a Level 2 Ncea student and I took Psychology last year and I am taking it this year. Psychology is my favourite subjects. I don't think that these three subjects mix very well. I strongly disagree with this change.	I think that pet care or something to do with animals would be a great asset to the Ncea subject list.	No			2020-03-16 19:43:48	ANON-YFPW-RWTV-S	2020-03-16 19:43:48	2020-03-16 19:44:10
Yes	My Name is Dipak Bhana, I am President of the Wellington Indian Association I would like Ministry of Education to provide Hindi as a secondary school. -Hindi is the fifth most spoken language in New Zealand -If Hindi was taught it would equip NZ students engage and do business with India and Indian diaspora -It would broaden and deepen there understanding of the Indian Culture, Society, languages and policy. -It would help with economic and trade with India and asia pacific.	Strongly agree	I feel NCEA is the right year level to introduce Hindi Langage to be taught and retained as New Zealand looks to diversify trade India would be a new generation of New Zealanders who can make trade to India happen in the future.	I would like to see Hindi language introduced into the curriculum as I feel this is the next area That New Zealand can grow in trade.	No	Yes	I feel Te Reo is important and Indians share a special link to Maori through Te Whiti o Rongomai, the Maori leader of Parihaka they shared similar traits to Mahatma Gandhi and feel that we have more in common. When studying Hindi I would like to have shared some links with Parihaka when teaching language as I feel this will help build links between Maori and Indians.		2020-03-16 20:18:26	ANON-YFPW-RWTC-6	2020-03-16 20:18:26	2020-03-16 20:18:55

Yes		Disagree	Health and Physical ED should be separate	Health needs to be separate to Physical Education as Health curriculum is presented in a different context and with different concepts. Health tends to promote learning in vital issues around wellbeing such as drugs and alcohol, change & loss, Sexuality whereas PE standards tend to target the concepts associated with the body, teamwork, leadership and safety management...very different from the Health curriculum. Both address Hauora and Interpersonal skills however within a different context. From my experience a significant number of students did not want to partake in a PE focus approach but instead preferred the health contexts and learning. Having two domains helps cater for the diverse needs of our students...both subjects offer very different concepts and learning outcomes. Therefore they need to stay separate to ensure the diverse learning needs are met.	Keep Health and PE standards separate...	No				2020-03-16 22:20:45	ANON-YFPW-RWTS-P	2020-03-16 22:20:45	2020-03-16 22:21:09
Yes		Strongly disagree		Please don't get rid of Latin for Level 1! Latin helps with: -Critical and analytical thinking (as NCEA Latin is very structured and logical, and -English skills and comprehension (as roughly 60% of English words are derived from Latin). Specifically students who want to go on to things like law or science - a lot of law/science terms are directly from Latin! -Learning other languages (as Romance languages like Spanish and French are also derived from Latin, and Latin increases understanding of grammar and tense in general, which helps with all languages)		No				2020-03-17 12:21:53	ANON-YFPW-RWTS-U	2020-03-17 12:21:53	2020-03-17 12:22:04
Yes		Strongly disagree		Latin being excluded from the curriculum is a very bad move in my opinion- Latin provides a great base for learning many other European languages, better understanding English, improving your grammar, as well as learning about Ancient Greece and Rome as many schools do not offer classics until year 12. I also feel that classics should still be included at year 11, as it is very useful in university studies of things like law and history. Media studies is also not similar enough to sociology to be combined- they are very different, and target different groups of people with different interests.		No				2020-03-17 12:25:49	ANON-YFPW-RWT9-V	2020-03-17 12:25:49	2020-03-17 12:25:55
Yes		Strongly disagree		Please don't combine accounting, economics, and business studies. All of them are very useful subjects, as it's a great way for students to understand more about money and businesses in the real world. These subjects, while all relating to commerce, are different in nature as it's focusing on different things. I strongly think that it would be a shame to have little accounting work in Level 1, as accounting is a very crucial and valuable skill to learn, as it gives students a better understanding of how businesses work, which is good general knowledge and extremely valuable skills for students who go on to take commerce and start businesses		No				2020-03-17 12:36:08	ANON-YFPW-RWTG-A	2020-03-17 12:36:08	2020-03-17 12:36:15

No		Strongly disagree	I believe that the subjects are becoming too broad, people have the opportunity to experience broad subjects in the junior years and should start specializing from Level 1	As a Year 12 student, I believe that the proposed changes to NCEA are unnecessary and irrelevant. Dropping Latin from all levels of NCEA would be detrimental for the subject, it's students and those who teach it. Latin is a foundational subject that promotes deeper thinking and expands the logical connections of the brain. Dropping this subject from NCEA would kill it, and that is an illogical decision that has not been thought through on a higher level. Many students currently benefit from Latin being taught in schools through NCEA. It is enjoyable and different, something that takes you out of the norms of school whilst still providing a valid and useful set of skills that can be used in careers such as law and medicine. If this subject is to be withdrawn from NCEA, there will be outrage from students, teachers and communities. It is also highly unfair that Latin is the only subject being completely cut from NCEA, when it's usefulness is comparatively better than many other subjects. It is also unfair to take away the choice of doing Latin from those who want to take NCEA and not another qualification. As well as this, we would be the first English-speaking country to get rid of Latin, making the decision even more illogical than first proposed.		No			2020-03-17 12:42:12	ANON-YFPW-RWTJ-D	2020-03-17 12:42:12	2020-03-17 12:42:22
Yes		Strongly disagree	I strongly disagree with the proposed subjects for level one. These changes are unnecessary and a waste of time. Many subjects such as Latin, Classics, Art history, accounting, psychology, and media studies will be practically non-existent with the ministry's new view for ncea. This is not ok! There are many of us students who are very upset.	I believe that these changes have not been thought out properly and practically excluding Latin, Classics, Art history, accounting, psychology, and media studies is a big mistake. With out these subjects we will be missing out on a ton of learning. I myself am a Latin student and have taken the subject for the past 4 years. Obviously I am less than thrilled at Latin being taken off the curriculum. Latin has been cut because it is supposedly not important and leads to no future pathways. However, this is not true. This language greatly benefits us in many ways. Firstly Latin is one of the founding languages and has helped to form english. Learning latin has greatly widened my understanding of english and helped my a lot in the past few years. As well as this with these new changes New Zealand would be the first english speaking country to stop teaching latin. This fact is already ringing warning bells. Half of the english language is made up of latin words! So why should our small country be arrogant enough to think that we don't need it! Latin can lead to many pathways including law, medicine, science, music, theology, philosophy, art, and literature. Just because a subject doesn't lead to one direct career, shouldn't declare it useless. Many other subjects including maths, english, history etc do not lead to direct careers either. Clearly the	Latin should be kept.	Yes	I do not know much about it but I have heard of it and believe that it is a great idea and will help the language to grow again.		2020-03-17 13:02:49	ANON-YFPW-RWTS-R	2020-03-17 13:02:49	2020-03-17 13:03:16
Yes		Strongly disagree				No			2020-03-17 13:29:08	ANON-YFPW-RWTP-K	2020-03-17 13:29:08	2020-03-17 13:29:14
No		Strongly disagree			Please keep Latin	Yes			2020-03-17 13:29:40	ANON-YFPW-RWT7-T	2020-03-17 13:29:40	2020-03-17 13:29:49
No		Strongly disagree	Latin must be in cluropean languages, even english. Latin is easier to learn, even easier than English. Latin teaches us about its importance in many countries, Rome's history and conquest. How they lived and the most important. The language.			No			2020-03-17 14:07:05	ANON-YFPW-RWTF-9	2020-03-17 14:07:05	2020-03-17 14:07:11

Yes		Disagree		<p>I don't think that the separate science disciplines should be amalgamated into "general science". There is enough to learn in each separate discipline for each to stand alone.</p> <p>The abolishing of Latin would be a great shame. To deny students the opportunity to read the words of great characters of the past is surely the opposite of what an education system should be doing. Personally I have been recently reading of the ruthless ambition and political manoeuvres of Julius Caesar. It's thrilling stuff read in translation but to read of these events in the original Latin would be even better.</p>	<p>I would like to see statistics separated from mathematics and developed into a standalone subject: Data Science.</p> <p>For centuries scientists have been pursuing their interest in nature and the cosmos by means of building models, usually mathematical models, and then testing their models' predictions in experiments. Physicists in particular have built extremely sophisticated mathematical models. But even for physicists the mathematics is just a means to express their ideas in an unambiguous way. A scientist wants to explore the natural world, not the world of equations and logic. The huge body of know-how involved with designing, building and conducting experiments means that it is proper for science to be taught separately from mathematics. The statistician tries to make sense of the random, chaotic and unpredictable aspects of the world. Like the scientist in a laboratory, he uses some mathematics to</p>	No			2020-03-17 15:45:23	ANON-YFPW-RWT1-M	2020-03-17 15:45:23	2020-03-17 15:46:22
Yes	This is contradictory to the proposed changes. the list is so narrow that we feel that content is going to be missed.	Strongly disagree	Food Science is confusing as it DOES NOT technically cover 'well-being'. Some of the generic technologies are important in construction.	Hard to see where 'well-being' fits in Food Science. Considering the state of the nation in terms of wellness where will this be taught? Home Economics could be called 'Food and Nutrition' or 'Food and Well-being'. It could incorporate be called Foods which leaves it open to whatever way the course could be developed to suit the needs/requirements of the students.		Yes			2020-03-17 16:37:39	ANON-YFPW-RWT2-W	2020-03-17 16:37:39	2020-03-17 16:38:11
Yes	This was brought to my attention at the end of last year at a cross-school PD	Undecided	I am unsure of the impact it will have in my subject area - Health & Physical Education. The initial impression is that Health will cease to be a separate subject altogether: yet this was not the case when it was presented to teachers at the end of 2019. I would love clarity around this, so I can inform my department accordingly!	PE/Health being labelled as combined - two different disciplines altogether.	No	Yes	I am aware of the content of the document, although I am not fluent enough to read it.	No.	2020-03-17 19:26:53	ANON-YFPW-RWTH-B	2020-03-17 19:26:53	2020-03-17 19:27:12
Yes		Agree	Although I support this notion, I don't believe all students may need to complete Level 1 as a mandatory measure of education. For those ready, willing and with clear pathways, even if in earlier year levels, the ability to do Level 2 and 3 be made possible.			Yes		yes. It is not widely known that the NZC was written on the premise of Te Marautanga o Aotearoa. In the effort to bring down disparities of systematic racism in educators, will the Ministry release documentation of this as Te Aho o te reo Māori launch nationwide approaches?	2020-03-17 20:46:28	ANON-YFPW-RWTB-5	2020-03-17 20:43:51	2020-03-17 20:46:39
No		Strongly disagree	Latin absolutely must be included in this list and it is curious that no rationale is given for its exclusion. Not only has Latin been proven to improve cognitive and linguistic capacities of all pupils who take it, but it also allows a gateway to a cultural, historical and linguistic world of great richness and interest to the young mind. Like many Western countries, New Zealand owes a great debt to the classical tradition in a literary and cultural sense, while the appreciation of an ancient culture by all participants in New Zealand society leads to great intercultural understanding - if one can see and understand the world through the eyes of people who lived two millennia ago, one can much better understand the perspectives of one's neighbours, fellow citizens and fellow humans around the world.	<p>Latin absolutely must be included in this list and it is curious that no rationale is given for its exclusion. Not only has Latin been proven in studies to improve cognitive and linguistic capacities of all pupils who take it, but it also allows a gateway to a cultural, historical, linguistic and mythological world of great richness and interest to the young mind. Like many Western countries, New Zealand owes a great debt to the classical tradition in a literary and cultural sense, while the appreciation of an ancient culture by all participants in New Zealand society leads to great intercultural understanding - if one can see and understand the world through the eyes of people who lived two millennia ago, one can much better understand the perspectives of one's neighbours, fellow citizens and fellow humans around the world.</p> <p>At a time when enrolments in classical subjects are increasing annually in nations such as America, Britain and Australia and when appreciation of different perspectives is more critical than ever, it seems strange that a country like New Zealand would turn its back on a subject which breeds academic discipline and intercultural understanding and stimulates logical, analytical, rules-based thinking and literary appreciation.</p>	No				2020-03-18 01:21:22	ANON-YFPW-RWTM-G	2020-03-18 01:21:22	2020-03-18 01:21:34
Yes		Agree		We need to know what L2 & 3 specialisation options will look like to make sure L1 option will align with them and help with the step up	No	Yes			2020-03-18 07:28:31	ANON-YFPW-RWTD-7	2020-03-18 07:28:31	2020-03-18 07:28:46

Yes		Strongly agree		General broader subjects may better suit the needs of Level 1 students.	No		No	2020-03-18 08:23:26	ANON-YFPW-RBRP-V	2020-02-26 15:59:25	2020-03-18 08:23:38
Yes	Im a year 12 student and wont have to deal with the changes as much but i'm an art student and i take psychology and taking art history out of the curriculum all together is annoying. Psychology is a huge subject that should not be put with media studies and social studies. I did rly well in level one psychology and thats because it was a single subject that taught me so much and didn't jump around between three subjects. I think it would be better to keep the subjects as individual as possible to get a more in depth level of learning by inter grating all the sciences together students will be missing out on learning the full subject. Science it self is a lot of different areas of science in one not including biology, chemistry and physics. You skim over the top of them and don't dive into them. I think this will be to big of a change to soon!	Strongly disagree	Its not a good idea at level one it will make the jump from level one to level two even bigger then it is now and will stress kids out who go through it to the max stress levels at school can effect a students mental health the need to achieve self pressure to perform i ask you have you factored this in??	Not including art history will upset a lot of artist in high school because our passion is art if we were doing it at high school and if we want to turn it into our careers one day it would be better for us to have as much opportunity to learn it at high school than later in life when we could have had the opportunity to learn it earlier.	No			2020-03-18 09:00:26	ANON-YFPW-RWTR-U	2020-03-18 09:00:26	2020-03-18 09:00:40
Yes	Yes and I agree with this sentiment so we need to ensure this happens in all schools and individual principals don't go cutting core subject times etc.	Strongly agree		I do feel under our present system of examinations it is going to be quite hard to complete all the necessary study for level 2 Chemistry, Bio and Physics in the one year as level 1 Science is only a smattering of each. In a small Maori Girls' School where I teach I have been able to pick and choose with the students which assessments they do and tailor them to their needs. with compulsory report writing at level 1 this will disadvantage students with English as a second language and students not as fluent in English.	No.			2020-03-18 10:47:16	ANON-YFPW-RWTR-A	2020-03-18 10:47:16	2020-03-18 10:47:42
Yes		Strongly disagree	Combining three distinct subjects into one Commerce subject seems to go against the current push to improve financial capability and ignores how popular Economics, Business Studies and Accounting are as subject choices for students at Level 1.	Economics, Business Studies and Accounting are distinct subjects, each with their own vocabulary and cannot be effectively combined. In my experience as a teacher of more than 30 years, Accounting is very difficult to pick up at Level 2 without having the basis provided by Level 1. This may discourage students from this pathway and so Commerce in general. Financial capability will be watered down by combining three subjects into one as none of the subjects will be covered thoroughly. Parents and students currently choose to do these subjects in big numbers. They are all in the top half of subjects entered in 2019. Employers seek people with these skills.	No		No	2020-03-18 13:02:32	ANON-YFPW-RWTR-H	2020-03-18 13:02:32	2020-03-18 13:02:49
No		Disagree		Psychology should be a subject on its own because it is widely different from Social Science and much more interesting. Many students are interested in Psychology but not too much in Social Science, including me, because they are two different branches of learning and should not be taught together. This also applies to Media studies because it is also extremely different to Social Science and Psychology in its own respect.			No	2020-03-18 17:59:53	ANON-YFPW-RWTR-E	2020-03-18 17:59:53	2020-03-18 18:00:00
Yes		Agree	I dis-agree with the changes being made on media studies merging with social studies as it had already been spit in year 10.	I am a student at Glendowie college who takes Media Studies. I am a year ten (2020) student an, who is undergoing MYP (Middle Years Program). I dis-agree with the plan to merge Media studies in to Social Studies; as in the Middle Years Programme it is a popular subject choice at My school. It also would mean that I would have to stop and restart media studies when I get to NCEA Level 2.			No	2020-03-18 19:32:11	ANON-YFPW-RWTR-S	2020-03-18 19:32:11	2020-03-18 19:32:30
Yes		Strongly disagree	The subjects that are being combined under one umbrella subject do not meet the needs of all students. They are forced to take a subject area that they have no interest in because they don't have choice. This will impact on future learning as it is very difficult to get them up-to University level when they have not had the basic requirements at L1. The steps between levels is already difficult for them this will just exacerbate the problem.	Physical Education and health are not necessarily the same subject and not everyone has an interest in the other side of the subject. This will not be suitable for all. Schools need to have the ability to chose for themselves how to set up the most appropriate course structure not have it forced on them by misguided opinions. Remember one size does not fit all and one option does not fit all schools.			Yes	2020-03-19 09:56:55	ANON-YFPW-RWTR-N	2020-03-19 09:56:55	2020-03-19 09:57:04

Yes		Strongly disagree	Excluding Latin is no more broad than including it - unless you were to remove all languages except English.	Latin, Art History, and Classics are important parts of the curriculum. They help you learn about the world and appreciate for it. Latin is broad in that it significantly helps you learn other Romance languages. It develops a base for language that can lead to fluency in other languages. Art history is already introduced at a high enough level that it is good for students to be able to specialise. Both of my older siblings and their friends in that class are passionate about it, and with so many students taking art classes, it is important we have the curators some will need. Art is a large subject, and Art History is a broad facet of it. If it were to be covered in the art curriculum, it would not get the attention it deserves. Social studies is one of the broadest subjects available, and it needs to diverge into specialisation to be manageable. Classics is a large enough subject that it has plenty to cover, while being a clearly defined subject because of way its aspects fit together into a convenient curriculum.		Yes			2020-03-19 12:29:19	ANON-YFPW-RWTW-T	2020-03-19 12:29:19	2020-03-19 12:29:37
Yes	Our school was aware of the changes coming up but at no point was it ever indicated that Accounting/ Economics and Business Studies would be combined to create 1 Commerce subject. This has completely blindsided teachers in this area and bought a sense of distrust to the situation.	Strongly disagree	You have combined 3 subjects that have different content and need to remain separate. The foundations taught at Level 1 in all 3 subject areas lead to future success at L2/3 and Scholarship. A number of students take Level 1 Accounting, to gain enough understanding to take with them for the future. This is especially important in farming areas where parents encourage their children to take level 1 Accounting. A number of students also take both ECO and ACC at level 1 and use this to decide which of the 2 they will continue with if a choice is needed.	I believe the status quo for Economics, Accounting and Business as individual subjects, should remain. The numbers of students sitting external examinations place these subjects as 6th, 9th and 13th. Yet you are proposing keeping subjects separate that have only a small number of participants. It appears that Commerce subjects, and Accounting in particular, will be a step behind with respect to learning as it is not able to be accessed at Level 1, or will need to be condensed significantly to fit in the other subject's ideas (trying to cover the key foundation ideas of 3 subjects in one is just not feasible). You are undermining teachers' professional skills and expertise by assuming that all areas are the same and can be taught together.	No	No			2020-03-19 12:37:10	ANON-YFPW-RWFG-V	2020-03-04 12:15:13	2020-03-19 12:37:26
Yes		Strongly disagree				Yes			2020-03-19 12:51:04	ANON-YFPW-RWT4-Q	2020-03-19 12:51:04	2020-03-19 12:51:12
Yes		Disagree		We are over assessing our students at level 1. We can focus on gaining level 2 and 3 over a greater space of time.	Outdoor Education	Yes	no		2020-03-19 13:52:29	ANON-YFPW-RWTT-Q	2020-03-19 13:52:29	2020-03-19 13:52:40
Yes		Strongly disagree		I take both psychology and media studies. These subjects are VERY different and both of these subjects are my favourite and crucial to my learning. This will ruin my whole future in university and my next years subjects as I'm looking to study psychology and media studies is my only back up plan. Psychology and media are not even social sciences. Leave how it is. Psychology teachers have also fought hard to make psychology uni approved. Doing this horrible change is such a step back and will ruin so many's peoples hard work and futures.		No			2020-03-19 14:36:28	ANON-YFPW-RWT3-P	2020-03-19 14:36:28	2020-03-19 14:36:48
Yes	While a broad, more foundational qualification at level 1 was clearly on the cards after the decision to retain level 1 was made, I did not necessarily think that this would mean collapsing subjects, as is proposed.	Strongly disagree	While the seven criteria are sound, I cannot see how these have been consistently applied across the curriculum.	I would like to comment specifically on the proposal to merge health and PE at level one. This is highly problematic for several reasons: -Teachers of health and teachers of PE are not necessarily the same teachers. -The foundations from which health and PE draw their subject-specific knowledge are quite distinct. -Some students choose to do both subjects at year 11, so having only one 4-standard matrix will limit opportunities for them - Māori and Pacific students, for example, often engage with both subjects - and achieve well (Fitzpatrick, K. (2011). Trapped in the physical: Māori and Pasifika achievement in HPE. Asia-Pacific Journal of Health, Sport and Physical Education, 2(3/4), 35-51.). -Now, more than ever in our world, health-related learning contexts are critical. By reducing opportunities at level 1 (if combining HPE), we have a missed opportunity to strengthen teaching and learning in this critical domain; one in which has so much to offer young people in our world. -It is a reality that some PE teachers do not want to teach health; or are ineffective teachers of health (Dixon, 2019 - PhD thesis forthcoming). Likewise, many teachers of health are not PE teachers. By "lumping these two subjects together" the potential for rich, engaging, authentic and meaningful learning in both health	No.	Yes	No.		2020-03-19 15:56:40	ANON-YFPW-RWT2-N	2020-03-19 15:56:40	2020-03-19 15:56:50

Yes	The decision to align the subjects of Accounting, Business Studies and Economics into one broad Commerce subject with minimal Accounting was unexpected and disappointing.	Strongly disagree		<p>We would like to express our concern about the proposal to combine Level 1 Economics, Accounting and Business Studies into one subject Commerce.</p> <p>We would like to know the rationale behind this proposal, given that the criteria for the provisional subject list (as outlined in the questionnaire introduction) does not seem to align at all with this decision.</p> <p>The national data of student numbers taking these subjects supports the popularity of these subjects individually as well as student success in these areas. In particular we note, that many subject areas that have less students engaging with them nationwide have been able to maintain their status as individual subjects.</p> <p>We believe the status quo for Accounting, Economics and Business Studies as individual subjects, should remain.</p> <p>Our other concerns are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of information around pathways in L2 and L3 Accounting, as well as Economics and Business Studies • It is a concern that it was signposted to be minimal Accounting content and Standards at L1. It is not clear what that even looks like or the intention behind it. 		No			2020-03-19 16:11:00	ANON-YFPW-RWTU-R	2020-03-19 16:11:00	2020-03-19 16:11:22
Yes		Undecided		<p>I propose that Statistics should be separated out and re-developed into a new world-leading subject, Data Science.</p> <p>When Statistics is positioned under the umbrella of "Mathematics and Statistics", it is regarded as the option for students who are weaker in mathematical ability, especially algebra. This denigrates a subject that deserves increasing attention in modern times. The ability to analyse data to make informed decisions is vital, economically and socially, locally and internationally. We need look no further than the Covid-19 pandemic to appreciate this.</p> <p>The University of Auckland's Department of Statistics is already developing a Data Science curriculum for the last two years of high school. We should start as we mean to go on, offering Data Science at Level 1.</p> <p>Much of NZ's Statistics curriculum no longer requires a high level of mathematics. This message rang loud and clear when AS90642 "Calculate confidence intervals..." was deprecated and AS91584 "Evaluate statistically based reports" was introduced.</p> <p>Externals such as AS91037 "...Chance and Data"</p>		No			2020-03-19 17:48:43	ANON-YFPW-RW9V-X	2020-03-19 17:48:43	2020-03-19 17:49:05
Yes		Agree	Some concern around Health and PE being combined.	<p>Health and PE should separate at L2 NCEA</p> <p>I'd like HPE to be combined because I believe in the intent of the new L1. However, I am worried I won't like the way the RAS group sets it up with new standards and by then it will be too late to change.</p>	Health and PE should separate at L2 NCEA	No			2020-03-19 19:29:12	ANON-YFPW-RW9C-B	2020-03-19 19:29:12	2020-03-19 19:29:24
No		Undecided		<p>Health and PE should be completely separate. Some students don't want to do the practical side of PE but love learning about Health. Keep it separate. You can have food economics as part of Health if needed.</p>	No	No			2020-03-19 20:00:20	ANON-YFPW-RW98-Z	2020-03-19 20:00:20	2020-03-19 20:00:35
Yes		Undecided				No			2020-03-20 07:53:42	ANON-YFPW-RW99-1	2020-03-20 07:53:42	2020-03-20 07:53:57
Yes		Strongly disagree	It will discourage some students to not do a subject just because they don't want to do the other half of the subject.			No			2020-03-20 10:08:13	ANON-YFPW-RW9J-J	2020-03-20 10:08:13	2020-03-20 10:08:25
Yes		Strongly disagree	If you fuse Health and PE together I will be very angry.	It is very stupid.		Yes			2020-03-20 10:13:07	ANON-YFPW-RW9Q-S	2020-03-20 10:13:07	2020-03-20 10:13:21
Yes		Strongly disagree		<p>As a student who has done health for the past 3 years I believe health should be included as a discrete subject, unconnected to physical education elements. This is because the content covered, especially in level 1, is important for personal development and needs time dedicated to its learning. Additionally the students taking health and PE are very different and this change could deter students from taking health.</p>		No			2020-03-20 10:17:19	ANON-YFPW-RW95-W	2020-03-20 10:17:19	2020-03-20 10:17:58

Yes	We heard about it at school.	Strongly disagree	I believe that a lot of these subjects are too different to be merged together and that doing so will have the opposite intended effect. I believe that instead of keeping students option open it will actually cause them to not take the subjects because they are too broad and not directed to a particular subject. I also think by combining the subjects it will mean that important information and standards will be unable to be taught meaning kids lose important education.	I believe that by combining health and PE it will deter a lot of kids from taking the subject. It will also mean that important standards aren't taught for example assertive communication, positive sexuality and healthy relationships. These standards are so incredibly important for teenagers to learn and by taking them away it provides no opportunity for students to learn this. Health gives students the opportunity to learn such important knowledge such as the standards mentioned above, an opportunity that may not be available for them anywhere else.		No			2020-03-20 10:21:28	ANON-YFPW-RW9F-R	2020-03-20 10:21:28	2020-03-20 10:21:36
Yes		Strongly disagree		As a student who has taken health at a senior level for the past three years, I do not think that health should be merged with PE. If these subjects had been combined when I chose my subjects for level 1, I would not have chosen to carry on with health even though it is my favourite subject. I think that merging health and PE will cause fewer people to choose that subject meaning there will also be fewer people taking level 2 and 3 health. Combining health and PE would mean there would be less time to focus on health assessments and students wouldn't have the chance to learn some of the essential skills that are covered in level 1 health. Taking health has helped me to evolve as a person much more than any other subjects and the content that I have learned has helped me in my everyday life. For example, learning about the aspects of wellbeing, and positive communication. I do not agree with the idea to combine health and PE, and I hope that you reevaluate your decision.		No			2020-03-20 10:21:53	ANON-YFPW-RW97-Y	2020-03-20 10:21:53	2020-03-20 10:22:27
No		Disagree	students in NCEA level 1 should be able to choose specific subjects	n/a	no	Yes		no	2020-03-20 10:26:40	ANON-YFPW-RW9F-E	2020-03-20 10:26:40	2020-03-20 10:26:58
Yes		Strongly disagree		As a senior health student, I believe that merging it with PE is a stupid and terrible idea. It completely changes the curriculum and takes away from important skills that are taught. These skills are things such as assertive communication, healthy relationships, and positive sexuality. How can we promote wellbeing in our students if they are not learning about it? Additionally, many health students will not want to participate in physical education and visa versa. It seems unfair that they have to participate in activities that hold no interest to them, it may even result in fewer kids taking the subject. After doing years of classics, I know that it can simply not be lumped in with 'history'. There is far too much material to learn. It would be extremely difficult to have a sufficient understanding of the classical world. This would also take away from other important parts of history such as our Maori history which is something I would hope you cared about. It would be too hard to get an understanding of each era of history and not benefit students' education. Finally, psychology should be its own subject. It's received nothing but positive reviews as it grows. We should work on continuing to support this		No			2020-03-20 10:29:58	ANON-YFPW-RW91-S	2020-03-20 10:29:58	2020-03-20 10:30:04
Yes		Strongly disagree	As a student, I strongly disagree with the idea of merging specific aspects of a subject into one class. Especially merging Health Education with Physical Education disagrees with me. There are very important topics that are discussed in health classes and it would simply be impossible to continue teaching them as thoroughly if it does get combined with PE. There are students coming from families that need that education to promote their own wellbeing because in their situation there is no other way they would learn to take care of their emotional, spiritual, physical and social Hauora.	I suggest that none of the suggested merges takes place, because it is simply an irresponsible action and would result in the loss of effective learning. In level 1 students are already able to decide in what areas they are interested in and want to educate themselves. By putting different subjects under one big umbrella, you will take away the opportunity from students to learn what they want to learn. That will lead to a decrease in motivation and attendance and eventually, more dropouts.		No			2020-03-20 10:34:13	ANON-YFPW-RW92-2	2020-03-20 10:34:13	2020-03-20 10:34:22

Yes		Strongly disagree	As a Māori senior student that takes health, outdoor education, and sociology, taking away the all our subjects that make our choices broader is something that I truly disagree with. Grouping these different classes together in year 11 takes away some of the choices that we have when choosing our classes. In health, outdoor education and sociology we focus on subjects regarding Te Ao Māori and Māori Tikanga. I'm afraid that clumping (health and pe and social studies) these classes into one subject will take away all of our classes from learning about Te Ao Māori and Tikanga. Although physical education is a large part of my learning, I do appreciate the fact that health and outdoor education are separate. I learn different things in health and outdoor education. So taking away the fact that people are able to choose if they are able to choose if they wish to do physical education or not is one thing that I truly disagree with.	Don't change it. I can tell you right now that you'll see an decline in students taking health.	Art with Maori	Yes			2020-03-20 10:41:19	ANON-YFPW-RW9B-A	2020-03-20 10:41:19	2020-03-20 10:41:27
Yes		Strongly disagree		All of the different p.e subjects have got a very unique way which does not suit everyone and they are all very very different		Yes			2020-03-20 11:31:31	ANON-YFPW-RW9M-N	2020-03-20 11:31:31	2020-03-20 11:31:53
Yes		Strongly disagree				Yes		Student voice	2020-03-20 11:31:42	ANON-YFPW-RW9D-C	2020-03-20 11:31:42	2020-03-20 11:31:58
Yes	DO NOT CHANGE	Strongly disagree	DO NOT CHANGE	DO NOT CHANGE	DO NOT CHANGE	No	DO NOT CHANGE	DO NOT CHANGE	2020-03-20 11:32:10	ANON-YFPW-RW9X-Z	2020-03-20 11:32:10	2020-03-20 11:32:22
Yes	I think this is quite a bad idea as health and sports science etc are still very important knowledge and arguably are more important than having to do physical education as they hold information that may be helpful later in life.	Disagree				No			2020-03-20 11:32:49	ANON-YFPW-RW9A-9	2020-03-20 11:32:49	2020-03-20 11:33:04
Yes		Strongly disagree		Health and PE are completely different subjects that talk about different matters. If they were to change towards merging Health and Physical education it would completely change the way we are taught and how teachers teach us. Plus there are subjects that contribute to what kids love doing physical activity such as Sports Science, Outdoor Education, and Rec. (it would be weird talking about societal pressures of both men and women then play softball the next lesson.) (student's voice)		No			2020-03-20 11:35:39	ANON-YFPW-RW9N-P	2020-03-20 11:35:39	2020-03-20 11:35:50
Yes	i do not Think merging health and PE at level 1 is a good idea. i took health at level one as a student last year. it was one of my favourite classes but i wouldn't of taken it had it been merged with PE. That would have been a shame because then i wouldn't have been able to take it in yr 12.	Strongly disagree	i think health and PE are completely different subjects i see no reason why they should be merged. It would be just as strange as merging english and math. It would diminish the learning of each subject and make it difficult for student to learn what they wish.	i love health but i hate PE. Please don't change it. Its so important for kids to be able to learn about things such as mental health and safe sex. I don't see what this has to do with physical education.	not that i can think of.	Yes		encourage students to learn how to converse in the language instead of just to be able to pass ncea standards.	2020-03-20 11:36:09	ANON-YFPW-RW9K-K	2020-03-20 11:36:09	2020-03-20 11:36:22
Yes		Strongly disagree	I do not support this decision because Health and PE should not be merged. In my health class, the teacher asked us students to raise our hands if we wouldn't have taken health in level 1 if it was merged with PE. All 20 or so students in the class raised their hands. What makes health so special is that we learn about issues surrounding our wellbeing, whereas in PE you play sports. There is little to no overlap in what you learn. It would not at all be logical to merge health with PE, for the kids who are interested in taking health are not at all interested in taking PE and vice versa. If this suggested change were to be made, I am almost certain that you would see a massive drop in the amount of students taking that subject.			No			2020-03-20 11:37:57	ANON-YFPW-RW9E-X	2020-03-20 11:37:15	2020-03-20 11:38:07
Yes	I am a student.	Strongly disagree		I think health, outdoor ed and recreation are so important. I did health last year and this year and I have learned so much important information. Health is the one subject that you learn valuable things that you can apply to your life outside of school. Without health as an option, I think the future students would be lacking useful information.	I would like the ministry to consider how much the students would be missing out when you remove these such important subjects.	No			2020-03-20 11:38:05	ANON-YFPW-RW9R-T	2020-03-20 11:38:05	2020-03-20 11:38:19

Yes	Discussed it in my level 2 health class.	Strongly disagree		Student voice: Health and Physical Education are completely different subjects. Health is incredibly important to me as well as my classmates. It provides a safe space where we can actually learn things important for day to day life, it is the only class which provides insights into mental health, gender and sexuality. Some students who are incredibly interested in health science may resent pe and therefore avoid taking the subject because of it. Personally health is my favourite subject and if it were to be combined with p.e I wouldn't have taken it. Health as a subject which requires many hours of discussion about topics such as social injustice and if it were to be combined with p.e then it would cut into that time and our ability to learn as much as we could would be cut down. Having other generalized subjects at level 1 cut out is frankly an awful idea, providing a generalized subject will benefit some students, however to those who excel in learning and know what they want to do with life combining these subjects may bore them and lead to more truancy. This is because if a certain topic doesn't interest a student they may just stop turning up to class until the topic they actually want to do is being studied. Removing subjects such as Psychology and Classics at level one is also an awful idea. These are subjects which when it comes to university are		No			2020-03-20 11:41:19	ANON-YFPW-RW9W-Y	2020-03-20 11:41:19	2020-03-20 11:41:30
Yes	I am a student voice and I don't understand how this promotes levels 2 and 3 for health and not hinder health.	Strongly disagree	I will never agree with this	this will impact health for level 1 and that is irrational as health in level 1 is greatly different from PE and would make no sense to merge as they are both very different. this is also bad because there is a lot of people who picked health that would not pick health if it meant they had to be physical as people feel that to do PE you have to be fit and because of that if people wanted to do health then they would not have the option and people would not go into a level 2 course they have any learning in making it if you make these changes you will just get rid of health and make it that the domestic violence rates may increase because people will have no class to learn that it is bad or to learn about themselves making them more unstable people.	"develop"	No			2020-03-20 11:41:39	ANON-YFPW-RW94-V	2020-03-20 11:41:39	2020-03-20 11:42:00
Yes		Strongly disagree		P.E. and health are very different subjects. In years 9 and 10, health and P.E. are joined together. There are two different sections where students perform physical activities and where students talk about health-related topics. This benefits all students as some are more leaning towards health and some more leaning towards physical education. However, in NCEA level 1, students are able to pick their subjects. They can choose to do Classics rather than English, and further onwards can pick individual sciences such as chemistry or physics rather than science as a whole. Why would this not be able to happen to health and P.E? Keeping it the same, with health and P.E. being different subjects, would be beneficial to students as each lesson flows into the next. If the subjects were joined, one lesson would be students going out to play soccer and the next we talk about influences on gender. It just doesn't work. So I would appreciate it if both subjects were kept separate. (Student voice.)		No			2020-03-20 11:44:16	ANON-YFPW-RW9T-V	2020-03-20 11:44:15	2020-03-20 11:44:32
Yes	Student	Strongly disagree	I think they are completely different subjects that should stay separate. People who take outdoor ed or rec want to do physical education and learn about the human body. People who take health want to learn about sexuality and society.	If you make 3 classes into one people will only be slightly interested most of the time and only put effort into the part of the subject that they want to. From experience, I felt this way in a design subject that had to be merged with art I didn't want to do. I found myself only trying n the half of the year that had what I wanted to do because I felt I was wasting my time the rest of the year.		Yes	I did a very small amount of Te reo Maori in primary school but that was only because we brought an outside teacher to separate the school board.	I would like to see mandatory Maori lessons for all primary students. I believe it's important to learn the language of the people who belong to this land and the people who invaded show respect by now learning at least some of the language that belongs to this country.	2020-03-20 11:46:32	ANON-YFPW-RW93-U	2020-03-20 11:46:32	2020-03-20 11:46:41

Yes	When I first heard I thought, terrible idea. There is nothing good about this decision the majority of health students in my level 2 health class would not have even taken level 1 health if it was a general P.E class. In conclusion, There are about 170,000 words in the current english language but I could never string enough together to express how much of a terribly baffoonish idea this is.	Strongly disagree	If I hadn't learned skills for assertive communication in level 1 health I would express my anger towards this decision with a lot more than just words. Health is the most useful class I have ever taken and actually prepares me for real life, to think that year 11s in the future could get an improper health education from unqualified P.E teachers instead of having a whole class devoted to a subject a lot of students are passionate about.	P.E subjects in level 1 should remain the same as they are now, all the students I have talked to believe that students should get a proper, full education in the P.E class they have chosen without being forced into doing other things on the side that they don't want to do and won't be engaged in. I would not have taken health if it was a general Health and P.E class.	Never get rid of Sonic arts in level 2/3. It doesn't need development because it's already perfect.	No			2020-03-20 12:03:45	ANON-YFPW-RW92-T	2020-03-20 12:03:45	2020-03-20 12:04:15
No		Agree		I suggest that Latin should be included.	Yes, Latin.	No	No		2020-03-20 14:13:06	ANON-YFPW-RW9U-W	2020-03-20 14:13:06	2020-03-20 14:13:16
Yes	Although I've been out of teaching for 6 years, I try to keep up with what's happening in the Education sector.	Strongly disagree	I cannot understand why Latin, of all courses, is subject to elimination. It is one of the few subjects to truly be of lasting assistance for those who find English difficult. In my experience, ESOL students made massive strides in English by means of the study of Latin. Furthermore, lower ability students were doing proportionally much better in their senior years for having studied two - or even one - year(s) of Latin. At the other end, high ability student can truly be tested by the intricacies of the language. The real question is whether education, and the subjects promoted within it, must of their very nature be utilitarian in scope and outlook. This is the model it appears is being followed, and it is a mistake.	See my comments above.	More Latin. Promote it, especially for the lower ability student.	No			2020-03-20 15:14:09	ANON-YFPW-RWU9-W	2020-03-20 15:14:09	2020-03-20 15:14:32
Yes	would not approve of this change whatsoever literally the only class I love	Strongly disagree	it would suck so bad	I personally would hate if they combined them, I love only health	NA	Yes	was taught it when I was I younger but since then haven't	NA	2020-03-20 15:29:59	ANON-YFPW-RWUG-B	2020-03-20 15:29:59	2020-03-20 15:30:07
Yes		Strongly disagree	See no. 3	The Classical Studies Programme at Massey University is entirely opposed to the planned changes to the teaching of Classical Studies and Latin. We find the suggestion that reducing the range of options will increase opportunities to be entirely contradictory. We also think that the consequences of the proposed cuts will only be harmful (and they are cuts, even for Classical Studies: you cannot bury one subject in another without loses to one, the other, or both). Cuts at one level will almost inevitably lead in time to cuts at another, and cuts in one area frequently have harmful effects in others. These plans therefore are not simply detrimental in what they propose but are also detrimental in what they will almost inevitably lead to (namely further cuts in time. The proposal that Classical Studies can be offered as part of History entails a considerable misconception of what the subject involves. While it does involve the study of the history of ancient Greece and Rome, it also involves the study of the art, literature, philosophy and religion of ancient Greece and Rome, as well as the reception of ancient history and culture in more recent and contemporary times. If Classical Studies were to be included in History, a significant part of the subject would have to be jettisoned; indeed, the subject would be disembowelled. Classical Studies		No			2020-03-20 16:48:27	ANON-YFPW-RWUJ-E	2020-03-20 16:48:27	2020-03-20 16:48:41
Yes	Although in part I understand the need to provide what is seen as a broad, more foundational education at Level 1, by restricting options at this level, students will then be fed into more narrow streams later (since they will have had access to only certain topics earlier.	Disagree		If you want broad education at lower levels, Latin makes the most sense in terms of language since it is the basis for romance languages, is the foundational language for terminology in Science and Maths, and will help students to better understand English grammar, structure, syntax while increasing their vocabulary. Classical Studies is also not history. There is more to Classics than just names, events, and dates. It is a study of their culture (through study of art, and literature), something that will be overlooked if Classics just becomes part of the history curriculum.		Yes			2020-03-20 17:06:26	ANON-YFPW-RWUQ-N	2020-03-20 17:06:26	2020-03-20 17:06:56

Yes	While I was aware that the intended change was meant to support a broad, more foundational education, I was not aware that the threatening cutting and combining subjects was even an option. I have to strongly disagree with these proposed changes. As a year 12, I can attest to the fact that this is not what my peers or I would have wanted. Year 11 was the beginning of us starting to develop a passion into the areas we want to possibly pursue further. We spent the last 10 years of school doing a generalised study of subjects that we are not necessarily keen on, this is our chance to start studying what we wanted, not what the government or school wants us to study. Changing the curriculum to make it more 'foundational' is impartial and demeaning. If the last 10 years of school haven't been 'foundational' enough, then maybe that's where the changes need to happen. Changing NCEA to create a more broad spectrum of subjects is stupid and idiotic. I can see how changing the system may benefit some students, but it takes away from those who want a push, those who know what they want to do and have the drive to get there. The system needs to work for everyone not just one type of learner. These proposed changes are definitely not designed for everyone. The changes don't support a broad foundational education, they support the Education	Strongly disagree	I strongly disagree with the Ministry's proposed subjects for Level One. I believe that these subjects will leave gaps. The cutting of the 'Classical subjects (Classics and Latin), levels a gaping hole in the education system, and make us the only English speaking country in the world to not teach them. Is this something we really want to be known as? The one country that doesn't teach the foundation of our current civilisation? I do support the addition of native New Zealand subjects, but the combination of some subjects and the discontinuation of others is foolish. Students want a choice for what they can study. This is undeniable and the Ministry's proposed changes belittle students decisions. Year 11 is the start of properly studying, sitting exams and thinking about your future. For students that know what they want to do and want to push themselves these proposed subjects will have a negative impact.	Cutting Latin and Classics is a horrible mistake. I have taken Latin for the past four years and it taught me more in the first term than 12 years worth of English classes. I've heard it all; "Why do you take Latin?", "It's a dead language.", "You don't even need to speak it!" and "It won't get you anywhere." I take Latin because it teaches you logical and critical thinking, as well as basically teaching you all the 'Romantic' languages in one. It teaches you sentence structures, the origin 70% of English words and demonstrates the derivation of Roman culture to the Western present culture. Learning Latin doesn't directly lead to a career path, but it opens so many doors, the sciences, languages, cultural studies, the law. It proves to employers that you are capable of learning something hard and adapting. It's not about whether it is speakable, it's about being able to obtain knowledge and use it to your advantage. I take physics and chemistry and there are terms being used that my peers don't know, but I do because I learned them in Latin. Latin is the language of the law, and cutting it from the curriculum is not hurting the students that want to take it now, but also the future because it will kill Latin in this country. Yes, you can take it at University but it has been scientifically proven that learning a language when your younger is much	At my school, we are very lucky to already have a wide array of subject choices offered to us at NCEA levels. However, I feel as if Classical Studies, Latin and Art History especially are underrated and undervalued. They are subjects which are talked about in the past tense, symbolising that they are no longer important. However, this is hardly the case, they are integral to our society and social standing today. Sometimes I think we are so focused on the future that we forget that some of the most useful lessons are from history. In New Zealand, we are pulling away from Classical studies and that's sad. Those subjects need to be injected back into our education system and improved upon, so generations to come can continue to study them.	No	I am not very familiar with the New Zealand Curriculum for Te Reo Maori, but I fully support the extension of Maori based subjects in NCEA. I just don't think that it should take away from subjects that are also such an integral base of our modern-day society; such as Latin and Classics. Definitely more options are needed for studying Maori and culture-based subjects.	2020-03-20 17:16:30	ANON-YFPW-RWUE-9	2020-03-20 17:16:30	2020-03-20 17:17:19
Yes		Agree			Sociology	Yes		2020-03-20 21:59:32	ANON-YFPW-RWU5-S	2020-03-20 21:59:32	2020-03-20 21:59:41
Yes		Strongly disagree	This is a misguided goal. Many subjects (particularly the individual sciences) require time to be spent in building up understanding. The proposed plan cuts the time allowed to students to gain this deep understanding.	While Latin, Classics, and Art History lack tangible uses, they are crucial in giving young people a broader understanding of the world in a wider context, and in developing complex and critical thinking. These deeper thinking skills are crucial to developing engaged and informed members of society.	It is increasingly important for people to be conversant with computers in the modern world. Some form of programming/computer science would be a beneficial addition.	No		2020-03-21 00:04:19	ANON-YFPW-RWUP-M	2020-03-21 00:04:19	2020-03-21 00:04:43
No		Disagree				No		2020-03-21 10:54:24	ANON-YFPW-RWU7-U	2020-03-21 10:54:24	2020-03-21 10:54:41
No		Agree				No		2020-03-21 15:41:51	ANON-YFPW-RWUF-A	2020-03-21 15:41:51	2020-03-21 15:42:02
No		Strongly disagree	The removal of subjects and merging of others does not reflect the interest of students, it forces condensed learning onto students (particularly with history and classics) with subjects not compatible	Do not merge classics and history because of there differences, which would mean that neither subject gets the attention it deserves. It could put students off both subjects altogether		Yes		2020-03-21 18:50:14	ANON-YFPW-RWU1-N	2020-03-21 18:50:14	2020-03-21 18:50:22
Yes	Yes, I was aware of this, but, the NZ Curriculum states: The core strand, Nature of Science, is required learning for all students up to year 10. The other strands provide contexts for learning. Over the course of years 1-10, science programmes should include learning in all four context strands. Students in years 11-13 are able to specialise in one or more science disciplines, depending on the choices offered in their schools. The achievement objectives in the context strands provide for strand-based specialisations, but a wider range of programmes is possible; for example, schools may offer programmes in biochemistry, education for sustainability, agriculture, horticulture, human biology, or electronics. (NZC, p29) What is being proposed for science is a huge change in the curriculum and a huge reduction in the flexibility for schools to offer courses that suit the needs of their akonga. Far from encouraging students into STEM subjects, which is a worldwide problem, these changes will create barriers for students wanting to pursue Science related careers.	Strongly disagree	As stated above the proposed changes for science are completely at odds with the NZ Curriculum. I urge the panel considering these changes to science to look at the UK Science curriculum documents: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-curriculum-in-england-science-programmes-of-study Which state in their introduction: A high-quality science education provides the foundations for understanding the world through the specific disciplines of biology, chemistry and physics. Science has changed our lives and is vital to the world's future prosperity, and all pupils should be taught essential aspects of the knowledge, methods, processes and uses of science. There is still a strong emphasis on the Nature of Science in the UK but unlike the proposed changes to Level 1 NCEA in New Zealand which make NOS the focal point, the UK curriculum states: 'Working scientifically' specifies the understanding of the nature, processes and methods of science for each year group. It should not be taught as a separate strand. The notes and guidance give examples of how	In science there need to be assessments related to Biology, Chemistry, Physics, Agricultural and Horticultural Science, and Earth and Space Science. I believe that New Zealand has an excellent curriculum document based on sound values with the aim of producing well-balanced citizens capable of creative and critical thinking. The Science curriculum rightly emphasises the Nature of Science (NOS) to complement these overall aims and the current NCEA assessment matrix allows the flexibility to design different courses that suit the needs of our students, whatever their future pathways. We aim to satisfy both of the objectives identified by Professor Gluckman (2011): There are at least two distinct objectives of science education at secondary school – the first is that of pre-professional education which is traditionally for careers needing science, usually arranged around mathematics, physics, chemistry, biology and perhaps general science. The second is the citizen-focused need for all children as they mature to have a clear understanding of the complex world of science that they will confront as citizens over the next 60 years of their lives.	No However, the science disciplines of biology, Chemistry, Physics, Earth and Space Science, and Agricultural and Horticultural Science must be retained. All of these need supporting Level 1 subjects and assessments, including an additional general science course, as currently exist.	No		2020-03-22 10:04:43	ANON-YFPW-RWU2-X	2020-03-22 10:04:43	2020-03-22 10:05:01
Yes		Strongly disagree	if this were to change, the change should happen in either year 9 or 10 and students should have the choice as they become seniors			Yes		2020-03-22 14:23:45	ANON-YFPW-RWUH-C	2020-03-22 14:23:45	2020-03-22 14:23:54
Yes		Strongly agree				No		2020-03-22 15:19:45	ANON-YFPW-RWUB-6	2020-03-22 15:19:45	2020-03-22 15:20:03

Yes		Strongly disagree	Students should be able to specialise starting at level one. These non-specific subjects are well and good for junior school subjects (9/10), but students are less engaged and less interested when subjects are broad. People like to specialise, and if they aren't given access to subjects which they enjoy, school becomes a worse place for people.	Media studies is so different from social studies. It is primarily an English-based subject with elements of social studies/geography as media fits into the context of the wider world, and is not comparable or able to fit in with either of those subjects. Media studies allows students a whole subject slot in which they are able to pursue their passions for film, and spend a large portion of the year making films. In English, or social studies, there is absolutely no way this would happen, which means level one students would miss out on valuable learning in practical filmmaking, problem solving, and teamwork.	I think more specialised art subjects, with more technical elements built into it would be valuable, as artmaking is both technical and artistic.	No				2020-03-22 18:22:04	ANON-YFPW-RWUW-H	2020-03-22 18:22:04	2020-03-22 18:22:14
Yes	But I was not aware that some subjects would be culled. It seems that nobody knew this until 22 February.	Strongly disagree	See response to Q3	1 - Accounting, Business Studies and Economics, as three separate and distinct subjects fit with the policy vision of a broader, foundational NCEA Level 1 with increasing specialisation at Levels 2 and 3. If the desire is to create a broad education at Level 1, we have concerns that narrowing the number of subjects available would also actually narrow the education at Level 1, as teachers would have to teach less content from each subject in order to fit them all into a year. If the goal is to encourage a broader education at Level 1, we fail to understand how other highly specialized subjects continue to exist in their own right if the same decision-making rationale were applied evenly and fairly to all current subjects. oCould Dance, Drama and Music not be combined in a subject called "Performing Arts" under this logic? With specialisation at Level 2. oCould History and Geography not also be merged into a broader Social Sciences course? oCould modern foreign languages be merged into a single broader language course, with the different languages being the context, limiting student choice to just one modern foreign language? Surely studying more than one language narrows students' Level 1 education? oWhy have commerce-based subjects been	No, as it seems students will be unprepared for a large number of Level 2 subjects as it is.	Yes		No		2020-03-22 21:11:14	ANON-YFPW-RWUW-8	2020-03-22 21:09:43	2020-03-22 21:11:40
Yes	Yes, and I think this makes some sense. However, I think there needs to be more clarity around what "broader" and "more foundational" actually mean. Based on the proposal above, there seems to have been an attempt to separate by subject (i.e. "broader" subjects, based presumably on content, and more narrow). However, this misses the fact that many of the subjects have very broad methodologies and learning approaches, which give access to a huge range of subjects, despite having more focused areas of content. I would suggest that the MOE rethink its approach and adopt a less rigid, and indeed more appropriate, definition.	Strongly disagree	As noted above, I think the MOE's proposed subjects prioritize with (often slightly) more general content at the expense of subjects which offer a better foundation for actually learning different types of material. Classical Studies is an excellent example of this, as the subject allows students to study history, art, language, archaeology, sociology, demography, etc. of a particular set of populations. This subject gives access to a HUGE range of other subjects, and indeed has been considered "foundational" to education for centuries. I am honestly confused how a subject like "History", which forms only one part of Classical Studies, could be considered broader?	I am deeply concerned to see both Latin and Classical Studies are on the list to be removed. I would encourage the MOE to have both taught from Level 1 onward.	No	Yes		No		2020-03-23 09:37:05	ANON-YFPW-RWUW-V	2020-03-23 09:37:05	2020-03-23 09:37:27
Yes		Disagree				No				2020-03-23 17:58:35	ANON-YFPW-RWUW-5	2020-03-23 17:58:35	2020-03-23 17:58:42
Yes	I support this	Strongly disagree		No - I applaud these changes	Latin	Yes		No		2020-03-23 18:23:27	ANON-YFPW-RWUW-J	2020-03-23 18:23:27	2020-03-23 18:23:36
No	While I did attend the meetings to discuss proposed changes at Level 1 nothing was at all mentioned about the possibility of there being fundamental change to the subject list. All information discussed the amount of credits, how to get literacy and numeracy etc. This completely blindsided not only myself but the whole Department at school.	Strongly disagree	While PE and Health may fall under the same curriculum they are essentially two very different subject areas. Not only in terms of the content taught but also in terms of the students who choose to take these subjects at school. In speaking with students over the proposed changes NONE would take the subject if it moved to being combined as they have only an interest in one of the areas. While there is discussion that getting Health specialists is sometimes an issue or that schools do not offer robust Health programmes within these schools, this will not fix that situation - it simply impacts those schools who have embraced these curriculum areas. It was also discussed in the SEG meeting by James that the joining of these areas together would allow the "curriculum area to be held in equal esteem with other areas" which after 20 years teaching in this area, developing programmes and raising the profile within schools was a bit like a slap in the face.	Psychology fitting into Social Sciences is an interesting fit where I feel it would fit better in the HPE area.		Yes	We need to make sure that this inclusion is linked not only to wider Aotearoa but also can have local links as well.			2020-03-24 08:04:02	ANON-YFPW-RWUW-F	2020-03-24 08:04:02	2020-03-24 08:04:16

Yes	I think this is a good aim, however, I do not think the exclusion of subjects is the correct way to achieve this. Subject content can be broadened to encompass a wider range of material without the loss of exposure that the exclusion of subjects would bring.	Disagree	Including subjects such as Classics and Latin at NCEA Level 1 allow students to delve into new topics in a way that is in-depth and unprecedented in their learning career. With higher stakes for NCEA Level 2 (such as gaining university entrance), it is important to allow students this time to explore and learn without the pressure this imposes.	Classics should be included at NCEA Level 1. NCEA Level 1 is an ideal opportunity for students to engage with new and interesting subjects in a low pressure context. People are consistently fascinated with Classics, and even the slightest exposure to the subject ignites a passion due to the many elements it has. One can learn about religion, politics, economy, social structures, literature, mythology - there are countless themes and avenues one can continue down. Classics provides a broad foundation for future education, and a useful background when continuing into the Bachelor of Arts programme available at many New Zealand universities. Classics is an immensely popular topic that remains hugely relevant to modern society, and needs to be included at NCEA Level 1.	No	No			2020-03-24 22:29:12	ANON-YFPW-RWU6-T	2020-03-24 22:28:28	2020-03-24 22:29:16
Yes		Disagree	Shame to see Latin go and it just seems to reduce flexibility in general		No				2020-03-25 07:16:23	ANON-YFPW-RWUR-P	2020-03-25 07:16:23	2020-03-25 07:16:30
No	I have attended NZQA workshops, meetings and presentations and was not aware that this was being considered.	Disagree	The needs of our students differ greatly between Health and Physical Education. We currently run both subjects separately at Level 1, 2 and 3. The size of our school provides an avenue that allows these to run in their separate areas. The enjoyment from students is obvious in their decision to continue with these subjects throughout school. We run Health and PE together in Year 9 and 10 and find students typically engage with one subject area more than the other. The needs students have for a more practical learning subject is limited already with Level 1 subject choices and Level 1 PE allows students to take a subject that has a strong practical applied learning component to engage with the subject content and learning styles.	Continuing to run as separate subjects meets our students needs more. The combination of two subjects such as this makes less sense when similar practical subjects such as Dance and Drama maintain separate domains. Consistency is key. We will lose subject numbers if the subjects are combined and therefore staff in our department. It is a stressful time seeing this in the future.	No				2020-03-25 12:22:00	ANON-YFPW-RWUW-U	2020-03-25 12:22:00	2020-03-25 12:22:12
No		Agree			No				2020-03-25 14:36:50	ANON-YFPW-RWU4-R	2020-03-25 14:36:50	2020-03-25 14:37:08
Yes		Strongly disagree			Yes				2020-03-25 21:06:25	ANON-YFPW-RWUT-R	2020-03-25 21:06:25	2020-03-25 21:06:39
No		Disagree	Latin should be retained for NCEA level 1	Latin has been an established and standard academic subject in the European educational tradition over the ages. New Zealand students who have the interest and desire to know about European heritage and therefore to study Latin for NCEA levels (or for the International Baccalaureate or the Cambridge Examinations if their schools present them for these examinations) deserve the right to study Latin at NZ NCEA levels. This is underpinned by the Government Goals for Education NEG 10: "Respect for the diverse ethnic and cultural heritage of New Zealand people, with acknowledgment of the unique place of Māori, and New Zealand's role in the Pacific and as a member of the international community of nations." Our European heritage should not be excluded from our learning. Latin is a foundation language of English; more than 50% of English words are derived from Latin. Knowledge of Latin gives understanding of how English has developed and what it means, thereby recognising one of New Zealand's official languages. Latin continues to meet the following Government Goals for Education:	Latin should be retained for NCEA Levels 2 and 3	No			2020-03-26 08:40:22	ANON-YFPW-RWU3-Q	2020-03-26 08:40:22	2020-03-26 08:40:41

No	Only in very general terms, until I received a notification from a colleague, and read the information on this website.	Agree	In general terms I support the changes. My reservations are outlined below in Q3.	I am disappointed that Art History will not be available at level 1. However, I understand that one consideration is low enrollment in level-1 Art History. My feedback is that Art History be included as one standard in the NCEA Level-1 Art. This would address the issue of low enrollment, and provide a pathway to Art History at Level-2. It would also counteract the way that Art History has been marginalized in art education in New Zealand for some time. It is astounding that Art History is not a compulsory component of studio art education, something that is taken for granted in other countries. In the United States, for instance, tertiary-level studio art programmes need to have an art historian on staff to receive accreditation. By including Art History as part of the Art standard, it would be a small but significant step to counteract this tendency.	N/A	No			2020-03-26 16:00:47	ANON-YFPW-RWU2-P	2020-03-26 16:00:47	2020-03-26 16:01:00
Yes		Strongly agree		No	No	No	No		2020-03-26 16:22:42	ANON-YFPW-RWUJ-S	2020-03-26 16:22:42	2020-03-26 16:22:55
Yes	No, the first time I heard about this was on Facebook.	Strongly disagree	Classics should not be removed	Please keep Classics in - this is a valuable subject and do not remove students' rights to take subjects they like	International Relations	No			2020-03-26 19:43:26	ANON-YFPW-RWSY-U	2020-03-26 19:43:26	2020-03-26 19:43:36
No	The assumption that Classical Studies and Latin are not foundational is plainly wrong. These subjects were invented in the Graeco-Roman world and have given rise to all subsequent subjects which are taught in schools and universities today. It hardly needs pointing out that the names of the faculties and departments of our universities are Graeco-Roman (e.g. Arts, Science, Geography, etc., etc.) precisely because they are "founded" on the divisions of knowledge bequeathed to us from the ancient world. You are proposing the reversal of the understandings which characterise Western knowledge systems. This is surely not what you want to do, for it will distort the sense of knowledge development that you probably want for students in NZ schools.	Strongly disagree	Why has, for instance, Classical Studies been subsumed into History? Classical Studies is conventionally understood as the Language, Literature, History, Art, Archaeology and Philosophy of Greece and Rome, and of their reception into the modern world. Classical Studies is the umbrella subject, or the primary subject. It is not the secondary or 'specialised' subject. The only reason for thinking this way is because of certain prejudices among Education scholarship - a number of which I support, such as the desire to counter conservative patriarchal attitudes. But Classical Studies is not inherently conservative. The Greeks and Romans knew all the political attitudes and persuasions that we do. Classical Studies is no longer taught as it was in 19th Century public schools in countries such as England. The cart is being conceived of as pulling the horse. Please see that what might at times be the latest or the loudest is not necessarily the best or correct.	Latin is not a dead language. Along with Greek, Latin is the language of learning in what is often called the "Western" tradition. It transformed into the Romance languages and it was used to express the ideas, attitudes and beliefs that are distinctive of European cultural traditions, such as those which have heavily influenced modern New Zealand. Languages not spoken or even known by the majority are not necessarily without value, even primary value. Programming languages for computer systems are a good example of this. 'Computer', by the way, is a Latin word. We understand the world according to the Graeco-Roman conceptions of it. Latin is the key to unlocking these conceptions and enlightening us about our own evolved versions of them.	Classical Greek has the same value as Latin, if truth be told.	No	I live in Brisbane, Australia, now, but I lived and worked in Auckland, New Zealand, for 12.5 years (1991-July 2003). I fully support the teaching and learning of Te Reo Maori. It is as basic to the expression and understanding and assessment of the value of Maori culture as Latin is to the European cultures which are heirs to the Graeco-Roman heritage.		2020-03-26 22:32:31	ANON-YFPW-RWSC-5	2020-03-26 22:32:31	2020-03-26 22:33:01
Yes		Disagree	too many subjects folded into Science yet performing arts are still in three subjects? Not clear why some subjects are being collapsed into something that looks quite generalists and others not. Where is NZ history?	too many subjects folded into Science yet performing arts are still in three subjects? Not clear why some subjects are being collapsed into something that looks quite generalists and others not. Where is NZ history?		Yes	Only that they need to be adequately resourced and updated to reflect students interests (e.g. digital technologies) with opportunity to integrate assessments.		2020-03-26 22:39:10	ANON-YFPW-RWS5-N	2020-03-26 22:39:10	2020-03-26 22:39:22
No		Strongly disagree		I feel that reducing the choices of subjects for NCEA 1 is further dumbing down our society. We have an option to be providing more and yet this proposal is trying to do less. Its interesting that many of the subjects your are proposing to cut are the subjects that provide students with an insight into culture and civilisation. Something fiercely needed as we see a resurgence of neo Liberal nationalism.	There are many entry level Uni subjects you could be looking at a foundational level for Level 2 and 3. Womens studies, anthropology, etc....	Yes	Yes, I feel they should be left as it is and more support given to help kaiako teach through a digital platform.		2020-03-28 08:11:09	ANON-YFPW-RWS8-T	2020-03-28 08:11:09	2020-03-28 08:11:27
Yes	I doubt this is more functional. Perhaps consider your wording.	Strongly disagree	Cutting classical studies while it is still a popular subject at university is daft. I do not know why you would cut that as an option. In high school that was the only subject that made me enjoy school enough to make university entrance. It made me enjoy education.	Classical Studies. This subject taught me how to research more than history, english, and art history combined. It was also vital in my understanding of how the world worked and was the only class which could keep engagement with some of my peers. Going into university I was only prepared because of the skills learned through level 3 classics. And has been a huge base in my journey to a PhD with Anthropology.	Classical studies	Yes			2020-03-28 09:46:10	ANON-YFPW-RWS9-U	2020-03-28 09:46:10	2020-03-28 09:46:25

No	By creating it foundational, like with Science in Level 1, it makes it more difficult for students to focus on their particular areas of interest. This is particularly important, as in years 9 and 10, students are expected to spend those two years to determine what they are wanting to do at years 11 through 13. It means you are removing the student's capability and decision to focus their studies in their senior school years to prepare them for university, if that is the pathway that they are wanting to follow. By combining, particularly History and Classical Studies into one subject (History), you are expecting teachers to cover a lot of material in a year and therefore will not provide their students with the effective tools that they need if the student is wanting get into specific fields at the tertiary level. This is particularly true as you are not providing the students with the opportunity to study Classical Studies at all unless it is considered a context for History.	Strongly disagree	Removing the subjects makes students feel less valued as they are not being provided choice. By removing this choice it basically removes the student's ability to decide on their own pathway.	You should not remove Classical Studies or merge it with History. The techniques involved in both subjects are not the same. As a former student who studied in both areas, at a NCEA level as well as a tertiary level, I can tell you that they are not the same. By focussing solely on history, likely to neglect Classical Studies in favour of modern history, you will be ensuring that when students get to University and are wanting to study Ancient History and Classical Studies they will not be equipped with even the basics that they are needing for effective study in this area of study. Classical Studies provides a useful way of viewing the modern world which simply is not covered in History in any respect except for a brief coverage. This means that expecting that the students to jump from a combined History/Classical Studies subject to courses in Classical Studies and Ancient History at university is not an appropriate decision that you can make for these students. Additionally, even though I have not personally taken the subject in NCEA (cause it was not even offered at my school), removing Latin completely from the curriculum for students is not a smart move either. Latin is a foundational language for English along with other Romance languages which are taught. Students who want to learn one	Continue with Latin and Classical Studies as subjects. Do not remove them.	No	This was not something that was focussed on in my school, though it would be a good idea to provide this as an option for students who wish to pursue it.	2020-03-28 10:38:35	ANON-YFPW-RWSG-9	2020-03-28 10:38:35	2020-03-28 10:38:52
Yes		Strongly disagree	"It takes centuries to build a city, which is destroyed in an hour. Ashes are made in a single moment, forests in an age." I would like to register my disagreement with the proposal to remove Latin and Classical Studies from the list of NCEA subjects. My thoughts could be summed up by the quote above from the Roman philosopher Seneca in his Natural Questions. In a country like New Zealand that is growing and becoming ever more diverse and connected with the wider world, it seems to me to be a regressive decision to remove two subjects that offer something unique within the New Zealand school curriculum. It would be better both to embrace growth and build on the strengths that our heritage gives us. In a broader perspective, New Zealand's contributions to the long history of Classical Studies are better known and more recognised outside the country than in New Zealand and there is the danger here that an internationally well regarded tradition might be permanently damaged, and New Zealand's international reputation in studies in the Humanities harmed in the future. Submission by: Dr James McNamara DAAD-Prime Postdoctoral Research Fellow, University	Latin is the only subject available in NZ that gives school pupils access to a two thousand year old tradition of writing in the original language. The intellectual challenge of directly studying an ancient language and its texts, and understanding a culture that is both so distant in time and space, and yet fundamental to the multicultural society we inhabit, is unique to Latin in the New Zealand school system. New Zealand's educational system has many great strengths, but in an international perspective, languages are an area of comparative weakness. I would like to emphasise two things that would be lost. First, Latin embodies ancient traditions of linguistic analysis, to a greater extent than is generally practised in the teaching of modern languages (I have studied both ancient and modern languages in New Zealand). Learning Latin provides students with widely transferrable insights into the functioning of human language and produces young adults capable of mastering further languages with ease, a highly desirable skill in the modern world. Intercultural competency is at the heart of studying Latin.		No		2020-03-29 00:59:51	ANON-YFPW-RWSJ-C	2020-03-29 00:53:19	2020-03-29 00:59:58
Yes		Undecided		I am concerned that subject such as Latin and Art History are not included in the subject list. Latin, in particular, is very useful in the further study of English. 70% of English comes from Latin. It encourages decoding skills as these skills are useful for the learning of other languages.		No		2020-03-30 08:59:38	ANON-YFPW-RWSQ-K	2020-03-30 08:59:38	2020-03-30 08:59:57
Yes		Strongly agree				No		2020-03-30 15:35:49	ANON-YFPW-RWSE-7	2020-03-30 15:35:49	2020-03-30 15:36:00

Yes		Undecided		<p>Separate Biology, Chemistry, Physics and Earth and Space Science (ESS) subjects. This is about ESS, which is a different case from the other three sciences.</p> <p>ESSE (Subject Association) is broadly supportive of the direction of the new L1 science standards. But, if the other three sciences design separate subject standards ESS would like to as well. These would be based around Nature of Science and science capabilities in the PEB/ESS contexts at NZC L6. ESS also needs to have its own domain; at the moment it is part of the Science domain resulting in the impression from many that ESS is not as rigorous as the other sciences (it is!).</p> <p>Earth and Space Science (ESS) was not a separate science subject when the last science matrix was put together in 2008. The Ministry of Education asked the lead person for the Planet Earth and Beyond contextual strand, in 2009, to put together a team to design a subject that reflected the PEB contextual strand for NZC L7 and Level 8. This became ESS.</p> <p>So ESS never had a separate subject at L1 although four good internally assessed AS were designed for the L1 Science matrix.</p> <p>Neither ESS L2 or L3 can assume prior ESS knowledge. This is partly because teaching of the PEB strand varies greatly at primary and junior</p>	no	Yes	I am especially of Pūtaiao. The content and skills align well with the Science learning strand in NZC. The AOs of both curricula overlap and in many cases the Pūtaiao strands enhance the Science AOs. ESSE are actively building the kaupapa of Māori into our courses and assessments. Examples are Kaitiakianga which is built into our courses on any aspects of the	Pūtaiao is a great learning area and the structure of this is easily understood. This would become a good subject Pūtaiao. The different Taumata overlap and enhance the NZC AOs.	2020-03-31 00:46:57	ANON-YFPW-RWSS-Q	2020-03-31 00:46:57	2020-03-31 00:47:31
Yes		Agree		In the light of the climate crisis, a dedicated class to climate change, how to mitigate and adapt using a pedagogy of inquiry based learning that could be supported by other subjects would be forward thinking and essential learning for our youth.	Climate change education, the science behind climate change and how to mitigate and adapt.	No			2020-03-31 11:40:23	ANON-YFPW-RWS7-S	2020-03-31 11:40:23	2020-03-31 11:40:41
Yes		Agree		<p>Many schools have junior Business studies for years 9 and 10. Within these courses, they cover, Accounting Business and Economics.</p> <p>Financial literacy is an area that is lacking right across the board. Students having a lack of basic financial literacy.</p> <p>Only 1/3 nationally of our students go to University. This means that many of our students throughout new Zealand go into trades or similar. If students go into trades, they still require an understanding of how a small business works. If Accounting at Level 1 is scrapped, this means that we are not capturing those individuals who would most benefit from this course.</p> <p>If Accounting at Level 1 is not available, then a course with Financial Literacy could be an option, however, it does not give the in-depth knowledge that is required to start one's own business.</p>	Financial literacy at Level 2 so that there is a Pathway for students.	No			2020-03-31 12:51:42	ANON-YFPW-RWSF-8	2020-03-31 12:51:42	2020-03-31 12:51:52
Yes	But not to the degree that some subjects would be impacted Science and Social Science (especially commerce subjects), while other areas such as languages, arts and technology there would be no impact	Strongly disagree	<p>Given the impact the current virus situation will have on the economic environment, the removal of the commerce subjects to some sort of generic vagueness is a step backwards 20 years for preparing candidates for their future. The only reason Commerce subjects are considered accessible at level 2 is that all commerce subjects are one of the few subjects that don't gate keep candidates (that is create artificial and ethically wrong restrictions on many students moving from level 1 to 2 in other subjects - especially for students who fail). Dumbing down the content at level 1 (in commerce and some other social science subjects) will reduce the high end of the class and reduce the ability of students experts to act as co-teachers. It is almost like someone wants New Zealand students to lack understanding of the economic economy and be workers in another person's business.</p>	<p>If you want success, make unseen text (English) and a similar core paper in Mathematics COMPULSORY in a separate external examination at both level 1 and 2. Too many candidates are rote learning answers for both internals and externals in all subjects.</p> <p>Instead of combining Science, Social Science and Commerce subjects each into a single paper - with the lowest common denominator content thrown together. Candidates are restricted to only one specialised course in Social Science and Commerce and in Either general science or a specialised science subject at level 1. Let them sample a subject at an excellence level than make them sample a mixture of things they have no interest in. They are 15 years of age and with 10 years of schooling behind them are capable of specialised learning. Interesting you feel this is appropriate for languages and Arts but not for Entrepreneurship (where these students will find future jobs).</p> <p>The jump from a combined vague sample of commerce at level 1 to a specialised full on subject at level 2 will be too much for many students and will reduce diversity (economic / gender / cultural) in fulfilling these in the future. especially in the commerce subjects. This approach implies the</p>	<p>As stated below if you want to improve the validity of NCEA (and the fall in our international rankings both relatively and absolutely.</p> <p>Make unseen text (English) and a similar core paper in Mathematics COMPULSORY in a separate external examination at both level 1 and 2. Too many candidates are rote learning answers for both internals and externals in all subjects.</p>	Yes	<p>Cultural viewpoints are very similar to multiple language students. They are simply better members of society and able to both see, understand and implement changes in a growing diversity intense environment.</p> <p>STEM focus is now 20 years out of date as a progressive goal, We need to move on with the cultural goals</p>	A compulsory 3 hour paper compromising of 3 separate papers consisting of an unseen text, core maths and a diverse cultural appreciation / viewpoint papers would propel our education to the next level at level 1 and 2.	2020-03-31 21:13:55	ANON-YFPW-RWS1-K	2020-03-31 21:13:55	2020-03-31 21:14:09
No		Undecided	Latin should still be available to learn, it is a big part of the history of language		budgeting running a clean, healthy household - a lot of young parents out there will need to do this as well as work in a paying job	Yes			2020-03-31 23:39:22	ANON-YFPW-RWSZ-V	2020-03-31 23:39:22	2020-03-31 23:39:42
Yes		Strongly agree				No			2020-04-01 06:36:00	ANON-YFPW-RWSH-A	2020-04-01 06:36:00	2020-04-01 06:36:17

No		Strongly disagree		Keep the separate sciences and classical studies! They were incredibly important and developmental to me as a student!	Civics education	No				2020-04-01 11:02:30	ANON-YFPW-RWSB-4	2020-04-01 11:02:30	2020-04-01 11:02:36
Yes		Strongly disagree	<p>I am extremely concerned at the lack of choices for students in their subjects that comes from the changes, the loss of subject areas at Level 1 which will lead to students not taking the subject at Level 2 and 3 and thereafter the loss of jobs for teachers of these subjects at schools due to the drop in numbers.</p> <p>I am also deeply concerned at the decision to drop Latin as a language from Levels 1-3 of the curriculum as an associated subject of Classical Studies (although I do not teach this subject personally it led directly to my decision to take Classical Studies at school and university and become a Classical Studies teacher myself).</p>	<p>I am very concerned about the changes to incorporate Level 1 Classical Studies into History. History is only a small component of Classical Studies, and as a teacher of both Classical Studies and History at a prominent Auckland secondary school, Classical Studies fits much more into the Ministry policy vision of a broad, foundational education.</p> <p>To quote from the Ministry of Education TKI website http://seniorsecondary.tki.org.nz/Social-sciences/Classical-studies</p> <p>"To understand ourselves, and our place in a bicultural society, we need to know about the societies that have laid the foundations for the world in which we live.</p> <p>Classical studies is the study of the people, places, and events of the classical world and how they influence the modern world.</p> <p>Classical studies is an interdisciplinary subject: students engage with literature, languages, art, history, science, technology, religion, and philosophy."</p> <p>The rationale for Classical studies on the same website is as following:</p> <p>"Classical studies encourages students to make links between past and present civilizations, to imagine a possible future. By exploring diverse values and traditions, viewed from their own</p>		No				2020-04-01 16:31:49	ANON-YFPW-RWSD-6	2020-04-01 16:31:49	2020-04-01 16:32:01
Yes		Agree		I dont agree with channeling The various social sciences subjects down to 1 and the sciences, and even commerce. I feel like these are all quite different subjects and it would not do them justice to narrow it/broaden the learning that much...although they are not my subjects, so ...grain of salt.		Yes				2020-04-01 21:57:46	ANON-YFPW-RWSX-T	2020-04-01 21:57:46	2020-04-01 21:57:57
No	I was really only aware because this questionnaire alerted me to the change.	Undecided	As a food teacher with 20 years of Food Technology industry experience, I am confused about lumping Home Economics and processing technologies into Food Science as a subject. In addition it would be ideal for Food Technology to remain as part of the Technology subjects because it fits really well into Technology.	<p>Home Economics in my opinion has become a victim of 'healthism' ie it has been hi-jacked by nutritionists and health educators with a personal viewpoint that by pushing nutrition heavily into the subject knowledge it will have an impact on behaviour. I don't know if this viewpoint is very engaging for students.</p> <p>Home Economics is about economics in the home/personal living space - planning resources effectively and efficiently, making choices influenced by a variety of factors including nutrition, making use of available resources (recipes/cooking/processing/preserving). Food Science enters into the mix but it's not the only component.</p> <p>I suggest that the subject combo of Home Ec and Processing Tech is renamed 'Food studies', with an emphasis on planning (recipes/food shopping), food composition, food as a material, food and the body, developing and making food for particular outcomes specifically related to the students and their communities.</p>		No				2020-04-01 22:36:32	ANON-YFPW-RWSA-3	2020-04-01 22:36:32	2020-04-01 22:36:45

No		Disagree	I think that Latin and Classics should still be included in Level One (and beyond, for Latin).	I think that Classical Studies should be included at Level One, and that Latin should not be removed from the curriculum. NCEA Level 1 is to be 'broad' and 'foundational'. Classics is a multi-disciplinary subject, which introduces students to history, art, literature, philosophy, religion and more in one course. This allows students to get a taste of each of these subjects, allowing them to specialise later on if wanted. It exposes students to a range of different ideas and possible study options. Latin can lead into other study of languages, and for someone interested in linguistics it is one of the building blocks for many languages, allowing students to understand them and our own language better. Classical Studies is a very important subject rich in learning. From my experiences in Classics I can verify this, having learned where many modern concepts and ways of doing things have come from (such as democracy), and the different ways in which humans used to and still do interact and relate to each other. There is much in the Classical world that is still relatable and relevant today, such as their forms of theatre. These plays reflect the same desires and worries that we have today - family, honour, religion vs the government - and		No			2020-04-02 11:16:21	ANON-YFPW-RWSK-D	2020-04-02 11:16:21	2020-04-02 11:16:31
Yes	I was aware of the intention to change Level 1 to be broad and foundational while Level 2 and 3 would promote greater specialisation. I do not agree with the change. I believe that NZ students already get a broad, foundational education over the ten years of education before NCEA. I do not understand the reason to remove specialisation at Level 1. Students at NZ high schools have two years of a broad, foundational education and are ready to specialise at Year 11. As young adults, they are starting to recognise what subjects they enjoy and are good at. By removing some of the specialisation at Level 1, you are restricting students ability to focus on the areas they already know that they want to focus on. I am also frustrated by the process this review is taking. The Level 1 subject list was released before the deadline for feedback on the Vision for NCEA Levels 1-3 document. This does not make sense to me as how does the review committee make a decision on what subjects should be offered at Level 1 when they have not received all the feedback on the underlining document about the purpose and vision for NCEA.	Strongly disagree	As mentioned above, I disagree with the view that NCEA Level 1 should be more foundational. I believe students are ready to specialise by the time they get to Level 1. This does not mean we should restrict pathways for students but removing subjects seems to do just that. One area of concern and frustration is the fact that some subjects seem to be prioritised over others. Why is that the Arts subjects remain specialised but some Social Sciences have been condensed? Why is Dance considered a foundational subject but Media Studies is not? Despite there being a criteria, there appears to be no clear explanation why some subjects have been retained and some have been condensed and removed when many of the removed subjects do in fact meet the criteria. I do not agree with the list of subjects as well as the process that the creation of this list has followed. If the vision is for Level 1 to be foundational, don't have some areas of learning specialised while others are not. Greater explanation is needed why some subjects, in particular Media Studies, is viewed as not being needed in a Foundational programme of learning.	As a Media Studies specialist and teacher, I am greatly disappointed and concerned that Media Studied is not included at Level 1. Media Studies IS a foundational subject. In today's Media saturated world, students needs the media skills to make sense of messages and ideas that are shared both visually and online. Students are more and more living their lives online and having to interpret what information is accurate and relevant. Media Studies is the ONLY subject that truly focuses on this skill. Media Studies is also the ONLY subject that puts students truly in the role of media producer where they have to consider the messages that they are communicating to a variety of audiences. As the current situation of COVID 19 has shown us, students need to operate successfully online and need to communicate successfully via a number of different media products. Again, Media Studies is the subject that allows students to do this. My question is, where will students develop these skills if there is no Media Studies at Level 1? Simply adding it as a context to a Social Studies course is not acceptable and does not allow students to really develop media literacy which is so crucial in today's modern environment. Media Studies at level 1 is so important in order	My focus is on retaining and strengthening the current subjects we do have, which there are plenty of, rather than adding to the subject list.	No			2020-04-02 12:10:26	ANON-YFPW-RWS6-R	2020-04-02 12:10:26	2020-04-02 12:10:40
No	this was a shock to me - who has decided that Accounting, Economics and Business Studies aren't important enough to amalgamate into one subject and even worse "note that Level 1 Commerce is likely to have very little Accounting content due to the practical constraints of the subject and the ability to access the subject directly at Level 2 in most settings. Commerce subjects don't really start until year 10 and it we don't offer them at Level 1 students will not choose them moving forward.	Strongly disagree	Really disgusted that you are trying to combine the Commerce Subjects. Don't you think that everyone in the world needs some financial knowledge - it makes the world go round. I have been an Accounting Teacher for over 30 years and now you are telling me my subject isn't important anymore. Everyone needs some financial literacy and other subjects are not going to pick it up and take it on. If you look at the numbers of students taking Commence Subjects at Level 1 you will see we ranked 6th, 9th and 13th out of all the subjects sat externally in 2019. How can you justify the reason for reducing these subjects.	I would like to see you bring all three business/commerce subjects back into Level 1 - if you feel the need to drop some subjects then you need to look at those subjects which have far less numbers than those ranked in the top 15. How can you justify cutting these subjects out?	no - but you must continue to offer all the business/commerce subjects.	No			2020-04-02 12:37:58	ANON-YFPW-RWSR-M	2020-04-02 12:37:58	2020-04-02 12:38:09
Yes	That information is clear, especially in the purpose and outcome statements for NCEA L1	Strongly agree	I think the subjects are clear and relevant.	N/A	-	No		N/A	2020-04-02 12:40:49	ANON-YFPW-RWSW-5	2020-04-02 12:40:49	2020-04-02 12:41:12
Yes		Strongly disagree	Lack of Science content and Commerce subjects all integrated into one	Core skills offered by Accounting at level 1 are useful in real life. Sad to see disappearing as good subject to learn even if just at Level 1	Financial literacy	No			2020-04-02 12:55:44	ANON-YFPW-RWS4-P	2020-04-02 12:55:44	2020-04-02 12:55:55

Yes	Aware, disagree with how the decisions are being made / the process. Should start level 3 (what we want our leavers to know) and work our way down	Strongly disagree	1) what evidence is there to keep geography on its own, but to combine commerce and science? 2) to what extent has the current jump between level 1 and 2 in these newly made combined subjects been considered? 3) if we are combining subjects, and reducing assessments per subject (2x internal, 2x external) how far behind the rest of the world will our students fall? Cambridge IGCSE students typically do 10 to 12 subjects - are we not limiting our children's futures? 4) to what extent has subject specialists been consulted about this combo, as well as universities?	Business studies and Economics are as different as Geography and History. Combine accounting and business studies instead		Yes			2020-04-02 13:00:59	ANON-YFPW-RWST-P	2020-04-02 13:00:59	2020-04-02 13:01:13
Yes		Strongly disagree		Accounting cannot be merged with economics or business. The foundation accounting skills need to be separately studied at level 1 to allow for senior level 2 & 3 study	If no accounting level 1 then this will have to be moved to level 2. This then requires everything to shunt up a level making level 3 redundant	Yes			2020-04-02 13:25:53	ANON-YFPW-RWS3-N	2020-04-02 13:25:53	2020-04-02 13:26:12
Yes		Strongly disagree	I don't think it's equitable - arts for example remains as is but commerce and soc sc are seeing big changes with wind very different fields all being lumped in together	Psychology is a new area for NCEA. Obviously a lot of time has gone into setting up does standards etc and now to just lump them in with soc sc doesn't make sense. It's a very different field. Again commerce subject are very different and to lump them all as one isn't very fair when the same is not happening in other curriculum areas. I think this will lead inequality in learning areas in L2 and 3.		Yes			2020-04-02 15:48:30	ANON-YFPW-RWS2-M	2020-04-02 15:48:30	2020-04-02 15:48:45
Yes	I was aware but I felt that the aims of the review were not clear and the process of deciding who was the committee and who was not was very unclear.	Strongly disagree	As a media studies teacher I believe very strongly that the level of skill required at level 2 and 3 in the subject cannot be easily provided by other subjects. Without the foundation of level 1 it becomes very difficult for a student to succeed at the level of excellence. I have also spoken to my colleagues in economics, accounting and business studies and they concur that skills developed at level 1 are crucial to success at level 2 and 3.	I believe that Media Studies is a vital subject to include at level 1. Although English departments teach visual text, this is no substitution for the level of skill that is taught in Media Studies in terms of analysis and practical skills. The subject gives students the tools to understand the mechanics and function of mass media in our society. We have reached a critical point in our society where understanding the rapid and ever changing methods information delivery will be crucial to development of a better future. We have seen rapid technological disruption, the creation of media conglomerates and the intense targeting of news narratives at the individual. Speaking to students at level 1 I have found most have never ever considered they are being advertised to and that they are a target market. Exploring this just does not occur in English nor is Social Studies which I also teach. Finally in Media Studies students have a chance to express themselves, be it via broadcasting, video production or audio production. Every student I have guided through this process has found it challenging but rewarding experience.	No	No			2020-04-02 19:25:54	ANON-YFPW-RWSU-Q	2020-04-02 19:25:54	2020-04-02 19:26:13
Yes	Foundational - floundering. As someone who works in education, and having children in years 9 & 11, I am extremely concerned. I see schools using the Kete method, blending subjects. The teachers think they know what they are teaching, appear passionate, but it doesn't come to fruition. Students and whanau are not informed fully. Students are confused, the amount of worked and standards from teachers is poor, very little follow up work, nil communication to family. Students are not NCEA ready after junior years. Community communication was a joke in our small semi rural town. One advertisement on social media, missed by many. Contacted MOE, join in another area. Two hours drive away. Not realistic or possible by many.	Undecided			I'm more interested in the content. What are the teacher supposed to be teaching the students, they don't seem to know themselves! They are all saying we don't know what's happening, we only hear from MOE once it's decided by them. No one appears to have an overview on anything. All talk, but no practical plan. No assessment schedule. All we hear is assessments aren't needed. This is false. We need to know if our children are succeeding, progressing more importantly. You can't do that without some sort of criteria. If students have learning disabilities, they are left behind and being denied equal learning opportunities.	No			2020-04-03 06:53:05	ANON-YFPW-RW8V-Z	2020-04-03 06:53:05	2020-04-03 06:53:23

Yes		Agree	The combination of Social Studies with Media Studies also seems to be logical.	As an Accounting/Economics teacher I am aware of some concern amongst teachers over Level 1 Accounting largely disappearing at this level. While understanding this worry, I feel that much of the content at Level 1 has become very outdated to the extent that some things taught are not currently in use in the business world and, in some cases, have not been used for many years. We have done a 'patch-up' once with the Realignment but the content still really links back to the old bookkeeping days than it does a modern business world. On several occasions I have taught Accounting to 'new' students commencing at the current Level 2 or, in some cases, Level 3 curriculum. These students have shown a maturity that enables them to link with the analytic nature of interpreting number data more effectively and, with more skill with communication, they are better able to communicate these ideas with a richness that was not available to them as year 11s. Through the old Business and Economics programmes, there is still the opportunity to introduce business ideas.	No. However, several times it has been suggested that Social Studies should be a Scholarship subject. In Scholarship's interesting placement outside of NCEA, I guess this is not the place for this feedback.	No			2020-04-03 10:44:39	ANON-YFPW-RW8V-W	2020-04-03 10:44:39	2020-04-03 10:45:09
Yes		Strongly disagree	My name is Keri Garlick and I am a secondary chemistry and science teacher. Although there are many proposed changes to Level 1 NCEA, I will only be addressing my concerns to the changes to science as I believe it's not my place to speak on other subject teachers behalfs because I don't know how best to teach their subject. In fact, I can't say what is best for science, but I can write about my experiences as a teacher and a scientist. I am currently at a school that teaches two forms of general science. One is called specialized science, which teaches biology, chemistry and physics and intended to prepare students for Level 2 Biology, Chemistry and Physic specialisations. The other is called integrated science, which mainly teaches space science and biology, preparing students to only take L2 Biology or continue with a general science course. I have also been the Acting Head of Junior Science for one year while my colleague was on maternity leave and during that year, I was primarily focused on developing assessments and teaching material for the skills of the New Zealand Curriculum (Nature of Science material - Investigating in Science, Participating and Contributing in Science). Next, I've had one year as a teacher in charge of the intermediate science program, which involved year 7 and year 8 students from our feeder schools coming	What I believe should happen with Level 1 NCEA Science is that two versions of science should be offered, Natural Sciences, which would consist of Biology and Earth/Space Science, and Physical Sciences, which would consist of Chemistry and Physics. The other way that the sciences could be paired is Biology with Chemistry and Earth/Space Science with Physics. Students should be allowed to take both science courses if they want to as many students do want to take all three specialised sciences in Level 2. These courses should offer six standards, but only five to be assessed. For example, in a Physical Science course, two assessments should be chosen for Physics and two for Chemistry. That way teachers can select the topics most important to prepare students for the Level 2 version of their course. For the 5th assessment, a chemistry internal and a physics internal should be offered and students choose individually which one they want to do. Out of the current science matrix, I would recommend the following standards for the courses, but granted I'm sure the other science speciality teachers might have a different opinion of which standards are important. I am making		No			2020-04-03 11:52:04	ANON-YFPW-RW8C-A	2020-04-03 11:52:04	2020-04-03 11:52:16
No	N/A	Disagree	N/A			Yes			2020-04-03 20:30:36	ANON-YFPW-RW8S-T	2020-04-03 20:30:36	2020-04-03 20:30:56
Yes		Strongly disagree	I object in the strongest possible terms to the exclusion of Latin and Classics in the new curriculum.	Latin and Classics must remain. The ancient world offers fundamentally important lessons for us in almost every educational category (literature, philosophy, science, architecture). Latin is vitally important, both as one of the richest literary and scientific languages in the world, and as a blueprint for studying other European languages. To remove Latin would debar New Zealand school children from one of the most important languages in human history and one of the great 'keys' to understanding our own language and grammar (the vocabulary of English is approximately 75% comprised of Latin words). Please reconsider this aspect of the new curriculum.		No			2020-04-04 10:54:29	ANON-YFPW-RW8B-Y	2020-04-04 10:54:29	2020-04-04 10:54:42
Yes		Agree		No	No	No			2020-04-04 14:05:52	ANON-YFPW-RW89-Z	2020-04-04 14:05:52	2020-04-04 14:06:04

Yes		Strongly disagree		I was disappointed to hear that New Zealand students are at risk of being deprived of access to Latin and Classical Studies. The country has had a long-standing and proud tradition of Classics which has well served many generations of young people. Latin and Classical Studies introduces students to a civilisation that is simultaneously so different to their own, and yet one of the major historical shapers of the world they inhabit. Exposure to exciting myths and stories fires their imagination. For those who elect Latin, the rigorous training in language produces great skill in communication and sensitive reading. Given cross-cultural understanding and communication are especially vital skills in our globalised world and economy, it would be counter-productive to remove subjects that expressly develop these abilities, and do so in a fun and engaging way. I strongly encourage the Ministry to reconsider their proposed decision, and ensure that Latin and Classical Studies are kept for the enjoyment and benefit of the next generation of young students.		No			2020-04-04 16:23:06	ANON-YFPW-RW8G-E	2020-04-04 16:23:06	2020-04-04 16:23:18
Yes		Strongly disagree		Subjects should not be combined as there are less options for students, pathways and for teacher knowledge and experience.		No			2020-04-04 17:02:28	ANON-YFPW-RW8J-H	2020-04-04 17:02:28	2020-04-04 17:02:55
Yes	This should not come at the expense of providing a firm foundation at Level 1 for subjects that are necessarily taught cumulatively and cannot be studied at a higher level without a disciplinary basis at the lower level. This includes mathematics, sciences and languages. Such subjects need "at least" three years middle to upper high school level (years 11-13) of cumulative disciplinary achievement before reaching an adequate level for university study.	Strongly disagree	Latin needs to be retained at Levels 1-3 (see below, under Qu. 3), and Classical Studies should not be discarded at Level 1. Level 1 Classics is currently only beginning to grow and ought to be given the opportunity to prove itself over the medium term before any decision is made. Since Classics is a broad subject in its own right, including literature, history, art and philosophy, it fits perfectly within the vision of foundational studies at Level 1. It is disingenuous to claim it can be folded into History Level 1, if that is meant to be New Zealand History, since then Classics will not be taught at all, or ineffectively, having little directly to do with local history, although it is important for giving young minds a sense of their own place in global history and the whole range of human culture and civilizations. This cannot be effectively reduced to a component "within" modern History, where it does not belong, without confusing school age students.	Please do not drop Latin from NCEA Levels 1-3, for the following reasons. First, note the remarks above about the inappropriateness of treating Level 1 as exclusively broad and foundational. This applies to Latin, Mathematics, the sciences, and other languages. The sooner students begin serious study of these the more they will achieve, while early learning of formal structures and foreign languages has been shown to increase mental ability generally in all areas later in life. Second, Latin contributes directly to important and rich learning, both as immediately above, and because it opens young minds to the reality and significance of other cultures, languages and ways of thinking and self-expression, and because Latin literature provides a detailed and evocative picture of a vast array of human possibilities and experiences beyond the limitations of the local, and so leads to self-understanding in a broader context, sensitivity to poetic and rhetorical uses of language, and the articulation of ideas and emotions, awareness of differences in social organisation, and an appreciation of the roots of the European culture that has influenced New Zealand so deeply. There is no way this cannot be	No.	No			2020-04-05 16:59:58	ANON-YFPW-RW9Y-1	2020-03-19 16:32:08	2020-04-05 17:00:21
Yes	I support this intention and the broadening of subjects at Level 1. Would specialism at Level 2 & 3 be better enabled with a two year course where completion at the end of Level 2 provides a certificate and Level 3 a Diploma or the like. This would provide the time to enable depth and breadth of subject knowledge, skills and understanding and the knowledge/skill progression and assessment for learning required to accelerate learning. Access to in-depth subject knowledge and the progression required for such will be a challenge in a one year course, as it already is. The reality is that we have no more than 2 and a half terms to teach/learn as it is. A weakness of the current system is the arbitrary unitising of subject knowledge into optional Achievement Standards. Carving subjects up into topics dilutes the ability to make links across the subject, for teachers to plan for progression and students to practice skills repeatedly and think critically with breadth of understanding.	Strongly agree	I fully support a change in subjects at Level 1 because too often I hear teachers and parents misinforming students that they must opt for a subject at Level 1 if they have any thoughts of pursuing it at university. Are we sure that the NZ curriculum outcomes are a good starting point and do not need to be reviewed first? Some of the NZ curriculum outcomes are so poorly written, for example the Social Studies outcomes that relate to commerce talk of "understanding xyz"; there is no progression from one level to the next in terms of knowledge, skills and understanding, no application of a taxonomy such as SOLO or Bloom's, it's all just "understand" a topic and then "understand" another topic.	I support the move to combining all subjects as listed - not sure about the name Commerce...hardly future focused. I don't understand why Maori Performing Arts is not included within the Dance and Drama subjects as a mandatory or optional standard/teaching module?	Agribusiness? Business Studies could be rewritten to include management accounting - the analysis standards from Acc. A Business Enterprise strand within Business Studies to ensure we keep Young Enterprise. This is highly regarded by employers and is a very successful pathway into employment and enterprise degrees. This programme is future focused and develops all of the key competencies of the NZ curriculum, in an authentic, contextualised learning experience.	No			2020-04-05 17:23:51	ANON-YFPW-RB2F-J	2020-02-23 20:27:12	2020-04-05 17:23:56

Yes	I do have major concerns about greater specialisation at level 2 and 3. Many students do not know what they want to do at that age and moving away from a broad education will narrow the opportunities for them.	Undecided	Too narrow, academically driven, -not all our students go to/want to go to university.	We are still not equipping our students with the basics to survive in an ever changing world. Issues regarding resilience, basic nutrition, practical cookery skills (especially during lockdown), basic hygiene, food safety child care... Many people are in the throws of job loss - are we preparing our students for a world where pandemics could be the norm? The Health curriculum is overloaded - the Home Economics curriculum covered alot of what is missing.	I do not want to see Home Economics disappear - Food Science does not cover the important factors from that curriculum	No				2020-04-06 08:48:57	ANON-YFPW-RW8Q-R	2020-04-06 08:48:57	2020-04-06 08:51:30
No	Not until I read this information.	Strongly disagree	The removal of the classics from the curriculum removes context to understand white, colonialist thought an culture as it interacted and interacts with New Zealand Maori culture. This is a grave mistake.	Latin and the Classical History of Europe give context for European thinkers and governments which gives context for modern thinkers and governments. Context is important to any understanding of any historical movement or response.	Latin	No	I am not			2020-04-06 11:35:51	ANON-YFPW-RW8E-C	2020-04-06 11:35:51	2020-04-06 11:36:07
Yes		Strongly disagree	There seems a clear attempt to phase out 'ancient' subjects and topics such as Latin and Classical Studies. I am very strongly opposed to this, as I explain in the next feedback box.	It is clear that phasing out Latin and having Classical Studies only as part of History will do untold harm to New Zealand's international reputation in these fields. The skills that both subjects encourage are both stimulating and developmental. It is particularly important that these two subjects have as broad as base as possible in New Zealand society. Both Latin and Classical Studies have become prime targets for the far right in recent years; they deliberately misrepresent elements of it (eg Sparta, slavery, Roman history, questions of ethnicity) to further their sordid aims. Having students aware of the subjects, and able to engage critically with the source material will ensure that are less likely to be persuaded by the arguments of the far right, and are able to dismiss them for the nonsense they are. Latin, specifically, allows students to access quickly access some of the most well regarded literature, even at an entry level. This is empowering and quickly develops critical faculties.		No				2020-04-07 02:18:56	ANON-YFPW-RW8S-V	2020-04-07 02:18:56	2020-04-07 02:19:17
Yes		Strongly disagree	Home Economics should be retained at Level 1, not renamed Food Science and not incorporating process technology. Home Economics is an internationally recognised subject and has a strong historical links and name recognition within NZ. I have a PhD studying in Food Science, and this is not what is taught in our subject. It is strongly based within the Health and PE curriculum, we do not look at the chemistry of food, nutrient structures and chemical reactions, we do not follow scientific method. Food Science would be a very narrow definition to our subject which at NCEA level 1 is about the enjoyment of food, the preparation, the sharing with others, the development of independence and benefits on well-being. It is fun, it is inclusive, it is practical.		No	No				2020-04-07 09:51:19	ANON-YFPW-RW8P-Q	2020-04-07 09:44:02	2020-04-07 09:51:37

Yes		Strongly disagree	Please do not combine process technology with Home Economics.	In our school ākonga can choose between studying Home Economics and Technology as separate subjects. Ākonga who choose HE do so because they do not enjoy Food Tech. They particularly dislike the design process and having to come up with many possible solutions and work through these in order to reach an outcome. Instead they enjoy the practical aspects of cooking a variety of nutritious meals - ones that they can cook at home for their families, and sharing with us the meals they are already cooking at home. At L1, ākonga cover food safety, meeting individual's nutritional needs, and how factors (personal, interpersonal and societal) influence our food choices. This provides a 'tool kit' for our students for their lives and plays a huge role in their capacity to function independently in terms of their food choices now and in the future. The background paper suggests that decisions regarding RAS were based on future career pathways. This is an incorrect basis for decision making within our education system. Home Economics does lead to career pathways - nutritionists, caregivers, chefs, food industry. However it is much more important than this - equipping our society with food literacy. Recent isolation has highlighted the need for people to be able to cook. Restaurants argued that	no	No			2020-04-07 10:23:02	ANON-YFPW-RW87-X	2020-04-07 10:23:02	2020-04-07 10:23:10
No	These changes do not seem to have been put out for consultation to the parents of younger children who will be the ones affected by these changes.	Strongly disagree	Reducing science, commerce and history options at Level 1 seems to limit the options of more academic children	Reducing science opportunities at a time when NZ schools are trying to promote science learning seems a mistake. What options will there be for children to extend themselves in science and history if these are their interests?	Science	No			2020-04-07 13:11:00	ANON-YFPW-RW8F-D	2020-04-07 13:11:00	2020-04-07 13:11:14
Yes	I support the broad, foundational level NCEA level 1 with the greter specialization at Levels 2 and 3	Disagree	It is difficult to see how even the most blinkered approach to the concept of a 'broad foundation' could fail to see that the ancient world provides the basis for so much of western society and its values. Indeed, in the original formulation of Classical Studies, the breadth of the offering covering history, politics, art, science etc was what enticed teachers and pupils to the new subject. It is hard to see what has changed except the need for even greater clarity in the understanding of the broad foundations of western society in the face of so many threats to it. On Latin, I agree that learning any language is a bonus both in gaining skills in language learning per se, but also in understanding different cultures. Removing Latin from the curriculum simply makes it less likely that students will understand the foundations of democracy etc. To crystalize the argument, are recently deceased colleague every year began his first year Ancient History course by saying, 'this course will not get you a job, but it will make you a better citizen'.	It will be clear that I am advocating for the retention, as specific subjects, both Latin and Classical Studies. If it proves impossible to save both, I would advocate the saving of Classical Studies. Both subjects will lead to a greater understanding of the world, and provide a wide perspective on human life, its folkies and the institutions it creates and lead to critical thinking on them all. You are requiring that NCEA show clearer pathways to employment: it is difficult to see how a developed critical view of the world and an adaptability to different circumstances, plus a broad spectrum of knowledge, could fail to contribute to that criterion.	No	No	Though I have no detailed expertise in this area, it is as highly important that Maori culture become an essential part of the curriculum in the same way that western culture remains important. The need is to develop over a time a culture that incorporates the two (without one being privileged over the other); but to achieve that students will need to understand	no	2020-04-07 14:41:53	ANON-YFPW-RWSM-F	2020-04-01 15:04:14	2020-04-07 14:42:07
Yes		Strongly disagree		This body of knowledge is so large in science that students need the opportunity to experience the specialised sciences in Year 11. The step up to Year 12 specialised sciences is already large, and by placing the assessment focus on NOS rather than scientific knowledge in Year 11, this step will be even harder.	No.	No			2020-04-07 15:41:49	ANON-YFPW-RW81-R	2020-04-07 15:41:49	2020-04-07 15:41:58
No		Disagree	The purpose of NCEA originally was to have a variety of subjects that schools could pick and choose from dependent on the strengths of their teachers, students and communities. NCEA has become so credit driven that you have devalued such subjects. Classical Studies and Accounting. There is no way Classical Studies fits the History standards. You are devaluing a subject. Maybe this is a time to reflect on why we need to keep a range of subjects and do away with the credit chasing that is devaluing the learning that should be happening at Level 1. I must also say what a cost cutting exercise for the government to do away with subjects. You have already cut moderation and put more pressure on teachers internally.	Again, don't remove subjects, think about restructuring NCEA and reevaluating the purpose of our entire education system. PS - the Kahui Ako's are a joke and a waste of money.	Have whole courses designed specifically for trades and maybe rethink how you can put more teachers into this area. There are some great tradesmen/women out there who would make fantastic teachers only to be turned off by the entry level low pay grade.	Yes		Good luck staffing them.	2020-04-07 18:15:03	ANON-YFPW-RW8Z-1	2020-04-07 18:15:03	2020-04-07 18:15:13

Yes	I am very concerned about the new NCEA particularly in science. I am not certain it is a change for the better.	Strongly disagree	I feel like the ministry must strongly dislike science. They are making science less relevant to the real world and they are making it less linked to senior science and university science.	I feel they are increasing the writing requirement for science. Making it less accessible to students who are not high in literacy. I think it will disadvantage students at university and in senior science subjects.	No I fear they would stuff them up as well	Yes	Maori content is essential! It is an official language of New Zealand's.		2020-04-07 18:52:03	ANON-YFPW-RW8H-F	2020-04-07 18:52:03	2020-04-07 18:54:21
Yes	Yes, I was aware of this, but, the NZ Curriculum states: The core strand, Nature of Science, is required learning for all students up to year 10. The other strands provide contexts for learning. Over the course of years 11-13, science programmes should include learning in all four context strands. Students in years 11-13 are able to specialise in one or more science disciplines, depending on the choices offered in their schools. The achievement objectives in the context strands provide for strand-based specialisations, but a wider range of programmes is possible; for example, schools may offer programmes in biochemistry, education for sustainability, agriculture, horticulture, human biology, or electronics. (NZC, p29) What is being proposed for science (removal of Biology, Chemistry and Physics assessments) is a huge change in the curriculum and a huge reduction in the flexibility for schools to offer courses that suit the needs of their akonga. Far from encouraging students into STEM subjects, which is a worldwide problem, these changes will create barriers for students wanting to pursue science related careers.	Strongly disagree	As stated above the proposed changes for science are completely at odds with the NZ curriculum. I urge the panel considering these changes to science to look at the UK Science curriculum documents https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-curriculum-in-england-science-programmes-of-study/national-curriculum-in-england-science-programmes-of-study Which state in their introduction: A high-quality science education provides the foundations for understanding the world through the specific disciplines of biology, chemistry and physics. Science has changed our lives and is vital to the world's future prosperity, and all pupils should be taught essential aspects of the knowledge, methods, processes and uses of science. There is still a strong emphasis on the Nature of Science (NOS) in the UK but unlike the proposed changes to Level 1 NCEA in New Zealand which make NOS the focal point, the UK curriculum states: 'Working scientifically' specifies the understanding of the nature, processes and methods of science for each year group. It should not be taught as a separate strand. The notes and guidance give examples of how 'working scientifically' might be embedded within the content of biology, chemistry and physics, focusing on the key features of scientific enquiry, so that pupils learn to use a variety of approaches to answer relevant scientific questions. This is the case in the current NZ	In science there needs to be assessments related to Biology, Chemistry, Physics, Agricultural and Horticultural Science, and Earth and Space Science. I believe that New Zealand has an excellent curriculum document based on sound values with the aim of producing well-balanced citizens capable of creative and critical thinking. The Science curriculum rightly emphasises the Nature of Science (NOS) to complement these overall aims and the current NCEA assessment matrix allows the flexibility to design different courses that suit the needs of our students, whatever their future pathways. We aim to satisfy both of the objectives identified by Professor Gluckman (2011): There are at least two distinct objectives of science education at secondary school – the first is that of pre-professional education which is traditionally for careers needing science, usually arranged around mathematics, physics, chemistry, biology and perhaps general science. The second is the citizen-focused need for all children as they mature to have a clear understanding of the complex world of science that they will confront as citizens over the next 60 years of their lives. The proposed changes address the second point Gluckman makes, but miss the first completely. In order to prepare students for the rigour required in scientific	No. However, the science disciplines of biology, Chemistry, Physics, Earth and Space Science, and Agricultural and Horticultural Science must be retained. All of these need supporting Level 1 subjects and assessments, including an additional general science course, as currently exist	No			2020-04-07 23:04:33	ANON-YFPW-RW8B-9	2020-04-07 23:04:33	2020-04-07 23:04:53
Yes		Strongly disagree	Science needs to remain the same. My son thrived on assessments	Do not change science		No			2020-04-08 09:44:03	ANON-YFPW-RW8M-M	2020-04-08 09:44:03	2020-04-08 09:44:15
Yes		Undecided		Secondary teachers I have spoken to seem to oppose the changes on the grounds that having general science only at year 11 could mean learners are not equipped to learn the specialised areas of Biology, Chemistry and Physics from year 12. I would like to know more about that. Would it mean that the level achieved by year 13 is lower in the specialised science areas as learners have missed a year of specialisation at year 11? Are the courses changing for years 12 and 13 to take the change at year 11 into account?		No			2020-04-08 10:09:48	ANON-YFPW-RW8D-B	2020-04-08 10:09:48	2020-04-08 10:09:57
No		Disagree	It would seem a difficult jump to level 2 in specialist science subject and also such things as accounting and economics, as they will now only get touched on generally with no real depth of understanding. This concerns me in regards to my child achieving highly in level 2 subjects			No			2020-04-08 10:22:35	ANON-YFPW-RW8X-Y	2020-04-08 10:22:35	2020-04-08 10:22:42
Yes		Undecided	Concerned that Science, which is the subject I teach, has specialist sciences replaced by a general science which could reduce opportunity for those who need the more technical background particularly physics covered explicitly to help them progress to trades or engineering	Would like the option retained, for students to take Science, chemistry, physics or bio as AS which could be pick/mixed to form a course suited to schools/students aspirations/needs	trade/technical science? I know tech subjects are being discouraged as school workshops close in favour of tech courses 1 or 2 days a week. But continue to teach some academic/content knowledge relevant to beginning a course in engineering or a trade	No			2020-04-08 10:47:20	ANON-YFPW-RW8A-8	2020-04-08 10:47:20	2020-04-08 10:47:52
No	Just found out -	Strongly disagree	At Level 1 a significant number of science students have a specific career path and enjoy going into a depth of knowledge to prepare them for the specialisms they want to get into. Pathway to a generalist rather than giving students the choice to focus on what they want to do - no balance in the proposal.	Keep Science as it is - my kids really benefited by going deep in Physics, Biology and Chemistry. A Generalist science approach at this level is a pathway to killing future careers where they will want to specialise. Also not sure about generalising on classics also. Great roadmap to phi etc. Getting more important in computing as we move more into AI. Also - Accounting very different skill set to a general commerce - this will definitely but off future entrepreneurs.		No			2020-04-08 12:36:10	ANON-YFPW-RW8N-N	2020-04-08 12:36:10	2020-04-08 12:36:23
No	Was only aware of the change via our children's school and a communication from them	Strongly disagree	I feel there is a dumbing down of scientific subjects particularly science	Science - the students should be exposed to all facets of science in the Science subject and there should be an exam to assess their learning. I agree with the Social Sciences as this means the students have exposure to all facets and then can specialise at level 2	NCEA level 3 as this is know as not much of a year, students already have entrance to Uni and so don't work as hard as in year 12. We have spent time in the UK in education and our level 3 is lagging behind the UK A Level which is of concern for our international standing.	No			2020-04-08 12:39:19	ANON-YFPW-RW8K-J	2020-04-08 12:39:19	2020-04-08 12:39:33

Yes	Completing level 1 NCEA should still be a stepping stone to 2 and 3 and if you make level 1 too generic it will be too difficult for students and teachers to branch the gap to level 2 and 3	Strongly disagree	The proposed changes are completely at odds with the NZ Curriculum. The disciplines of physics, biology and chemistry are still required in level 1 science.	There needs to be assessments in relation to Biology, Chemistry, Physics, Agricultural and Horticultural Science and Earth and Space science. Don't change what doesn't need to be fixed. Keep the external exam in level 1.	No However, the science disciplines of biology, Chemistry, Physics, Earth and Space Science, and Agricultural and Horticultural Science must be retained. All of these need supporting Level 1 subjects and assessments, including an additional general science course, as currently exist.	No			2020-04-08 13:10:44	ANON-YFPW-RW86-W	2020-04-08 13:10:44	2020-04-08 13:11:01
Yes		Strongly disagree		Technology requires the generic technology subject to allow the flexibility of assessment and while allowing required subject knowledge within the subjects. Student choice means we offer multiple subjects using the same standard pool. And removing too many standards removes student choice and flexibility which generic technology supports.	Electronics Design and develop digital outcomes Computational Thinking Digital Media Programming Technological Design Technological Development Materials Technology Fabrics Technology Food Technology	No			2020-04-08 14:03:52	ANON-YFPW-RW8R-S	2020-04-08 14:03:52	2020-04-08 14:04:23
Yes		Disagree	Where will standards be that aim to support students who wish to continue at L2 at school in vocational areas such as building, automotive, hospitality etc? Where the written word is given less emphasis and the actual skill level is given the priority. It could be in some Technology above but only if the actual skill level is given the priority.	There should be courses/standards that aim to give students training in vocational course skills at L1 for students who do well in practical settings. These courses would include English and Maths, plus more school time for the students to engage in building skills, hospitality, fashion design/manufacture, plus another option or so.	To expand the delivery of skills based training, as in the current trades programmes that exist. To develop the opportunity for students to start their apprenticeships etc while at school if applicable. This allows a support system from the school, to be effective while students develop their career pathways to beyond school and makes it as seamless as possible.	No	Have a limited understanding.	NA	2020-04-08 15:37:26	ANON-YFPW-RW8W-X	2020-04-08 15:37:26	2020-04-08 15:37:41
Yes		Agree			Ag	Yes			2020-04-08 23:49:37	ANON-YFPW-RW84-U	2020-04-08 23:49:37	2020-04-08 23:49:51
Yes		Strongly disagree	Especially for the sciences students at Level 1 should be able to choose their specialty areas.	they should keep them the same	Geology	No			2020-04-09 08:07:24	ANON-YFPW-RW8T-U	2020-04-09 08:07:24	2020-04-09 08:07:34
Yes	Yes, I was aware of this, but, the NZ Curriculum states: The core strand, Nature of Science, is required learning for all students up to year 10. The other strands provide contexts for learning. Over the course of years 1–10, science programmes should include learning in all four context strands. Students in years 11–13 are able to specialise in one or more science disciplines, depending on the choices offered in their schools. The achievement objectives in the context strands provide for strand-based specialisations, but a wider range of programmes is possible; for example, schools may offer programmes in biochemistry, education for sustainability, agriculture, horticulture, human biology, or electronics. (NZC, p29) What is being proposed for science (removal of Biology, Chemistry and Physics assessments) is a huge change in the curriculum and a huge reduction in the flexibility for schools to offer courses that suit the needs of their akonga. Far from encouraging students into STEM subjects, which is a worldwide problem, these changes will create barriers for students wanting to pursue Science related careers.	Strongly disagree	As stated above the proposed changes for science are completely at odds with the NZ Curriculum. I urge the panel considering these changes to science to look at the UK Science curriculum documents: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-curriculum-in-england-science-programmes-of-study/national-curriculum-in-england-science-programmes-of-study Which state in their introduction: A high-quality science education provides the foundations for understanding the world through the specific disciplines of biology, chemistry and physics. Science has changed our lives and is vital to the world's future prosperity, and all pupils should be taught essential aspects of the knowledge, methods, processes and uses of science. There is still a strong emphasis on the Nature of Science (NOS) in the UK but unlike the proposed changes to Level 1 NCEA in New Zealand which make NOS the focal point, the UK curriculum states: "Working scientifically" specifies the understanding of the nature, processes and methods of science for each year group. It should not be taught as a separate strand. The notes and guidance give examples of how 'working scientifically' might be embedded within the	In science there needs to be assessments related to Biology, Chemistry, Physics, Agricultural and Horticultural Science, and Earth and Space Science. I believe that New Zealand has an excellent curriculum document based on sound values with the aim of producing well-balanced citizens capable of creative and critical thinking. The Science curriculum rightly emphasises the Nature of Science (NOS) to complement these overall aims and the current NCEA assessment matrix allows the flexibility to design different courses that suit the needs of our students, whatever their future pathways. We aim to satisfy both of the objectives identified by Professor Gluckman (2011): There are at least two distinct objectives of science education at secondary school – the first is that of pre-professional education which is traditionally for careers needing science, usually arranged around mathematics, physics, chemistry, biology and perhaps general science. The second is the citizen-focused need for all children as they mature to have a clear understanding of the complex world of science that they will confront as citizens over the next 60 years of their lives. The proposed changes address the second point Gluckman makes, but miss the first	No However, the science disciplines of biology, Chemistry, Physics, Earth and Space Science, and Agricultural and Horticultural Science must be retained. All of these need supporting Level 1 subjects and assessments, including an additional general science course, as currently exist	No			2020-04-09 08:23:09	ANON-YFPW-RW83-T	2020-04-09 08:23:09	2020-04-09 08:23:27

Yes		Strongly disagree	<p>I support the inclusion of Māori performing arts. I think this is a great initiative to embed this important aspect of Māori culture in the curriculum. However, in general I disagree with the subjects proposed for elimination at Level 1.</p> <p>There is a significant danger that in removing a subject from level 1, enrolments in levels 2 and 3 will diminish to the point of making the subject not viable. I do not see an indication in the proposal of how the skills and content from the disciplines proposed to be cut at level 1 will be incorporated or embedded into other subjects. Therefore it does not seem to me that level 1 will become a wider foundation, but that many subjects will no longer be represented at that foundational level.</p>	<p>I strongly disagree with the proposal to eliminate Art History and Media Studies. In a highly visual age of fake news, it is important for society overall that students gain visual and media literacy, to develop their critical thinking skills. This can be done effectively via Art History and/or Media Studies.</p> <p>My most detailed concerns are with the proposal to cut Classical Studies at Level 1 and Latin at all levels. In this submission I will speak to the issue of Classical Studies; I have another submission on Latin.</p> <p>I am a senior lecturer at the University of Auckland who specialises in teaching Classical Studies, Latin, and ancient Greek. I conduct a lot of outreach to high school teachers, including hosting an annual schools day that 600-700 level 3 NCEA students visit. The teachers and students come from as far away as Rotorua and Tauranga; they are extremely dedicated to their study. Many of these students are Māori and Pasifika - they choose to learn about Greek and Roman history, culture, art, literature, philosophy and language. They often report that this is because they see interesting overlaps with their own cultures and languages. And, they often continue their studies with us at</p>	N/A.	Yes	strongly support the teaching of te reo Māori at all levels of the NCEA.	N/A. This is not my area of discipline expertise.	2020-04-09 13:36:34	ANON-YFPW-RW82-S	2020-04-09 13:36:34	2020-04-09 13:36:43
Yes		Disagree		<p>Canning L1 Classics and Media Studies narrows rather than broadens the foundational base. By all means scrap the externally assessed standards, but the internals are useful when constructing cross-curricular/cross-domain courses as we seek to create more relevant and engaging offerings for the students.</p> <p>This is obviously an opinion based on my own experiences, but I know the students I work with would be missing out on something they really value if you went ahead with these changes</p>	<p>I would like more scope allowed for schools to create cross-curricular/cross domain subjects, in a sense that these could gain recognition/meet criteria for things like endorsement and UE approved status. The subjects that currently exist are a good range, but courses can be multi-faceted, and I believe that if, for instance, a student has completed X number of Achievement Standards to M or E level, then that deserves recognition such as endorsement, even if they are drawn from more than one domain (ie. History and Classics and Geography).</p> <p>This would allow/encourage far greater creativity and innovation in course design in order to meet the interests and aspirations of the students we work with in our communities</p>	Yes		kao	2020-04-09 13:58:03	ANON-YFPW-RW8U-V	2020-04-09 13:58:03	2020-04-09 13:58:35
Yes	<p>The plan to cut Latin from all levels of the NCEA goes against the idea of teaching Level 1 subjects that have foundational knowledge for multiple other subjects. Latin gives a linguistic foundation for all other Romance languages; it gives vocabulary and technical foundations for the study of the hard sciences, medicine, and law; it gives a grammatical foundation to the study of English.</p>	Strongly disagree	<p>I strongly disagree with the proposal to abolish Latin at all levels of the NCEA, partly for the value of the subject, and partly for the equity implications of removing Latin specifically from the NCEA.</p>	<p>I am extremely dismayed about the proposal to abolish the teaching of Latin. I am a senior lecturer at the University of Auckland who specialises in teaching Classical Studies, Latin, and ancient Greek. I frequently have students in my own Latin courses who have studied Latin at high school, and who are able to come directly into intermediate and/or advanced classes. Such students have gone on to take Latin at the highest levels, with some becoming employed as academics and teachers. I also have many students who wished to take Latin at high school, but were not able to only because it was not offered. They begin their study of Latin at university, but they regularly talk about how they wish that they could have started earlier (indeed, this was my own situation back at a regional public high school in Australia). The lack of student numbers does not reflect lack of student interest.</p> <p>I very much support teaching that meets and exceeds treaty obligations, and that engaged with te ao Māori and Māori pedagogy. These factors can go hand-in-glove with Latin pedagogy. Many teachers at high school and tertiary level are teaching Latin to be accessible to a diverse range of students. The committee may have a perception that Latin is a "dead" language. In fact,</p>	N/A.	Yes	Yes.	N/A.	2020-04-09 14:10:19	ANON-YFPW-RWEU-D	2020-04-09 14:10:19	2020-04-09 14:10:30

No	I was aware of the general concept being expressed. However, the proposed assessments for NCEA 1 science make it clear the sort of 'foundational education' intended is radically different to what I and every other science teacher I've spoken with consider to be foundational learning in year 11 science.	Disagree	As currently proposed, the science area seems headed for disaster. The large majority of science teachers have serious and well founded concerns regarding the implementation of this subject as outlined in the proposed NCEA 1 science standards and, rather than use these concerns to improve the implementation, the Ministry of Education is (according to its paper to Cabinet on the results of its consultation on these proposed standards) determined to persist with the standards unchanged.	The diametrically opposed approaches to the science and technology subject areas make no sense. Where science is amalgamated into a single overarching subject, the overarching technology subject is removed and sub-areas of technology fully separate out. Why fully amalgamate one, yet fully separate the other? Identical arguments apply to each of these two areas: the arguments for amalgamation in one area apply equally against separation of the other, and vice versa. In terms of science, the failure to adequately identify necessary foundational learning areas within the overarching subject mean that, as currently proposed, this subject area also fails to meet the intent "to support a broad, more foundational education at NCEA level 1". Specifically, the "big ideas", around which the proposed level 1 science standards have been written, are only a subset of the foundational science learning required in year 11. In terms of technology, the failure to incorporate the specific technology areas within an overarching technology subject area mean that this area fails to meet the intent in terms of breadth and corresponding scope of foundational learning.	I can't answer this as the current specialised subjects proposed for NCEA 2 and 3 are not provided.	No			2020-04-09 15:29:24	ANON-YFPW-RWEV-A	2020-04-09 15:29:24	2020-04-09 15:29:37
Yes		Strongly disagree	The change to a broad curriculum is certainly a good idea. This makes it all the more surprising that the broadest subject, namely Classical Studies, is omitted from the proposed curriculum.	Classical Studies is the broadest subject imaginable, covering ancient societies as a whole. Classical Studies examines the history, philosophy, art, literature and politics of the cultures which have been the cradle of European civilisation. New Zealand is a multi-cultural society firmly rooted in its European past. To ignore this past is short-sighted and disadvantages New Zealand students. As it is, the lack of history and geography lessons in Primary School has turned New Zealand children into insular students with a limited knowledge of the wider world. Regarding Latin: sadly, that horse bolted long ago. If Latin had remained a standard subject in NZ schools we might now have teachers with a better grasp of English grammar.		No	Regarding te reo Māori: though their has been considerable improvement, the introduction of te reo Māori is still too haphazard. Too few teachers in primary schools take the language seriously and are unable to teach it properly. Without a good foundation in the early years, students have that more trouble in the senior years. Te reo Māori is thus in a similar		2020-04-09 16:06:22	ANON-YFPW-RWEC-Q	2020-04-09 16:02:07	2020-04-09 16:06:36
Yes	While I support the idea that some subjects are combined, I feel the process by which this has been done has not always been thought through. Some subjects have always been anomalously bundled under a broader heading that does not fit comfortably. Consideration needs to be given about the skills and resources required in a subject. My main concern is the inclusion of Media Studies as a 'context' for Social Studies. This seems inappropriate. Media Studies draws upon very different skills - writing in specific contexts (e.g. screenplays and news writing) and production skills that are not a natural fit into Social Studies. Teaching and assessing these skills requires very different skill sets in both teachers and students.	Disagree	I am concerned that the classifications have been made without due consideration to the skills required in a subject. My own subject, Media Studies, requires students to plan, shoot and edit films, write newspaper reports, study film genres and so on; these do not naturally fit within Social Studies. I am concerned that Social Studies teachers will lack the skills to teach these aspects adequately - teaching film making is as distinct as teaching physics and you would not expect a non-specialist to do either.	Level 1 Media Studies does not belong in Social Science. It is distinct enough - and important enough - to merit its own place as a subject. I teach Level One Media Studies at one of the few schools to offer it - the first year we offered it to students (2019) it was massively oversubscribed. Students loved the idea and could see value in it. Most of these students opted to continue with the subject to Level 2. This includes some of the most capable students in the school. It has completely transformed the nature of the subject. This is in distinct contrast to the pattern of previous years, before we offered a LI course. Then, we struggled to attract students as they were often 'set' on a course by then and were not looking for a new subject in Year 12.		Yes			2020-04-09 17:15:31	ANON-YFPW-RWES-7	2020-04-09 17:15:31	2020-04-09 17:15:53

Yes		Strongly disagree	No issue with the newly introduced subjects, but great issue with those that are proposed to be eliminated.	<p>The proposed elimination of all three subjects listed above is concerning.</p> <p>How does preventing students from exploring these areas at level 1 benefit their overall learning and future opportunities? Surely eliminating a year of possible study in any of the subjects listed above does the exact opposite.</p> <p>Many students enjoy learning languages such as Latin purely for the mental challenge that learning the grammatical rules brings, just as others enjoy mathematics or physics for similar reasons. Latin, as the progenitor of the modern Romance languages, is also an excellent primer towards learning Spanish, Italian, French, Portuguese, or Romanian, along with a number of less-spoken ones.</p> <p>Classical Studies allows students to begin exploring some of Western culture's most fundamental works. From philosophers to generals and statesmen to playwrights, the Classics offer students a fantastic range of texts that are of real-world utility. Classical Studies provides a solid foundation to careers in high-level professions, particularly politics and law.</p>		No			2020-04-10 11:28:30	ANON-YFPW-RWE9-D	2020-04-10 11:25:27	2020-04-10 11:28:41
No		Strongly disagree	As someone who took Latin NCEA Level 1 and 2, I strongly disagree with the Ministry's proposal. Although student's can study for it through foreign qualifications like the International Baccalaureate, this is unlikely to happen. Students from disenfranchised backgrounds are likely to lack the resources to study Latin through a secondary provider.	<p>I think Latin should be kept for studying at NCEA all levels. I think more students should be encouraged to study Latin at school, because it improves one's critical thinking due to its inflected nature. Latin is intellectually rigorous, and a subject from which a lot of great works are written. Latin is a subject which should be available to all secondary school students. which is unfortunately not the case at the minute. From my knowledge, generally only high decile and private schools offer it. I am lucky enough to have studied it at private school, and know of its benefits in understanding key texts in Western civilisation.</p>		No			2020-04-11 09:28:24	ANON-YFPW-RWEG-U	2020-04-11 09:28:24	2020-04-11 09:28:36
No		Strongly disagree	I strongly disagree with the elimination of Latin as a subject from all levels of NCEA.	<p>Latin should continue to be included in secondary school education. As a former Latin student, I found that studying Latin helped me greatly in my understanding of the English language, with respect to sentence structure and grammar. While I was a student at university, I found that what I had learnt from my time studying Latin greatly helped me in writing reports for assignments and to express what I was trying to convey in a clear and logical manner.</p> <p>Learning languages inevitably exposes one to the culture and way of life of the people who speak that language. With Latin, this gives a student a direct insight into the great culture of the Ancient Romans. The civilisation of Ancient Rome has greatly influenced many aspects of our modern life, among areas such as politics, law, engineering, science, art, and literature. Studying Latin gives a student access to texts in these areas, helping to broaden a student's knowledge base and giving rise to a more well-rounded student with a greater appreciation and understanding of the world around them.</p> <p>With its grammar rules and syntax style, learning to read and understand Latin helps develops critical thinking and logical problem solving. The simple act of translating a Latin sentence requires logic and critical thinking to understand how all</p>	Latin - Latin should continue to be offered at all levels of NCEA.	No			2020-04-11 11:30:49	ANON-YFPW-RWEI-X	2020-04-11 11:30:49	2020-04-11 11:31:12

Yes		Strongly disagree		<p>Over the past few weeks a common conversation topic has come up at the Invercargill City Youth Council regarding the decisions the ministry as made on Classics and Latin.</p> <p>As a group we spoke of a number of reasons as to why Classics is a beneficial subject. Classics helps strengthen student's research, analysis and essay writing skills. Students are able to use these skills across many other subjects like English. These skills are also used throughout NCEA and they help prepare students for university. Classics is also a very broad subject. If it was to be included as part of History in level one, students would not get to experience it completely because there are other subjects completely different from Classics that need to be taught in the course.</p> <p>As we all know, Latin is the foundation of most modern languages today. By taking away student's abilities to learn it in school, we are robbing them of a deeper understanding of human history and language.</p> <p>By not giving students the opportunity to learn about less mainstream subjects limits their opportunities and potential career options that relate to those subjects. Humanities subjects are</p>		No			2020-04-11 15:46:43	ANON-YFPW-RWEQ-5	2020-04-11 15:46:43	2020-04-11 15:47:01
No		Strongly disagree		Classics are the basis of humanities. This requires the knowledge of Latin too.	Latin literature.	No			2020-04-12 01:22:42	ANON-YFPW-RWE5-9	2020-04-12 01:22:42	2020-04-12 01:22:53
Yes		Disagree	I disagree with some proposed changes, namely losing Latin, Classical Studies, Media Studies and Art History.	I think these subjects (Latin, Classical Studies, Media Studies and Art History) should still be offered. I have both taken these classes and taught them. The study of the classics teaches us so much about culture and language learning. Studying media bias and the technology of various media are vital modern life skills.	Arabic and TOK.	No			2020-04-12 08:30:24	ANON-YFPW-RWE4-4	2020-04-12 08:30:24	2020-04-12 08:30:48
Yes		Undecided	While I agree completely that the move towards more general subject categories at this level i.e. the umbrella subject of Science over the range of different science specialties, I strongly disagree with the removal of Latin as a subject.	Latin is clearly not a subject that is widely taught or taken up but it is a foundation subject for students who have a passion for languages and it encourages an alternative perspective and challenge for academically strong students who may excel in areas other than the traditional Math and Science. To mistake Latin as an irrelevant and "privileged" subject is easy to do but it reflects a very superficial approach. It is only available at state schools in Wellington and is popular and engagingly taught. At the schools where Latin is still available I cannot understand why it would be removed as an option. Latin is not like other subjects where the essential skills can easily be incorporated into a more general subject umbrella enabling them to be picked up at NCEA Levels 2 or 3 when specialisation becomes more appropriate. Removal at level one would seem to be the first step in removing Latin entirely from the curriculum which I believe would be short sighted.	I would like to see Latin continue to be offered at Levels 2 and 3 as a follow on from retaining the subject at Level 1. I also hope that Classical Studies and Art History will still be offered as independent subjects at Levels 2 and 3.	No	other than reading a general summary in connection with completing this questionnaire.		2020-04-12 10:30:24	ANON-YFPW-RWE7-B	2020-04-12 10:04:43	2020-04-12 10:30:36
Yes		Strongly disagree		I strongly disagree with the Ministry's decision to abolish Latin as a subject, as learning Latin gives students insight into the language used by ancient civilizations. We learn to think logically and meticulously, training our minds for further studies in university and beyond.	No	No			2020-04-12 20:35:33	ANON-YFPW-RWE7-T	2020-04-12 20:35:33	2020-04-12 20:35:44
Yes	I think this is reasonable but must build on foundation learning from years 9 and 10. It is sensible not to offer new individual subjects such as the commerce options. It is not sensible not to offer Latin in year 11 (Level 1) which will build on yr 10. I am very concerned by the reduction in science options when we should be strengthening STEM.	Strongly disagree	As above. Latin, although niche, is an excellent model for all learning: structured subject matter, fundamental language structure, grammar, historical context. Unlike many other subjects it can not be picked up later. Individual science subjects allow much greater learning than General science: NCEA 1 general science curriculum is very limited			Yes	I am surprised to see the number of sub specialty Te reo Māori options while the premise of decreasing other options is to focus on fundamental learning		2020-04-13 09:17:53	ANON-YFPW-RWE1-5	2020-04-13 09:17:53	2020-04-13 09:18:18

Yes	I really like the thinking around this, it would mean that students get a taste of a greater spread of content at Level 1 instead of narrowing down quite early on. I also like that Level 1 can be optional, I personally don't think our students need three years of assessment at secondary school.	Agree	We have had an NCEA Level 1 Commerce class for quite a few years where we include a mix of mostly Economics content but also some Accounting. It works really well as it gives students a taste of what both involve and gives us a lot of choice and scope in terms of topics that we include. So if Economics and Business Studies were combined with a little bit of Accounting I see this as a good thing. I find the Accounting standards quite repetitive over the three levels, eg concepts, statements, analysis, so if this process addresses this I see this as an advantage.	I know a lot of my Commerce colleagues are very concerned about the combination of the three subjects into one. They may feel their jobs are at risk and that we are losing our subject. As teachers we can be very protective of our subject area and feel threatened when changes like this are proposed. I think it is also easy to believe that the content of our subject needs to be built on over a number of years and that this improves student's understanding. I'm not sure this is the case, and think that if students see something as important and relevant then they will learn it anyway, no matter if they have been taught it before or not. I think it will be a hard job to convince many Commerce subject teachers that this is a good thing.	We have introduced an Agribusiness class at NCEA Levels 2 and 3. We are a rural school and this has been a really positive addition to our curriculum. I wonder if Agribusiness would be a stand alone subject after the review or will it still exist within Business Studies? Either is fine as long as it is not lost in the review.	No			2020-04-13 09:40:31	ANON-YFPW-RWE6-S	2020-04-11 20:27:06	2020-04-13 09:40:59
No		Undecided				No			2020-04-13 17:27:14	ANON-YFPW-RWEZ-E	2020-04-13 17:27:14	2020-04-13 17:28:09
Yes		Strongly disagree	CLASSICS AND ART HISTORY ARE IMPORTANT AS SINGULAR SUBJECTS!! DONT TAKE THAT AWAY FROM PEOPLE!!	Classics is a passion of many and having that class really helps people who don't want to learn about general world history and specifically greek and roman. I personally am very interested in the classical world but not the classical world of anything but greece and rome.		No			2020-04-14 02:53:00	ANON-YFPW-RWEH-V	2020-04-14 02:53:00	2020-04-14 02:53:05
No		Disagree			Media studies	No			2020-04-14 18:39:07	ANON-YFPW-RWEM-1	2020-04-14 18:39:07	2020-04-14 18:39:27
Yes		Strongly disagree	What problem was this change intended to solve? Why have some subjects disappeared and not others? Why have 3 Sciences been merged, but Social Sciences not? Why have subjects like Art History disappeared, but not subjects like Korean? There is no clear rationale for this change. It also smacks of genericism and disdain for academic knowledge.	No changes were needed.		No			2020-04-15 10:55:41	ANON-YFPW-RWED-R	2020-04-15 10:55:41	2020-04-15 10:55:55
Yes		Strongly disagree	Removing the separate sciences from Level 1 is a short sighted and incredibly detrimental suggestion.	Do not remove the ability for students to study biology, chemistry and physics at this extremely important foundation level.		Yes			2020-04-15 13:42:34	ANON-YFPW-RWEX-C	2020-04-15 13:42:34	2020-04-15 13:42:50
Yes	It is seriously inadequate to remove Latin from NCEA and also to minimise Classical Studies. Latin is the basis of modern medical and legal terminology. Latin is also the original language source for modern Romance languages in Europe including French, Spanish and Italian. Classical studies is a major factor in contemporary culture, literature and art. New Zealand education will be seriously compromised by the removal of these vitally important academic subjects. Modern intellectual disciplines such as Philosophy, Science, Architecture and Art, just to mention a few, originated in the classical Ancient Greek and Roman achievement.	Strongly disagree	Removal of Latin as an academic discipline and minimising Classical studies are both completely unacceptable in this context			Yes			2020-04-15 13:43:01	ANON-YFPW-RWEA-N	2020-04-15 13:43:01	2020-04-15 13:43:31
Yes	This is what was agreed to	Strongly agree	Except Latin - I don't know why this has left the list ??	Love the 4 Science Standards - (I am a science / bio teacher) ... but why aren't all languages - including LATIN- under 4 standards, surely language learning is a transferable skill - treat it like Science - because it just provides further fuel to the loud Chem Physics private school brigade to say - look at languages, they have separate standards - seems very lazy for the language team not to have sorted out commonalities in skill based - it's not as if learning a language means you end up speaking it - it is just a learning to learn skill for most students	Latin Classical Studies	Yes	No		2020-04-15 13:58:39	ANON-YFPW-RWEN-2	2020-04-15 13:58:39	2020-04-15 13:58:56
Yes		Strongly disagree	The amalgamation of level 1 subjects seems to affect some subjects much more than others. Science is particularly badly impacted by this	There are lots of individual arts and humanities subjects including a wide range of languages. One science, one maths. This doesn't provide breadth unless science, maths -and English- are compulsory for all students. Removing choice runs counter to best practice		No			2020-04-15 14:00:06	ANON-YFPW-RWEK-Y	2020-04-15 14:00:06	2020-04-15 14:00:18
Yes	It has been well communicated amongst schools.	Strongly agree	I am a science teacher and completely agree with making level 1 a broad subject with a focus on nature of science.	- combining the sciences is a good idea, it will encourage teachers to look beyond teaching to the old NCEA standard content. - I hope that in combining all of the sciences we will see more teachers willing to cover earth and space science which seems to get forgotten in the current NCEA model when schools create their courses.	- please retain Earth and Space science - it would also be good to see a level 2 and 3 "science skills" or "science for everyday life" type course for students who are interested in the subject but don't want to pursue it at university level. - human biology	No			2020-04-15 16:40:20	ANON-YFPW-RWE6-A	2020-04-15 16:40:20	2020-04-15 16:40:38

Yes	<p>What does "broad" and "foundational" mean in the context of this proposal? These terms need to be defined. Why, for example, are Latin and Classical Studies and Art History not considered broad and foundational but Food Science is? What does "greater specialisation" mean in the context of your proposal? Why, for example, is Classical Studies considered a greater specialisation (assuming that it will continue to exist at Levels 2 and 3) than a subject like History (which still exists at Level 1)? The rationale behind decision making like this is not at all clear or transparent. It seems entirely arbitrary.</p> <p>It seems deeply ironic, even amusing, that the Ministry claims to be making Level 1 more BROAD by REDUCING the number of subjects available! How is this even logical?</p> <p>The philosophy behind this proposal denies choice and opportunity to students. The Ministry should be well aware of the importance of engaging student interest in achieving successful learning outcomes. This reduced range of subjects does not allow teachers or schools the chance to appeal to a wide range of student interest.</p> <p>This proposal of a broad and foundational Level 1.</p>	Strongly disagree	<p>An absolute disgrace on our education system. Ironically I note that the Ministry wants to ensure the credibility of NCEA as a qualification overall among stakeholders, including its credibility as an internationally recognised qualification. This would be a laughable way to achieve this goal if it weren't actually serious. How does the Ministry expect to ensure the credibility of the qualification by eliminating subjects such as Chemistry, Biology and Physics at Level 1, not to mention Art History, Classical Studies and Latin? The qualification will become a national embarrassment and infamous in the eyes of international audience for its curriculum based on simplicity and mediocrity. Has the Ministry conducted any research on the success of this approach in other countries?</p>	<p>It is a shocking disappointment to see that Latin will be abolished completely as a subject. I can not begin to guess the Ministry's justification for this decision. What subject other than the one which is the basis of our English language could be considered more broad and foundational than Latin? It not only enhances a student's understanding of English but also develops so many of the skills which underpin other subjects: close reading, critical thinking, attention to detail, analytical decoding, among many others. The very nature of the subject makes it broad and foundational. What evidence is the Ministry using to suggest the contrary? I believe that New Zealand would be the only English speaking country in the world where Latin is not offered as a subject in its national curriculum. In the same breath, the Ministry claims that it wants to maintain international credibility for NCEA! This is not the right way to go about it.</p> <p>Perhaps the prominent use of the word "pathways" is being used by the Ministry against the subject? It is unclear exactly what the Ministry means by this particular word. Maybe they think that Latin is a dead end subject with no future opportunities for students? If so, this faulty thinking is predicated on a severe</p>	<p>The Ministry should focus on improving this disastrous proposal for Level 1 before it thinks about introducing more subjects at Levels 2 and 3.</p>	Yes	New Zealand should be proud of its Maori-medium schools and this parallel curriculum for these kura.	<p>I do not have enough knowledge of this context to provide worthwhile feedback but I applaud the continued support of these schools.</p>	2020-04-15 17:33:48	ANON-YFPW-RWER-6	2020-04-15 17:33:48	2020-04-15 17:34:06
No	<p>No, I didn't understand this idea as it seems that by getting rid of specialist subjects like Latin you will in fact reduce the field for specialisation seen in other countries. It is short sighted when other countries such as the UK are seeking to widen Classical access.</p>	Strongly disagree	<p>Again, I think that Latin is key to stretching one's mind linguistically and culturally. One only has to see the alumni such as Mark Zuckerberg or J.K Rowling and the impact they said that studying the Classics had on them.</p>	<p>Yes, please consider Latin as a stand-alone subject.</p>	<p>Yes, look carefully at how other countries do Latin, Greek and the Classics to keep them alive.</p>	No			2020-04-15 21:26:06	ANON-YFPW-RWEW-8	2020-04-15 21:26:06	2020-04-15 21:26:22
Yes	<p>The Building and Construction ITO generally favours approaching NCEA Level 1 as a broad foundational qualification. However, this should not preclude the existence of programmes that develop foundation capabilities through a contextualised learning approach. For example, it should still be possible for learners to achieve NCEA Level 1 through a specifically construction-oriented programme of learning that combines both broad curriculum-based Achievement Standards, and more focused Unit Standards maintained by ITOs (or, following ongoing reforms, Workforce Development Councils). We see greater use of a combination of these two types of assessment standards within a learner's personal study programme, as a method for balancing the foundational focus of NCEA Level 1 with the benefits of pathway-based approaches to young people's learning.</p>	Undecided	<p>We note that this question is not accurately phrased. The proposed 'subjects' are those for which curriculum-based Achievement Standards will be developed – not the only areas in which learners can obtain standards that will contribute toward achieving NCEA Level 1. To be clear, we are not aware of any proposal to prevent ITOs/WDCs from developing Unit Standards at Level 1 or stopping such standards from contributing towards NCEA; we would strongly oppose any such move without further consultation.</p> <p>Given this, we do not have a strong view on the proposed subjects for NZ Curriculum-based Level 1 Achievement Standards. However, we note that it is critical for ITOs (and, in the future, WDCs) to be represented in relevant Subject Expert Groups. ITOs/WDCs are the statutory standards-setting bodies for education in their fields and thus the core source of expertise of educational knowledge for those fields; their involvement is analogous to, for example, including university-based English staff in the English SEG. Moreover, WDCs will have a statutory mandate for skills leadership which explicitly includes (under both the current Education Act and forthcoming Education and Training Act) working with schools in this area. Given their power over (non-degree) tertiary</p>	<p>As noted above, we do not generally have a view on the proposed subjects other than ensuring ITO/WDC involvement in and with Subject Expert Groups.</p>	<p>We do not currently see the need for additional Ministry-developed specialist subjects at NCEA Levels 2 and 3. Instead, we see promoting the inclusion of Unit Standards within programmes of learning at these levels as key to developing effective specialist pathways for young people. For example, our BCATS suite of Unit Standards can be used on their own, but can also be used to form the 'spine' for a construction-focused learning programme that leads to the awarding of both NCEA and a formal BCATS qualification. In the future, Workforce Development Councils could be encouraged to develop similar specialist Unit Standards and associated resources that support such contextualised programmes. For example, the Health, Community, and Social Services WDC could develop suites of Unit Standards designed specifically to support school students to pursue health profession pathways.</p> <p>In keeping with this the Ministry should, rather than developing additional specialist subjects, encourage schools to develop new models or methods of structuring learning that combine Achievement and Unit Standards. In our experience too many schools continue to</p>	No			2020-04-16 11:10:57	ANON-YFPW-RW37-5	2020-03-10 13:21:27	2020-04-16 11:11:23
Yes		Undecided		<p>I'm still unsure whether continuing the combination of Health and PE into Level 1 is in the best interests of all students.</p> <p>Currently there are many who do not enjoy Health as a subject, and vice versa for PE - the concern is that there is potential to alienate both groups of students.</p> <p>However, I do agree that there should be certain topics that are covered in Level 1 Health that should be taught school-wide - e.g. sexuality, interpersonal skills, taking action to enhance an area of personal well-being.</p>		No			2020-04-16 16:08:57	ANON-YFPW-RWE2-8	2020-04-16 16:08:57	2020-04-16 16:09:21
Yes		Strongly disagree	<p>Keep latin in the system</p>	<p>Please keep latin. It is helpful in science because it helps you know what the definitions of some of the words are. It helps win debates against my family about the roots of words. It helps with law because lots of the laws are written in latin.</p>		Yes			2020-04-17 12:47:41	ANON-YFPW-RWE2-6	2020-04-17 12:47:41	2020-04-17 12:48:01

No	There has not been much put out there publicly really. I was aware of a move towards less formal testing at Level 1, but was not aware that subject choices would be reduced.	Disagree	I don't think it is a good idea to reduce the number of subjects for science. Students have Years 1 - 10 to cover science as a broad topic and learn scientific principles and ways of working and investigating. I think it is very valuable for students to sample some of the specialised subjects at Level 1 - at our High School they do this still under the umbrella of 'Science', but get a taste of Chemistry, Biology and Physics. This gives them a chance to find areas of interest, and start to learn what is after all a large body of information which needs to be covered to work in some fields. My concern is that students who wish to work in the field may be disadvantaged if they are not able to start learning the specifics at Level 1.	See above	Not currently	No				2020-04-17 17:10:08	ANON-YFPW-RWCY-B	2020-04-17 17:10:08	2020-04-17 17:10:24
No		Strongly disagree	Latin should remain as a choice for students through NCEA Levels 1-3 and NZ Scholarship.	In recognition of the fact that the Treaty of Waitangi is a partnership between Maori and Pakeha, it follows that both matauranga Maori and matauranga Pakeha need to be included in the NZ curriculum. I applaud the celebration of all ancestral wisdom treasured by Maori, but working to achieve this recognition surely does not require the removal of access to the ancestral wisdom of western heritage. A responsible government, especially one with a focus on 'kindness' and 'opportunity for children' would allow children access to the heritage of both major cultures in which they grow up. Latin is at the heart of western heritage, and the foundation of the English language and literature. A knowledge of Latin raises the literacy of NZ children considerably, enabling them to speak and write English articulately and with precision. It is not a subject which should be considered to be 'elite'. As the daughter of a labourer, I was able to study Latin in a state secondary school and have derived great wellbeing therefrom. As a teacher over the past half century I have had the joy of watching children, including Maori children, excel in Latin lessons. Mamae Wikiriwhi, who won a NZ Government scholarship to the	No.	No				2020-04-18 15:13:52	ANON-YFPW-RWCV-8	2020-04-18 13:57:21	2020-04-18 15:14:18
Yes		Strongly disagree		I would like to see more subject specific standards in the science curriculum. I am concerned that the current proposed standards will not sufficiently prepare students for level 2 Chemistry or Level 2 Physics.		Yes				2020-04-18 19:33:08	ANON-YFPW-RWCC-N	2020-04-18 19:33:08	2020-04-18 19:33:17
Yes		Disagree	With the best will in the world year 9 and 10 may provide some content knowledge but then dilute this in Level 1 before respecialising in L2 is a stretch. We are already as a sector finding it hard to progress students with the requisite knowledge and skills into L2 and L3, nevermind UE.			No				2020-04-18 21:27:04	ANON-YFPW-RWCS-5	2020-04-18 21:27:04	2020-04-18 21:27:13
Yes		Undecided		I think that Classical Studies and Latin should stay on the Level 1 syllabus. A knowledge of Latin can make learning modern Romance languages a lot easier due to the similar vocabulary and grammar. It is also helpful in trying to understand literature from all sorts of time periods. Classical Studies is important because it allows for an interdisciplinary understanding of a particular time period and culture and therefore can be useful for developing critical thinking.		No				2020-04-19 14:29:34	ANON-YFPW-RWC8-A	2020-04-19 14:29:34	2020-04-19 14:29:48

No	I think the idea is good in theory. In practice I think some of these are a bit too specialised - e.g. I don't know how science teachers will be expected to cover all of the sciences in any reasonable depth in a single course, unless you recommend that schools run Science as a double or 1.5x size course.	Disagree	I'm going to level with you: I'm here to argue against dropping Latin from the NCEA curriculum. This might be a bit incoherent, because I left it to the last minute, I'm tired, my back hurts and there's a pandemic on. But please bear with me.	I strongly support the retention of Latin in the NCEA Level 1 Curriculum. Benefits of learning Latin in Secondary School: - Learning Latin gives you a strong foundation (keyword) in language itself. This is really unlike learning any modern language: Latin teaches you more about grammar than you ever learn in English class; it forms a basis for learning other languages such as French, Italian, Spanish (Romance languages) and German, Greek (cognate languages). - While you learn the language, you also learn the culture. And not just Roman culture: Latin is also the key to much of the Middle Ages and Renaissance. - Understanding language in general improves your reading and writing skills. - It also engages your analytical brain as you translate. - At Level 1-3 Latin you read and analyse poetry and prose, which develops your ability to close read and analyse a text. You learn the principles of tone, style and rhetoric, which are hugely important to develop if you want to write to affect people, or understand why things are written in certain ways. - The subject itself is fascinating and one I think	Please keep Classics! It's a very popular subject that covers a wide variety of humanities and social science topics (history, art history, literature) and teaches skills such as writing, research and analysis. I think that the subject is a huge benefit even to those who do not continue with it. It also provides an alternative 'essay' subject to English and History, which are not for everyone. Again: writing and communication skills are very important! Misc Recommendations: - Programming / Logic - Ensure that there are digital components to e.g. Art, Music. - Linguistics? - Ancient Greek (kidding)	No			2020-04-19 16:47:17	ANON-YFPW-RWC9-B	2020-04-19 16:11:10	2020-04-19 16:47:34
Yes		Disagree	I do not agree with the grouping used for the social sciences. History, geography and classics are more classically grouped together in junior social science courses. It would make sense to carry on with these subjects being merged at level 1. Media, social studies and psychology are sufficiently different in terms of the purpose behind the learning and the skills that are developed. I don't believe a course like this would sufficiently prepare students with the skills or philosophies that ensure success at level 2 and 3. These subjects would be more supported by a level 1 course.	Again I want to reinforce that psychology should not be grouped together with media studies and social studies especially as a context for social studies learning. Yes psychological theories or studies can support and be brought into these lessons. However this would mean students would not have the same background of the philosophies or history of psychology. This is better gained by studying psychology itself.	No	No			2020-04-19 20:01:34	ANON-YFPW-RWCG-S	2020-04-19 20:01:34	2020-04-19 20:01:44
Yes	Yes, but the current level one courses are already general and provide a foundation for level one students.	Strongly disagree	Last year I sat level one accounting, and it was my favourite subject, it provided me and my classmates a great foundation for higher education. I believe combining accounting with economics and business studies, is not a good idea, as these subject are far too different. accounting offers a broad understanding of problem solving, whereas economics and business studies are more like social sciences. furthermore, accounting is very difficult to pick up in level two without learning the fundamentals in level 1. level one is fun and we learn a lot of financial literacy.	Keep level one accounting separate to economics and business studies. Level one students are ready for accounting is its own right. I think schools should be able to decide if they want to offer to account in level one.	No.	No			2020-04-19 20:01:43	ANON-YFPW-RWCI-V	2020-04-19 20:01:43	2020-04-19 20:02:15
No		Disagree		I disagree on the exclusion of Latin and the downplay of Classics and Art History in the curriculum. Learning an ancient language is a very different experience from learning a modern one. Firstly, if you stick it out with Latin, you show that you have resilience, attention to detail, can handle a very complex system of knowledge, do quality work (there is no other way to pass Latin!) and not give up in the process. All these are transferable skills into any job. Secondly, Latin classes, unlike modern language classes, come with a massive gift of learning on history, literature, linguistics, philosophy and art - something you're most likely not going to get in modern language classes. I took modern and ancient languages (including Latin) at a public school, te kura-a-tuhi, and university between the years 2000-2010 and practically every day I think of how lucky I was to receive that education. To be honest, many modern language courses tended to be centred around 'how I spent my summer holidays' kind of language and they seemed like a rip off compared to the quality and depth of ancient language courses.	No. But glad that NZSL, Korean and Maori Performing Arts made it on the list!	No			2020-04-19 21:57:34	ANON-YFPW-RWCQ-3	2020-04-19 21:57:34	2020-04-19 21:57:44

No	I was not aware of this review and process until the proposed changes were announced in the media earlier this year. I do read articles and listen to commentary on the education sector regularly, I was aware that greater collaboration and consultation with a view to improving education experiences for Maori and Pasifika was a focus for curriculum review. I am supportive of this and the change I could "feel" in the air was why I felt this was an interesting and good time to join the teaching profession, a time when my values were aligning with the direction the sector seems to be taking. (I am currently enrolled in The University of Auckland's 2020 Post Grad. Sec. teaching diploma.)	Undecided	I was hoping to have had a little more experience in the classroom before submitting - lockdown has disrupted practicum, obviously. I am aware that there is contention regarding the dropping of media studies at level one. I hold a media studies degree and am currently training to become an English teacher with specialism in Media Studies, so forming a measured and informed opinion is important for me as I follow the review process developments. I do know that I feel quite passionately that media literacy is a key skill necessary for anyone entering adulthood and contributing in our society. I have chosen to make this my vocation because I believe a sound understanding of media and (sociological) theories empowers people individually and collectively. With this knowledge we are able to form better relationships with each other, understand power and how our world is framed, and hopefully work together to build well-functioning societies. There are many contemporary social issues and problems associated with communication in this world and the theories and practical skills teenagers learn in media studies are one way that this might be positively addressed individually and on an abstract scale.	My previous answer talks about the dissemination of media studies at lower levels. I view it as a core literacy and would be keen to see more junior pupils benefit from a broad knowledge of the topic for practical interdisciplinary as well as specialised application into their academic futures but also a means to support wellbeing for future life in a highly mediated society. However I do fear that by diluting it into a voluntary component of a social studies stream it may mean less pupils benefit from interaction to the topic.	No	No			2020-04-19 23:15:14	ANON-YFPW-RWCE-Q	2020-04-19 23:15:14	2020-04-19 23:15:48
Yes		Strongly disagree	I ardently disagree with the removal of Art History, Classics and Latin from NCEA Level 1. At the same time, I strongly agree with the importance of including Maori Performing Arts, it being vital to learn and pass on the unique cultural taonga of this nation especially as New Zealand is basically the only place in the world in a position to value and provide this.	Art History, Classics and Latin are not disposable subjects at NCEA level 1 or any other level and should not be removed. Even mild familiarity with news and current affairs should make it apparent to an observer that this planet is entering a crisis provoked by a mass withering of public curiosity, and a public more willing to choose "simple-but-wrong" explanations rather than engage with subjects with nuance. One symptom of this is rampant rise in conspiracy theories (Q-anon, Antivax, Climate Denialism, 5G, Chemtrails) and the resurgence of fascism and xenophobia, both which are finding a widening audience because our public no longer cares to understand the world in complex terms. Art History, Classics and Latin are valuable for perhaps the same reason some regard them as expendable - they noticeably share a common quality that these subjects resist being engaged with trivially. That Art History and Classics are understood by the citizenry is a vital protection; Art History opens us to experience that artistic values and concepts and meaning as contingent on places and times, and Classics, to see that despots and corruption and insincere pretends for war and even the ways we human creatures experience drama and purpose itself are not inevitabilities of life, but,	Critical thinking	No			2020-04-19 23:40:42	ANON-YFPW-RWC5-7	2020-04-19 23:40:42	2020-04-19 23:40:58
No	Very poor communication!! I only found this out because of my Teachers' Association in Wellington. Nothing from you! Disappointing! There has been no consultation for your decision.. when will you ever talk to teachers or students who actually teach and take these subjects???	Strongly disagree	The reasons are: If the goal is to encourage a broader education at level 1, we fail to understand how other highly specialized subjects continue to exist in their own right if the same decision making rationale were applied evenly and fairly to all current subjects. Could Dance, Drama and Music not be combined in a subject called "Performing Arts" under this logic? With specialisation at level 2. Could History and Geography not also be merged into a broader Social Sciences course? Why have commerce based subjects been singled out? If part of the rationale is to eliminate overlap between subjects, CETA Wellington wishes to emphasize the distinctly different skills and concepts covered in Accounting, Business Studies, and Economics. Again, this is akin to combining dance, drama and music into performing arts. We are concerned that combining Accounting, Business Studies and Economics into one subject at level 1 would water down the learning, leaving	If the goal is to encourage a broader education at level 1, we fail to understand how other highly specialized subjects continue to exist in their own right if the same decision making rationale were applied evenly and fairly to all current subjects. Could Dance, Drama and Music not be combined in a subject called "Performing Arts" under this logic? With specialisation at level 2. Could History and Geography not also be merged into a broader Social Sciences course? Why have commerce based subjects been singled out? If part of the rationale is to eliminate overlap between subjects, I wish to emphasize the distinctly different skills and concepts covered in Accounting, Business Studies, and Economics. Again, this is akin to combining dance, drama and music into performing arts. We are concerned that combining Accounting, Business Studies and Economics into one subject at level 1 would water down the learning, leaving	How about you just leave things the way they are for Accounting, Economics, and Business Studies. You say there is a teacher shortage now - this will result in an even worse statistic for Accounting, Economics and Business Studies teacher - why will we enter secondary schools when we can not teach what we specialise in. Also to decrease the "subjects available" at Level 1 means you don't need as many teachers - are you trying to put us out of jobs??? Really?	Yes			2020-04-20 10:34:19	ANON-YFPW-RWCP-2	2020-04-20 10:34:19	2020-04-20 10:34:28

Yes		Disagree	I like the idea of having a broad focus for level 1 but disagree with merging subjects to achieve this. Merging subjects will narrow what we can offer students as they will get two half subjects rather than more from one subject.	In Health and Physical Education it will restrict our ability to meet the variety of needs that our students have. We have a mixture of academic students and practical students. We like to provide students a range of courses that cater to their learning direction. I believe that merging the two subjects will frustrate learners as they will have to share the learning focus between academic and non academic assessments. This merging of subjects will also put pressure on jobs as teachers of level one Health and PE may find they have lost a class.		Yes		I agree with the inclusion of Maori values and world view being included more in the curriculum.	2020-04-20 10:35:37	ANON-YFPW-RWC7-9	2020-04-20 10:35:37	2020-04-20 10:36:09
Yes		Strongly disagree	I am responding as a teacher of Economics (at all levels)	I strongly support NO CHANGE to Economics at Level 1. Note that I have taught this subject (among others) for many years, in many schools ranging from Decile 1 to Decile 10. I've also been a marker for External examinations. My reasons are: 1. Level 1 Eco as it is, is essential learning for what follows in Level 2. The jump to Level 2 is already probably too great, so reducing basic understanding of Demand, Supply and govt interventions in the market will have instant ramifications for Levels 2 and 3 content. 2. Many students have told me over the years how much they love Economics because it links so well into their everyday life. Even without Level 2 study the subject as it stands is extremely valuable for any young person and the students are enthusiastic about what they are learning - much more so than for maths for example (another subject I've taught) The extent to which the subject supports coherent and robust pathways into NCEA Level 2 and further study or training. 3. Look at the numbers enrolled nationally in Level 1 Internals and Externals for Economics. On the basis of demand alone, it makes no sense to shut down this subject! I also hope you realise that	No	No		2020-04-20 10:38:59	ANON-YFPW-RWCF-R	2020-04-20 10:38:59	2020-04-20 10:39:30	
Yes		Disagree		Concerned about the merge of Economics, Accounting and Business studies. The course would be too packed and not cover enough basics for students to enter Level 2 and 3 in which the subjects are to be more specialised. Most schools offer a year 10 course in which all three subjects are broadly introduced. At this level students have an introduction to all three pathways and can make an informed choice as they enter year 11. Also concerned about the equity between Commerce subjects and the Arts for example. If Commerce is suggested to combine, why isn't Dance, Drama and Music? From a teacher and staffing perspective this could result in less jobs available for some teachers.		No		2020-04-20 12:25:07	ANON-YFPW-RWCZ-C	2020-04-20 12:20:01	2020-04-20 12:25:16	
No		Strongly disagree		I strongly disapprove of the decision to remove Latin and Classical Studies from the curriculum.		No		2020-04-20 18:30:59	ANON-YFPW-RWCH-T	2020-04-20 18:30:59	2020-04-20 18:31:17	
Yes	Yes I have been on the RAS and am on a SEG	Agree	I don't like the name Food science and I worry about no latin at level 1.	Food science is a terrible name it does not encompass all that Home Economics is as a subject.	The Technology needs to have many options. Especially Textiles and Fashion- Sustainability, cultural awareness.	No	No but I fully support more included into the curriculum	2020-04-20 20:35:07	ANON-YFPW-RWCB-M	2020-04-20 20:35:07	2020-04-20 20:35:19	

Yes	Level 1 Latin should be an essential part of a broad foundational education.	Strongly disagree	See comments below.	<p>* For fifty years from 1968, I had the good fortune to teach Latin as well as another eleven subjects, but only in my Latin classes did I observe a real passion for the subject. Since 2018, I have taught Latin in a retirement village to delay their dementia.</p> <p>* Latin is strong internationally. New Zealand could become the only OECD country not offering Latin. In 2017, nearly 150,000 students from countries as diverse as Australia, Canada, China, France, Germany, Ghana, Italy, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Singapore, Spain, Taiwan, the United Arab Emirates, the United Kingdom, the United States, Zimbabwe and Belize participated in the annual international Latin exam, the American Latin exam.</p> <p>* Latin is not a dead language. Latin is around us every day. How often do we meet with examples of Japanese, Mandarin, Korean, Spanish, German or even French every day? Virtually never.</p> <p>* A good working knowledge of Latin can be achieved after only three years. For Mandarin and Japanese? Eight years. Those students have been in it for the long haul or they are only dabbling.</p>	No	No	N/A	N/A	2020-04-20 20:41:00	ANON-YFPW-RWCM-Y	2020-04-20 20:41:00	2020-04-20 20:41:25
Yes	In principle, of course, this is admirable, but exclusivity does not sit well under the rubric of 'broad, more foundational education,' and it is hard to see (in the case of the proposed reduction of Classical Studies to an element within History) how the greater specialisation is to be achieved in the absence of a sound foundation; even more, with the proposed abolition of Latin from the curriculum, how can there be more specialisation?	Disagree	There is too much of a bias towards the local. New Zealand has always been at risk of failing to take account of how it fits into the global context, and the proposals run the risk of enabling this cultural blindness to reassert itself and be strengthened.	I suggest retaining Latin, and Classical Studies Level 1, in the interests of retaining an international cultural and linguistic foundation. The laudable emphasis on Maori culture and language should absolutely NOT be at the expense of the basis of western culture (which is unarguably part of our NZ culture) and the basis of our own vocabulary and language system (and of many other western languages). Why, when we are finally beginning to give recognition to our Maori heritage, should it mean that we must deny the other half of what has made us a nation?	Not as such, although I do believe that more energy and encouragement could be given to enabling a broader inculcation of cultural norms and values from ALL our contributing heritages in New Zealand: Maori, Asian and Western European (to name the main ones). Notably, the study of Latin and Classical Studies provides a most extensive and multi-applicational basis for the last-mentioned.	Yes	As above, it is indeed admirable and timely that there be appropriate emphasis on an important part of our cultural and linguistic heritage (and indeed, the two are totally intertwined). But this must not be exclusive! not, that is to say, at the expense of other long-recognised valuable subjects such as Latin and Classical Studies.	Not particularly, as these areas are regrettably outside of my knowledge-base and competence. I should very much like to have had the opportunity to study some at least of them, but not at the expense of my study of Latin and Classical Studies. I should particularly have valued the opportunity to engage with Te Reo Rangitira, and Toi Ataata, as there, in my experiences, would be the richest potential for comparative study of culture: in my own particular field, that would be oral tradition, myth, and traditional artistic representation. It would be wonderful for our young students from now to have the opportunity to see both sides of this cultural nexus that is New Zealand society.	2020-04-20 21:39:04	ANON-YFPW-RWCD-P	2020-04-20 21:38:29	2020-04-20 21:39:12
No	I had heard that changes were planned to NCEA, but I wasn't aware of the nature of those changes.	Agree	In general, the broadening of subjects sounds good in that: - students won't have to make such specific choices, to the exclusion of related content (e.g. being able to cover accounting & economics content under Commerce) - schools won't have to offer so many separate subjects at Level 1 However, I see some disadvantages: - students who have a keen leaning to one specific area will be held back. For example, at present, a student can potentially take Physics, Chemistry and Biology at Level 1 and earn 60 credits in science. Under the proposed changes, that student will only be able to study one-subject's worth of content across the whole science curriculum - schools will have to pick and choose which areas of the broader subject to focus on, thus leaving significant content not taught.	The new plan looks good, overall.		No			2020-04-23 08:54:58	ANON-YFPW-RWCX-A	2020-04-23 08:54:58	2020-04-23 08:55:53

No	<p>While general statements had been made in 2019 by MoE, the lack of detail in those statements meant that the MoE's Feb 20 provisional subject list announcement of collapsing of many subjects was NOT foreshadowed. The restructuring of NCEA standards to be 4 per subject, larger and fewer, at least 2 external for each was fully explained, but NOT the deletion of individual sciences and other subjects. Even during the "consultation" process of the science-SEG draft standards that ran from early December of 2019 to March 2 2020, the MoE and the sci-SEG specifically stated repeatedly in December, January and February that the specialist sciences would remain based on decisions of those subject SEGs.</p> <p>These exact questions were also asked repeatedly by the sector throughout 2019. Each and every time the official MoE response did not indicate the collapsing of subjects as shown in the "provisional subject list". The subject associations of chemistry and physics in particular were not consulted either at any stage before the Feb 20th announcement by the MoE as these two press releases clearly state: NZIP, NZIC.</p> <p>Links to these documents: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1fpg02P13-</p>	Strongly disagree	<p>The MoE seem to be making decisions to delete or collapse L1 subjects based on either a philosophical framework or a misinterpretation of the true demand, size, complexity and nature of L1 courses that focus on specialist science throughout NZ's high schools. The flawed "insight report" has been supposedly used by the MoE in a deeply flawed argument to collapse biology, chemistry, physics and earth & space science into just 1 course. At the top of page 2 of the insight report is the fact that the conclusions of this report are wrong and that the report is based on ridiculously small estimates of the number of students in Yr11 specialist science subjects. Basically they misinterpreted the NCEA L1 science matrix of standards and how NZ schools have used that matrix to craft various courses for at least 6000 to 7000 Yr 11 students! This can easily be seen by the summary of a survey conducted of NZ schools that include 260 different schools. The restriction of the insight report to only count Yr11 courses with 14 or more credits of a single science reflects a lack of understanding of how NZ schools work, how science is taught in NZ and how NCEA works.</p> <p>Link to survey: https://docs.google.com/document/d/1o7uTDvX4berEYWr1bGk3IOsm9RKEock_gIheO_NDXo</p>	<p>As explained in detail above all of the specialist sciences should be reinstated at L1.</p> <p>To allow a Yr11 student to choose from TEN different languages, FIVE different technologies, THREE different performing arts (drama, dance and music) but only allow a single "science" course to cater for the diverse needs of the 35,000+ Yr11 students is not logical. It will restrict the futures of NZ's children. It will make it more difficult for those that do decide to continue into L2 programs. It will be seen by multiple stakeholders as a wrong decision by the MoE and limit NZ's economy in the STEM-related employment fields.</p> <p>Nowhere in any part of the draft L1 science standards are there any assessments, nor even parts of assessments that target the problem solving skills critical to understanding of physics. Nor anywhere in the draft L1 science standards are there any assessments of the cornerstone concepts also critical to the understanding of physics. Thus the "science" package of standards will not fit the purpose of allowing students to learn about physics, much less allow students to develop a foundational platform to then move into L2 and perhaps L3 and tertiary physics courses.</p>	<p>The RETAINING of L1 subjects is the goal here. Not the addition of further subjects. If further subjects are added, they should fit into the cultural and societal goals for various NZ schools and communities. To limit those communities with any one-size-fits-all approach would be a disaster for NZ education and would be a removal of the freedoms that NZ schools, teachers, students, parents and communities have had since the creation of NCEA in the early 2000s.</p>	No		<p>I assume you mean "If you answered "yes" to Question 5..." but no, I have no further comment.</p>	2020-04-26 15:29:19	ANON-YFPW-RWCN-Z	2020-04-26 15:29:19	2020-04-26 15:29:43
Yes	<p>I am aware of the intend change but disagree with the exclusion of Classical Studies at L1. Classical Studies is a cross-disciplinary subject, based on studies of Literature, Art History, History and Philosophy. If the vision is for L1 to be foundational, then Classical Studies should be included. The cross-disciplinary nature of Classical Studies provides a foundation for study across a range of disciplines - contributing to broad disciplinary literacy. Disciplinary literacy is a foundation for studying in disciplines at higher levels (Johnson & Watson 2011; Moje, 2007; Stribling 2019; Wilson et al. 2012). With particular regard to the Art History, if Art History is excluded from L1, Classical Studies provides the only supportable foundation subject and pathway for students interested in Art History. Art History is not a part of the History curriculum and NCEA achievement standards, but it is a disciplinary foundation of Classical Studies and reflected in the Classical Studies achievement standards. Also, study of History alone will not give students exposure to disciplinary understanding in Classical Literature, Art History and Philosophy that are part of L2 Classical Studies. It is a contradiction of review criteria #1, 3 and 4 to remove Classical Studies from NCEA L1.</p>	Agree		<p>I disagree with the exclusion of Classical Studies from NCEA L1. Classical Studies should be included at all levels of NCEA, to provide a coherent pathway through the subject and support students in multi and cross-disciplinary study (through the infusion of disciplinary knowledge from Literary, Art History, History and Philosophy). It is a false understanding of the disciplinary natures of both Classical Studies and History to assume that Classical Studies can (and should) be taught purely as a context in History. Classical Studies provides rich learning grounded in multiple disciplines and is a cross-disciplinary subject. In this, it supports the aim for rich learning from the National Curriculum. It is complementary to, not overlapping with, History. Excluding Classical Studies from NCEA L1 is contrary to review criteria #2 and 7.</p>		No			2020-04-26 18:05:59	ANON-YFPW-RWCK-W	2020-04-26 18:05:59	2020-04-26 18:06:17
Yes	<p>The exclusion of Latin in all levels does not promote either a foundational education or greater specialization, as its absence leaves a substantial knowledge gap in subjects such as English, History, Classical Studies, Religious Studies, French, Art History, Mathematics and Statistics. I feel students would benefit more from Classical Studies being separate from History, as it allows two significantly broad subjects to explore a fuller amount of content without restricting each other. Reductions in Latin and Classical Studies begin to exclude a number of students who are passionate about these subjects.</p>	Strongly disagree	<p>The inclusion of Classical Studies and Art History into the subject of History at Level 1 limits the individual scope of these subjects. Classical Studies is multi-disciplinary and broad subject and only supporting it within the context of 'History' to a low degree restricts the content of this subject. The exclusion of Latin at all levels removes a fundamental base subject for other European languages such as English and French. While in History one learns about the history of the world, in Latin one learns about the history of a multitude of current and widespread languages, which is just as important, and ultimately significant to a fuller understanding of history.</p>	<p>In including Classical Studies and Art History into History, the wide subject breadth of Classical Studies will be significantly limited. Classical Studies contains literature, politics, art history, language, culture, history, architecture, geography, philosophy, and allows students to gain key research skills. In dissolving this subject at Level 1, students lose a base understanding of areas which would be important in Tertiary study in subjects such as Law, Politics and Medicine. With such a broad amount of content in Classical Studies, think of what would be lost in a single year. The exclusion of Latin at all levels will have implications, and limitations, on other subjects. Latin provides a fuller understanding of the English language through Etymology, understanding the origins of each individual word gives students an application for both language and history. Religious Studies remains a subject in Level 1, yet Latin is fundamentally important for contexts within this subject, and its exclusion would leave a gap in the understanding students can gain from this subject.</p>	<p>Keeping Classical Studies and History separate at Levels 2 and 3 allows both subjects to be taught to their greatest extent, allowing students to appreciate as much depth in each subject as possible. Latin should be taught at Levels 2 and 3. As a University student who did not have the ability at High School to take Latin as a subject, I feel very strongly about the ability of other students to take this subject. Many students are passionate about the history of the ancient world, the history of languages and religion, and to students who want to continue with their interests at University level, learning Latin at High School is just as important to their future as learning Mandarin or French is for a student preparing for a degree in Politics and International Relations.</p>	No	<p>The subjects of Classical Studies and Latin should be available to any student. Although many schools do not teach these subjects due to the recent addition of Classical Studies at Level 1, the absence of the subject in schools should not be considered an absence of demand for it. Both subjects have impacts on student's interest in history and cultural heritage, and</p>	2020-04-27 10:01:09	ANON-YFPW-RWC6-8	2020-04-27 10:01:09	2020-04-27 10:01:37	

Yes		Strongly disagree	As a PE teacher I believe that Health and Physical Education need to be stand alone subjects. I also believe that Outdoor Education needs to be included. It is huge at our school because of the practical nature but also because it is unit standards so easier for lower level students to achieve.	As a PE teacher I believe that Health and Physical Education need to be stand alone subjects. I also believe that Outdoor Education needs to be included. It is huge at our school because of the practical nature but also because it is unit standards so easier for lower level students to achieve.		No				2020-04-28 07:47:33	ANON-YFPW-RWCW-9	2020-04-28 07:47:33	2020-04-28 07:47:58
Yes		Disagree	Where does outdoor education fit with these changes in level 1 combining health and pe together in 4 achievement standards? I see a direct loss for our students with no recognition of outdoor education	Outdoor education achievement standards in PE. This could be through specialization or as common achievement standards. As our students access greater technology in their daily life there needs to be the balance teaching students to access their local surroundings/ build resilience and confidence.	Outdoor Education	No				2020-04-28 07:59:45	ANON-YFPW-RWC4-6	2020-04-28 07:59:45	2020-04-28 07:59:56
No		Undecided	I am not sure how this will effect Outdoor Education. Would it be a subject within PE and Health?	Level 1 Outdoor Education would be fantastic as an inclusion within PE and Health.	Outdoor Education as a stand alone achievement standard.	No				2020-04-28 08:05:47	ANON-YFPW-RWCT-6	2020-04-28 08:05:46	2020-04-28 08:05:57
No		Strongly disagree	Latin is a great subject and very helpful. Do not get rid of it. Also art history should be kept.	Yes. Keep Latin as it teaches students about language and words and teaches many vital skills. Please also keep art history as the arts are very important and it's good for students to have a broad variety of subjects.		No				2020-04-28 08:07:25	ANON-YFPW-RWC3-5	2020-04-28 08:07:25	2020-04-28 08:07:36
Yes		Disagree	I thi link it narrows choices later down the track	Am against Combining health and PE. Although they are in the same curriculum document, they focus in very different topics and contexts. Leads to trouble when specializing later on, as in depth knowledge is not there. Also weakens Outdoor Education options, a subject that teaches our students so so much about themselves, others, the environment, geography and tourism. One of our countries main industries.		No				2020-04-28 08:17:12	ANON-YFPW-RWC2-4	2020-04-28 08:17:12	2020-04-28 08:17:20
Yes		Undecided		It is disappointing to see that Outdoor Education has been left off the list entirely. This is a very engaging subject that provides students with such a diverse range of learning, especially essential in today's world. Students currently love learning in (hard skills such as navigation), through (soft skills such as effective communication, problem solving and cooperation) and about (Environmental Care) the outdoors. With an eye to our future, these traits are becoming more and more essential.	Outdoor Education has proven to be an effective medium for learning throughout all levels of secondary school.	No				2020-04-28 08:31:00	ANON-YFPW-RWCU-7	2020-04-28 08:31:00	2020-04-28 08:31:15
Yes		Strongly disagree	There is no area for Outdoor Education in Level 1. This is a major part of many schools curriculum and it needs to be present in the Level 1 subjects.	Outdoor Education, see answer above.		No				2020-04-28 08:32:59	ANON-YFPW-RWJY-J	2020-04-28 08:32:59	2020-04-28 08:33:13
Yes		Strongly agree				No				2020-04-28 08:37:03	ANON-YFPW-RWJV-F	2020-04-28 08:37:03	2020-04-28 08:37:15
Yes		Disagree	there needs to be scope for specialisation at PE in level 2 to offer Outdoor Education, or to hold OED as a separate subject. I mean if Drama magically is allowed to be an endorsed subject than surely OED with a strong basis across a number of different curricula does	Outdoor Education, as a strand of PE or to hold OED as a separate subject. I mean if Drama magically is allowed to be an endorsed subject than surely OED with a strong basis across a number of different curricula does. It utilise aspects of PE, Geo, Sci, and Maori aspects and is in most schools already. It provides personal growth and success in a way in which oher subjects do not, plus despite the recent developments with COVID 19, it was a solid pathway for employment.	Outdoor Education, I mean if Drama magically is allowed to be an endorsed subject than surely OED with a strong basis across a number of different curricula does. It utilise aspects of PE, Geo, Sci, and Maori aspects and is in most schools already. It provides personal growth and success in a way in which other subjects do not, plus despite the recent developments with COVID 19, it was a solid pathway for employment.	No				2020-04-28 08:56:53	ANON-YFPW-RWJC-V	2020-04-28 08:56:53	2020-04-28 08:57:13
No	I have only just heard of this through the EONZ rather than through my school or Ministry communication	Undecided	I worry about only having limited Health and Physical Education standards to choose from. This does not allow me to choose standards that highlight their strengths. On a positive note, it does mean that all Level 1 pupils will have a foundation knowledge that can be built upon. Plus the Health and Physical Education standards complement each other so seeing them together may be beneficial. It would be good to see Outdoor Education Level 1 standards as this is the most popular course at Level 1 for our students.	Level 1 Outdoor Education This is the most popular Level 1 subject at our school. It is really important that we have that scaffolding of learning from year level camps into NCEA.	Outdoor Education	No				2020-04-28 09:08:27	ANON-YFPW-RWJ5-C	2020-04-28 09:08:27	2020-04-28 09:08:40
Yes	Yes, through EONZ (Education Outdoors NZ)	Disagree		It would be good if there was a specific Outdoor Education mention in there - it would be good to have a pathway through level 1,2 and 3.	Outdoor Education	No				2020-04-28 09:23:58	ANON-YFPW-RWJ8-H	2020-04-28 09:23:58	2020-04-28 09:24:14
No		Undecided		- Not sure if HPE will incorporate some Outdoor Ed - Outdoor Ed, provides a space for experiential learning and self reflection in new environments - I am a little concerned with the absense of OE		Yes				2020-04-28 09:55:33	ANON-YFPW-RWJ9-J	2020-04-28 09:55:33	2020-04-28 09:55:55
													- Create an environment that is more connected to Māori practices in a whare wānanga or marae. - Having safe spaces in schools for māori to be māori

Yes		Disagree	I disagree with the joining of the Health and PE subject, they are both in-depth courses and offer a range of information and learning at Level 1. Also, Outdoor Education is an important course at Level 1 that needs to be reconsidered.			No				2020-04-28 10:19:37	ANON-YFPW-RWIJ-Z	2020-04-28 10:19:37	2020-04-28 10:19:59
Yes	The concern is that "broad" means covering more topics in less detail. And to for subjects such as Science, to understand many of the topics relevant to students lives (e.g. climate change, medical topics, genetic engineering, science claims in the media) a detailed level of scientific knowledge is needed. Also, will this "broad" education provide sufficient foundation for L2 and L3? By limiting subject areas, are you also limiting the scope for delivery - for example, PE and Health turn into one subject. With just 4 achievement standards available does this limit the opportunity for schools to offer alternative pathways such as outdoor education to achieve these achievement standards?	Undecided	I think that for subjects such as Science and PE/Health, the "broad" has been made too broad. Holistic subjects such as Outdoor Education that tie many learning areas together with "real world" education will be paralysed under these subject definitions as they can currently pull achievement standards from different subjects to build the most relevant course	Perhaps open Science up into Physical/Biological/Science to allow students who wish it the opportunity to specialise earlier by taking two science options (physical and biological) and having a general Science course for those that wish to remain generalists Outdoor education as a subject separate from PE. Possibly with elements of environmental and sustainability tied into it.		No				2020-04-28 10:23:24	ANON-YFPW-RWIJ-3	2020-04-28 10:23:24	2020-04-28 10:23:36
Yes	Am wary of the limitations of "Squeezing" Health and PE together - I feel we would lose too much depth from both of these subjects. We would not have a strong enough foundation to build upon at levels 2 and 3.	Agree				No				2020-04-28 10:33:22	ANON-YFPW-RWIJ-A	2020-04-28 10:30:32	2020-04-28 10:33:29
Yes	It seems like it is becoming less broad?	Undecided		I don't see Outdoor Education on the list. This is an age where students are hungry for real life experiences. The benefit of challenging outdoor experiences is huge for students in need of opportunities to accept responsibility and develop resilience.		No				2020-04-28 10:33:57	ANON-YFPW-RWIJ-X	2020-04-28 10:33:57	2020-04-28 10:34:02
Yes		Strongly disagree		I'm quite upset at the proposed omission of Latin from the curriculum. I studied Latin for my full 5 years at secondary school and felt like it provided me with a greater understanding of the English language (people might believe it is a dead language but it is indisputably important for advancing writing skills and understanding where words are derived from), supported me with many aspects of French (which I learnt alongside Latin for the full 5 years), and has helped me tremendously over the last 6 years at university (I have a BSc and am now completing my Master's in Dietetics and it has been tremendously helpful having an understanding of latin with all the hospital terminology).	N/A - although an introduction to Nutrition and Food Technology would have been so helpful for my degree and many others.	No				2020-04-28 11:22:38	ANON-YFPW-RWIJ-E	2020-04-28 11:22:38	2020-04-28 11:22:59
Yes		Undecided	I am concerned that some different subject areas such as outdoor education will not be able to be provided by schools with sufficient assessment if PE health and OEd are all rolled into 4 standards	Again Outdoor education needs to be included in the subject list it is provided by almost all schools in NZ and is significantly different to both PE and health. It also has direct pathways into the workforce in tourism. And is a significant part of our cultural identity.	Yes L2 and L3 Outdoor Education	No				2020-04-28 11:26:26	ANON-YFPW-RWIJ-9	2020-04-28 11:26:26	2020-04-28 11:26:43
Yes		Disagree	I do not think generalization and watering down of subjects in any learning area is in the best interest of our students. It will end up a watered down version of what is currently taught in order to fit in more material and cover a greater range of topics. Learners should be free to choose to study the specific subjects that interest them, thus giving them the best opportunity to gain knowledge and specialize in their chosen areas.	Outdoor Education. Adventure is a major industry in NZ with many exciting job opportunities for young people to make a career in. Yes this industry has been hurt by Covid-19 but it will recover.	Outdoor Education	Yes				2020-04-28 11:42:23	ANON-YFPW-RWIJ-Y	2020-04-28 11:42:23	2020-04-28 11:42:39

Yes		Disagree	I disagree due to Outdoor Education not being seen as a stand alone subject at level 1 and being completely left out as if it doesn't exist in many schools around the country.	I am disappointed that 'Outdoor Education' has been completely left out. Outdoor Education needs to be valued for what it is and the part it plays and contributes to retaining students, engaging/motivating students and creating well rounded young people that contribute to an import part on NZ society. Your idea that a broad education can be delivered by reducing the opportunities for young people and flexibility for schools to deliver subjects/programs to meet the needs of their communities young people is very short sighted.	Outdoor Education & Environmental education	Yes			2020-04-28 11:50:47	ANON-YFPW-RWJ1-A	2020-04-28 11:50:47	2020-04-28 11:51:00
Yes		Strongly disagree	Outdoor Education is a subject taught at this level. It is one of the more popular level 1 option subjects at our school with two full classes. It is not mentioned as a current or future subject at level 1. Does this mean that the subject will no longer be able to eb offered?	Yes. Outdoor Education is a subject taught at this level. It is one of the more popular level 1 option subjects at our school with two full classes. It is not mentioned as a current or future subject at level 1. Does this mean that the subject will no longer be able to eb offered?	Outdoor Education	No			2020-04-28 12:06:26	ANON-YFPW-RWJ2-K	2020-04-28 12:06:26	2020-04-28 12:06:38
Yes		Undecided	I am concerned that Outdoor Education - currently a very valuable and popular subject at level 1 - will be lost in the mix of Health and PE or delivery will be attempted by inexperienced and unqualified PE staff. I believe it's a valid alternative to PE and needs to be offered as a separate subject for students to choose instead of PE if they prefer. All PE key competencies can be taught in OE.	Having Outdoor Education as an option at level 1 will help students decide whether they want to specialise more in this area at Level's 2 and 3. Without this practical experience at level 1 they may struggle to understand what is involved and be successful in it at higher levels.	Outdoor Education is an important subject for many reasons - safety in the outdoors for a country that has a strong outdoor culture; developing judgement around risk/competency; working with others in a non-competitive, collaborative way; developing confidence and self esteem; connecting with and developing motivation to care for the natural world; being active and in the outdoors away from screens/digital connections. This needs to be a specialist subject available to students at Level 2 and 3, developed as a separate curriculum that can be taken alongside PE and Health. Sharing 4 Achievement Standards with PE will cause competition for credits as it currently often experienced. For many students achieving academically and thriving as a person will come from being able to take both these subjects, achieving 2 sets of credits.	No			2020-04-28 12:59:05	ANON-YFPW-RWJH-1	2020-04-28 12:59:05	2020-04-28 12:59:29
Yes		Agree			Outdoor Education to have its own subject matrix at Level 2 and 3.	Yes			2020-04-28 13:11:26	ANON-YFPW-RWJ8-U	2020-04-28 13:11:26	2020-04-28 13:11:52
Yes	was not current in my understanding of what has been proposed.	Agree	Have some reservations regarding the opportunity for students to move into certain areas of 'specialisation' at Level 2 and 3, if there is not sufficient scope within the Level 1 foundation subjects.	As above. The Health and PE curriculum can be seen in many schools to be 'under the same umbrella' currently. However if the context is limited at Level 1 then it will inhibit the opportunity for students to move into a range of existing contexts in Years 12 / 13. I.e. Outdoor Education, (Adventure) Tourism, Exercise Prescription. Currently Level 1 programmes allow students to consider a range of contexts. This enables students to choose from a wider range of context during senior schooling, within Trades opportunities and moving on to employment or tertiary training opportunities.	Outdoor Education	No			2020-04-28 13:20:57	ANON-YFPW-RWJM-6	2020-04-28 13:20:57	2020-04-28 13:21:16
Yes		Agree			Outdoor Education needs to remain at these levels. It would be unbelievable for this subject to somehow disappear from schools in a country like NZ.	No			2020-04-28 13:46:08	ANON-YFPW-RWJD-W	2020-04-28 13:46:08	2020-04-28 13:46:52
Yes		Agree			Specialisation of Outdoor education. Tourism and outdoor activities are a big part of NZ workplace and there is a shortage of specialist NZ instructors. - provides a pathway for the industry - lends itself to PE standards to combine for interesting courses/context - students have a real interest in OE -this sector is growing in demand and we need quality professionals involved,	No			2020-04-28 14:43:23	ANON-YFPW-RWJX-H	2020-04-28 14:43:23	2020-04-28 14:43:36
Yes		Strongly disagree	Outdoor Education is not included anywhere.	Outdoor Education is a hugely valuable subject in schools and I would like to see it be a stand alone subject included in the proposed list of subjects.	Outdoor Education.	Yes		Outdoor Education has sat under Physical Education, but I think it needs to stand alone. It is a completely different subject where they have very little in common.	2020-04-28 15:07:39	ANON-YFPW-RWJA-T	2020-04-28 15:07:39	2020-04-28 15:07:57

Yes		Strongly disagree		I am a PE and Health teacher. These are two completely different subjects and combining them will not be worthwhile. Even at a junior level, the subjects are taught separately - eg, PE twice a week and Health twice a week depending on where you work. They can interlink as subjects however, they are far more valuable for students when they are separate. At an all girls school we have a handful of students who select PE and Health as two separate subjects. Most already make the decision that they either want to be studying Health or PE for various reasons. If we all of a sudden add these in together then the students that previously took Health may not want the PE aspect of the programme and likewise the PE students may not want the Health aspect of the programme. Health is far broader than 'being fit'. Compare exercise physiology to abortion. These two completely different topics are our completely different subjects. Therefore for the subjects to be combined is not OK.	Yes. Outdoor Education. This needs to be added. So many schools are currently offering it as a subject. We will actually have a huge issue on our hands if the ministry starts to take subjects like this away and also merge level one together. It is basically killing the Health and Physical Education curriculum area. There are so many teachers in NZ that have worked tirelessly to plan trips and educational experiences for our youth for the ministry to turn around and not allow them to go ahead anymore. I would be extremely disappointed if this was to happen. You would also have a huge issue in schools with overstaffing if you are going to start taking subjects such as Outdoor Education away.	Yes			2020-04-28 16:12:24	ANON-YFPW-RWJN-7	2020-04-28 16:12:24	2020-04-28 16:12:35
Yes	BUT, what is being proposed for science (removal of Biology, Chemistry and Physics assessments) is a huge change in the curriculum and a huge reduction in the flexibility for schools to offer courses that suit the needs of their konga. Far from encouraging students into STEM subjects, which is a worldwide problem, these changes will create barriers for students wanting to pursue Science related careers.	Disagree	Proposed way of maintaining a broad focus means little opportunity to specialise or to gain adequate knowledge in a subject area that they have identified as necessary for future career training.	Chunking subjects into one broader subject is going to lose quality and value of knowledge passed on.	Keep the full range of Science and Commerce specialist subjects - foolish to lose these.	No			2020-04-28 16:41:43	ANON-YFPW-RWJK-4	2020-04-28 16:41:43	2020-04-28 16:42:07
Yes		Disagree		Latin needs to stay in the curriculum. It is essential for learning other languages, for a better understanding of the own language, for logic & reasoning and for pursuing careers in various fields (e.g. science, history, religious studies).		No			2020-04-28 18:12:38	ANON-YFPW-RWJ6-F	2020-04-28 18:12:38	2020-04-28 18:12:55
Yes	However, Outdoor Education is not included under the physical education and health subject area and at level 1 this is an age where students from our school participate to a high level and are engage in learning that excites and motivates them. It also allows them to connect to nature and their local environment. Learn skills for life, interpersonal skills are developed more in outdoor education than in school based subjects and sensible decision making is enhanced.	Disagree	This alignment limits student choice at a younger age and can eliminate options that could provide a high level of stimulus and learning.		Definitely would recommend to include outdoor education at levels 2 and 3	Yes			2020-04-28 21:09:33	ANON-YFPW-RWJR-B	2020-04-28 21:09:33	2020-04-28 21:09:45
Yes		Disagree		Would like to see Outdoor Education as a subject at this level to provide an introduction for all and a foundation for L2 and L3 study. If not then there needs to be OE Achievement Standard(s) within the PE/Health Learning Area.	Yes. Outdoor Education as a stand alone specialist subject rather than a part of PE. This would allow for more holistic, balanced, integrated, less 'physical performance' based units of study.	Yes		No.	2020-04-29 10:46:00	ANON-YFPW-RWJW-G	2020-04-29 10:46:00	2020-04-29 10:46:38
Yes		Disagree	Level 1 needs to have some focus to lead into the higher levels. We need specific Outdoor Education Achievement Standards at level 1 which lead into the higher levels. I do not support abandoning the move to have OE achievement standards written for level one.	Outdoor Education need to be included at level 1 as a stand alone subject in order to specifically feed into the higher levels. The higher levels of outdoor Ed must have achievement standards written for them in order to enable more students to choose it as a subject right through school. Currently too many students are advised to not take OE in level 2 and 3 because it does not lead to UE.	No	No			2020-04-29 11:44:12	ANON-YFPW-RWJ4-D	2020-04-29 11:44:12	2020-04-29 11:44:45
Yes		Undecided	I think that having PE and Health together is not a good idea. It is just another way to water down the content and make it non-specific or general. They are quite different subjects and this just takes more out of both of them again.	Have Health and PE separate. They are different areas.	Outdoor Education. It would be such a loss of this was removed from level 2 and 3 in schools.	Yes		no	2020-04-29 14:04:45	ANON-YFPW-RWJT-D	2020-04-29 14:04:45	2020-04-29 14:04:56
No		Disagree		Health and Physical Education should not be combined in Level 1 unless it is made compulsory. Student wellbeing is supposed to be a focus and priority. Currently Level 1 Outdoor Education can be taught through PE Standards. If PE and Health are combined where would that leave Outdoor Education? Some students learn well-being through Physical activity and others learn about it in the classroom through Health and they make their own decision to opt in.	OE specific Achievement Standards at level 2 and 3	No			2020-04-30 08:16:59	ANON-YFPW-RWJ3-C	2020-04-30 08:16:59	2020-04-30 08:17:17

No		Undecided			Yes. Outdoor education in many schools is provided as a subject. Currently it has to share achievement standards with physical education and/or be completely unit standard based. With the proposed reduction in achievement standards per subject this will severely limit the possibility for schools to deliver outdoor education as the subject. I strongly support outdoor education having its own achievement standards. Especially at level II and three. Without this we will lose a significantly valuable opportunity for students in secondary schools	No				2020-04-30 10:56:28	ANON-YFPW-RWJ2-B	2020-04-30 10:56:28	2020-04-30 10:56:42
Yes	I am an HOD of Physical Education and Health. I feel that by combining the two subjects in Level 1 will severely hinder my school. I am at a low decile single sex boys school and believe that my students would not enjoy doing the health education aspect of the course. They are predominantly an active environment and greatly enjoy this course. In addition this would leave our subject with limited options for any productive assessments.	Disagree	As explained above	As explained above. I strongly advise to keep Health and Physical Education separate.	Outdoor Education as a separate subject	Yes		NA		2020-04-30 11:38:08	ANON-YFPW-RWJU-E	2020-04-30 11:38:08	2020-04-30 11:38:33
Yes	I was aware of changes. However, it is concerning that Outdoor Education has been taken completely out of the Health and Physical Education domain	Undecided	While I agree that there needs to be changes to the current Level 1 structure, limiting options for subject areas can affect the uptake of students in these areas. Having only a select few AS options for students will affect students being able to take a number of options they are passionate about e.g. Level 1 PE and Level 1 OE	There needs to be an inclusion of Outdoor Education into the HPE subject area. With the proposed change it is going to make it extremely hard for schools to offer Outdoor Education courses that offer achievement standard credits. Students will not be able to choose both a PE and OE senior option.	Outdoor Education - there needs to be a separate set of standards that can be offered for Outdoor Education, otherwise schools may have to cut their OE programs due to the standards being used in the senior PE courses	No				2020-04-30 11:51:55	ANON-YFPW-RWXV-Z	2020-04-30 11:51:55	2020-04-30 11:52:55
Yes		Strongly disagree	If Health and PE become one subject there is the potential to significantly limit options for other learning area contexts such as Outdoor Education. Limiting the contexts in which Level 1 NCEA would not be good for Outdoor Education. Students may also want to take PE and not Health at this level but are forced to. They should be able to specialise at Level 1 or pick the combined subject if they wish.	I would like them to still be able to do Outdoor Ed and be able to use the PE Achievement standards.	Outdoor Education Achievement standards which are being devised now.	No				2020-04-30 14:44:11	ANON-YFPW-RWXC-A	2020-04-30 14:44:11	2020-04-30 14:44:31
Yes		Agree	I agree with the principle of having a less specialised focus to Level 1. I do have concerns about the impact this is going to have on the students who struggle with literacy in particular, and with school in general. Standards with a higher number of credits have always been more difficult to achieve so those students with poor attendance and lower academic ability are going to struggle with getting out of level 1. NCEA does need a good shake up but primary and intermediate have to improve what they are doing so that secondary schools get cohorts at year 9 who are able to communicate effectively by reading and writing. I have been teaching for a long time and the ability of year 9 has changed so much - those at the higher end continue to be better while the tail of lower achievers grows longer and longer.	I teach Health. I am extremely disappointed with the proposal to combine PE and Health. With all of the issues that the youth of today are facing you are going to reduce the amount of health content that students will be getting. The vast majority of people who have died from covid have had comorbidities - one or more of hypertension, T2 diabetes, obesity or vascular disease. There have been predictions that health expenses will bankrupt our country in the not too distant future due to T2 diabetes alone. So there is a legitimate argument that Health is the most important of all subjects taught at school. I think that is crazy - moronic even - to combine PE with Health as it will undoubtedly reduce the amount of health education being taught at level 1.	I think a subject that includes ethics, values & value systems - stoicism, logic, argument. Call it Basic Philosophy if you like. The NCEA system has seen a huge decline in questioning and thinking - boys just want credits. Thinking and inquiry are sadly lacking in our society. A course that would encourage and develop these skills would fit very well in our system.	No				2020-04-30 18:42:25	ANON-YFPW-RWJ7-G	2020-04-28 11:40:17	2020-04-30 18:42:50
Yes	It is a pity that outdoor education is not given any attention in the new NCEA L1 at a time when our students are even more disconnected from nature during the Covid 19 lockdown. Time spent being active or simply walking in nature is proven to lessen mental health issues associated with too much screen time and teens living vicariously on social media. Outdoor activity is a quintessential New Zealand pastime and is extremely important yet it receives no focus at NCEA L1 under the new curriculum. This is of particular concern to me as a teacher of PE / Health working under the shadow of NZ's high youth suicide rates.	Strongly disagree	please read my comments above regarding Outdoor education.	Outdoor education and teaching students how to actually spend time in nature is important within the curriculum if we are to help young New Zealanders live healthy, happy and balanced lives in an increasingly technological world. https://www.monbiot.com/2013/10/07/rewild-the-child/	Outdoor Education, Bushcraft, Health fitness, Food Technology, Sustainable Technologies.	Yes	-	-		2020-05-01 09:13:22	ANON-YFPW-RWXV-W	2020-04-30 12:40:42	2020-05-01 09:13:33
Yes		Strongly disagree	Strongly disagree with the recommendation to abolish Latin.	Strongly disagree with the recommendation to abolish Latin. Studying Latin expands minds through works of literature, enhances knowledge of other languages, refines critical thinking skills and analytical reasoning. It would be a travesty to deny this opportunity to New Zealand students in the future.	Keep Latin at NCEA Levels 2 and 3.	No				2020-05-01 14:53:26	ANON-YFPW-RWXS-T	2020-05-01 14:53:26	2020-05-01 14:53:34
No		Undecided				No				2020-05-01 14:55:48	ANON-YFPW-RWX8-Y	2020-05-01 14:55:48	2020-05-01 14:55:59

Yes	Yes, however the question above fails to acknowledge there is no intention to include all subjects - such as with Latin and is therefore misleading.	Strongly disagree	This is a dumbing down of education and a great injustice to future learners.	Latin should be included throughout all levels. It is the language of science (including medicine and plant). It provides important history lessons, lessons in research and learning about other cultures. The skills learnt from studying Latin can be transferred to learning in other topics.		No			2020-05-01 15:11:21	ANON-YFPW-RWX9-Z	2020-05-01 15:11:21	2020-05-01 15:11:42
Yes		Strongly disagree	Latin and the sciences are being sacrificed for more generic subjects. I'm astounded that these subjects are not considered fundamental. See Q3 for my reasoning.	We NEED depth in scientific capability and curiosity in our children...not less. Science is one of the foundations of our future (alongside tech), how can we even consider reducing the level of science teaching in schools? We need to learn Chemistry, Biology, Physics in depth...not 'science'. Latin is the foundation of many languages, in structure, grammar and vocabulary. How can this be a positive outcome?! Surely teaching the foundation language is more critical at an early age.		No			2020-05-01 15:14:13	ANON-YFPW-RWX9-E	2020-05-01 15:14:13	2020-05-01 15:14:22
Yes		Disagree		As a former Latin student, at the Form 5 level, I have since gone on to write best selling historical fiction, in all major markets around the world, and for the past five years, have worked at the incredible Roman era treasure that is the Vindolanda Roman Fort in England. Without the original introduction to the rich historical narrative of the Latin syllabus at school, my interest in all things historical, and the lives of persons long gone, I would not now be a full time author, earning enough from my book royalties to support my family. The Cambridge Latin Syllabus isn't just a language, it is living history, and leads on to so much more.	Please continue the Cambridge Latin Course.	No			2020-05-01 15:22:20	ANON-YFPW-RWXJ-H	2020-05-01 15:22:20	2020-05-01 15:22:29
Yes		Strongly disagree	To remove Latin from the school curriculum is akin to cultural vandalism To subsume classics in history is a poor decision as these subject are as different as night is from day	To remove Latin from the school curriculum is akin to cultural vandalism. For the last two millennium Latin has been the language of intellectual discourse, to remove it removes one of the cornerstones of Western Civilisation. Without Latin as a unifying language neither the renaissance or the modern world would be born. Latin is the language of the learned and professional classes. I believe that New Zealand more learned and professional classes, and by abandoning Latin you will doom a generation of New Zealand children to ignorance and poverty.	Greek and Sanscrit would be a welcome addition to the curriculum for the learned student	No			2020-05-01 15:24:02	ANON-YFPW-RWXQ-R	2020-05-01 15:24:02	2020-05-01 15:24:18
Yes		Strongly disagree	I strongly disagree with the Ministry's proposal to remove Latin as a NCEA Level 1 subject.	I feel that Latin offers the opportunity not just to expand our minds through wonderful works of literature but also to enhance our knowledge of other languages and refine our skills in critical thinking, close reading, analytical reasoning and mental processing. Denying our children the opportunity to study this language throughout their high school years is a travesty, in my opinion.		No			2020-05-01 15:24:13	ANON-YFPW-RWXE-C	2020-05-01 15:24:12	2020-05-01 15:24:23
Yes	The removal of latin is short sighted and shows lack of respect for more academic subjects.	Strongly disagree	The removal of latin is wrong. It is a language which greater enriches a person's life and helps them understand history and the world around them. In addition, the learning of this language teaches students the discipline of language and solving problems in a way which is similar to maths and algebra	Latin is an important foundation for english and history. It's value cannot be underestimated.	Latin	No		The changes are generally dumbing down education in New Zealand.	2020-05-01 15:24:27	ANON-YFPW-RWXS-V	2020-05-01 15:24:26	2020-05-01 15:24:41
Yes		Agree				No			2020-05-01 15:29:24	ANON-YFPW-RWXP-Q	2020-05-01 15:29:24	2020-05-01 15:29:30
Yes		Disagree	I strongly disagree with the decision to cease teaching Latin. I studied Latin to Scholl Certificate level in 1984, then studied Medicine. My Latin knowledge has proved invaluable in terms of understanding the origins of Anatomy terminology, which is almost direct Latin. In the wifer world, Latin is the basis of much of our English language, and the country will be poorer if this subject is dropped. Please keep Latin!			No			2020-05-01 15:32:57	ANON-YFPW-RWXF-D	2020-05-01 15:32:57	2020-05-01 15:33:09
Yes		Strongly disagree	I strongly oppose Latin being removed from the curriculum.	My daughter has benefitted so much from studying Latin, she is year 13, my two sons in year 10 also want to continue with this subject. Please keep it.		No			2020-05-01 15:38:26	ANON-YFPW-RWX1-R	2020-05-01 15:38:26	2020-05-01 15:38:40

Yes		Strongly disagree		I strongly disagree with the Ministry's proposal to remove Latin from all levels of NCEA. The common perception that Latin is irrelevant because it is a "dead language" is a spectacularly ignorant viewpoint. Obviously students don't learn Latin in order to converse in it. They learn Latin because it offers an understanding of the history and evolution of Western civilisation; an understanding of the evolution of English and other Romance languages, greatly facilitating the learning of these modern languages; and develops invaluable skills in logic and decoding. I acquired knowledge in all these areas by learning Latin at school and it provided me with a broad and essential knowledge of a myriad of subjects, knowledge which remains useful to this day. Obviously it is important to learn about our own culture and I fully support that; but that doesn't mean we should abolish subjects which teach us about other cultures. How can we hope to produce true global citizens when we focus solely on our own culture and neglect a subject that provides such a fantastic foundation for the study of so many other cultures and disciplines?	Art History and Classical Studies, for the reasons outlined above. Why would you even contemplate discouraging students' interests in these areas? We need to encourage learning for the joy of learning AS WELL AS learning for specific vocational reasons. Sure, not many students will go on to a career specifically focused in Art History or Classical Studies. But the knowledge they gain of a variety of cultures, of history, of the disciplines of discussing, analysing and writing essays will all serve them in any chosen career path. To not recognise this is indicative of a tragically insular and unimaginative perspective.	No			2020-05-01 15:40:27	ANON-YFPW-RWX7-X	2020-05-01 15:31:12	2020-05-01 15:40:40
No		Disagree	Latin should continue to be included Science should not be a single general subject and should continue to be split into the specialist areas at level 1	Latin should continue to be included in the curriculum as it offers the opportunity not just to expand our minds through wonderful works of literature but also to enhance our knowledge of other languages and refine our skills in critical thinking, close reading, analytical reasoning and mental processing. It would be a travesty to deny this opportunity to New Zealand students in the future.	Latin should continue into Levels 2 & 3.	No		No comments	2020-05-01 16:00:23	ANON-YFPW-RWX2-1	2020-05-01 16:00:23	2020-05-01 16:01:02
No		Disagree		Don't get rid of Latin! Latin is a critical and core subject for the learning of young people. It can be applied in the law and in medicine, it would be a tragedy to remove it from NCEA.	Keep Latin!	Yes		Keep Latin. The young people of our country deserve a chance to learn it.	2020-05-01 18:22:39	ANON-YFPW-RWXH-F	2020-05-01 18:22:39	2020-05-01 18:22:51
No		Strongly disagree				No			2020-05-01 20:28:41	ANON-YFPW-RWXB-9	2020-05-01 20:28:41	2020-05-01 20:28:50
No		Strongly disagree	I am disappointed at the subjects being excluded.	I do not understand why Latin is no longer included. It provides the base for all European languages even though it is not spoken. Combined with the historical and cultural depth of classical Rome, it is a subject that can capture people's imagination and engage them deeply. Many cultures have been influenced by ancient Greece and Rome. The academic value of learning Latin is unquestionable and certainly stands up along the subjects included in the level 1 NCEA list. It may be difficult to resource schools to offer Latin for small classes but there are probably other subjects with small class sizes and speciality knowledge included in the curriculum. I can't see how class efficiency measures justify killing Latin in schools. So, I am struggling to understand why a subject of proven academic value like Latin needs to be discontinued. Once the decision is made to remove it from the system, it will be almost impossible to bring it back. I strongly oppose taking away that option for the next generations of New Zealanders.	No	No	I am supportive of te reo Maori.	No	2020-05-02 08:34:42	ANON-YFPW-RWXM-M	2020-05-02 08:34:42	2020-05-02 08:35:00
Yes		Strongly disagree		I am extremely disappointed to learn of the Ministry's proposal to remove Latin from all levels of NCEA. I am a 71 year old grandmother who studied Latin at school to University Entrance level in 1965. In my experience Latin offers an understanding of the history and evolution of Western Civilisation, as well as the development of English and the Romance languages. In the modern world Latin has relevance as it also develops invaluable skills in logic and decoding. Although no longer a spoken language Latin offers insight into a broad range of subjects and the usefulness of my knowledge of it is as relevant today as it was in 1965. Space must be made for study of our own culture, but not at the expense of a subject that teaches us so much about our past and other cultures	Art History and Classical Studies should also be included in NCEA Levels 2 and 3 for the same reasons as given above. School students should be encouraged to study as many diverse subjects as possible, not just narrowly focused on their own particular career subject choices. Specialisation of these can be developed at a Tertiary level. The knowledge they gain of a variety of cultures and their history at school will add perspective to their general understanding in any chosen career path.	No			2020-05-02 13:12:43	ANON-YFPW-RWXD-B	2020-05-02 13:12:43	2020-05-02 13:13:39

No		Strongly disagree	I cannot protest strongly enough against the removal of Latin from NCEA Level 1 syllabus. Yes, I do believe in the value of language learning. Yes, I do believe that every Language is of value. In our country probably English and Maori are of vital importance but I consider Latin very close behind. Obviously this is not of great importance to everyone but those who have not studied Latin are unaware of its far-reaching influence. I consider myself very lucky to have gone through Secondary School in a lowly-rated country highschool in the 1960s and to have been able to take Latin (and English, French and Maori) right through to the highest levels. I have taught English (and other subjects) in NZ and overseas for over 50 years and I call on my Latin knowledge in daily life with surprising frequency. I implore you, make Latin available for those students who wish to study a rigorous and highly valuable subject. I remember the words of a Rhodes Scholar when I had to make the choice between Latin and Geography in Year 11. He strongly advised me to take Latin as he explained that it would be very easy to pick up and learn Geography anywhere but opportunities to learn Latin would probably be limited to High School and University. I took his advice and never regretted it.		No			2020-05-02 15:29:21	ANON-YFPW-RWXX-Y	2020-05-02 15:29:21	2020-05-02 15:29:45
Yes		Strongly disagree	Latin is the foundation of so many languages, I strongly disagree with the removal of this from the curriculum, it will be a backwards step in language learning in NZ. Likewise, I disagree with the merging of the various science subjects into a single science subject. This feels like a dumbing down of the curriculum and will just become sound bite learning. These are separate and very different disciplines and I see no reason to combine them into one enabling students to choose which they wish to study. NZ needs to lead the world in science not go backwards!	This is a dumbing down of the curriculum which I get is trying to adapt to the society our kids will live in but science and technology are going to be key for the future of our world so let's not make the wrong choices here.	No			2020-05-03 11:08:18	ANON-YFPW-RWXX-N	2020-05-03 11:08:18	2020-05-03 11:08:41
Yes		Strongly disagree	Latin must remain. The pathways created ad linked to History and Classical Studies make Latin a critical subject for those wishing to peruse it.	The removal of Latin as a subject is not acceptable. The pathways created linked directly into History and Classical Studies, making Latin a critical subject for those wishing to peruse it. Latin must remain. Latin is a key subject for those wishing to do History or science too. Given so many scientific names have roots in Latin. Its deeply seeded in NZ and English history and its removal makes absolutely no sense what so ever.	Latin.	Yes	no	2020-05-03 12:34:22	ANON-YFPW-RWXX-J	2020-05-03 12:34:22	2020-05-03 12:34:38
No		Strongly disagree		I'm not sure why you would remove Latin. My daughter had been excited to take this subject and is not only learning a language but also a lot about history that is simply not covered in other subjects. This subject needs to stay	No			2020-05-03 16:01:35	ANON-YFPW-RWXX-S	2020-05-03 16:01:35	2020-05-03 16:01:41
Yes		Disagree	I would be very disappointed if you took away Latin as a subject	Please do not include Latin	No			2020-05-03 20:42:28	ANON-YFPW-RWXX-X	2020-05-03 20:42:28	2020-05-03 20:42:48
Yes		Strongly disagree	with the "intended change to support a broad, more foundational education at NCEA Level 1" removing Latin as a subject doesn't make sense. Latin is so obviously a foundation language for other languages such as English, French, German and obviously Italian. Therefore if there is to be a "change to support a broad, more foundational education at NCEA Level 1" it should be included.	copied from my answer to question 2 with the "intended change to support a broad, more foundational education at NCEA Level 1" removing Latin as a subject doesn't make sense. Latin is so obviously a foundation language for other languages such as English, French, German and obviously Italian. Therefore if there is to be a "change to support a broad, more foundational education at NCEA Level 1" it should be included.	no	No		2020-05-04 08:53:33	ANON-YFPW-RWXX-U	2020-05-04 08:53:33	2020-05-04 08:53:42
Yes		Strongly disagree	The removal of Latin from the curriculum cannot happen.	Latin must be included in the curriculum.	No			2020-05-04 11:19:09	ANON-YFPW-RWXX-T	2020-05-04 11:19:09	2020-05-04 11:19:19
Yes		Strongly disagree			No			2020-05-04 11:22:21	ANON-YFPW-RWXX-T	2020-05-04 11:22:21	2020-05-04 11:22:27
Yes		Disagree		Latin as a subject should not be taken off the list. It offers the opportunity not just to expand our minds through wonderful works of literature but also to enhance our knowledge of other languages and refine our skills in critical thinking, close reading, analytical reasoning and mental processing. It would be a travesty to deny this opportunity to New Zealand students in the future.	No			2020-05-04 12:28:12	ANON-YFPW-RWXX-S	2020-05-04 12:28:12	2020-05-04 12:28:43

Yes		Strongly disagree	Latin needs to be included in the school curriculum as an option for languages. It is the language on which many international languages are based and students going on to study linguistics will often need a firm base on the language.		No			2020-05-04 13:55:22	ANON-YFPW-RWXU-V	2020-05-04 13:55:22	2020-05-04 13:55:45
Yes		Disagree	At Level One, the breadth and depth of science covered in Science is limited. To extend some students with specialist subjects at level one is important for their learning and to develop breadth and depth if they go on to specialist subjects at Level 2 and 3.	At Level One, the breadth and depth of science covered in Science is limited. To extend some students with specialist subjects at level one is important for their learning and to develop breadth and depth if they go on to specialist subjects at Level 2 and 3. For other students, to allow them to access science and hopefully to be able to go on and make sense of (and be critical of) scientific data/information that is presented to them in the future, internal assessments focused on one aspect of a science is best for their learning (rather than broad coverage).	No.	No		2020-05-04 14:54:07	ANON-YFPW-RWBV-A	2020-05-04 14:54:07	2020-05-04 14:54:21
Yes		Strongly agree	The proposed subjects provide a broad coverage of the NZ Curriculum. It is pleasing to see subjects with strongly related learning brought together e.g. Processing and Home Economics brought together under the Food Science umbrella as well as Commerce subjects being brought together. However, many schools will not assess level 1 of NCEA and may retain more specialist subjects at year 11.	I am very satisfied with the list of subjects included. I think they provide good coverage of curriculum opportunities and also provide a foundation for pathways that suit a wide range of students.	Yes, I would like to see a Media Design/Art Design type subject developed. Some consideration could be given to whether this subject should combine the current Digital Media curriculum and the current Art Design curriculum or whether these subjects should stand alone. I also think that Materials technology should split into Hard materials and Textiles/Fashion Design. This is because the pathways that these two subjects lead to are quite different from each other and the learning and assessment should reflect that. I would also like to see Classical Studies and Art History become distinct subjects at level 2 and 3.	No		2020-05-04 15:55:53	ANON-YFPW-RWBV-7	2020-05-04 15:55:53	2020-05-04 15:56:12
Yes	See response to question 3.	Strongly disagree	See comments for question 3.	I strongly oppose the removal of Latin at NCEA Level 1. My rationale is outlined in brackets after each bullet point. I am an English and Latin teacher recently arrived from the UK. In only 8 weeks of teaching Latin here, I have seen my Year 7 and Year 9 students: ***begin to learn the vocabulary and grammar of a new language*** ("important and rich learning"; "coherent and robust pathways" to language learning; "supports credibility as an internationally recognised qualification."; "broader, foundational learning" - what can be a broader foundation to learning a modern foreign language than learning Latin?) ***draw connections to the English language, thus broadening their vocabulary*** (lends "credibility as an internationally recognised qualification") ***explore the history, geography, and morality of slavery and colonisation*** ("important and rich learning"; "supports the Crown's obligations under Te Tiriti o Waitangi"; "supports credibility as an internationally recognised qualification.") ***learn about the geology of a volcanic eruption and its devastating impact on local people***	Latin!	No		2020-05-04 22:52:34	ANON-YFPW-RWBC-M	2020-05-04 22:52:34	2020-05-04 22:52:54
Yes		Undecided		I notice that Outdoor Education is not on the current or target list. Outdoor Education provides a pathway to physical as well as mental health. Promotes connections with nature, others, and self. It promotes values based education, and for many students is a gateway into being engaged (and kept) in school.	Outdoor Education	Yes		2020-05-05 09:44:01	ANON-YFPW-RWBS-4	2020-05-05 09:44:01	2020-05-05 09:44:24

Yes	I was aware of the review, not what form it would take	Undecided	It's hard to judge what the impact of the proposed change is without seeing what the standards would look like under the new Level 1 (or other levels). It is poor to ask for consultation when we have such limited information - so far all we really know is there is a name change and merging of subjects. Is this to be our only consultation?	The commerce subjects are very different. It is hard to see how they will be combined into functional standards. It is also unrealistic to ask students to go into level 2 (or level 3) Economics or Accounting without a very detailed prior learning. If these subjects are to be combined there is a risk to Level 2 and 3 student numbers and achievement in those subjects/levels. There is no mention of Agribusiness as a subject or where they would fit in the proposed changes.		No			2020-05-05 10:09:43	ANON-YFPW-RWB8-9	2020-05-05 10:09:43	2020-05-05 10:09:52
Yes		Strongly disagree	Health and Physical Education as one subject is not ideal.	Physical Education and Health need to be separate, stand alone subjects. We still have an obesity epidemic and need to foster good foundations for movement and physical fitness in Physical Education. Health also needs to be pushed more as a stand alone subject. It needs an overhaul of what it is now and should focus on how young people can look after themselves, their whanau and wider communities.	Outdoor Education	No			2020-05-05 10:29:24	ANON-YFPW-RWB9-A	2020-05-05 10:29:24	2020-05-05 10:29:52
No		Disagree				No			2020-05-05 10:34:47	ANON-YFPW-RWBG-R	2020-05-05 10:34:47	2020-05-05 10:34:59
No		Disagree	No Outdoor Education	I think Outdoor Education should be included as a branch of Physical Education	Outdoor Education	Yes			2020-05-05 10:58:43	ANON-YFPW-RWB1-U	2020-05-05 10:58:43	2020-05-05 10:58:57
No		Undecided		I am disappointed to see the proposal to drop Latin. The study of Latin is very useful in terms of understanding much of the proto-European languages. It allows a student to understand the grammar and syntax of all European languages. This is important given the importance of European culture in our lives. Furthermore, Latin teaches students logical thinking. In coming years, as the nature of work changes, so-called non-cognitive skills rather than STEM skills will become far more important. I am a Professor in Economics with experience teaching in multiple countries. I believe high school students are much served by being exposed to the classics at this level than to subjects like economics, accounting or business studies. The study of Latin is not only the study of a language but a way of acquiring fundamental skills in logical thinking and arguing.		No			2020-05-05 14:41:37	ANON-YFPW-RWBQ-2	2020-05-05 14:41:37	2020-05-05 14:41:46
No		Strongly disagree	Have you asked pupils and/teachers and/or parents for an indication of how many would take up the new subjects under development and how many would be enrolling in the subjects you are planning to ban from NCEA???? PLEASE find this out before you throw out Latin and Classical Studies and replace them with subjects that pupils want to learn. Surely if we have teachers skilled in teaching Latin and Classical Studies, and pupils wanting to study them, they can be taught? I don't understand why they have to be dropped. Why can't you just add new subjects IF there is demand, without throwing out these existing programmes?	I am dismayed that Latin and Classical Studies is to be deleted from the curriculum. Latin is a foundation subject for the English language. My daughter says she has learnt more about rules and structure of the English language through studying Latin, than she has in English. Latin provides context and meaning to so many words in the English language, as well as specialist terms used in Law and Medicine. The study of Classics should never be lost - myths, wars, civilisations, kingdoms, ... this gives richness and history and background to current geography, international relations, religious studies, political studies and models. This is an important and fascinating area within the history of the world. If we stop teaching our pupils these subjects, they will be lost for ever. That is unacceptable and unnecessary.		Yes			2020-05-06 12:23:34	ANON-YFPW-RWBE-P	2020-05-06 12:23:34	2020-05-06 12:24:05

Yes		Disagree		<p>I would strongly advocate the inclusion of Latin as a language, on the basis it provides a foundational basis which underpins both English, and all widely spoken Romance languages (French, Spanish, Italian etc). Furthermore the grammatical constructs supports the application of logic and analytics, which are critical for future work skills such as critical thinking and analytics. Finally, the wider teaching of Latin accesses core history and philosophy which continues to inform some of the greatest ethics and military minds.</p> <p>Relative to narrow languages which has a limited application, Latin is a foundation language for a multitude of applications, and should be continued in the curriculum. Thanks.</p>	<p>I would strongly advocate the inclusion of Latin as a language, on the basis it provides a foundational basis which underpins both English, and all widely spoken Romance languages (French, Spanish, Italian etc). Furthermore the grammatical constructs supports the application of logic and analytics, which are critical for future work skills such as critical thinking and analytics. Finally, the wider teaching of Latin accesses core history and philosophy which continues to inform some of the greatest ethics and military minds.</p> <p>Relative to narrow languages which has a limited application, Latin is a foundation language for a multitude of applications, and should be continued in the curriculum. Thanks.</p>	No			2020-05-06 20:20:36	ANON-YFPW-RWB5-6	2020-05-06 20:20:36	2020-05-06 20:20:57
Yes		Strongly disagree		<p>Classics should remain in the curriculum and not absorbed into History. The linguistic study of classics has been tracked in the UK to improve literacy rates of students and to help students of low SES backgrounds to understand grammar of a higher level. Moreover, Classics is an excellent option for students who may have insecurities about public speaking or have hearing impairments. It allows them to access language without the barriers of speaking or listening assessments. Classics teaches many important historical lessons about society and politics which are applicable to a citizen's life. While it may not have a direct, economic pathway to employment, it does develop skills in pattern recognition, problem-solving and deductive reasoning that are highly prized in workplaces. The grammatical structures of classics are also excellent training grounds for those who are interested in coding.</p>		No			2020-05-06 22:11:10	ANON-YFPW-RWB1-1	2020-05-06 22:11:10	2020-05-06 22:11:21
Yes		Strongly disagree	<p>Why on earth would the Ministry even consider not including Latin? There is no other academic subject which has so many important connections to critical thinking, literature's heritage and linguistic code-breaking and which is so accessible to students of different ages?</p> <p>(Mark Chambers, Latin teacher, New South Wales)</p>			No			2020-05-06 22:54:40	ANON-YFPW-RWB7-8	2020-05-06 22:54:40	2020-05-06 22:55:05
No		Strongly disagree		<p>The exclusion of Latin is short-sighted. Learning Latin is valuable for students for many reasons. Aside from the benefits common to the learning of any language, here are some specific to Latin:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It supports general literacy. The grammatical and/or linguistic knowledge gained in the study of a difficult language, like Latin, is transferable to English. Students who learn Latin are likely to greatly improve their literacy in English. This is more effective with Latin, a comparatively complex language for a native English speaker, than modern languages: modern European languages are much simpler in their morphology and syntax. Asian and Pacific languages differ so greatly from English, that the skills are less transferable. 2. It improves vocabulary. Much English technical vocabulary is derived from basic Latin words. Even a small amount of studying Latin can unlock very difficult English vocabulary for students. 3. It introduces students to texts and philosophies that have greatly shaped the world, through Rome's initial spread, but also through the Renaissance and Enlightenment, drawing on classical authors and ideals. It is difficult, for example, to properly appreciate Shakespeare, without understanding the classical Greek and 		No			2020-05-07 15:24:33	ANON-YFPW-RWB6-Q	2020-05-07 15:24:33	2020-05-07 15:24:50

Yes		Agree		<p>I question the need for level 2 and 3 at all and the use of standards which break a full curriculum into a plethora of standards. Students only want to complete three or four standards and end up knowing half of the information that they should because the courses are designed in this way.</p> <p>Another difficulty particularly in Technology is if you have a student taking two or more subjects in Technology there is a high chance those students will have a curriculum specifically designed for them and increase workload for teachers because there is only one standard they can sit in all areas. Why do designs or manufacture in any other area if they are already getting the credits for that standard in another subject. It then becomes a nightmare to design a course for that student for both areas and even worse again if they do three technology subjects or more.</p>	Develop NCEA LEVEL 2 AND 3 so students gain more holistic education and why are students being awarded credits for getting a driving license.... what are the students actually learning and why water down the academic stature of the profession.	No	Not enough resources for a new resident	Review technology so students can make a range of projects, learn a range of skills and processes and develop an actual curriculum for specific subject areas in Technology in terms of knowledge they should know and or a booklet to follow. Looking at the tools and characteristics for use with materials, why is this just done for bcito and not ue approved standards. We are dumbing down the Technology areas.	2020-05-07 19:28:12	ANON-YFPW-RWB1-2	2020-05-07 19:28:12	2020-05-07 19:29:03
Yes		Disagree	<p>Your exclusion of Latin as an NCEA subject is a great shame. Latin is the foundation language of the Western world and the root of all European languages. Having learnt Latin, you have the power to understand English and the meaning underlying our language as well as access to all the Romantic languages.</p> <p>I advocate very strongly that Latin be kept as a subject for NCEA. There are some schools who have a very strong following and I believe this interest ought to be rigorously maintained rather than being axed.</p> <p>We need to maintain our educational base in New Zealand so we have a cultured population with wisdom acquired from the literature and culture given by Latin.</p>	<p>I have given feedback as above as to the general nature of benefits offered by keeping the ancient language of Latin. I believe it is very important to maintain at a high level the interest base of the intelligentsia of this country so that we are not dumbing education down into mere trade or vocational opportunity but for education for and of itself.</p>	Yes, I would suggest that Latin is retained at the higher levels of NCEA.	No		No.	2020-05-08 10:31:50	ANON-YFPW-RWBH-S	2020-05-08 10:31:50	2020-05-08 10:32:55
No		Disagree		<p>The subject Latin should not be removed - while it is not commonly spoken throughout the world, it provides the basis for many Romantic languages such as French and Italian. Learning Latin can help people learn multiple languages! Latin is also required for some Classical Studies degrees in university. Being able to study Latin at school is easier than learning a language by yourself, or paying money for a tutor, which may become a barrier for students who wish to further study Classics but cannot afford tutoring. I also disagree with Classics being absorbed into History. As someone who studied History at NCEA Level 1, and currently studying Classics at Level 2, the subjects are very different. Classics focusses on different aspects of Ancient History to History (the subject). If the two subjects were to be combined, many course material may be removed as two subjects share one class. I also felt that History and Classics focus on very different time periods (at least in my school) and I know many students who preferred Classics over History, and would not want to take Classics if it was combined with History, as they did not find it interesting. That as well discourages students from pursuing a Classics degree at university if they wish, either because they have not had the exposure or the high school knowledge of the subject.</p>		No			2020-05-09 14:59:06	ANON-YFPW-RWBB-K	2020-05-09 14:59:06	2020-05-09 14:59:32

Yes	<p>While I write specifically with regard to the curriculum area of Technology, this applies to other areas as well, as it addresses a deep concern in education.</p> <p>The term foundational education requires an awareness that foundational or core disciplinary knowledge is abstract and general, it does not exist in a context. For example a stakeholder consultation has the same underpinning investigatory requirements in different contexts - to get to the root of the issue. To place technological practice inside a context of materials,digital or dvc etc reduces the understandings that students gain - they come away with not a broader but a narrower perspective of foundational knowledge, thinking (for example) this is how material technology is done, rather than this is how technological practice is done. The curriculum does not distinguish areas, and the specialization of technological practice into an assessment in context works against the goals of the curriculum, not for them.</p> <p>This thought of silo-ing technological practice into contexts therefore works against the opportunity to create a broader technological experience. Teachers will become forced to apply Technological</p>	Strongly disagree	For the reasons above. These are counter to a broad education, providing instead a narrower more contextualized one.	<p>Home economics and food technology are not the same, and I feel should not become intertwined. I acknowledge there is a tension in many schools as teachers work concurrently across the areas of food technology and also provide programs for students who will enter the hospitality industry. To resolve this by effectively dissolving food technology is not necessarily the best solution. Nor does it meet the goals of the curriculum to provide a 21st century education, one of technological literacy .</p> <p>To conflate the two areas would see one become dominant and the other diminish. At the core of this is the role of the school, it is their decision on how to implement a local curriculum, it is not the purview of NZQA to effectively remove their choice.</p> <p>Also as an educator of technology teachers, I see people with both backgrounds enter our program, highly experienced and expert food technologists, and highly experienced experts from the catering and hospitality industries. I then work on developing their understandings that both areas provide opportunities for students, however with the more powerful learning in food technology. I also discuss with them the tension that exist in</p>	No				2020-05-11 06:46:55	ANON-YFPW-RWBW-X	2020-05-11 06:46:55	2020-05-11 06:47:07
No		Disagree	Latin has been excluded. My daughter studies Latin and is greatly enjoying this subject. Latin benefits students in how they learn across other languages, including English, as it provides a deeper understanding of the development of many languages.		No				2020-05-11 11:16:17	ANON-YFPW-RWBD-N	2020-05-11 11:16:17	2020-05-11 11:16:31
Yes		Strongly disagree	I am disturbed about the decision to remove Latin. It offers the opportunity not just to expand our minds through wonderful works of literature but also to enhance our knowledge of other languages and refine our skills in critical thinking, close reading, analytical reasoning and mental processing. It would be a travesty to deny this opportunity to New Zealand students in the future.	See above	Yes				2020-05-11 13:11:44	ANON-YFPW-RWBX-9	2020-05-11 13:11:44	2020-05-11 13:12:02
Yes	We value the new more cross-curricular focus for Level 1. We envisage this will enhance English language learning, as well as literacy, which are both critical in and across all learning areas.	Strongly agree	We would like achievement standards for English Language instead of the current unit standards. 93% of TESOLANZ secondary members support the call for achievement standards for English Language. English Language unit standards provide a pathway used by a significant number of diverse learners in New Zealand schools. Achievement standards for English Language would provide equity of assessment status for these diverse learners. Diverse learners and their teachers need the same level of timely provision of assessment resources. To illustrate this point there are currently no published exemplars of student work on the NZQA website for the current English Language unit standards. For achievement standards exemplars are published before teachers begin to use these standards.	With the aim to provide a broad, more foundational education at NCEA Level 1, TESOLANZ suggests that an achievement standards pathway for English language learners is provided.	Please refer to previous responses with regard to EL standards.	No	However, we are aware of parallels between Te Reo Māori as an additional language and English language and request that equity of assessment is provided.		2020-05-11 20:32:59	ANON-YFPW-RWBW-Y	2020-05-11 20:32:59	2020-05-11 20:33:12
Yes		Disagree		Continue with Latin. Many students love this subject, and as it is a dying language I don't believe it should be removed. A lot of languages have been lost already and I would hope that New Zealand doesn't allow Latin to be lost as well.		No			2020-05-12 11:59:22	ANON-YFPW-RWBK-V	2020-05-12 11:59:22	2020-05-12 11:59:28

No	Was not aware of the changes before being told by colleagues and hearing about it from news outlets.	Disagree	The changes being suggested are narrow sighted and short-term oriented at best. Although getting a job after school is of course desirable and our school curriculum should be preparing us for employment, this doesn't need to be specifically prioritised come at the cost of so many interesting specialised subjects. What has happened to genuine enjoyment of learning? Having four different technology subjects and then only one science is just ridiculous.	As a student of Latin, I feel very strongly that it should be kept in the curriculum. The changes, if they go ahead, will not affect me at all, but I have learnt so much from my journey through Latin and have no doubt that I will carry the experience through my life. Sure, it may not have the most direct applications in the majority of jobs, but what is more important is the skills it teaches us. No other subject has provided me such a rigorous education in problem solving, detailed analysis, creativity and deeper thinking. At the moment Latin is admittedly not a very widespread or popular subject and is mostly offered in select schools, but taking it away completely would remove the possibility of any school ever, or indeed any individual, taking it up if they so choose. New Zealand will become a laughing stock amongst the international Latin community. Never before has a developed country not given its students the opportunity to study one of the founding languages of civilisation - a language that is the basis of many others today. Please reconsider your proposals and keep Latin in the NCEA curriculum. The minuscule extra cost it would take to keep it going would be balanced out by an education system with integrity, that creates and educates students able to think for	No			2020-05-13 00:26:23	ANON-YFPW-RWB6-7	2020-05-13 00:26:23	2020-05-13 00:26:32	
Yes		Agree	What will Religious studies include and who, or what group will have the mandate to guide this subjects inclusion.	When reading the recent EOTC 2020 report students show support for education outside the classroom, yet this is backed up by MoE including OR in the proposed subject list. It has not been included in PE/Health. This exclusion seem to go against the evidence.	Outdoor Education EEFs	No		I think that needs to yes to question '5'?	2020-05-13 12:39:12	ANON-YFPW-RWB8-3	2020-05-13 12:39:12	2020-05-13 12:39:38
Yes		Agree	Who and or what group will provide the curriculum content for religious studies?	Reading the 2020 EOTC report it is evident that students value EOTC. Why is it not included in NCEA L1? It's exclusion seems to go again the evidence gathered in that report. Also goes against the focus of L1, which is to provide a broad range of options to students at this level.	Outdoor Education EEFs- Environmental Educational for Sustainability	No		((I think that you are asking about 'yes or no' in question 5 rather than as asked to Question 4)	2020-05-13 12:48:11	ANON-YFPW-RWBW-8	2020-05-13 12:47:35	2020-05-13 12:48:35
Yes	Latin as a NCEA Level 1 subject is ideal for providing a broad, foundational education. Latin: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Bifts academic outcomes in other subjects •Stretches verbal, analytic and problem-solving skills •Is a highly organized and logical language, sharpens the mind, cultivates mental alertness, creates keener attention to detail, develops critical thinking, and enhances problem solving abilities •Assists in: Maths, English, foreign languages, science, arts, theatre, archaeology, history, geology, botany, medicine, law, computer science etc 	Strongly disagree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Do not support in any way the removal of Latin as a subject •See responses to other questions for clarification 	<p>Latin must be included as a subject in the New Zealand curriculum. Latin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Assists understanding of mathematical concepts, improves problem-solving abilities, and logical thinking •Along with Maths, both have a logical structure and require attention to systems, detail and thinking in an orderly manner •Strengthens English literacy skills – vocabulary, grammar and syntax •Provides invaluable insights into English vocabulary and the structure and meaning of English words. Most English words are derived from Latin. •Facilitates learning another language, provides the foundation for learning other modern foreign languages •Provides exposure to ancient history and the background of modern civilisation and culture – historical and literary texts enable better understanding of literature, theatre, art, and music •Prepares students for scientific, legal or medical careers: Latin supplies many of the root words for the specialised vocabularies of the modern sciences, including medical terminology, zoology and botany. It is also the language of law (most legal terms come from Latin), politics, logic, and theology. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Latin must continue to be offered •See responses to other questions for clarification 	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •It is essential for Maori students to be supported and validated, for their identity to be acknowledged and their potential to be realised. •Education in New Zealand must have the lockdown under Covid -19 has not caused, but has highlighted, the inequalities that have existed for a long time in the New Zealand education system. 	<p>Latin supports the Crown's obligations under Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Latin can play a full role in Te Marautanga o Aotearoa. Latin has strong historic links to Māoritanga and te reo:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Latin has a strong place in the promotion of te reo in the historical context of New Zealand: at the Pompallier Mission in Russell, "the French Marist Brothers translated Latin religious texts into te reo under Covid -19 Māori and produced beautiful bound books. In only three years the missionaries printed an impressive thirty thousand publications in te reo." https://tohuwhenua.nz/northland/pompallier-mission-and-primery •Latin is taught through the context of history, geology and archaeology. Parallels 	2020-05-13 16:50:16	ANON-YFPW-RWB4-5	2020-05-13 16:49:39	2020-05-13 16:50:31

Yes	I only say yes as at the start of the RAS process I worked at NZQA and my manager was rather excited about the subjects that would be axed. If I found that unprofessional and rather sad - I was made sadder still that the subject rep who sat on the RAS didn't appear to know what was happening and since moving back to a school there has been NO consultation with the people it will impact - namely students and teachers. If this has been done it has in my humble opinion excluded many voices. The messages have not been articulated or shared well.	Undecided	I remain undecided as this is big picture - and the articulation of this is not set. As a Media Studies teacher I ponder how the frame of Social Studies at L1 will allow for the practical, industry and nuanced mix of technical production and design and plan intrinsic to MAKING media products - which both helps learners engage in social and narrative engineering at the same time as applying the critical thinking of the broader will be translated and honoured by the standards.	I am concerned as to how subjects were selected. They appear arbitrary - at best my guess is they appear to be based on numbers. Why not remove all of Level 1 and really revision the NCEA platform? Why stop at a few subjects? The "bits" and pieces and strunge pulling in and then omitting subjects that don't appear to conveniently "fit" to the "big picture" is just sad and underwhelming in the face of what could be. Media, Art history, Classics and Latin should be no more excluded as it sends message of aspects and "outcomes" - which they are not. These should be areas schools get to choose the articulation of the curriculum to set and assess. Media - it could be argued - sits across and plays into many curriculum areas - Art, Technology, Digital Tech, Social Science, English - the issue being that its adaptability and agile nature and failing of many "educationalists" to accept the challenge of this ambiguity is limiting - Taika Waititi talks of empowerment vis storytelling - we have a massive push for STEM and there are no "collision" subjects that are about digital tools and narrative and critical thinking - Media deserves to stay in at Level 1 - feeding up to Level 2 and 3 - and needs to EVOLVE and be allowed to move to the bigger picture of its role engineering culture.	NA	Yes	This is a fabulous document that is not engendered, distributed or developed as best it could be in mainstream NZ school settings. For shame. For all the time and resources thrown into the RAS this does not appear to have been genuinely done in alignment or real consultation. Indeed my professional and humble opinion is that most voices in	NA	2020-05-13 23:08:52	ANON-YFPW-RWB7-5	2020-05-13 23:08:52	2020-05-13 23:09:55
No		Agree		I'd like to see Latin included. It is an old language that many are based on.		No			2020-05-14 08:31:03	ANON-YFPW-RWB3-4	2020-05-14 08:31:03	2020-05-14 08:31:13
Yes		Strongly agree		Food Science is a red herring, the MoE must decide which curriculum area Level 1 will be aligned with - Technology or the Health and PE curriculum. Decisions need to be made as to which of those 2 curriculum areas best supports the specialism at L2 and L3 The provisional subjects list should not be looked at in isolation - L2 and L3 should also be shown to mitigate confusion in the community as to what the proposals mean for L1. There is a lack of community understanding in relation to the proposals for more specialisms potentially being available across subject areas at L2 and L3.	This should be unpacked, in terms of relevancy for identified future needs. Thinking should not be limited to "traditional subjects", we do not live in the 1950s nor do our learners. Future proof subject potential.	Yes	Make it relevant to learners		2020-05-14 12:38:28	ANON-YFPW-RWB2-3	2020-05-14 12:38:28	2020-05-14 12:38:40
Yes		Strongly agree				Yes			2020-05-14 17:20:10	ANON-YFPW-RWB6-6	2020-05-14 17:20:10	2020-05-14 17:20:28
Yes		Strongly disagree	Latin should remain a language option.	Latin is integral to an understanding of English language and culture. It is also relevant to other areas like coding in technology.	No	Yes			2020-05-14 19:07:24	ANON-YFPW-RC6Y-A	2020-05-14 19:07:24	2020-05-14 19:08:04
No		Undecided		Please don't get rid of Latin! It's an option that should be available to students, and not only increases understanding of the English language, but has other benefits such as promoting focus, greater understanding of literature/literary references, history and geography. It may not be the most popular language, but it's very important!		No			2020-05-14 19:58:01	ANON-YFPW-RC6V-7	2020-05-14 19:58:01	2020-05-14 19:58:10
Yes		Disagree		I would like to see Latin included as part of the language curriculum		Yes			2020-05-15 00:01:40	ANON-YFPW-RC6C-M	2020-05-15 00:01:40	2020-05-15 00:02:02
Yes		Disagree			I would like to see Latin continue as part of the curriculum	Yes			2020-05-15 00:04:17	ANON-YFPW-RC6S-4	2020-05-15 00:04:17	2020-05-15 00:04:37
Yes		Disagree		Please do not remove Latin. It is an important foundation for the proper study of English and the Romance languages. Of all the subjects I did to an advanced level at school, I think it has been of more use to me than most. It has given me a much deeper understanding of the construction of all language, and the roots of English. It informs the study of European history. It is a valuable mental discipline.		No			2020-05-15 10:09:56	ANON-YFPW-RC68-9	2020-05-15 10:09:56	2020-05-15 10:10:03

Yes	In principle, I support the intended change. I would, however, ask that the Ministry to consider that by year 11 many children will or should have received a broad foundational education after ten years at school, and those who so opt may wish to specialize in some areas to a degree not possible under the proposed changes.	Disagree	<p>The removal of Latin is retrograde, and somewhat inexplicable when one considers the applaudably wide range of languages, including Pacific and Asian ones most relevant to New Zealanders, that is on offer. How hard would it be to retain Latin, when it is already well established in some schools? This would not involve any undermining of the principles of change proposed.</p> <p>The removal of Classical Studies and Art History also appear somewhat puzzling, in view of the number and range of subjects being proposed under the revised schedule. What prioritizes Dance, Drama and Visual Arts over Art History for example?</p> <p>The reduction in the number of science offerings is retrograde. Students should have the option of more specialized work across a range of scientific subjects.</p> <p>In the final analysis the proposed changes appear superficial, and somewhat biased. They do not appear to address the fundamental problems of NCEA at Level 1, not to mention Levels 2 and 3, that have concerned many educators since its inception.</p>	<p>Published studies, and my own observations as a University teacher, indicate that literacy and facility with one's first language are improved through study of a second language, which raises awareness of grammar and linguistic variety. Latin, of course, is particularly interesting as a 'language' albeit barely a living one, that has profoundly shaped and influenced modern English usage. I would not wish to foreground Latin necessarily, but I would be disappointed to see it denied a place beside the splendid array of Pacific and Asian languages to be offered under the current proposal. Retaining Latin is not elitist, old-fashioned, or somehow irrelevant to Aotearoa in the 21st century.</p> <p>I come back to the structural problem. Removing Latin from NCEA Level 1 will undermine its viability as a subject in the years prior to and after Year 11. Its removal appears to have little or no relevance to the broader principles underpinning the proposals for change. Why remove an excellent subject that has such a proven track record of stimulating academic excellence?</p> <p>As for the sciences, despite my eventual career path in Humanities, I was (at school and university) and am passionate about science. I</p>	Yes. Philosophy, Linguistics.	Yes		No.	2020-05-15 12:12:15	ANON-YFPW-RC69-A	2020-05-15 11:16:15	2020-05-15 12:12:30
Yes	I am so disappointed in the lack of flexibility that the new NCEA package creates. In a time when flexibility is so important in terms of what we have had to adapt to in the lockdown period, the current NCEA curriculum has been amazing for teachers to be able to create diversified and differentiated learning programs to cater for all of our learners especially our priority learners.	Strongly disagree	<p>There are 10 potential language options. this is something that can easily be learnt online now, and has been proven to be something that students are not choosing anymore. There is little consideration of our priority learners apart from including a Maori performing arts option. By decreasing subjects such as Science and Business Studies down to one core subject means that students lose the flexibility to select areas of specific interest. Research shows if students are interested in a subject they are more likely to engage in and have success in that subject. this is particularly true for our Maori and Pasifica students. By limiting these two areas where we are trying to build the success of our priority learners so that they engage in and continue on their learning pathway to future career pathways means they will be more likely to fail and drop out at level 1. I am deeply disappointed in these limiting pathways</p>	<p>Business and Science subjects should be allowed to have the specialist subjects earlier to engage students in and create multiple pathways forward. By specialising in these areas sooner means there is more flexibility to create courses of work that are meaningful for students and can be differentiated to cater for specific students..for example I am looking to create a Maori and Pasifica Business course with my priority learners next year..in that course I can include some Accounting standards to create financial literacy and also keep that pathway open, Business Studies standards where we can look at coming up with and creating a meaningful Maori/ Pasifica business and also integrate some Economics..In the new proposed curriculum I will be unable to be creative and differentiated as there are limited standards that I am able to offer.</p>	The Ministry needs to seriously consider being more flexible with what subjects can offer at Level 1, 2 and 3..this is the best part about the NCEA qualification and if these changes go ahead this will hugely marginalise our priority learners even further and our priority learners will be hugely disadvantaged yet again	Yes			2020-05-15 14:19:31	ANON-YFPW-RC6G-R	2020-05-15 14:19:31	2020-05-15 14:19:48
Yes		Agree	<p>I agree but with provisions. It is great to get the subjects tidied up and slotted into more relevant departments, BUT commerce was killed off many years ago and now it is being brought back in with little to no training for the Social Studies teachers for this specialist subject. Also, I am extremely concerned that Level 1 Accounting is all but disappearing. To those of you who do not teach accounting, it is like learning how to add and subtract for maths - it is the basis on which L2 and L3 and tertiary accounting is built on. If students don't get the basics then they are going to struggle with this, especially at tertiary level.</p>	<p>As mentioned above, I am extremely concerned that Level 1 Accounting is all but disappearing. To those of you who do not teach accounting, it is like learning how to add and subtract for maths - it is the basis on which L2 and L3 and tertiary accounting is built on. If students don't get the basics then they are going to struggle with this, especially at tertiary level.</p> <p>I am a Deputy Principal who has taught accounting and my job is not based on this decision - I am concerned for future Commerce students!</p>		No			2020-05-15 14:26:42	ANON-YFPW-RC6J-U	2020-05-15 14:26:42	2020-05-15 14:26:59

Yes		Undecided	I agree with many of the changes as they seem well aligned and natural but some are reducing learning areas substantially where the perceived links are going to have reduced outcomes at higher levels of study.	<p>Economics, Accounting and Business Studies are three very different disciplines and there would be no way to accommodate the learning required to be able to pick these up again individually at Level 2/3 if all pushed into a 'commerce' subject.</p> <p>These subjects are all well taken up by students and have high numbers in external examinations - they are popular as individual subjects and strong academic performers, please don't dilute the knowledge and skills that these learning areas provide.</p> <p>It is now more important than ever that we develop strong skills in all 3 of these disciplines as we look to rebuild the economy following what will be a huge global economic shock following COVID-19. It will take strong skills and understanding across all areas of the economy to bounce back and these current students are the future workforce. We will need students in all 3 areas to bring into teams/businesses across New Zealand as we look to the future of NZ.</p> <p>The subjects are very diverse and although many students enjoy studying them together, often students have an interest in one particular area. The students have had a grounding in all three</p>	No	No			2020-05-15 15:08:47	ANON-YFPW-RC6Q-2	2020-05-15 15:08:47	2020-05-15 15:09:01
Yes		Disagree		<p>I have a problem with taking classical studies and art history into 'history' because:</p> <p>a) classical studies provides an excellent, discrete basis for understanding significant aspects of all the social sciences and a knowledge of it helps develop critical thinking;</p> <p>b) classical studies are also highly relevant to the arts; and</p> <p>b) art history is also more broadly relevant, not only to the visual arts but also to aspects of technology, particularly Design and Visual Communication.</p> <p>I also have a problem with excluding Latin: it is very useful as a basis for understanding English and French and Spanish and enhancing their pedagogies; as a lawyer, writer, editor and publisher I constantly use what I learned in Latin classes, which also provided some excellent learning experiences and disciplines that I was able to transpose to other disciplines.</p>		Yes			2020-05-17 18:47:37	ANON-YFPW-RC6E-P	2020-05-17 18:45:57	2020-05-17 18:47:52
Yes		Strongly disagree	<p>I am responding to the proposal to take Accounting out of the Level 1 programme choices. It is correct that this cannot be taught in a piecemeal way at Level 1, but this is not a reason to get rid of it. We have a very long history of students going on to study Accounting at tertiary level, and moving into careers where their financial capabilities have enabled them to be very high achievers in the workplace. Accounting is a very specialised language which takes time to learn. I had 8 years previous experience teaching this programme over two years, rather than three. There is no doubt that students were able to achieve scholarships and a comprehensive understanding, along with a love and passion for the subject, after three years. This was not possible when covered in two years - it was just a rushed, hard slog. Accounting at Stage 1 at university is very difficult to pick up - take a look at tertiary institute results, if possible. Do they compare the success of newbies with those who've studied at secondary level? Financial capability is so important in our modern world.</p> <p>Economics being combined with Business studies is creating a bitsy course where nothing too challenging is covered - we'll just see the marking become even more ridiculously pedantic, to ensure a suitable grade spread, rather than keeping challenging content to</p>	<p>If accounting is gone, and economics and business studies are combined, as a nation, we need to have some kind of compulsory financial literacy course in our curriculum. The lack of financial literacy in both young and old adults, in NZ is astounding. A prevalent attitude to that it should be taught at home (like sex and drug education). Often the parents aren't that schooled up either and we are letting our students down on this front, in preparing them for adulthood.</p>		Yes			2020-05-17 19:01:56	ANON-YFPW-RC65-6	2020-05-17 19:01:56	2020-05-17 19:02:13

Yes		Undecided	Accounting and Economics are underrated in the NZ Curriculum. They have tried to dump these two subjects under the Social Sciences curriculum area, but both subjects require specialized skills which requires its own curriculum area to cover. Business Studies fits nicely under the Social Science curriculum in the junior school, but has a large component of group work which makes it slightly difficult to teach compared to subjects of History and Geography.	For the Commerce subject to succeed, it needs the respect and recognition it deserves. It is currently seen in some schools as the alternative to Economics and Accounting which are both strong UE and Academic subjects. It is very difficult for students to pick up Level 2 or 3 Accounting and Economics without the basics in level 1. If both subjects were to continue at level 2 and 3, it will need to allow students to go back to basics and still receive credits for it - that is difficult.		No			2020-05-18 21:24:08	ANON-YFPW-RC6P-1	2020-05-18 21:24:08	2020-05-18 21:24:23
Yes	But I do not like health and physical education being combined. They are very different subjects then different cohorts of students lot for. To offer them as a combined subjects will not meet 50% of my school populations need.	Strongly disagree	As per comment regarding combing health and PE. Yes they are in the same subject area...but they are two very different subjects drawing two very different groups of kids. Combing HPE together would not meet the learning needs of many of out students.	As per comment regarding combing health and PE. Yes they are in the same subject area...but they are two very different subjects drawing two very different groups of kids and the learning contexts and styles are extremely different. Combing HPE together would not meet the learning needs of many of out students. There are young women who sees career in health, but do not want to step into the gym. Equally there are young women that only want to do PE ... and others that want to do both. Combining the subjects would not meet student need at our school - a girls school.	Keep PE and health separate. Make sure the standards can also be used for outdoor education.	No			2020-05-22 22:53:15	ANON-YFPW-RC6F-Q	2020-05-22 22:53:15	2020-05-22 22:53:28
Yes		Strongly agree				No			2020-05-23 13:42:28	ANON-YFPW-RC6I-2	2020-05-23 13:42:28	2020-05-23 13:42:38
Yes	Another survey, I wonder if anyone will actually listen to the 96% of NZ Science teachers who are saying this is a bad move?	Strongly disagree	This is curriculum change by stealth.	It is one thing to look at nature of science but there is no real knowledge in the proposed standards. Soft skills are exactly that; skills that can be learned anywhere, anytime. Core knowledge is important. You cannot spout on about changing perspectives of anti-vaxers, flat earthers, global warming deniers if you don't actually have some actual content/science knowledge.	For some strange reason Electronics is over looked as a subject in NZ? How strange, billions of microcontrollers are being placed into devices all over the world, the Internet-of-things is looming as the next big technology jump and NZ doesn't see electronics as being important? Makes a mockery of the "knowledge economy".	No			2020-05-23 17:11:12	ANON-YFPW-RC6Z-B	2020-05-23 17:11:12	2020-05-23 17:11:22
Yes		Strongly disagree				No			2020-05-23 17:25:53	ANON-YFPW-RC6H-S	2020-05-23 17:25:53	2020-05-23 17:26:23
Yes	Yes, but was not sure of the details nor what the new subjects would look like.	Undecided	I still think there needs to be some specialised background as part of the Level 1 programme for each of the individual sciences to act as a necessary stepping stone to Level 2. Otherwise, the step to Level 2 will be even more significant and perhaps daunting.	Individual sciences as previous answer	NIL	No			2020-05-23 21:36:21	ANON-YFPW-RC6B-K	2020-05-23 21:36:21	2020-05-23 21:36:57
Yes		Agree	Schools still need flexibility to design courses suitable to the learning needs of their students.	The combination of Health and Physical Education needs to be discussed further. I am neither for or against this combination as I believe it has the potential for schools to engage more learners and design courses with different focuses (some more health, some more PE)	NA	Yes		NA	2020-05-24 12:08:02	ANON-YFPW-RC6M-X	2020-05-24 12:08:02	2020-05-24 12:08:16
Yes		Disagree		To disclose: I am an English teacher who is interested in and researches knowledge & pedagogy in all areas of the curriculum. Some changes are good. Latin could be removed at NCEA Level 1 but not Level 2 or 3; i.e. do not get rid of the subject altogether. The reason why Latin doesn't need to be part of L1 is because the relevant skills associated with learning Latin at school are mostly high-level such as translation. It is better for students to be introduced to language-learning through a more accessible, conversational language. Students could be encouraged to study Italian, German or Spanish as a prerequisite for learning Latin. Classics being removed is OK but again only at L1. Keep the subject around please. Commerce - that merger is a good idea. Economics and Accounting are almost indistinguishable anyway at NCEA Levels 1 and 2. Business Studies is generally treated as a merger of Economics, Accounting and cognate areas. The Science merger is NOT at present a good idea and I think we should be encouraging a more content-based approach to the sciences rather than broad brushstrokes as indicated by the new syllabus. I do not think the SEG has actually understood the nature of the problems teachers	Classical Studies, Art History, Latin are all disappearing from Level 1 and need to be retained at Levels 2 and 3. Psychology has recently had achievement standards developed for it. Now it is Sociology's turn to have achievement standards (I am a sociologist by training and would love to help with this process). 'Social Studies' is a poor alternative that is more suited to the lower secondary curriculum. English as a Second Language should have Achievement Standards, or at least a tagged programme that is not disparate Unit Standards, because there needs to be some way of accrediting pupils whose first language is not English, for English proficiency. The need for an ESOL programme has always been there, but is now of vital importance in Aotearoa given the numbers of students arriving in the country who have limited proficiency in English at the required curriculum level, which disadvantages them from attaining good results in other areas of NCEA (as it is primarily an English-medium programme). However, students who speak English as a first language should be restricted from taking these standards. There should be a debate and consultation started about this.	Yes		None	2020-05-24 16:44:15	ANON-YFPW-RC6D-N	2020-05-24 16:44:15	2020-05-24 16:44:28
No		Disagree		Media Studies and Psychology should not be condensed into social studies, especially Media Studies, which requires a lot of time to develop certain skills. Making Classics a part of History also condenses things down when Classics is in a way a vastly different subject and view on the world than the current History curriculum taught.	Psychology is a subject that really needs to be boosted as it teaches really valuable lessons and skills especially in an age where understanding mental health is extremely important. While Health somewhat teaches mental health, it honestly gets passed over by a lot of schools and the opportunity to learn about Psychology is not facilitated at all at quite a lot of schools.	No		No.	2020-05-25 19:14:02	ANON-YFPW-RC6X-9	2020-05-25 19:14:02	2020-05-25 19:14:13

Yes		Undecided		Please keep latin, I really enjoy it at school and i would hate for it to go.		Yes		Please keep latin!	2020-05-28 14:08:11	ANON-YFPW-RC6A-J	2020-05-28 14:08:11	2020-05-28 14:08:26
No	Very poorly communicated to the public	Disagree	Appears to be diluting the sciences physics chemistry and biology are quite different and should not be lumped together as "sciences"	I am concerned that Latin has been dropped although not a current language it forms the backbone of several European languages. Latin also teaches grammar and classical history.		No			2020-05-28 14:10:40	ANON-YFPW-RC6N-Y	2020-05-28 14:10:40	2020-05-28 14:10:47
No		Disagree	I believe the Latin is a very useful subject and I would be extremely disappointed if it was abolished	I believe that Latin should be included	No	No			2020-05-28 14:13:34	ANON-YFPW-RC6K-V	2020-05-28 14:13:34	2020-05-28 14:13:39
Yes	But only this year	Disagree	Reducing options early on seems shortsighted. We want aBROAD education, so why reduce the options. Keep Latin.	Keep Latin as a language option, and classics as a subject as well	Keep classics. I'd like to see more options available in the digital tech space as well.	No			2020-05-28 14:22:38	ANON-YFPW-RC66-7	2020-05-28 14:22:38	2020-05-28 14:23:03
Yes		Disagree	Removing Latin and Art History is extremely inappropriate. These subjects are foundations for a broader understanding of the world as a whole, and it would be a shame if NZ were to move towards more insular inwards focussing education alone.	Neither Latin nor Art History should be removed from NCEA. Both of these subjects while not as foundational as english, maths and science, have a broad application to general knowledge and learning - far more so than some of the newer items included. Secondary school is exactly the time in which children should be encouraged to focus on foundational, historical and creative educational elements, that may not be available to them in subsequent vocational education or training.		Yes			2020-05-28 14:23:37	ANON-YFPW-RC6R-3	2020-05-28 14:23:37	2020-05-28 14:23:50
Yes		Strongly disagree	Latin is a building block of all modern languages. It should not be removed from the curriculum.	Please leave Latin in the curriculum.		No			2020-05-28 14:54:55	ANON-YFPW-RC6W-8	2020-05-28 14:54:55	2020-05-28 14:55:01
Yes		Strongly disagree	Latin is a building block of all modern languages. It should not be removed from the curriculum.	Please leave Latin in the curriculum.		No			2020-05-28 14:55:46	ANON-YFPW-RC64-5	2020-05-28 14:55:46	2020-05-28 14:55:49
Yes		Strongly disagree	I believe that the opportunity to learn Latin is essential. My 2 sons at Wellington College take it in years 10 and 12. There were 2 year 9 classes alone of Latin students there last year. Double the usual number. That increase has continued. My husband took it through school to 7th form at Mt Albert Grammar. He became a lawyer. My brother took it through school to 7th form at Sacred Heart College in Auckland. He won the Girdler's scholarship to Cambridge and became a physicist. By having it available to all in NZ state schools, pupils are encouraged to shine and connect with the past. It was not available at my girls' school in Auckland. I would have loved to have taken it if I could have. NZ can embrace the past without rejecting the development of Te Reo. There is room for both.	See 2 above.	See 2 above.	Yes			2020-05-28 15:01:21	ANON-YFPW-RC6T-5	2020-05-28 15:01:21	2020-05-28 15:01:48
Yes		Strongly disagree		I am extremely disappointed as a current Year 10 Latin student that this subject is being removed. Although I am aware that I will be able to undertake the course until Level 3 even if it is removed, I feel that it would be a travesty to deny future students the opportunity to study this language, given the foundational knowledge of all the Romantic languages such as French, Spanish and Italian, not to mention English that it provides. Given that English as a subject in its current form barely scratches the surface of the reasons behind many of the rules imposed on students around the English language, I feel that it would be in the best interests of the Education Ministry and all students both present and future to keep the language. Although I recognise that upholding the Maori language as a major art of our culture is vitally important, I do not think (given most New Zealanders have European and therefore Latin origins) that we should completely divest ourselves of this rich and diverse culture that New Zealand has. In my view, Latin is not a dead language; it is a connection with the scientists, mathematicians and explorers of our past. For centuries, Latin was the scientific language of choice for most of the world, and let us not forget that it's origins stem from one of the greatest and most diverse groups of people history has seen for	No	No	Good idea. Te Reo Maori does need further development.	2020-05-28 15:35:31	ANON-YFPW-RC63-4	2020-05-28 15:35:31	2020-05-28 15:35:53	
No		Strongly disagree		I would like latin to be included		No			2020-05-28 16:30:35	ANON-YFPW-RC62-3	2020-05-28 16:30:35	2020-05-28 16:30:55
Yes		Strongly disagree	I strongly disagree with the removal of Latin because I feel that it, as a subject, enhances one's understanding of other subjects in the curriculum. For example, it improves your understanding of romance languages and of English grammar - from personal experience I can say that my knowledge of English grammar has been improved more so by Latin as a class than by English.			No			2020-05-28 17:41:41	ANON-YFPW-RC6U-6	2020-05-28 17:41:41	2020-05-28 17:41:49

No		Strongly disagree	The removal of Latin is strongly opposed. As someone who studied Latin, it provided a wonderful combination of language basics, reasoned thought (including for law), and history/art. It offers the opportunity not just to expand our minds through wonderful works of literature but also to enhance our knowledge of other languages and refine our skills in critical thinking, close reading, analytical reasoning and mental processing. It would be a travesty to deny this opportunity to New Zealand students in the future.	See comment above.	Latin.	Yes		No	2020-05-28 18:52:23	ANON-YFPW-RCWV-B	2020-05-28 18:52:23	2020-05-28 18:52:28
No		Disagree		I disagree with the removal of Latin and classics. These subjects underlie the basis of Western civilisation.	No	No			2020-05-28 19:01:35	ANON-YFPW-RCWV-B	2020-05-28 19:01:35	2020-05-28 19:01:50
No		Strongly disagree	It is a travesty to exclude Latin from the Target List. This subject, at the heart of Western/European tradition, the Renaissance, and Enlightenment, taught for centuries, provides rich foundational context for our modern world, and languages. It opens pupils' minds to the worlds' past and keeps minds open for the future. Let us embrace this tradition for all.			No			2020-05-28 19:48:39	ANON-YFPW-RCWC-N	2020-05-28 19:45:52	2020-05-28 19:48:44
No		Undecided	I think Latin should be retained as an option	As above, I recommend retaining Latin. It was a valuable and enjoyable subject for me and my son is currently enjoying it very much at year 10		No			2020-05-28 20:25:22	ANON-YFPW-RCWS-S	2020-05-28 20:25:22	2020-05-28 20:25:45
Yes		Strongly disagree	Extraordinarily disappointed with the decision to exclude latin from the curriculum see below.	Exclusion of latin, the basis of most modern European languages defies reason when aiming to provide broad subject choice at level 1. Latin teaches structure and patterns relevant not only to modern day english and other romantic languages but mathematics and in the digital world is directly relevant to the patterns of coding. I have 3 teenagers - one now year 2 law who did latin in years 9 10 and 11 and another currently year 11 still doing latin and my 3rd in year 9 also studying latin - all by choice.. All of them would choose latin as one of their most favourite subject complimenting respectively french and spanish, but also aiding with pattern learning and giving an appreciation of the classical world, that with my eldest led onto a study of classical studies til year 13 and a knowledge of the ancient world useful in a wide range of subjects, including nut not exclusive to philosophy history politics and the basis of law. Latin teachers are notoriously passionate and engaging and favourites of the students - with one of the main goals of education being to create life long learners latin, it is clearly a subject that creates a desire to learn. Study of the history of the english language and grammatical patterns is directly relevant to current english. Making connections and fully understanding a culture on		Yes		no	2020-05-28 21:19:31	ANON-YFPW-RCW8-A	2020-05-28 21:19:31	2020-05-28 21:19:41
Yes	I think this is a mistake	Strongly disagree	Students need a broad understanding of history to understand the present and plan for the future. Limiting this by sliding classics in with history (where we know it will not get the attention it deserves), losing art history entirely and removing Latin (important for language skills as well as historical context) dumbs down the offerings and limits access to learning. Combining economics and accounting will make the former inaccessible for students who lack the arithmetical skills and know how for the latter, preventing them from accessing valuable learning about how money and economies work. Similarly lumping all sciences in together will make for a much watered down knowledge bank. These choices are narrowing options, not broadening them, which is the stated intent.	See above - Combining science = once over lightly for all = limiting options for students in the future Dropping Latin and Classical Studies = losing access to key language learning AND historical context = limiting options for students in the future Combining economics / accounting / commerce = making the subject inaccessible for thos for whom part of it was previously valuable - limiting options for students in the future. This is an ill conceived idea that will lead to a further dropping of education standards in New Zealand. The education system needs to stop looking for easy answers to mass education the greatest number of students for the least amount of money and get back to the actual purpose of education - to give students a pathway to better themselves, broaden their horizons and develop skills to give them equal footing with others on the world stage.	Philosophy Political Science	No			2020-05-28 21:26:01	ANON-YFPW-RCW9-B	2020-05-28 21:26:01	2020-05-28 21:26:12
Yes		Strongly disagree	Would be a huge shame to lose Latin My son has taken it and found it to help so much in every other subject	Latin History learnt from this is huge Helps with the English language Very helpful		No			2020-05-29 04:02:11	ANON-YFPW-RCWG-S	2020-05-29 04:02:11	2020-05-29 04:02:32

Yes		Strongly disagree	One way to kill a specialist knowledge area is to absorb it into another. Both subjects decline, and it becomes a self fulfilling prophecy that the subject is not then studied at universities. I believe this is the case with Latin and Art History and Classics.	I never took Latin, though it was on offer at my school. I deeply regretted this after a year of another subject when I realised the other subject was not one I would be competent to take for School Certificate but it was too late to change my options and catch up. Latin is a core subject for understanding English orthography and derivation. Don't kill it, please! Lack of basic Latin has meant I have run to catch up with some aspects of English (my first and only language) in my two careers as a librarian and then as a primary school teacher. To combine Art History and History is just daft! While Art History informs us about social values, politics, power and societies, history itself is much much bigger an area and Art History will be lost. I didn't take Art History at school because I did Classical Studies instead - my favourite subject at Form 7. Keeping Classical Studies and History separate respects both areas. History can put more effort into New Zealand and Modern history this way and Classics can give due respect to ancient European history, culture and literature.	No. The curriculum is very full now.	No			2020-05-29 06:29:52	ANON-YFPW-RCWJ-V	2020-05-29 06:29:52	2020-05-29 06:30:05
Yes		Strongly disagree	I strongly believe that Latin should be continued. It is a valuable subject that teaches language, language evolution, history and social studies. It is fascinating and what is taught is very relevant to life today. I took Latin for 5 years at college and it still use it today. In particular it has been very useful in my studies and my job as a medical doctor, with reading and as a base for learning other languages. I think it is a great pity that the ministry is considering removing it from the curriculum, a great cultural and educational loss.	I strongly believe that Latin should be continued. It is a valuable subject that teaches language, language evolution, history and social studies. It is fascinating and what is taught is very relevant to life today. I took Latin for 5 years at college and it still use it today. In particular it has been very useful in my studies and my job as a medical doctor, with reading and as a base for learning other languages. I think it is a great pity that the ministry is considering removing it from the curriculum, a great cultural and educational loss.		Yes			2020-05-29 07:41:20	ANON-YFPW-RCWE-Q	2020-05-29 07:41:20	2020-05-29 07:41:29
Yes		Strongly disagree		The choice to exclude Latin in NCEA is a travesty. Not only does Latin provide knowledge of the language itself and provide engaging and insightful texts to study, such as the works of Catullus, Virgil and Ovid, but it also provides vital skills for life beyond school and the Latin classroom. Firstly, it provides immense amounts of practice in critical thinking and logic, not only through essays and literary analysis, which I acknowledge can be sourced through other subjects but through the exams. Latin exams are unlike any other in that one must translate a text in which more emphasis is placed on grammatical knowledge than on vocabulary. This transforms them into a puzzle of sorts, in which a clear head and logic are your best friends. This is unique to this subject and the benefits have many applications in the real world; this should not be lost. Secondly, it enriches one's repertoire of linguistic techniques, vital for English, and vocabulary. I fondly remember my first Latin lesson, reading the CLC and learning the word horticulture (the agriculture of plants) which comes from Latin. Hortus, meaning garden, an iconic word for any studying the CLC with the famous line "Caecilius est in horto". Not only is this important for		No			2020-05-29 11:41:09	ANON-YFPW-RCW5-7	2020-05-29 11:41:09	2020-05-29 11:41:22
Yes		Strongly disagree		Latin should not be dropped from the included subjects for these reasons: 1. it provides insight in the structure and syntax of language (any language for that matter) 2. it introduces students to the expression of history in a language which is based on a culture that is very different from their own 3. it provides crucial training in textual and rhetorical analysis and understanding 4. it empowers students to think holistically about language and expressive structures 5. it provides insight in patterns of thinking and expression which are still wielded today and which we all need to be aware of (definitely not necessarily agree with, but be aware of)	Latin -- all students should have an opportunity to study Latin at levels 1, 2, 3 and scholarship	No			2020-05-29 13:27:04	ANON-YFPW-RCWP-2	2020-05-29 13:27:04	2020-05-29 13:27:24

No		Strongly disagree	Latin should stay. Not only does it help students understand English grammar and European languages better it also a great help to those studying science and medicine. This decision is short sighted. The sciences should remain separate. History and geography remain separate subjects. At least biology chemistry and physics should remain as subjects. If NZ wants to keep up with Technology and the associated economic benefits more attention needs to be paid to science not less	See above Keep Latin Important for English European languages and science Keep the separate sciences we need more science education not less	No better education in the fundamentals is more important	No	Not born in NZ		2020-05-29 14:06:24	ANON-YFPW-RCW7-9	2020-05-29 14:06:24	2020-05-29 14:06:34
No	Not until recently (2020).	Undecided		Please leave Latin in the Targeted Subject list. Reasons: - it does supports coherent and robust pathways into NCEA Level 2 and further study or training (foe example if a student chooses linguistic or social (religious) studies as his/her future career pathway. - learning Latin offers the opportunity to enhance students knowledge of other languages and refine their skills in critical thinking, close reading, analytical reasoning and mental processing.		No			2020-05-29 14:23:50	ANON-YFPW-RCWF-R	2020-05-29 14:23:50	2020-05-29 14:24:06
Yes		Agree		I strongly support the continuation of the option to study Latin in NZ schools. The study of Latin is one of the most rewarding and satisfying intellectual activities that a school can provide. Its benefits for improving children's cognitive skills in other subjects, as well as increasing the understanding of English and assisting the learning of all Romance languages, have been well attested by studies in the USA and UK, as well as by common experience for centuries. Latin gives direct access to the literature and culture which (with Greek) has had the longest and greatest impact on the development of western civilization. The internet can provide ample arguments. Here is just one: https://classicalacademicpress.com/blogs/classical-insights/10-reasons-to-study-latin		No			2020-05-29 14:46:18	ANON-YFPW-RCW1-3	2020-05-29 14:46:18	2020-05-29 14:46:45
No		Strongly disagree	I disagree with the removal of Latin from the curriculum. Learning Latin at school enabled me to learn two other languages with ease. It also helped me to understand English grammar, which was taught very poorly at the time. It was a wonderful combination of history and language and it makes me feel very sad that it won't be accessible to students of public schools.	As above.		No			2020-05-30 08:07:26	ANON-YFPW-RCWZ-C	2020-05-30 08:07:25	2020-05-30 08:07:45
Yes		Strongly disagree	I feel particularly strongly against the proposed subject changes. The proposed removal of Latin from the National Certificate of Educational Achievement's Level 1 subject list is of distinct importance to my considerations. I am a Year 12 student who has studied Latin since Year 9 and have sat the Level 1 and Level 2 external examinations for the subject. I believe it will a very negative decision to remove Latin from this. The subject has been taught in New Zealand schools since the start of our country's history in the 19th Century. It has nurtured thousands of New Zealand students of all backgrounds in that time. It is not in the best interests of the Ministry to remove it from the curriculum.	As I said above, I strongly disagree with the proposal to remove Latin from the NCEA curriculum at Level 1. Any students wanting to study it would have to do so through an overseas qualification, which would discourage study of the language. New Zealand would be the only English speaking country not to offer it as a subject. The Ministry's proposal would take away from the experiences of many New Zealand students. Latin is not an anachronism. It may be a dead language but it is an immensely important one. I support the status quo of Latin being assessed at Levels 1, 2 and 3 of the NCEA curriculum. The Ministry's proposal is not in continuity with the history of New Zealand education. I fervently hope that this proposal will be reconsidered. If it goes through, then I fear that knowledge of Latin will essentially be non-existent in New Zealand. I thank you kindly for your consideration.	I hope that Latin is not removed from NCEA Levels 2 and 3.	No	No, I am not.	No, I do not.	2020-05-30 10:01:04	ANON-YFPW-RCWH-T	2020-05-30 10:00:15	2020-05-30 10:01:20

Yes		Disagree	Proviso below.	I would like to put a case for the retention of Latin and associated with that classical studies in the curriculum of New Zealand high schools. Latin is one of the heritage languages of New Zealand having arrived here as a language of education of every educated settler from Europe in the colonial period and after. It has been continuously taught since then in New Zealand schools. Greek, the other classical language, is no longer available in schools but to deprive students who wish to study a classical language at school for NCEA seems unfortunate and unnecessary since New Zealand's pākehā culture builds on centuries of classical education.	no	No			2020-05-30 16:50:30	ANON-YFPW-RCWB-M	2020-05-30 16:50:06	2020-05-30 16:50:55
No		Undecided	It would be a shame to remove some of the options our kids now have available to focus on broad skills only - especially for those kids who are already focused on a learning goal or career pathway that utilises those options being removed.	I don't support removal of the following... Latin: it's the basis of many other languages including English. Eventually we will have no-one able to teach or understand this ancient language if we remove it. Science varieties: many children find it hard to comprehend aspects of science but have an interest in one field or another, limiting those children to a course of study which is too broad could cause them to fail NCEA L1 even if they excel in the part of the broad science that their interest lies in. Psychology/Media Studies: Same reasoning as for Science.	Not presently.	No			2020-05-31 01:36:58	ANON-YFPW-RCWD-P	2020-05-31 01:36:58	2020-05-31 01:37:12
Yes		Agree		I oppose the intended removal of Latin from this level and levels two and three. Despite its modest uptake in New Zealand, the subject remains extremely valuable as a discipline and for what it exposes students to in terms of the language, literature, and culture that is part of our heritage. Removing this subject in its entirety is at odds with one of the stated goals of this change, namely: to ensure every student gets fair and equal access to the full range of possible quality pathways through NCEA and beyond. It ignores the feedback that is summarized above, that students value access to learning across the breadth of the curriculum and not closing doors to pathways too early. Moreover, its insularity threatens the credibility of NCEA as an internationally recognised qualification.		Yes	Supported		2020-06-01 09:31:04	ANON-YFPW-RCWX-A	2020-06-01 09:31:04	2020-06-01 09:31:34
No		Strongly disagree	Art history, classics and Latin should be available	Art history, Classics and Latin are such important subjects to study.		No			2020-06-01 20:32:16	ANON-YFPW-RCWA-K	2020-06-01 20:32:16	2020-06-01 20:32:37
Yes		Strongly disagree	Latin has a role in understanding our modern world from medicine and legal systems to how society and governments both failed and succeeded in meeting challenges.	Latin must be retained. My education did not involve classics or Latin. However, through working with international contracts, technological and commercial matters I have learned the extent to which Latin still influences our world. Latin while nominally a language subject also teaches the context and challenges which participants were faced with, and the decisions they made as people. Arguments that Latin is a "Dead" language do not consider the impact it still has on our modern languages and countries. There are also unfortunate connotations of the arguments once made against teaching Maori / Te Reo and Pasifika languages. In terms of international credibility, I am aware that curriculums overseas are maintaining Latin as an option. Latin has a role just like Te Marautanga o Aotearoa in providing the skills and knowledge to participate in and contribute to society and the wider world.		Yes	The proposal is a well-developed blend of language and achieving self-worth through the foundations of whānau, hapū, iwi and community.		2020-06-01 21:21:23	ANON-YFPW-RCWN-Z	2020-06-01 21:21:23	2020-06-01 21:21:44
No	i am aware now	Disagree	I don't mind consolidating the subjects, e.g. hard sciences (biology, chemistry, physics), and social sciences (psychology, media studies), but i do mind losing a language - Latin. Languages can't just be "picked up" and the earlier they are started the better. I realise this means specialised teachers, but that is the cost of an excellent education system that exercises children's brains.	I disagree to get rid of Latin at any year level. Latin is foundational for many subjects from science (biology / medicine) to other latin-derived languages (English, French, Spanish, Italian). Latin is interesting too - the history aspect is particularly fun for students to engage in. Latin is foundational as a language (lawyers benefit from it, as well as medics) but it is also foundational for classics (learning about history of Mediterranean peoples, places etc).	psychology - young people have told the Children's Commissioner in a survey, they wanted this subject to be added to their school. It helps students who want to study anything to do with people - from community services, to education, to government. 21st century learning is much about people skills and psychology is useful for that.	No	i only know it exists, and it is probably limited to the subject teachers available who are fluent in te reo for that subject.		2020-06-01 21:43:51	ANON-YFPW-RCWK-W	2020-06-01 21:43:51	2020-06-01 21:44:11
No		Strongly disagree	We need Latin!	Please bring back Latin.	Can't think of any	No			2020-06-02 08:44:21	ANON-YFPW-RCW6-8	2020-06-02 08:44:21	2020-06-02 08:44:32

No		Strongly disagree	I disagree with the removal of Latin	Very few schools still offer Latin. Why not continue to let them? Why kill off knowledge that is available to be passed on? Is it to save money? Then charge higher exam fees for less popular subjects. I studied Latin at school & my son is currently studying it. It's his favourite subject as it gives him a chance to spend time with like-minded people. Celebrate diversity! It expands our use of the English language & helps with learning European languages. It teaches critical thinking, close reading, analytical reasoning and mental processing. It would be a travesty to deny this opportunity to future NZ students.		No			2020-06-02 09:31:13	ANON-YFPW-RCWR-4	2020-06-02 09:31:13	2020-06-02 09:31:29
No	Learned about this through one school teacher	Strongly disagree	An international disgrace and true dumbing down. How does any of this broad brush stroke once over lightly help our kids achieve the foundation and knowledge to take them through to level 3 and university let alone achieve any sort of outcomes that would be internationally acceptable to any decent learning institution. Bringing the worse of primary school and flowing it uphill. Wrong, bad, unfair and a ripoff for students.	Keep Latin forever. It is the foundation of all Germanic languages.		No	I have School Certificate Te Reo Cannot see how the translation of the curriculum into Te Reo helps anyone		2020-06-02 10:29:16	ANON-YFPW-RCWW-9	2020-06-02 10:29:16	2020-06-02 10:29:25
No		Disagree	The decision to squash Classical Studies into History is ludicrous. In what way can this be considered foundational learning, when the result will reduce the amount of time that is able to be spent on individual subjects within the overall coursework? As any former History and Classics student will tell you, while there is a marvelous intersection between the two subjects, they offer entirely different learning opportunities, opportunities that would be wasted by this change. Removing Latin is callous and short sighted. But I won't get into that here as I, along with many others, have already made submissions against the proposal. Which was easy work, considering how obviously foolish NZQA's arguments were.	See above. Though I will add, NCEA fails students, not because it isn't foundational or specific enough, but because NCEA is a terrible qualifications system. It grades out of 8. Not even a clean 10. Students don't get percentage marks, from which they can at least note any improvements they've made. NCEA also expects students and teachers to be psychics, because the communication over what is expected in exams, and why grades come out the way they do is non-existent. It's incredibly telling that New Zealand teachers are beyond frustrated with NCEA 'guidelines'. It hinders them completely. Oh, also Universities hate NCEA. One of the first things we were told was to ignore half the NCEA requirements we'd spent years panicking over. The gulf between the university essays I wrote and the NCEA ones was hilarious. The former, at a tertiary level, were much easier, then the latter, at a secondary level. If NZQA wants to improve itself, it should listen to people with experience and not try and devise a system they think will give them the best surface level grades they can get from New Zealand	Yes. Latin.	No		N/A	2020-06-02 13:09:52	ANON-YFPW-RCW4-6	2020-06-02 13:09:52	2020-06-02 13:10:05
Yes		Agree	But subject to the ability to have a variety of standard so we can make our own local curriculum.		One in the field of transition/life skills as we are developing the whole person not just teaching subject knowledge.	No			2020-06-02 15:17:17	ANON-YFPW-RCWT-6	2020-06-02 15:17:17	2020-06-02 15:17:30
Yes		Strongly disagree	It is wrong to state that Art History is a marginal subject with links only to History at Level 1. It has direct links to the Visual Arts and many schools use the Level 1 AS as part of their Visual Arts programmes - in fact 1500 individual Level 1 Art History AS were used last year by the secondary sector.	There has been widespread feedback from both Art History and Visual Arts teachers about their disappointment and objection to Level 1 Art History not being included		No			2020-06-02 23:03:42	ANON-YFPW-RCW3-5	2020-06-02 23:03:42	2020-06-02 23:04:37
Yes		Strongly disagree		Art History at level 1 should not be taken away, the number of students sitting the internal standards strongly show that it is being used in schools to create a pathway and interest in the subject for the level 2 and 3 course. I think it is with ignorance that Art History at Level 1 and people are not aware of the importance of a visual history and the ability to read and understand images especially in our society that is largely image driven.		Yes			2020-06-03 07:45:38	ANON-YFPW-RCW2-4	2020-06-03 07:45:38	2020-06-03 07:45:46
No	It looks like more narrow not broad.	Disagree	Extremely disappointed to see Art History disappear. It won't be taught in those other areas at all.	Art History provides a strong theoretical and critical foundation for understanding the history of the world. Having it at L1 provides choice and options to best suit the learners in OUR context. By removing this and the other subjects you are homogenising and narrowing choice in the curriculum which goes against the NZC which talks quite directly about creating curriculum that best suits your community.	Visual Arts mixed media.	No	Not fully. I know of it.		2020-06-03 07:51:26	ANON-YFPW-RCWU-7	2020-06-03 07:51:26	2020-06-03 07:51:52
Yes		Strongly disagree				No			2020-06-03 08:19:34	ANON-YFPW-RCZY-E	2020-06-03 08:19:34	2020-06-03 08:19:44

Yes		Disagree	Art History hurts. Understand squishing the Science! Need to focus on STEAM and celebrate the arts especially after such turbulent times in NZ right now.	YES! I am an Art History Teacher AND a Visual Arts Teacher. I teach year 13 Art History. I use level one Art History for my year 11 Visual Arts course instead of using the standards on offer within the Visual Arts. This is great as it give my students a wee taster of what Art History is. They learn about the artist models that they are going to focus on for their folios. Some of them get literacy credit that they would otherwise not get. Can we still just keep the internats? I LOVE teaching Art History and the STUDENTS love learning about it. I know that in our school that our History teacher will not add any Art History into any of their other courses (there just isn't time nor are they interested). This will have an impact on my level 3 class as they not have the insight as to what the class is all about. This is just getting rid of cool cultural life skills.	They have enough going on - just nurture what we have.	No			2020-06-03 08:53:35	ANON-YFPW-RCZV-B	2020-06-03 08:53:35	2020-06-03 08:53:50
Yes		Undecided	The removal of subjects - ie Level 1 Art History and Classical Studies is short-sighted and needs rethinking rather than complete removal - to lump them in as "history" undermines their importance in their own right.	Okay - we are in an educational time where what we need is more flexibility and innovation way beyond the silos we have traditionally taught in. Therefore, it is important to allow scope for flexibility in our curriculum, including the subjects you propose to exclude. Do not write art history off purely as an adjunct to history - that is entirely misleading! Art history is more than mere pretty pictures and as such can enhance inter-curricular initiatives. Like all subjects, we need to think beyond what a subject has been in the past and think of the potential for its existence in the future. For example, the popularity in cultural heritage preservation; including Maori, first contact, postcolonial, Pacifica, feminist art (given we were the first country to give the woman the vote after all). Where do we inspire future curators to lead galleries in innovative and progressive ways? (innovation, curiosity, inquiry, critical thinking, diversity, injustice, relating to others, language, symbols, text!) Nor can we start throwing out opportunities to develop innovative art historical teaching and/or strategies. Thinking for just one minute this is		No			2020-06-03 14:27:44	ANON-YFPW-RCZC-R	2020-06-03 14:27:44	2020-06-03 14:28:04
Yes		Agree			Tourism Management - This course to be achievement standards and to future proof and help develop a sustainable industry	Yes			2020-06-03 17:13:16	ANON-YFPW-RCZS-8	2020-06-03 17:13:16	2020-06-03 17:13:38
No		Disagree	I disagree with the proposal to remove Latin from the list of languages taught. This is an excellent language to learn, to help understand the English language, grammar and to help decipher unknown words as an adult. I also like the history and classics aspects, as well as the thinking skills that are taught in this class. I did Latin in years 9 and 10 and I still have fond memories of the classes.	I think that Latin is taught in Australia and have read the advocates believe it is linked to higher academic performance in English, maths and science and has a "wonder" element for students.	No	No			2020-06-04 13:04:30	ANON-YFPW-RCZB-D	2020-06-04 13:04:30	2020-06-04 13:04:49
No		Strongly disagree	My answer is based entirely on the exclusion of Latin as a target subject	I believe it would be a mistake to remove Latin from the target subjects. Latin provides more than just an opportunity for learning a language. It helps students to thinking logically laterally and helps with understanding other words and their derivatives. I would thoroughly recommend keeping Latin as a target subject- maybe it needs to be repackaged/rebranded as logical thinking or broadened to encompass philosophical ideals. As a parent I have witnessed my son discover a love for language and words because of latin classes at Y9. As a scientist, academic and lecturer, I can also support the understanding of words and their derivatives to help in the understanding of science and associated terminology.	Keep Latin. Critical, logical thinking and philosophy also important.	No			2020-06-04 13:15:57	ANON-YFPW-RCZ9-E	2020-06-04 13:15:57	2020-06-04 13:16:08

Yes		Strongly disagree		<p>I am very disappointed with the proposal to drop Latin as an NCEA subject. Latin is a subject that gives students an understanding of the foundation of western civilisation. It forms the basis of western languages, including English, French and German, all of which are currently studied at high school level. Students who learn other languages at the same time as Latin benefit from their understanding of Latin. My daughter is really enjoying studying Latin at Year 9 level and hopes to study it at NCEA level as it is her favourite subject. She finds that Latin complements her study of the French language.</p> <p>High school students should have the opportunity to learn a range of subjects which may not be available later in life. Exposing students to subjects such as Latin broadens their minds and provides a good basis for learning other subjects, including other languages and history.</p> <p>I believe it is a mistake to only offer subjects that have a clear vocational pathway. That reasoning negates the value of a broad education as subjects such as Latin have an inherent value. I think that students should not narrow their options at high school level.</p>		No			2020-06-04 13:49:09	ANON-YFPW-RCZG-V	2020-06-04 13:49:09	2020-06-04 13:49:36
No	As someone who went through schooling and as someone who experienced foundational education during my first year of University, I am extremely against the idea of foundational education. The current system allows those who know what they want to specialise in as well as those who don't to still accomplish what they want whereas foundational education severely inhibits those students who are confident in their pursuits, in many cases, they have already learned what a foundational education could teach them if they are serious about their pursuits and instead waste a year.	Strongly disagree	I strongly disagree as I stand in opposition to greater foundational education as well as the changes made to the classics curriculum.	I am a strong advocate for the keeping of Lvl 1 Classics, Classics is a strong opportunity for students to improve english writing skills in an alternate environment than Lvl 1 English. In my experience, I gained better skills associated with essay writing through classics than I did english, and eventually dropped my English classes for Classics. Classics provides a strong alternative to the students less interested in things like poetry or novels, while maintaining the fundamental skills that they need to further their education.	I believe classes around creative media production should be developed, it is an extremely large industry that isn't valued in our schooling system despite New Zealand being home to companies such as Weta Workshop & Digital.	No			2020-06-04 14:00:48	ANON-YFPW-RCZJ-Y	2020-06-04 14:00:48	2020-06-04 14:01:04
Yes		Strongly disagree		The elimination of Latin, Classical Studies, and Art History as separate subject options will prejudice students' ability to develop their expertise in these longstanding areas of higher study, which are foundational to key cultural knowledge and informed citizenship in the pākehā tradition of civil democracy. Fostering and maintenance of a deeper understanding of these pākehā taonga is one obligation that NCEA and the education system has to its citizens of all traditions.		Yes			2020-06-04 15:16:03	ANON-YFPW-RCZE-T	2020-06-04 15:16:03	2020-06-04 15:16:16
Yes		Strongly disagree	I am totally dismayed and really gutted to see Latin dropped as a subject option for New Zealand students.	Please continue to include Latin as a subject for NCEA. The benefits of learning Latin, are huge. Learning Latin teaches students how to mentally process how other languages are structured, and is a strong foundation for learning any number of other roman-based languages. Latin has significant cultural links to our own way of life here in New Zealand, as our society and important aspects of political thinking, legal systems and social organisation can be linked back through the origins of the language. Learning Latin strongly enhances students' English language skills, as strong English skills are required to accurately translate from Latin to English. Depriving New Zealand students of all opportunities to learn Latin is to put the best interests of the students back in last place. We as a society need to do much better than that, we need to retain Latin as a subject taught in New Zealand schools to provide the best educational opportunities possible for New Zealand students.		No			2020-06-04 20:54:18	ANON-YFPW-RCZS-A	2020-06-04 20:54:18	2020-06-04 20:54:34
Yes		Strongly disagree	Latin is an integral language to t majority of modern European Romance languages. Ancient civilisation and culture studies also are the foundations to how we live today and they must not be forgotten. Like History (as a subject) it is vital we educate ourselves on the past	Latin should be offered as it is a foundational subject to any language study	Latin. I studied Latin at CIE AS level and have just completed a BA in French at Durham University in the UK. Latin helped me more than any other subject in the learning of linguistics and languages	No			2020-06-04 22:08:29	ANON-YFPW-RCZP-5	2020-06-04 22:07:31	2020-06-04 22:08:34

Yes		Disagree	Latin should be available too	Latin should not be eliminated		No	We need to keep the international dimension of our Nation in mind. Many subdivisions of Maori expertise and sub-subjects within Te Reo are helpful to some, but of limited use beyond our shores. We must be future oriented		2020-06-05 11:37:41	ANON-YFPW-RCZ7-C	2020-06-05 11:37:41	2020-06-05 11:39:01
Yes		Strongly disagree	<p>ANALYSIS FOR THE AUCKLAND CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION</p> <p>INTRODUCTION</p> <p>Presently I am the President of the Auckland Classical Association. This is a group of people devoted to the literature and culture of Ancient Greece and of Rome.</p> <p>My background in the Latin and Greek languages reaches back to secondary school for the former and to the University of Auckland for the latter, and (in respect to Roman law) to Harvard Law School. I have learnt and used in my working life French, German, and Spanish. Any language, and particularly an ancient one, is best studied when the mind is young and supple.</p> <p>By profession I am an international lawyer (New Zealand, California USA, and Germany). An education in Latin contributed to my verbal skills for speaking and writing, and accustomed me to mixing in different cultural milieus.</p> <p>I have never been involved in remunerated work in Latin. My other experiences include service as an altar boy at the Latin Mass in the 1960's, five years as a Territorial Force Artillery Lieutenant (and a qualified</p>	<p>LATIN</p> <p>My reasons for retaining Latin are generally set out above.</p> <p>Students can expect benefit from even one year of the study of Latin. Then the student could move on to a modern language, having understood another grammar to some extent. In particular, Spanish would be easy to pick up.</p> <p>I have never met a person who regretted studying Latin at secondary school.</p> <p>A structure exists already for the teaching of Latin in secondary schools. Abolition of Latin would destroy that structure. By the time the abolition of Latin was recognised as a mistake, the reconstruction of that structure would be expensive and difficult.</p> <p>Years are taken to build up a knowledge of a foreign language. Native speakers of English are famously slow in learning foreign languages. As the US Government found in its invasions of Iraq and Afghanistan, English-speakers cannot learn a foreign language in a rush, and have to rely on local interpreters. Hence several years of Latin</p>	Latin Levels 2 and 3. Classical Studies Level 2 and 3.	Yes	Generally aware, but not minutely aware.	No.	2020-06-05 13:25:30	ANON-YFPW-RCWM-Y	2020-05-31 00:44:52	2020-06-05 13:26:07
No	Not prior to the announcement of this review questionnaire in February. We are training to be Media Studies teachers, knowing about these possible changes sooner may have impacted on our choices to train as teachers or to train as Media Studies teachers had we have know about them as we can definitely see an impact on our teaching careers if the changes go ahead and that is a concern. Although NZQA has Media Studies in the Social Sciences domain, in reality in schools the subject sits in English departments, Arts departments, Technology, which is also reflected in the backgrounds of those of us training. While there may be creditable reasons for suggesting a reduction of subjects at NCEA Level 1 we worry that these changes will also lead to less student choice and a narrowing of courses taught in schools and, therefore, a narrowing of the taught curriculum. The Social Sciences curriculum is already crowded and so there are real risks in Media Studies being overlooked until Level 2. There is also the risk that students will be playing catch-up with Media literacy, production elements and skills. The motivation to keep the curriculum broad is nice in its intent but unlikely to play out in reality.	Strongly disagree	We can see potential risk for students continuing into Level 2 and 3 Media Studies if Media Studies is no longer offered as a stand alone Level 1 subject with its own Achievement Standards to specifically assess disciplinary knowledge. Media Studies has grown as a subject in schools when it became an NCEA subject and has been offered at all 3 levels of NCEA. To cannibalise subjects and force students to choose between subjects within the Social Sciences or to offer, at best, a once over lightly, we could risk losing out on the next Taika Waititi or Peter Jackson. Those two internationally recognised media figures have been able to be successful on the world stage without a number of years of Media Studies at school, however, they are only two people. If we want to continue to grow our success and numbers in the field we need to encourage students to see it as a viable pathway through the subjects that they can study all the way through their secondary schooling. We feel that the subject is too big to be squashed into 2 years; in fact we argue it should be given more weight and time in the crowded curriculum. Putting Media Studies into Senior Social Studies Achievement Standards increases the complexity for students in terms of understanding the curriculum, subjects and the connection with future employment. If a subject is invisible for students then there is a real risk that it will also be forgotten.	Rather than valuing the disciplinary knowledge specific to Media Studies, for us, there is a concerning possible implication of the 'possible context' statement in regards to the proposed combined subjects. We think the implication is that students as consumers of Media are necessarily already expert critical thinkers about Media and Media technology is deeply flawed and not supported by research and evidence. Media Studies is integral to students becoming effective contributors to NZ society. Media Studies specifically requires students to work collaboratively, be innovators, problem solvers, critical thinkers, be able to understand other perspectives, be future focused and able to be resilient and cope with change. It is the subject that embodies the Key Competencies from the NZC. New Zealand is one of the most under-regulated and overly commercial broadcast media countries in the world and so, it is very risky to assume that students, as media consumers, will also be automatically thoughtful and discerning producers of media when using it "as a possible context" to show their learning in broader Social Studies topics. Of course, beyond the context of the NZ media landscape we can see the genuine challenges to truth and accuracy of information caused by social media, which is almost entirely		No			2020-06-05 15:50:49	ANON-YFPW-RCZF-U	2020-06-05 15:50:49	2020-06-05 15:51:05

Yes		Strongly disagree	I question the rationale for a subject like Classical Studies being downgraded into History. The subject will not combine into History as Classics involves literature and art as well as history our history teachers will not be able to integrate this with their wide subject. I think that History is important but question why it should not be combined with Social Studies as it used to be. Classics is a broad based subject at level one, popular and relevant to social and political life in today's world. The reason for lower numbers in Nz is because many schools do not offer it at level one. When the subject is offered students love it and continue it at Level 2 and 3 if they can. Even if they cannot continue it the subject gives valuable literacy and analytical skills which can translate to other subjects at a later date. The message given by removing it as a Level One subject is that the subject is not valued in NZ It may die A real pity as parents and students appreciate the opportunities the subject has given them	See comment above. Classical Studies will be a sorry loss for N Z students. I would like it to be continued as a broad base for Level 2 and 3 Classics. Level one provides skills which provide links to literacy subjects and it is very popular for the students who take it. They should be allowed to take a subject which appeals as well as educates. It is a subject which motivates and challenges It is unique because it crosses several curricula		Yes			2020-06-05 19:09:39	ANON-YFPW-RCZ1-6	2020-06-05 19:09:39	2020-06-05 19:10:26
Yes	I support the principle stated above, but believe that we need to go much further and allow all Level 1 subjects to be school-defined and assessed to allow for wide selection of appropriate materials and activities. Community-based learning should be the normal process for years 7-11, with options available according to the strengths of families, staff and community resource people, and online availability of materials. A clear definition of desired learning outcomes, and descriptions and examples of assessment techniques, rather than narrowly named subjects, would be more helpful to teachers, students and family members.	Disagree	There is no particular reason why Latin, Classical Studies etc should be excluded as possible areas of study in Years 9-11. The broad 'Technology' is far too wide, as are Science and Social Science. The present topics- and new ones as they emerge- eg "robotics" should be included.	I can see no rationale for not including very different areas under the broad topics. In fact, I think the whole of NCEA 1 should be open to schools - or clusters of schools - to propose their own, with appropriate assessment procedures.	These should be nominated by schools, and developed where more than one school is involved.	Yes	Not appropriate for me as a Pakeha with a limited knowledge of te reo and matauranga to comment on these. But I was disappointed to see no mention of Te Reo Rangatira. I think with all languages, English included, there needs to be two different strands of assessment- one for native speakers /those who have been in immersion education in	No.	2020-06-06 18:49:19	ANON-YFPW-RCZ2-F	2020-06-06 18:40:44	2020-06-06 18:49:29
Yes		Strongly agree		Physics must be included - the current draft standards have virtually no physics in them at all. This is completely unacceptable. What is being proposed is a "social" science course - you have removed the "heart" of the subjects especially physics and this is completely ridiculous.	No other than if you are going to be consistent then nature of science will need to be introduced.	Yes			2020-06-07 11:56:29	ANON-YFPW-RCZ2-W	2020-06-07 11:56:29	2020-06-07 11:56:54
Yes		Strongly disagree		I do not agree with the decision to scrap Latin at level one with intent to scrap it at all levels. I am a Latin student and Latin has been crucial to my development in English and French, not only that but the subject itself teaches many skills like critical thinking and researching. It would be a shame to lose it.	Retaining Latin at those levels.	No		I don't have any feedback.	2020-06-07 12:34:35	ANON-YFPW-RCZ2-Q	2020-06-07 12:34:35	2020-06-07 12:34:41

No	I know that there was a review of NCEA planned but was not aware that this was the aim.	Disagree	I do not understand why, in an attempt to make Level 1 more broad and foundational, the Ministry is proposing getting rid of Classical Studies (as would be the consequence of making it an optional part of History to be included at a "low degree" if teachers/schools choose to do so). I am also horrified to see Latin potentially removed from NCEA entirely. By doing this, the Ministry of Education will be restricting access to this subject to only students from private and high-decile schools, meaning that it will create an elitist divide.	Classical Studies is perhaps the most broad and foundational subject, and so is ideally suited to the new NCEA Level 1. It should be left as is. It is a new and growing subject in many schools which provides exciting opportunities for our students to learn about the history, culture, philosophy, politics, religion, literature, art and architecture of the ancient world. This is very obviously rich and important learning which students should be able to access at Level 1, and continue at Levels 2 and 3. Classical Studies develops students' abilities to find, analyse and evaluate information, as well as develop and communicate opinions and arguments. These are hugely important in a vast range of subject areas and career pathways. Latin is also a broad foundational subject, allowing students to study the vocabulary, grammar, literature and culture of the ancient Romans. Through this they develop linguistic and analytical skills which they can apply to other languages and even subjects like Calculus and Computing. It is also an excellent academic subject which provides a robust challenge for our students. Should we removing it from our curriculum, we will be the only English-speaking country in the world not to offer it at a secondary level which I believe can only damage the credibility of NCEA, especially internationally.	No	Yes		No	2020-06-07 14:25:13	ANON-YFPW-RCZM-2	2020-06-07 14:25:13	2020-06-07 14:25:20
No		Disagree	Removal of Latin is a retrograde step. A student from school who has studied the classics, both Latin and Greek attains a firm understanding of the structure of Indo-European languages. He or she is also introduced to the history of Western civilisation, philosophy, logic, performing arts, political structures and the underpinnings of democracy. These are also essential subjects for anyone wanting to go on to study the eastern religions of Christians, Muslims and Jews and the interaction between the three.	Students come to the University of Auckland repelled by the idea of reading more than two or three pages of text. Their communication skills are limited. They are ill-equipped for university study and standards drop noticeably each year. I suspect one reason for this is that they may be tackling too many subjects over too wide a range. Their learning is superficial in the extreme and their focus is poor. They need to have time to drill down into the subjects they undertake. They would then derive true satisfaction from their school learning and reach university with a genuine thirst for knowledge and not just with the shallow goal of gaining a certificate, the worth of which is diluted more and more as the years go by.		Yes			2020-06-08 09:00:57	ANON-YFPW-RCZD-5	2020-06-08 08:45:06	2020-06-08 09:01:16
No		Disagree	I feel strongly that Latin should continue to be offered for NCEA.	Studying latin offers the opportunity not just to expand our student's minds through wonderful works of literature but also to enhance knowledge of other languages and refine skills in critical thinking, close reading, analytical reasoning and mental processing. It would be a travesty to deny this opportunity to New Zealand students in the future.	Latin!	No			2020-06-08 15:33:24	ANON-YFPW-RCZD-D	2020-06-08 15:33:24	2020-06-08 15:33:34
Yes	This has been made very clear	Strongly disagree	If Classical Studies were to become more or less invisible at Level 1, then it would provide no pathway to Level 2 and would thus soon be eliminated at Levels 2 and 3 as well, with further inevitable implications for tertiary level too. Approximately half of the Classical Studies curriculum is concerned with ancient Hellenic culture which is, after all, along with ancient Roman culture, the cultural background behind 64.1 % of New Zealanders (Stats NZ New Zealand Census 2018) and behind the English language, which 95.4 % of all New Zealanders speak in this country. Members of our Hellene (Greek) organisation, the Hellenic New Zealand Congress Inc., would be devastated if this were to occur.	With regard to Classical Studies, there are further important points to note: There are many connections between Hellenic and Māori culture, for example in oral traditions, rituals, performances, and mythologies. At this very moment, in fact, the basis of modern western poetry, Homer's Iliad is being translated into Te Reo, in a Pākehā/Māori partnership based at Victoria University of Wellington. Moreover, a number of Māori authors writing in English, perhaps most notably Witi Ihimaera, have for some time been using Hellenic mythological and dramatic material as reference points in their work. In general, the big growth area in Classical Studies today is what is called 'Reception Studies', whereby the ongoing legacy of ancient Hellenic (and Roman) culture is reinterpreted and/or reworked, and reapplied to contemporary literature, visual art, architecture, political thought, economics and other areas, and also considers how antiquity may be used to express important political, social and cultural questions in the future. Classical Studies is no longer 'just' the study of a Mediterranean past, but also of contemporary society.	If Classical Studies is rendered more or less invisible in NCEA Level 1, then it MUST be made available and developed at NCEA Levels 2 and 3. A new curriculum could easily be developed, working in aspects of Reception Studies (as applied to a range of contemporary societies and cultures), Mythology, the links between Hellenic and Māori culture (oral performance, lineage, storytelling, family structures etc etc), and so on.	No	But take into account what has been said above about the enrichment of all students becoming aware of Hellenic culture in relation to Māori culture.	No. this is beyond our brief.	2020-06-09 11:10:29	ANON-YFPW-RCZA-P	2020-06-09 11:10:29	2020-06-09 11:12:29
Yes		Strongly disagree	Narrowing down of subjects will limit the subject choice in schools.	N/A	N/A	No		N/A	2020-06-10 09:25:11	ANON-YFPW-RCZN-3	2020-06-10 09:25:11	2020-06-10 09:25:32

Yes		Strongly disagree	<p>Social Studies Level 1 - vast scope to cover:</p> <p>If Media Studies is absorbed into Social Studies (along with Psychology as "contexts"), it seems that Social Studies will then have an even greater variety of subjects and topics to attempt to cover than it already does. This will leave little room for going in-depth into any, which surely is doing a disservice to our students. Psychology, Media Studies and Social Studies have always been treated as completely different subjects - and for clear reasons. Ideas of a body of concepts and skills and practices directly connected to media will not exist, except sort of tangentially.</p>	<p>In the provisional list of Level 1 subjects for NCEA review, Media Studies has been removed. Although, the subject gets an asterisk and a mention that Media Studies can be taught in a Social Studies context.</p> <p>Relevance:</p> <p>The removal of Media Studies at Level 1 is concerning at a time when our students need critical media literacy more than ever - and that can only be expected to increase. Media of all forms is increasingly becoming embedded into all aspects of life and therefore having Media Studies as a stand alone core subject seems more important than ever before. In Media Studies, young people are encouraged to engage with texts through different cultural lenses, analyse how media creates meaning around ideology, race, gender and given skills to become active participants and creators.</p> <p>In the Ministry's own words: "the media shapes our understanding of the world, reflecting and communicating aspects of our public and private lives and contributing to the creation of personal, social, cultural, and national identities." This shaping, in a so-called 'post-truth' world, is</p>	<p>Journalism should be developed as a more specialised subject. Covid 19 highlighted the importance of journalism and the changing state of consumption. This subject would allow for a scope of writing styles, crafting and industry, software and technology standards. It could also combine English standards if possible. This could be a composite course with psychology, English, Media and Technology standards.</p>	Yes	Yes. However, I believe more advice as to how it can be incorporated into specific subject areas would be beneficial.	I think the concept is interesting and important. However, I believe students should have choice and all interests, such as students who LOVE media, should be allowed to study that too.	2020-06-10 12:01:57	ANON-YFPW-RCZW-C	2020-06-10 12:01:57	2020-06-10 12:02:06
Yes	I was made aware of such an important interruption just last year. I feel that it is a hurried proposed change (especially given the disruption from COVID) and needs more consultation. NCEA Level 1 is an excellent introduction to NCEA without the added stress of University requirements. It also allows those students unlikely to continue to university a chance for a qualification before leaving secondary school. Why deny these students this form of recognition for their efforts from 8 years of formal education?	Strongly disagree	<p>The watering down of the subjects by blending such different contexts makes the subjects' learning difficult to reach by all students. There will also likely to be very little real authenticity without that specialist content. As well the results will likely to be unengaging for the students if broad brush stroke teaching is required as a result.</p>	<p>My proposal is that the new technology subjects be named the following: Digital Technologies, Design and Visual Communication, Industrial or Product Technologies, Fashion and Textiles Technologies, Food Technologies.</p> <p>The NZQA insight data proposes to give an overview of subject usage trends for the subjects associated with the Technology Learning Area of the New Zealand Curriculum.</p> <p>However, the data actually shows student entries in Technology Achievement Standards strands - Digital Technologies and Hangarau Matihiko, DVC, Construction and Mechanical Technologies, Processing Technologies and not technology subjects where achievement standards maybe selected across the Technology matrix and not from just one strand</p> <p>It is essential too that subjects are future focused, show progression from Y9 -13, representative, and reflect subject specific skills across Technology curriculum</p> <p>Rationale</p> <p>The rationale for the following subject changes are illustrated below which shows that subject specific knowledge is unique to each subject.</p>	<p>I would like to see the current range maintained. It is so important that design is able to be flexible in it's reach across different contexts. This best happens when a good depth of understanding about the particular technology is accessible to the designer. Specialist skills and content knowledge are critical to enable this.</p>	No			2020-06-10 13:54:15	ANON-YFPW-RCZ4-9	2020-06-10 13:54:15	2020-06-10 13:54:30
Yes	I was aware you wanted to change it but there was very little consultation.	Strongly disagree		<p>My suggestions for Technology are as follows.</p> <p>Proposed subject areas: Technology (Generic) Food Technologies Product Technologies Fashion & Textiles Technologies Design & Visual Communication Digital Technologies ---</p> <p>Subject: Technology (Generic)</p> <p>Rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Allows for progression to NCEA level 2 ● Allows flexibility for local curricular ● Contexts/subjects/Biotechnology/Robotics/Electronics/eng ineering ● Opportunities for integrated learning ● Authentic learning ● Promotes future focussed learning ● Flexible approach to programme planning ● Allows a focus on thinking ● Encourages intertwining of subjects - like DVC/Digital/Materials/Foods to enrich, inform, and provide methodologies ● Supports pathways for individual learners 		Yes	I am aware of it but feel there is a lack of info here about the subjects derived from Te Marautanga o Aotearoa which are under development.		2020-06-10 14:23:35	ANON-YFPW-RCZR-7	2020-06-10 09:37:53	2020-06-10 14:23:44

Yes		Undecided			<p>The Tourism Teachers Association - NZ (TTA-NZ)</p> <p>We encourage the Ministry of Education to include "Tourism Management" as part of the achievement standard (AS) framework at level 2 and 3. The TTA-NZ has the support of tertiary tourism educators, the tourism industry and the ITO for tourism – Service IQ, in advocating for "Tourism Management" achievement standards.</p> <p>"Tourism as a multi-disciplinary, multi-method field of study is well suited to meet the changing complexities of societies. Tourism provides the platform for exciting, stimulating and highly relevant programmes of study" (Airey, 2019, p.261).</p> <p>The NZ tourism industry, until Covid-19, was a \$45B industry representing 20% of exports, 10% of GDP and 400,000 jobs. Tourism is a remarkably resilient industry that has withstood previous global challenges and, many countries, including NZ are now taking the opportunity to reimagine tourism while focusing on the environmental, economic and socio-cultural benefits tourism can provide. Tourism study is not only about training a service-delivery workforce but needs to also</p>	No			2020-06-10 15:45:16	ANON-YFPW-RCZ3-8	2020-06-10 15:45:16	2020-06-10 15:45:42
Yes		Strongly disagree	<p>The balance of which subjects have been combined with others, and which haven't, seems to have no rationale and almost to have been at random, or reflect a deep misunderstanding of the content/nature of the subjects.</p> <p>For example combining accounting, business studies and economics into a 'commerce' subject at level 1, makes about as much sense as combining dance, drama and music into one "performing arts" subject.</p> <p>It is also hard to see why highly specialized subjects such as geography are able to remain specialized at level 1 if accounting, business studies and economics are to be combined.</p>	<p>I strongly disagree with combining accounting, business studies and economics at level 1 for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. These subjects have distinct skills preventing their combination - see above point about how it would be akin to combining dance, drama and music into performing arts. 2. These subjects at level 1 provide an introduction to the broad range of issues and disciplines that sit within each subject, which can often ignite passions within students. <p>I personally have spoken with many year 13 and year 12 students who have gained passions through their economics courses having tried it at level 1 - who have expressed quite clearly that they would never have taken a commerce subject at level 1 because they "can't stand accounting", and vice-versa.</p> <p>It really concerns me that combining these three subjects into one 'commerce' subject at level 1 will mean these students never get to discover and chase these passions.</p>	<p>Not further specialist subjects - but rather a re-arranging of levels. I would swap level 2 and level 3 economics, and make level 2 economics focus on the advanced micro-economic concepts, saving all of the macroeconomic concepts until level 3.</p>	No			2020-06-10 15:49:48	ANON-YFPW-RCZ2-7	2020-06-10 15:49:48	2020-06-10 15:49:54
Yes	<p>*aware but STILL awaiting sufficient detail. What are the standards for implementation next year looking like? To propose changes for next year now and provide little or NO information about what this will look like in practice is very unfair. It also leaves very little time for planning.</p> <p>*Most schools already do foundation work in years 9 & 10 for many subjects - what is the rationale for extending this to year 11 as well?</p> <p>* It seems unfair that some subjects are expected to combine - thus reducing student choices - but others are not. If the rationale was used evenly on all subjects - then it wouldn't appear as if commerce-based subjects are taking the biggest hit.</p> <p>* expecting specialisation at levels 2 & 3, but not at level 1, means that the skills and concepts for economics, accounting & business studies that take time to develop and build on will be less, not more broad. Again, why are some subjects subject to this thinking but others not?</p>	Disagree	<p>Some changes seem quite arbitrary - why are history and geography stand-alone subjects but economics and accounting not? Even though there are many more accountants than historians & geographers. This does not fit with the drive for clearer vocational pathways. Maybe accounting isn't a vocation any more? If we follow the logic and apply it across all subjects - then Dance & Drama & Music could all become "performing arts" at level 1 with specialisation at level 2 and 3 - but they stay as stand-alone subjects. In many schools, the number taking languages is much less than the number taking accounting or economics, but languages are stand-alone (although I acknowledge the difficulty in combining them) but then, languages study is not always vocational. In other words, the rationale and the approach do not match.</p>	<p>Some changes seem quite arbitrary - why are history and geography stand alone subjects but economics and accounting not? Even though there are many more accountants than historians & geographers. This does not fit with the drive for clearer vocational pathways. Maybe accounting isn't a vocation any more? Accounting, economics and business studies are not interchangeable - few students take all three. Accounting, economics and business studies all focus on distinctly different concepts and skills. As there is a clear progression from level 1 to 3 for all subjects, why is it thought that this can be compressed? As a school, we offer a course at year 10 which is designed as a introduction/foundation course - why offer the same at year 11? Combining all three at year 11 may make it difficult for separate commerce subjects - especially with the split into three separate sciences at year 12 as happens in many schools.</p>	<p>Not really - no do I feel that there is sufficient assistance for teachers to become more acquainted with this</p>	No			2020-06-10 15:57:57	ANON-YFPW-RCZT-9	2020-06-10 15:26:49	2020-06-10 15:58:06

Yes	Greater specialisation by default creates smaller class sizes, which then get combined with other levels, or schools won't run them with lower numbers. The MOE should give greater support to schools to enable specialisation, recognising that fewer students will want to be an architect or a fashion designer etc... but for those that do it is their passion. They could do this by increased teacher funding to allow for this to happen in schools without schools having to generalise students by not offering courses or compromising their courses by having two or three levels combined in one class.	Disagree	Food Science is not Technology. Food Technology is a significant part of the Technology curriculum and it incorporates Technological Knowledge which includes some science, as well as nutrition. In the same way Materials Technology includes the science of material properties etc... Home Economics covers some Nature of Technology strand and some of the Technological Knowledge strand of the curriculum - such as sustainability, how things change over time etc... Home Economics should either be part of the Health curriculum or left out as the content is easily covered in Food Technology. It is such an old fashioned name that is reminiscent of women looking after the 'home' and dates back to the 60's - 80's. Food Technology covers cooking for families, nutrition etc... just as much as it covers developing new food products because we have the freedom to choose suitable contexts to sit work in. Having both is very confusing.	Generic Technology is the 'thread' that runs through the Technology curriculum. It is the part that connects all the strands and achievement objectives. Don't lose sight of the strands and the achievement objectives as NCEA is an assessment tool for our curriculum - not our curriculum. Without the generic standards as well as the specialist standards we would lose the heart of our subject which would be divisive, and our students would lose the wonderful opportunities for connections across Technology specialist areas. The generic standards are a vital part of our NCEA assessment tools. Teachers need more specialist PLD, which has been lost over the last three to four years with communities of learning that are not meeting that need, in order to pick up more of the generic standards. There is not a problem with the standards, the issue is fear of the unknown because the specialist support has not been put behind them.		Yes			2020-06-10 18:50:44	ANON-YFPW-RCZU-A	2020-06-10 16:57:49	2020-06-10 18:50:51
Yes	Level 1 will need to still give students in practical subjects the opportunity to develop knowledge and skills, to be able to be successful in practical standards such as implement standards as they need accurate skills to gain M and E. So 'broad' might be Ok in choice of subjects but subjects themselves still need the opportunity to develop specialist skills to see success at L2/3.	Disagree	'Food Science' ? This is non descript and does not reflect 'Food Technology', it does it a disservice. Food Technologists learn about nutrition, health issues, sustainability issues, ethical and moral issues as well as learn how to develop 'food products', and all the practical skills to enable them to do that. 'Home Economics' is not required - it is covered in Food Technology. The Food Technology areas have been split between the two which creates confusion and is unnecessary. The PE & Health curriculum has it's own AS and does not need another NCEA constructed subject to assess it. NCEA is the assessment tool not the curriculum - so where does Home Economics come from ? it is a historical name for a subject that was taught before Food Technology was introduced. It is outdated and has been superseded by Food Technology which covers the three strands of the Technology curriculum and can build in any of the knowledge or skills covered in Home Economics. Home Economics should be removed. Food Technology fits under Technology.	The generic standards in Technology are a critical part of the Technology curriculum. The Technology curriculum has three strands and 8 achievement objectives. At Levels 6,7 and 8 NCEA is an assessment tool. The generic standards reflect elements of the three strands and is the Technological practice strand. Without the generic achievement standards in the Technology NCEA assessment matrix you render our national Technology curriculum useless. It also shows ignorance around what actually happens in Technology. The generics reflect the Technological Practice strand which is how students become technologically literate [able to operate as technologists]. Without those standards you also greatly restrict our students opportunities to for flexibility as they give practical and theoretical opportunities to demonstrate skills and knowledge. The standards themselves are totally open - they can already be based around anything we would like to focus on - they are so broad they create freedom for students to focus in on topics they would like to explore. The Technology generics need to stay. Reducing the number of standards just to fit in with other subject matrices is not a justifiable reason.		No			2020-06-10 19:08:51	ANON-YFPW-RCAY-N	2020-06-10 19:08:51	2020-06-10 19:08:55
Yes		Undecided	There is not enough information to make an informed decision.	In Technology - 'Processing Technology' is used by materials Technology areas as well as Food Technology areas. There need to be more standards that give materials [hard and soft] more opportunities as students can only do this standard in one area currently. I use concrete and resin in materials, we can use dying in textiles - this area of the Technology matrix is too limited and has always been lacking in standards. This is a great opportunity to see its potential for non traditional materials and innovation. For Food Technology it needs to have more achievement standards and some of the home economics standards could be reshaped to fit within this. The other topics covered by home economics can be the focus of the generic technology standards. Home Economics is unnecessary.		No			2020-06-10 19:15:02	ANON-YFPW-RCAC-J	2020-06-10 19:15:02	2020-06-10 19:15:05
Yes		Strongly disagree	I disagree that Latin should be stopped. It is a wonderful subject for developing enquiring minds and helps in understanding how the English language evolved and is structured and can help in learning other languages.	I disagree that Latin should be stopped. It is a wonderful subject for developing enquiring minds and helps in understanding how the English language evolved and is structured and can help in learning other languages.	Yes, I would like Latin to be continued for levels 2 & 3 for the reasons set out above	No	No		2020-06-10 19:19:54	ANON-YFPW-RCAC-Y	2020-06-10 19:19:54	2020-06-10 19:20:20
Yes		Strongly disagree	Latin is a very good subject.	Latin is a subject that not only helps with English language and grammar but also for other languages such as Spanish or french.	I think latin would be good for level 2 and 3.	No			2020-06-10 19:26:58	ANON-YFPW-RCAS-F	2020-06-10 19:26:58	2020-06-10 19:27:32

Yes	I was aware of the intended change to subjects at NCEA at Level one, but not of its intent to support education at NCEA L1. As by removing student choice from curriculum areas where they have experienced educational success in previous years of learning, will result in disengagement by needing to instead refocus on a prescribed area of learning, or a lack of skill to then continue at a more senior level of their education.	Strongly disagree	<p>What is the harm of having subjects available, for schools to offer if they have the teaching staff knowledge and the student interest? If schools do not want to offer a subject they do not need to.</p> <p>What is the ongoing impact of removing subjects, and in turn the associated educational success for NCEA L1? The associated understanding of this subject name skimming is that it will remove opportunities for students to be assessed on their strengths, as courses wont be able to be made at a local level with a variety of focused assessments from a range of "subjects". This is especially true for Technology, where students go through tasters at years 9+10, and then know by yr 11 what they are interested in. But if generic technology was to be removed, students who excel in physical courses such as Wood based, metal based, and fabric based technology, will be discriminated against as this would become one "subject" and as such only be able to count towards their NCEA L1 certificate once. Requiring them to choose other "subjects" which they may not have such passion for and be penalized in their academic success as they are required to do the same as everyone else. Is this an equitable system?</p>	<p>My proposal is that the new technology subjects be named the following: Digital Technologies, Design and Visual Communication, Industrial or Product Technologies, Fashion and Textiles Technologies, Food Technologies.</p> <p>The NZQA insight data proposes to give an overview of subject usage trends for the subjects associated with the Technology Learning Area of the New Zealand Curriculum. However, the data actually shows student entries in Technology Achievement Standards strands - Digital Technologies and Hangarau Mathiko , DVC, Construction and Mechanical Technologies, Processing Technologies and not technology "subjects/courses" where achievement standards maybe selected across the Technology matrix and not from just one strand</p> <p>It is essential too that subjects are future focused, show progression from Y9 -13, representative, and reflect subject specific skills across Technology curriculum</p> <p>Rationale The rationale for the following subject changes are illustrated below which shows that subject specific knowledge is unique to each subject.</p>	No	I am aware of the existence of Te Marautanga o Aotearoa, but I am not aware of its content. I have looked at it over the years and have found accessibility to non te reo readers difficult. This curriculum is really important and it is disappointing it excludes access to those who need it, ie teachers, in order to deliver in schools across the country.	Can the subjects from Te Marautanga o Aotearoa be made transparent across the NZC aswell? The local learning focus would benefit all learners of Aotearoa, and have looked at for students who are unable to attend a Te Reo centered learning environment.	2020-06-11 08:44:12	ANON-YFPW-RC26-B	2020-06-10 09:29:26	2020-06-11 08:44:25
Yes		Strongly disagree	Vital elements of essential learning in Physics (as per the NZC definition) are not adequately covered in the current four standards for Level 1 Science. This must be addressed. It is hard enough to get Physics adequately covered at L1 currently and it lays a groundwork for several other subjects as well as continuing Physics. An erosion of the coverage is therefore unacceptable.	Level 1 Physics must be retained as a subject if basic knowledge is to be retained in our school population. Further erosion of physics subject matter is unacceptable and the standards presented do not cover the physics curriculum.	No	Yes	No	2020-06-11 09:59:16	ANON-YFPW-RCA8-M	2020-06-11 09:59:16	2020-06-11 09:59:38
Yes		Strongly disagree		YES – We must retain L1 Physics. The new standards do not allow students to gain the skills and knowledge required by the curriculum.	No	Yes	No	2020-06-11 10:18:45	ANON-YFPW-RCA9-N	2020-06-11 10:18:45	2020-06-11 10:18:59
Yes		Agree			The Tourism Teachers Association - NZ (TTA-NZ) encourages the Ministry of Education to include "Tourism Management" as part of the achievement standard (AS) framework at level 2 and 3. The TTA-NZ has the support of tertiary tourism educators, the tourism industry and the ITO for tourism – Service IQ, in advocating for "Tourism Management" achievement standards.	No		2020-06-11 11:29:17	ANON-YFPW-RCA6-3	2020-06-11 11:29:17	2020-06-11 11:29:23
No		Disagree		I don't believe economics, business studies and accounting should be grouped together as commerce. I believe economics and accounting especially are very different subjects and shouldn't be grouped together.	Tourism as a multi-disciplinary, multi-method field of study is well suited to meet the changing complexities of societies. Tourism provides the platform for exciting, stimulating and highly relevant programmes of study' (Airrey, 2019, p.261).	No		2020-06-11 11:39:05	ANON-YFPW-RCA1-6	2020-06-11 11:39:05	2020-06-11 11:39:12
					The NZ tourism industry, until Covid-19, was a \$45B industry representing 20% of exports, 10% of GDP and 400,000 jobs. Tourism is a remarkably resilient industry that has withstood previous global challenges and, many countries, including NZ are now taking the opportunity to reimagine tourism while focusing on the environmental, economic and socio-cultural benefits tourism can provide.						

No		Disagree	I completely disagree with the decision to bring the commerce subjects together, and the social studies subjects together.	Economics, accounting and business studies are very different subjects. Personally I am not sure I would've taken a 'commerce' subject in level one if it was accounting and business studies as well as economics. Students may be less likely to take this subject if they are passionate only in one area of this because they don't want to have to do the other standards for NCEA. I would suggest schools offer a merged subject in year 9 or 10 so students can decide before specialising in level 1. Also to fully understand a course such as economics or accounting, there is a lot of content needed to learn. Just doing parts of each course, or the whole course condensed would be confusing and very stressful for students. It may also be harder for the students who do specialise in year 12 because they may not have had the full course taught properly to understand well. Also I believe the three 'social studies' subjects merging is not a good idea, these subjects are very different. Maybe social studies and psychology could merge but media studies is entirely different, many of my friends take this and they say it is a completely different subject. Some people would definitely not want to have to do other social sciences just to do media studies and vice-versa.		Yes			2020-06-11 11:47:40	ANON-YFPW-RCAQ-D	2020-06-11 11:47:40	2020-06-11 11:47:56
No		Strongly disagree	I think it's so stupid, particularly the commerce bit. joining accounting, economics and business studies and calling it commerce is like combining dance, drama and music and calling it performing arts. If I want to do economics and suck at maths - what makes you think id want to do accounting too? id just fail the accounting bit, which would not help me at all. Itd make me not want to go to class or just not take the subject at all.	I'd say let the schools choose to do what they think is best for their school. the idea you are suggesting is very much a one size fits all type thing. for example, what you could do for bigger schools who normally have full classes for each subject in level one, let them do the broad subject in year 10 when you don't get credits for your work. so then if they don't enjoy part of it, it doesn't affect them when the grades actually matter. for schools that don't have that demand, they can choose to do the combined subjects in level one if they wish. I believe this is a good compromise and is more helpful than what you are suggesting. I've talked to lots of people about what you are suggesting and for some subjects, we can see how they could go together. However with commerce - I haven't met a single person who is in favor of these changes and I believe that it will prevent people from taking the subject because they don't like an aspect of it, therefore meaning they may not discover their love of a certain topic.	nope	No			2020-06-11 11:50:03	ANON-YFPW-RCAE-1	2020-06-11 11:50:03	2020-06-11 11:50:16
Yes		Disagree	I feel that some parts are good, such as adding in new subjects but the merging of other subjects could be improved or not done at all	I think that merging economics, accounting and business studies may be beneficial for school with lower demand for those subjects but I think it should be up to the school whether to merge those subjects. Those subject already all have plenty of content at level one so merging them may mean that students miss out on learnings that they need in level two or three. This is the same for the suggested merge of social studies.		Yes			2020-06-11 11:51:54	ANON-YFPW-RCA5-H	2020-06-11 11:51:54	2020-06-11 11:52:07

No	Until now I was not aware of this intended change, but I do believe the concept has the right intentions while the way it is carried out at level 1 NCEA rather junior school in year 9 and 10 is probably a less efficient use of time at college.	Disagree	Although I do not hold a strong opinion about the changes to Latin or Art History and do think the addition of Māori performing arts is great the changes from Economics, Business Studies and Accounting where they are merged into one subject seem to create an unnecessarily high workload for students and take teachers away from teaching their specialist area. The three subjects are very different especially with Economics being focused around a more English base and Accounting around a more Mathematics base. I think that this proposed change has the right intentions but would be better addressed by schools in year 9 and 10 levels. Schools should offer broader subject options by for example offering more subjects in a junior-level by offering half-year classes. This achieves the same broadness but allows students to specialise sooner and therefore not be forced to take exams and internal assessments in subjects that they do not wish to pursue and therefore students will not be discouraged from taking these subjects. This combination of subjects seems similar to if music, drama and dance were merged because they are very different subjects that require very different skills and teaching points. On the merge of social studies, media studies and psychology I think that a merge of social studies and psychology while leaving media studies as its own subject would be much more	I think that including māori performance arts is a good idea to include more Māori culture in our school systems but merging three subjects to get commerce undermines how different the three are while adding media studies to the social studies and psychology mix completely changes what the subject does for students and minimises its appeal to a greater range of students.		No			2020-06-11 11:53:51	ANON-YFPW-RCAP-C	2020-06-11 11:53:51	2020-06-11 11:54:10
No		Agree	I agree with most of the subject merges except for a few.	I suggest that commerce should become economics and business studies, accounting should be separate as it is a completely different subject. Commerce being a combined mixture of business studies and economics works well at many schools such as Wellington College and Queen Margarets. They offer accounting separately and that works well for those schools as accounting is very different from economics and business studies. It is more of a maths based subject and many students aren't interested in that option. I also suggest that media studies should be separate from social studies and psychology, it is taught very differently to those 2 subjects and is not similar at all.		No			2020-06-11 11:54:14	ANON-YFPW-RCA7-K	2020-06-11 11:54:14	2020-06-11 11:54:31
No		Undecided	Some of the changes I agree with, however I think that year 9 & 10 provides students with enough time to gain broad understandings on topics. In most cases, specialising in year 11 is beneficial.	- Art history and Classics are both important subjects that have enough valuable content to be their own course. Putting both subjects under history, and studying them only as possible contexts seems lazy and ill-informed. This is contributing to a constant lack of appreciation for arts and culture, something which the New Zealand curriculum should never enforce. - I do not think that having a combined commerce course is helpful, as each of the subjects that fall within that subject have complex topics that require a depth of understanding. This would potentially make Level 2 onwards more difficult. - Combining social studies, media studies and psychology into one subject should not happen. Perhaps more than the other subjects I mentioned, these courses are all very different and attract people from a range of different interests. Having these all in one subject may deter people from taking the subject at all, as one of the areas may not interest them. This blocks off an entire portion of potential learning.	- Philosophy - Legal studies - Politics	No			2020-06-11 11:57:57	ANON-YFPW-RCAF-2	2020-06-11 11:57:57	2020-06-11 11:58:14

Yes		Strongly disagree	Although I do already take multiple commerce subjects and the combination to create the subject of commerce would be ok if not better, I do strongly disagree with the idea of combining them. The subjects are very different and combining them do not make much sense.	I believe that by combining subjects it is not great as it is essentially giving people less time to learn from subjects that they do enjoy. Especially in the idea to combine social science and commerce, from taking them I believe that they are very different subjects and combining them is taking away the appeal for many students. We as students have year 9 and 10 to try a broad range of subjects, I believe that this is undermining students learning as we have already been given the time to try out subjects so since we are being assessed with NCEA it is important that we are passionate about our subjects in order to succeed. Also without changes to the curriculum in Level 2 and 3 of NCEA, students will have a 1/3 of the learning time and then be expected to be at the same level the following year. Level 2 of NCEA is already a large step up for students so making this gap in learning larger, will result in higher levels of stress among our youth.	I think that specialist subjects are really important as students are allowed to follow their passions, so these changes would be a large step backwards. I would recommend to keep the subjects as is.	No			2020-06-11 11:58:29	ANON-YFPW-RCA1-D	2020-06-11 11:58:29	2020-06-11 11:58:42
Yes		Strongly disagree	it's a TERRIBLE proposal. Level 1 is when you get to choose the subjects that interest you and start to specialise in subjects. There is no reason to combine the commerce subjects as they are all very different. So students that take economics wouldn't want to take commerce because it involves accounting which has more maths and vice-versa. But then in Note 2 basically saying there would be little to none accounting is UNFAIR, the reason that you proposed to combine economics, business studies and accounting together was like a taster for all subjects and by not offering an equal amount of accounting doesn't make sense then. It would turn students away from the subject and would put more stress on the subject for level 2 as level 1 accounting has a lot of content. teacher specialise a subject in university before doing their teaching degree. they usually go onto to teach the subject they got a degree in at University because they enjoy that and are confident in that but by condensing and dumbing down economics, business and accounting teacher that studied accounting at university would not know economics concept and	Instead of combing economics, business studies and accounting for level 1 do it for year 10, year 10 is the year where to figure out what subjects you will do for level 1. Instead of dumbing down level 1 subjects, make the curriculum at junior school more specific so that students get a taste of subjects then and not waste level 1.	NO	No		2020-06-11 12:12:21	ANON-YFPW-RCAZ-P	2020-06-11 12:12:21	2020-06-11 12:16:03	
Yes		Undecided			The Tourism Teachers Association - NZ (TTA-NZ) We encourage the Ministry of Education to include 'Tourism Management' as part of the achievement standard (AS) framework at level 2 and 3. The TTA-NZ has the support of tertiary tourism educators, the tourism industry and the ITO for tourism – Service IQ, in advocating for 'Tourism Management' achievement standards. 'Tourism as a multi-disciplinary, multi-method field of study is well suited to meet the changing complexities of societies. Tourism provides the platform for exciting, stimulating and highly relevant programmes of study' (Airey, 2019, p.261). The NZ tourism industry, until Covid-19, was a S&B industry representing 20% of exports, 10% of GDP and 400,000 jobs. Tourism is a remarkably resilient industry that has withstood previous global challenges and, many countries, including NZ are now taking the opportunity to reimagine tourism while focusing on the environmental, economic and socio-cultural benefits tourism can provide. Tourism study is not only about training a service-delivery workforce but needs to also be about producing critical, creative and	No			2020-06-11 13:08:53	ANON-YFPW-RCAH-4	2020-06-11 13:08:53	2020-06-11 13:09:19
No	Latin is more important than most of the languages being retained.	Strongly disagree	Like I said - Latin is an important part of world history. Stop playing identity politics and keep it.	I don't agree with the removal of Latin. It's one of the most important languages in our history.		Yes			2020-06-11 13:19:54	ANON-YFPW-RCAB-X	2020-06-11 13:19:54	2020-06-11 13:20:23

Yes	I was made aware of this only this week.	Disagree	Some changes seem unwise.	Why drop Latin? I am a professor in the Business School at Otago University. I have degrees in math, accounting, economics, etc. These are all quantitative fields. I am not a languages person at all, but I use Latin (and Greek) all the time. I am horrified at the inability of my students to comprehend simple concepts because they have no feel for the roots of our English language, and so they see no deeper meaning in the words we use. I turn to Latin and Greek in the classroom on a regular basis to help explain complex topics to students. I exploit knowledge of these language roots in my reading every day. I teach practical quantitative math-oriented topics, and stronger language roots in my students would help. I am forever explaining what words mean. I am hamstrung already with my students' lack of depth in the English language. Please do make the situation even worse.	You could, perhaps, make it "Latin and Greek" instead of just Latin.	No	No.	Is there a typographical error in this question? Did you mean Question 5?	2020-06-11 13:45:05	ANON-YFPW-RCAM-9	2020-06-11 13:45:05	2020-06-11 13:45:18
Yes		Disagree		I think Latin should be continued. My 13 year old chose her high school over others partly because it offered Latin. She had a brief taste of it at intermediate school, and instantly saw how fun and useful it was, with instant relevance to other subjects such as English, science and history. She did not see the same instant relevance/usefulness with any of the modern languages offered. It will be shameful if New Zealand does not have Latin in its curriculum.		No			2020-06-11 14:29:38	ANON-YFPW-RCAD-Z	2020-06-11 14:29:38	2020-06-11 14:29:56
No		Strongly disagree				No			2020-06-11 14:43:34	ANON-YFPW-RCAX-M	2020-06-11 14:43:34	2020-06-11 14:43:40
No		Undecided		I don't think that psychology should be a part of social studies. I don't think that health and pe should be one thing, some people may be interested in the health side of things but aren't into physical education enough to pass the class. I think that at level one its a good idea to merge economics, business studies and accounting into commerce and merging the sciences (science extra?) as it is good for someone to get a good insight on what each will be like before choosing at level 2.	no, I don't think that you should merge anything and I don't think there's anything needed to be taken away	No			2020-06-11 15:00:56	ANON-YFPW-RCAN-A	2020-06-11 15:00:56	2020-06-11 15:01:05
Yes		Strongly agree		The Tourism Teachers Association - NZ (TTA-NZ) encourages the Ministry of Education to include 'Tourism Management' as part of the achievement standard (AS) framework at level 2 and 3. The TTA-NZ has the support of tertiary tourism educators, the tourism industry and the ITO for tourism – Service IQ, in advocating for 'Tourism Management' achievement standards. 'Tourism as a multi-disciplinary, multi-method field of study is well suited to meet the changing complexities of societies. Tourism provides the platform for exciting, stimulating and highly relevant programmes of study' (Airey, 2019, p.261). The NZ tourism industry, until Covid-19, was a \$45B industry representing 20% of exports, 10% of GDP and 400,000 jobs. Tourism is a remarkably resilient industry that has withstood previous global challenges and, many countries, including NZ are now taking the opportunity to reimagine tourism while focusing on the environmental, economic and socio-cultural benefits tourism can provide. Tourism study is not only about training a service-delivery workforce but needs to also be about		No			2020-06-11 15:08:59	ANON-YFPW-RCAK-7	2020-06-11 15:08:59	2020-06-11 15:14:04

Yes		Agree		<p>I encourage the Ministry of Education to include 'Tourism Management' as part of the achievement standard (AS) framework at level 2 and 3. The TTA-NZ has the support of tertiary tourism educators, the tourism industry and the ITO for tourism – Service IQ, in advocating for 'Tourism Management' achievement standards.</p> <p>Tourism as a multi-disciplinary, multi-method field of study is well suited to meet the changing complexities of societies. Tourism provides the platform for exciting, stimulating and highly relevant programmes of study' (Airey, 2019, p.261).</p> <p>The NZ tourism industry, until Covid-19, was a \$45B industry representing 20% of exports, 10% of GDP and 400,000 jobs. Tourism is a remarkably resilient industry that has withstood previous global challenges and, many countries, including NZ are now taking the opportunity to reimagine tourism while focusing on the environmental, economic and socio-cultural benefits tourism can provide.</p> <p>Tourism study is not only about training a service-delivery workforce but needs to also be about producing critical, creative and strategic thinkers</p>	No			2020-06-11 15:15:40	ANON-YFPW-RCAG-J	2020-06-11 15:14:33	2020-06-11 15:15:47
No		Strongly disagree			No			2020-06-11 16:15:11	ANON-YFPW-RCAR-E	2020-06-11 16:15:11	2020-06-11 16:15:19
No		Strongly disagree	<p>It would be a true loss if Latin were removed from curriculum offerings. Latin is not only useful in learning the meaning of words in English that are derived from Latin, but it's also very helpful when studying any Romance language, like French and Spanish, and in all scientific fields.</p> <p>From dictionary.com: "About 80 percent of the entries in any English dictionary are borrowed, mainly from Latin. Over 60 percent of all English words have Greek or Latin roots. In the vocabulary of the sciences and technology, the figure rises to over 90 percent." https://www.dictionary.com/e/word-origins</p>	see above answer to 2.	Yes			2020-06-11 16:17:34	ANON-YFPW-RCAG-K	2020-06-11 16:17:34	2020-06-11 16:17:56
Yes		Strongly disagree	<p>Rationale: The current four standards for L1 Science do not adequately cover the key components of the essential learning in Physics as defined by the NZ curriculum.</p>	<p>YES – L1 Physics must be retained as a subject. The standards presented do not appropriately cover the physics curriculum. Science subjects are strongly determined by building concepts and skills in successive layers. While students might take physics as part of a general science course at L1, the physics part of that must be spelt out with common standards that are physics content specific. This is true for other sciences also; my concerns are those of a professional physicist, mindful of the fact that this foundational science underlies engineering and much else besides.</p>	No		No	2020-06-11 18:17:19	ANON-YFPW-RCAG-G	2020-06-11 18:17:19	2020-06-11 18:17:33
Yes		Strongly agree			No			2020-06-11 19:35:45	ANON-YFPW-RCAT-G	2020-06-11 19:35:45	2020-06-11 19:36:05
				<p>We encourage the Ministry of Education to include 'Tourism Management' as part of the achievement standard (AS) framework at level 2 and 3. The TTA-NZ has the support of tertiary tourism educators, the tourism industry and the ITO for tourism – Service IQ, in advocating for 'Tourism Management' achievement standards.</p> <p>Tourism as a multi-disciplinary, multi-method field of study is well suited to meet the changing complexities of societies. Tourism provides the platform for exciting, stimulating and highly relevant programmes of study' (Airey, 2019, p.261).</p> <p>The NZ tourism industry, until Covid-19, was a \$45B industry representing 20% of exports, 10% of GDP and 400,000 jobs. Tourism is a remarkably resilient industry that has withstood previous global challenges and, many countries, including NZ are now taking the opportunity to reimagine tourism while focusing on the environmental, economic and socio-cultural benefits tourism can provide.</p> <p>Tourism study is not only about training a service-delivery workforce but needs to also</p>							

No		Disagree		<p>Our family is disappointed that Latin won't be included.</p> <p>A knowledge of this ancient society and its language provides a contextual understanding of modern society. As such future generations will be better equipped to contribute positively to the continuation of civilisation.</p> <p>On a more personal note, our son has found this subject fascinating. Learning about the ancient world has inspired and interested him like no other subject. It has piqued his interest in travel to the Mediterranean. Should he be lucky enough to go there, his trip will be greatly enriched by a deep understanding of the history.</p> <p>Closer to home, the benefits of a Latin education will provide him with a historical perspective on government, trade, law, international relations and architecture.</p>		Yes			2020-06-11 20:11:57	ANON-YFPW-RCA3-F	2020-06-11 20:11:57	2020-06-11 20:13:26
Yes		Disagree	<p>It's not that I don't support the intention of the Ministry's proposed changes, it's the treatment of Latin and Classical Studies that I disagree with. Removing a subject like Latin would be a great shame to me personally and in general. Throughout my years in college, Latin was my guiding star. The countless skills I learnt from this challenging, interesting and unique subject continue to influence my life and my studies in a positive way. I have witnessed the benefits of a Latin education in myself and in countless of my peers. Even people who did not enjoy studying the subject admitted that it has instilled in them numerous learning skills. It would be a sad sight to see Latin removed from the curriculum, to know that future students won't have the choice to explore such a rich subject.</p>	<p>I would suggest that Latin continue to be included as a study option for all levels. In addition to what I stated above, I think that the schooling system would be doing a disservice to the students of NZ in removing a subject that has been treasured for centuries. In principle I believe that school students should have as much free choice in selecting subjects as logistically possible. Latin is very dear to my heart and to countless others I know. Attending Latin reading competitions and learning about all the details of the Roman Empire and their beautiful Latin language are without doubt the highlight of my schooling and of my life more generally. I would love to see future generations benefit from such an experience. Thank you.</p>		Yes			2020-06-11 22:01:13	ANON-YFPW-RCA2-E	2020-06-11 22:01:13	2020-06-11 22:01:37
Yes		Strongly disagree	<p>Social studies is so broad, it would not do justice to the amount of media literacy needed to equip students for the modern world, as well as all of the other vital skills. To cut out Media Studies as an independent subject is a step backwards in progressive, future-focused education.</p>	<p>Media Studies needs to be an independent subject. With the growth of issues such as fake news, and the digital, media-saturated age we live in, Media Studies should be an essential subject, not one that is diminished. Many social studies teachers do not have the media expertise to teach it effectively.</p>	<p>Media Studies and media literacy needs to stay and be built on further.</p>	Yes		<p>Media literacy needs to be a key competency</p>	2020-06-12 09:45:07	ANON-YFPW-RCAU-H	2020-06-12 09:45:07	2020-06-12 09:45:20
Yes	<p>However, some of the changes you are suggesting will be detrimental to the learning of our students and as a result detrimental to society as a whole. There is an urgent need for people to be more media literate than ever before. To subsume level 1 Media into a wider social science denies these students access to the comprehension skills they will require to be able to participate in society at their full potential - something the NZC asks us to prepare them for.</p>	Strongly disagree	<p>Some of the changes you are suggesting will be detrimental to the learning of our students and as a result detrimental to society as a whole. There is an urgent need for people to be more media literate than ever before. To subsume level 1 Media into a wider social science denies these students access to the comprehension skills they will require to be able to participate in society at their full potential - something the NZC asks us to prepare them for.</p>	<p>Yes, keep level 1 Media as its own subject so that we can continue to prepare students to participate in this ever increasingly digital world. Media is the only subject that prepares students to understand how media (digital and print) manipulate and shape people's perceptions of the world. It is imperative that students are given the opportunity to access that subject at all levels.</p>		Yes		no	2020-06-12 09:48:58	ANON-YFPW-RC2Y-6	2020-06-12 09:48:58	2020-06-12 09:49:10
Yes		Agree				No			2020-06-12 11:34:25	ANON-YFPW-RC2C-G	2020-06-12 11:34:25	2020-06-12 11:34:50
No		Undecided		<p>I think that accounting should be separate from economics and business studies as they are actually quite different subjects</p>		No			2020-06-12 11:35:02	ANON-YFPW-RC2S-Z	2020-06-12 11:35:02	2020-06-12 11:35:20
Yes		Agree				No			2020-06-12 11:37:26	ANON-YFPW-RC28-5	2020-06-12 11:37:26	2020-06-12 11:37:47
No		Disagree		<p>In the commerce, I think it will be very hard to combine accounting and economics because they are so different. I take Economics and accounting and there is already so much to remember, and combining the two subjects will cause a lot of confusion. I also think that not a lot of people will pick the subject because they may not like either accounting or economics.</p>		Yes			2020-06-12 11:38:48	ANON-YFPW-RC29-6	2020-06-12 11:38:48	2020-06-12 11:39:09
No		Disagree	<p>Combining economics and accounting could be quite difficult as they are quite different subjects. Combining them would mean very little accounting would be taught which could impact people who want to take accounting or impact them if it branches out again in level 2. A possibility would be making a combined commerce course at year 10 to let people get a taste of what each subject holds and have the 3 subjects individual at NCEA level 1 so people can pick and choose based on their liking.</p>			No			2020-06-12 11:39:59	ANON-YFPW-RC2G-M	2020-06-12 11:39:59	2020-06-12 11:40:09

No		Disagree		I dont think mixing all the commerce subjects together is a good idea, its ok for economics and business studies to be together but not for accounting, accounting is very different to the other 2 and the stuff we are learning at level 1 is very valuable and if the subjects are combined the new year 11s wont get the feel for the subject, accounting is very important and needs to be on its own, it is a subject that can provide us with the chance to have a universal career. if the subjects mix we wont have the chance to learn subject properly and then if we specialise in it for level 2 and level 3 we will have more work to cram into our learning because we never had enough time in level 1. so please do not combine accounting with the other subjects.		No			2020-06-12 11:40:06	ANON-YFPW-RC2J-Q	2020-06-12 11:40:06	2020-06-12 11:40:22
No		Agree	I think that combining all commerce subjects into one may be unnecessary as economics and accounting in particular are very different subjects, and students should be able to choose between doing one or the other so that they can specialise in it. I feel as though science as one subject is a good idea because later on down the track, students can still choose to pick up specific sciences if they desire.	I think Maori Performing Arts is a good subject to have because there is more to Te Ao Maori than the language, and the performing arts play a big role in the culture as well. I take Te Reo Maori myself and the teachers try to intertwine little bits of performing arts into our school year because it helps us to understand the culture more than we would with just the language.		No			2020-06-12 11:40:19	ANON-YFPW-RC2Q-X	2020-06-12 11:40:19	2020-06-12 11:40:43
No		Disagree	I think most the subjects that would get merged into one subject don't fit well together. I don't think they would be a good build-up to learn all those subjects together. For example, if you did accounting, economics and Business studies in one year you wouldn't learn enough for at least one of those subjects for the next year where you would be able to change to just doing economics or accounting, therefore, it would be harder to start those subjects.	I think most the subjects that would get merged into one subject don't fit well together. I don't think they would be a good build-up to learn all those subjects together. For example, if you did accounting, economics and Business studies in one year you wouldn't learn enough for at least one of those subjects for the next year where you would be able to change to just doing economics or accounting, therefore, it would be harder to start those subjects.	Humanities	No		I think humanities should stay a subject all through Ncea	2020-06-12 11:42:13	ANON-YFPW-RC2E-J	2020-06-12 11:42:13	2020-06-12 11:42:30
No	I wasn't aware of the change just until now when my teacher told us about it.	Disagree	I personally disagree with the idea of combining some subjects such as Economics and accounting. Economics and accounting, although they do share some things in common, the way they are introduced and the way they are dealt and taught are very different from each other whereas business studies and economics are quite a reasonable pair. In my case, I love economics but is not a big fan of accounting, and if Level 1 commerce included accounting in it I wouldn't have chosen it as a subject. I think having the the subject commerce generalised in Year 9 & 10 is enough to get an idea around what they look like and I believe that from Year 11 - 13 we should be able to choose the specific branches of it (as we are well aware of what each of them would look like from the junior years). Additionally, if they are all combined, we'd spent less time on each of them which decreases the depth we used to be able to get, and for people who are only passionate in one of those branches, this definitely is not the most ideal situation.	I've kind of answered this question in the previous one, with the economics and accounting, but just to clarify, I like the idea of combining some subjects that are relevant to each other and have similar values such as economics and business studies (As both of those subjects go along with each other and have several intersections), but accounting doesn't necessary have that much in common with the other two. So maybe generalising the subjects can be a bit more considered,		No			2020-06-12 11:52:11	ANON-YFPW-RC2S-2	2020-06-12 11:52:11	2020-06-12 11:52:25
Yes		Agree		We encourage the Ministry of Education to include "Tourism Management" as part of the achievement standard (AS) framework at level 2 and 3. The TTA-NZ has the support of tertiary tourism educators, the tourism industry and the ITO for tourism – Service IQ, in advocating for "Tourism Management" achievement standards. "Tourism as a multi-disciplinary, multi-method field of study is well suited to meet the changing complexities of societies. Tourism provides the platform for exciting, stimulating and highly relevant programmes of study" (Airey, 2019, p.261). The NZ tourism industry, until Covid-19, was a \$45B industry representing 20% of exports, 10% of GDP and 400,000 jobs. Tourism is a remarkably resilient industry that has withstood previous global challenges and, many countries, including NZ are now taking the opportunity to reimagine tourism while focusing on the environmental, economic and socio-cultural benefits tourism can provide. Tourism study is not only about training a service-delivery workforce but needs to also be about producing critical, creative and strategic thinkers		No			2020-06-12 13:12:56	ANON-YFPW-RC2P-W	2020-06-12 13:12:56	2020-06-12 13:13:04

Yes		Strongly disagree	While some changes are good the idea that an essentially practical subject like Media Studies can be integrated as an 'aspect' of a theoretical subject like Social Studies is a backwards step. If it has to be 'integrated' it should be an aspect of Art as it is more closely related to the visual language and practical skills of photography than it is to Social Studies.	I think it is absurd that Media Studies is being amalgamated into Social Studies. It is extremely short sighted. If anything, it should be increasingly differentiated. The parts students enjoy are the practical elements and this does not seem to be accommodated anywhere in the curriculum. Where are aspiring film makers going to learn their craft if they can not do it through Media Studies? It appeals to a wide range of students, not just academic students. Teachers of Social Studies will lack the skills, experience and equipment to implement a successful film making program. It isn't fair on them to expect them to teach practical film making, not on the students who will miss out on an enriching experience.		Yes			2020-06-12 13:16:30	ANON-YFPW-RC27-4	2020-06-12 13:16:30	2020-06-12 13:16:38
Yes		Strongly disagree	By combining subjects, students are getting a watered down version of the material they need to know for the future. How would this work with uni? Would students have to take more courses because they won't know the necessary info? That isn't fair.	Media studies and social studies have no overlap, they are completely different subjects in completely different fields of work. Economics and accounting use the same terminology but the words have different meanings, that would be so confusing. If students want to learn latin, why would you stop them from doing that?		No			2020-06-12 14:12:07	ANON-YFPW-RC21-X	2020-06-12 14:12:07	2020-06-12 14:12:24
Yes	I think that the broad, foundational education encouraged is already happening at year 9 and 10. Therefore, students are ready for specialisation by the time they are in their 3rd year of college.	Strongly disagree	It is combining subjects which are completely different, and not even teaching them at all as they will all be very condensed.	Media studies should not be combined with social studies and psychology. It is nothing like them, it is analysing into media genres and making media. That has nothing to do with the human brain or current events. If you are going to merge it, it should be with English as they have much more in common. Furthermore, it is very ignorant to combine economics, accounting and business studies. As somebody who has taken economics and accounting in level 1, they were completely different subjects, and the only correlation between the two is that they discuss money and people. They means for that discussion are completely different. Also my economics teacher is very mad, and you could be sacking my fave teacher mr morar.	no	No			2020-06-12 14:15:03	ANON-YFPW-RC22-7	2020-06-12 14:15:03	2020-06-12 14:15:12
Yes		Disagree	I disagree with the implemented changes because even though it might help with specialisation in level 2 and 3. Students would probably like to specialise in certain subjects anyway.			No			2020-06-12 14:23:03	ANON-YFPW-RC2H-N	2020-06-12 14:23:03	2020-06-12 14:23:14
Yes		Disagree		I disagree with the ministry proposed changes to NCEA level 1 subjects. This is because the rationale of there being an overlap between subjects (ie Media Studies, Social Studies, psychology or Economics, Business studies, and Accounting) is not true. Subjects like Media Studies and Social Studies have significant differences, the same goes for putting Economics and Accounting together. Having these subjects combined into one course will mean that individual subjects and the content taught to students will be diluted in order to fit them all in the course. This means students will have a lot of pressure and stress put on them when they have to pick up more concepts, skills, and ideas at level 2 when they specialize (as they weren't able to learn as much in each part of the course at level 1, e.g more economics being taught to them in the commerce course than accounting taught). This could mean that they may not be confident in going forward with specialising in a subject or pursuing the subject in tertiary education. Students as a whole may all not want to take the combined level 1 subject in general, because although they may have some interest in parts of it e.g. Economics, they may not like Accounting, so they won't take the subject. Another problem that can be posed with the Level 1 changes is that teachers would have to teach		No			2020-06-12 14:24:23	ANON-YFPW-RC2B-F	2020-06-12 14:24:23	2020-06-12 14:24:30

Yes		Disagree	I do agree with not making year 11s specialise to early, however, I believe some of the decisions that have made are flawed. I take economics and accounting and would never even consider them as similar. I do not believe that you could teach both to a high degree if they are combined into one subject. I also do not agree with joining history and classical studies. My older sister is very passionate about classical studies and has gone to study it beyond high school but does not enjoy history. Classical studies teaches about a specific era that has had immeasurable impacts on our modern lives. History is just as important, however, teaches very differently. History teaches a lot around events whereas classics studies art, poetry, plays and events from the Greek and roman era.	I believe that the decision to make science one subject at level one is very good as I know from experience junior science does not teach specialised sciences well. However as a level two student who takes both economics and accounting I cannot see many similarities that would allow for them to become one subject. This proposed change to make a commerce subject at level one would dilute all three separate subjects. Level one accounting sets students up extremely well to continue with level two (learning new things but built on the ideas learnt the previous year). Without a full course of level one accounting students would have to work extremely hard to try and learn to a high standard the level two course. Although both are commerce subjects accounting and economics not only study completely different ideas but the language and skills are not closely related. The only similarity is decision making and even then I found the way of explaining your ideas and use of language was very different in each subject. This mix of subjects may also discourage students from studying commerce. I know personally if I had to do economics, accounting and business studies as one subject I would not have taken it at level one because in year 10 I was only interested in accounting.	No				2020-06-12 14:27:24	ANON-YFPW-RC2M-T	2020-06-12 14:27:24	2020-06-12 14:27:36
Yes		Disagree	Some of the proposed ideas could work and make it a little better like making home economics to food tech but other things I do not agree with. I think that NCEA is doing ok with its subjects and connecting up level 1 and 2 and 3 so if anything should change it should be the assessment criteria not the actual subjects and content.	I think that you should not get rid of Latin as it is actually a very useful and valuable subject. The common misconception that it is a dead language is very wrong as it is a universal recognised language of many sciences. It is often said that medical student who took latin often do better as they already understand much of the medical terminology as it is in LATIN.	No				2020-06-12 14:28:43	ANON-YFPW-RC2D-H	2020-06-12 14:28:43	2020-06-12 14:28:53
Yes		Strongly disagree			No			2020-06-12 14:33:23	ANON-YFPW-RC2X-5	2020-06-12 14:33:23	2020-06-12 14:33:31	
No		Strongly disagree	It's hard to teach economics, accounting AND business studies with one student	Leave the classes as is	No	Yes	Nah	2020-06-12 14:33:53	ANON-YFPW-RC2A-E	2020-06-12 14:33:53	2020-06-12 14:34:16	
Yes		Strongly disagree		I don't think accounting and economics should be merged into 1 subject because they are very different subjects and as a student that takes both i think I very much enjoyed being able to take them separately and it would have forced me to take other subjects I found less enjoyable		No			2020-06-12 14:34:35	ANON-YFPW-RC2N-U	2020-06-12 14:34:35	2020-06-12 14:34:43
Yes		Agree				Yes			2020-06-12 14:35:17	ANON-YFPW-RC2K-R	2020-06-12 14:35:17	2020-06-12 14:35:25
No		Strongly disagree		keep the commerce subjects separated. the reason for this is because it is extremely hard to pick up accounting at level 2.		No			2020-06-12 14:44:20	ANON-YFPW-RC2R-Y	2020-06-12 14:44:20	2020-06-12 14:44:34
No		Strongly disagree				No			2020-06-12 14:45:24	ANON-YFPW-RC26-3	2020-06-12 14:44:04	2020-06-12 14:45:42
No		Strongly disagree		I believe that especially accounting and economics they are very different subjects and so would be not a good idea to combined them together, and though accounting will be taught in the commerce subject (but alas not very much), it would be very difficult to learn level 2 from scratch.		No			2020-06-12 14:50:11	ANON-YFPW-RC2W-4	2020-06-12 14:50:11	2020-06-12 14:50:22
No		Strongly disagree	It will be extremely, unbelievably hard to pick up accounting in level two. You need those fundamental skills, so you can understand it in level two. It also is a life skill that you need, when you are older you need to learn how to do your own taxes for example, and without those skills, the kiwis will be even worse at managing there finances as they already are.	how are media studies and social studies similar? How is business studies and accounting similar?		No			2020-06-12 14:50:57	ANON-YFPW-RC24-1	2020-06-12 14:50:57	2020-06-12 14:51:07

No	I was only told about this by one of my teachers, this should be widely published knowledge in order for everyone to be able to get their say as this is a major decision that will affect so many future careers	Strongly disagree	Many school combine subjects anyway. Forcing schools to combine subjects is going to force away many passionate kids and ruin learning for some	Media studies and social studies in particular are at extremely different ends, to lump the two subject together you would be getting rid of so much content for both as they are completely different concepts. social studies goes in depth about social issues whereas media studies focuses on film making and effects. it would be more effective to keep them separate as putting the two together will force people that enjoy one but don't the other to not take the combined subject. There is no reason to put together two courses which are completely different, and will drive away passionate students. As well as economics and accounting, they are completely different subjects and accounting especially needs much motivation for young people to pursue, as it is much needed in the future and combining the two will completely turn away many individuals as they are not able to fully focus on accounting. Level 1 accounting provides key skills for level 2, and without a baseline wide range course, level 2 will be a nightmare for many students as they will have to cover so many aspects, therefore causing them to not pursue accounting in the future leaving a gaping hole in the job market for accountants.	No				2020-06-12 14:55:13	ANON-YFPW-RC2T-1	2020-06-12 14:55:13	2020-06-12 14:55:29
No		Strongly disagree		As an accounting student I believe that the subjects accounting, economics and business studies should not be combined for level 1 NCEA. In the note it was stated that there would be very little accounting content which I personally do not believe will be good for future students. My experience from level 1 accounting is that the standards are the perfect level for the students to learn the basics so that level 2 is only one step further from what they learn, but at the same time, level 1 teaches just the right depth so that students can easily decide whether they want to continue learning this in certain subject or not.	No				2020-06-12 14:55:33	ANON-YFPW-RC23-2	2020-06-12 14:55:33	2020-06-12 14:56:15
No		Strongly disagree		Accounting and economics are two very separate subjects, with very different ideas. Accounting needs strong foundations to be built in level 1. Latin should stay as part of the curriculum as latin is important in a greater understanding of the world as well as languages.	No				2020-06-12 14:57:21	ANON-YFPW-RC22-Y	2020-06-12 14:57:21	2020-06-12 14:57:26
No		Strongly disagree	It's not fair to just get rid of subjects altogether at certain levels. Though few students may take certain subjects, they should have the option to do so, so that they can decide going forward in LV2/LV3 or tertiary education if it's something they want to pursue. If you want "broader foundational skills" why would you limit the options a student has? Year 9 and 10 and for exploring options, when you get to a point where you are earning credits (L1, L2, L3) you need to specialise and do something you're good at/ you like. It's completely ridiculous to wipe out subjects. For what?	It's completely unreasonable to combine eco/business/accounting into one "commerce" subject. Economics isn't even that much of a commerce subject, it's more of a social study. Also, there is no way a student would be able to pick up on level 2 accounting, not having done, or having done little accounting. Level one is extremely important to foundational skills in accounting, something you can't squeeze into level 2. As it is level two is difficult and way more stressful, so being a bit clueless isn't helping at all. And eco/business/accounting have one thing in common - they have something to do with business. But other than that they are such different subjects, it's ridiculous to combine it.	No				2020-06-12 14:57:47	ANON-YFPW-RC2U-2	2020-06-12 14:57:47	2020-06-12 14:58:06
No		Strongly disagree	I believe that there is serious value in having separated/specialised subjects at level 1. Art History, Classical Studies, and History are all very different subjects which attract different types of students. I personally know students who much prefer one type of study over the other and would benefit much from specialising in them. Additionally, the skills taught in these subjects are very different and once again different types of students will want to learn different skills. Economics, Business Studies and Accounting, are also very different areas of studies and forcing schools to combine them would dilute the quality of education in each area. As per the current norm, should there be a need for a combined commerce class, schools can do this. However, I do not think that forcing schools with students interested in particular commerce areas, should be forced to combine these subjects.	Commerce and Accounting should definitely not be combined as they cover very different subject matter and it would hinder the progress of students going into Commerce and Accounting subjects in level 2 and 3.	No				2020-06-12 14:59:20	ANON-YFPW-RCY-D	2020-06-12 14:59:20	2020-06-12 14:59:31

Yes	Although was horrified to see Media Studies blended into a more generic course.	Strongly disagree	I will elaborate below.	<p>Diluting Media Studies by blending it into a Level 1 Social Studies course is perhaps the most short sighted educational decision I have experienced in my 20 years as an educator.</p> <p>Given that our information and knowledge continues to be increasingly mediated through television, radio and the internet, it makes no sense that subject that provides students with the best critical literacy to cope with this would be scrapped. Leaving students to cope with a post-truth world where fake news is the news, is irresponsible and best and bordering on neglect.</p> <p>And while the thinking may be that students can pick this at level 2, in actuality fact the removal of level one will have dire consequences for the subject as whole. With no level 1, schools will no longer see courses at year 9 & 10 as a viable option as they have nothing to feed into. This will mean that only possible way students might come into contact with these essential skills needed to navigate the information mediated in our modern world is if they opt to take it at Level 2.</p> <p>Please, rethink this, otherwise you will kill this essential subject and with it the ability of our future communities to cope with the post-truth world.</p>	No			2020-06-12 15:05:41	ANON-YFPW-RCYV-A	2020-06-12 15:05:41	2020-06-12 15:05:48
No	We were not made aware of this until one of our teachers told us and I feel like you should be making this more public and allow more people to have their say on it as majority of people I know would very much strongly disagree with your decisions. this is disgraceful.	Strongly disagree	I am a student who takes both media studies and accounting from levels 1-3 and next year plan to study accounting. I was outraged to find that these are two of the many subjects that you have decided to essentially cut out of level one. Combining the subjects, considering how different these subjects are to one another, I feel like this 'merge' would be unintelligible of you and the future of this country. Accounting and business is one of the most important life skill and jobs around as its our economy that ensures the survival of the country. You claim that this new commerce subject would combine aspects of both however have also stated that there would little to no accounting present. From personal experience, I know that taking accounting as a subject in level 1 is what lead me to find my passion for it and to seek a future in this area, however, if accounting was barley present in this subject, then I and many others I know would not be able to discover our love for it, hence not be included to pursue it. Do you really want the next generation of people to lack the basic knowledge of accounting and have no accountants to guide the country to successes?? Also, I'd think that the people making these decisions would have at least some basic knowledge of economics and hence would understand just how different these subjects are to each other. Also on the topic of difference, let me get back to combining	As already stated I strongly disagree with accounting and economics combining as any student who takes them knows how different they are and how 'watered down' the content will be which is unfair.	No			2020-06-12 15:10:03	ANON-YFPW-RCYC-Q	2020-06-12 15:10:03	2020-06-12 15:10:26
Yes	Yes, but not to the detriment of completely taking out a Level 1 subject completely (Level 1 Media Studies).	Strongly disagree	I strongly disagree with some of the decisions that we are seeing coming through. I can agree with adding some of the new subjects but totally object to taking out a Level 1 course completely.	<p>If you remove Level 1 Media Studies, it can only have tremendous negative effects on both the students as well as teachers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Media literacy is one of the most important and significant skills for our students - to be aware of the media that they use and create content. By removing this important component, we are not providing the very important media literacy required by all student for being competent global citizens. - Removal of Level 1 Media Studies will mean to go backwards and teach the basics at Level 2 and 3 for students to get up to speed with the content and production skills required to achieve. - Many schools do not offer media literacy at all at junior levels, so Level 1 is the first time they experience with any types of media technology. - Our school only offers Media Studies at NCEA Levels 1, 2 and 3 (no juniors). By removing Level 1 will mean that in future I may not have a job as a Media Studies teacher as most of my timetable is around recruiting students at Level 1, teaching them the fundamentals, which they then specialise at Levels 2 and 3. I do not feel that I will be employed only to teach one class at Level 2 and one at Level 3 Media Studies. I do not wish to lose my job that I have spent so long specialising in, developing the Level 1 course content, offering 	Yes			2020-06-12 16:39:15	ANON-YFPW-RCYS-7	2020-06-12 16:39:15	2020-06-12 16:39:30

No		Disagree		<p>Latin and Classics has not been included. I took classics at school and found it extremely useful, not only was it fascinating but I believe the history of that era is very important, and we can learn a lot from it. I currently study law and I find what I was exposed too in classics has really has an impact.</p> <p>Furthermore, my mum learnt Latin at school, my school sadly did not let me, but she speaks 5 languages fluently and has said that Latin has helped tremendously with that.</p>		No			2020-06-12 17:03:59	ANON-YFPW-RCY8-C	2020-06-12 17:03:58	2020-06-12 17:04:14
No		Strongly disagree	<p>I am shocked and very upset that the Ministry proposes to drop Latin Level 1 altogether, and to merge Classical Studies into a History programme rather than a Level 1 subject in its own right. I strongly advise against this proposal.</p>	<p>Yes, my feedback is that the Classical Studies Level 1 should remain in the programme. Classical Studies is foundational to a deep appreciation of Western Civilisations and Philosophies, Ethics and Politics both past and present. As a discipline taught in schools, Classics has the unique position as a truly interdisciplinary subject; in the process of engaging with Classical Studies materials students develop skills in literary and visual literacy, and historical source interpretation. It combines the disciplinary skills of Literature, Art History, and History into one subject in the most complementary of ways. These are skills that need to be cultivated through a process of study and revision, which the Classical Studies NCEA structure provides when it includes Levels One, Level Two, and Level Three. By omitting Level One students are being deprived of learning - and educators are being deprived of providing - thorough and deep knowledge and skills abilities in this discipline.</p> <p>To omit Level One Latin from the NCEA Curriculum makes no sense to me at all. For one thing, how will students learn the basics of Latin that are provided in the first level of Learning Latin in order to be able to cope with Latin language at Level Two if they are not taught Level One? And if the</p>	<p>Philosophy should be introduced as a subject at Level 2 and 3.</p>	Yes		No.	2020-06-12 18:08:37	ANON-YFPW-RCY9-D	2020-06-12 18:08:37	2020-06-12 18:08:50
No		Disagree		<p>There are some students that may still be figuring out their options / subject choices and choosing classics could be a filler option. Classics is a very good subject for students to not only gain understanding on the classical world but to also gain foundational skills in essay writing, analysing primary texts, and relating to real world, that are beneficial to university study.</p>	No	No			2020-06-12 21:50:49	ANON-YFPW-RCYU-U	2020-06-12 21:50:49	2020-06-12 21:51:05
Yes	<p>There is no little irony arising from the recent proposals to eliminate Latin and diminish Classical Studies in the New Zealand curriculum. The international contribution by New Zealand to Classics is all out of proportion to the size of its population and a significant feature of its intellectual landscape. Ronald Syme, who was Camden Professor of Ancient History at Oxford and universally recognised as the greatest Roman historian of the 20th century, was raised in Taranaki and attended Victoria University. He is hardly unique: other New Zealanders of extraordinary international stature in the field of Classics include George Cawkwell, who was a leading Greek historian at Oxford, and Ernst Badian, who was John Moors Cabot Professor at Harvard. Edwin Judge, the senior figure in ancient studies in Australia, is another prominent New Zealander. And this is not even to mention New Zealanders who have made their careers at home. New Zealanders also hold distinguished positions in Classical Studies at places like Oxford, the University of Pennsylvania, and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. The current Giger Professor of Latin at Princeton, Denis Feeney, is a New Zealander, as is Richard Thomas, the George Martin Lane Professor at Harvard. In view of this marvellous heritage, it is astonishing that New</p>	Strongly disagree	<p>Any decision to fold Classical Studies into an omnibus course in history is, in effect, a decision to eliminate Classical Studies, not least by eliminating its distinctiveness. Highly generalised and allegedly multidisciplinary courses in the humanities, especially at introductory levels, tend to produce one of two results: (1) a course combining X, Y, and Z becomes, in effect, a course on Y, ordinarily because that is the subject the instructor is best qualified to teach, and so X and Z become occasional adjuncts (which our now overworked instructor must prep especially) or (2) the course delivers nothing more than a diluted treatment of X, Y, and Z, which leaves students only with generalities. In scenario (1), X and Z are unlikely to inspire further study; in scenario (2) one wonders if any of the three will fascinate.</p>	<p>Latin. The rudimentary study of Latin has been shown to improve competence in spoken and written English, especially by way of improved vocabulary, spelling, and grammatical competence. It is notably valuable in this regard for students for whom English is not a native language (or for whom English is not the language most frequently spoken at home). Latin, it strongly appears, also proves advantageous for students contending with challenges in learning. Even in studies which question some of the most robust pedagogical claims that have been made for Latin, the efficacy of studying Latin for enhancing academic performance in the schools is acknowledged. Relevant studies include:</p> <p>R.L. Sparks, L. Ganschow, F. Fluharty, and S. Little, 'An Exploratory Study on the Effects of Latin on the Native Language Skills and Foreign Language Aptitude of Students with and without Learning Disabilities', The Classical Journal 91.2 (1995-1996): 165-84.</p> <p>L.R. Holliday, 'The Benefits of Latin?', Educational Research Quarterly, 36.1 (Sept. 2012): 3-12.</p> <p>E. Bracke and C. Bradshaw, 'The impact of learning Latin on school pupils: a review of existing data',</p>	<p>Career paths in Classics: Obviously, not every student who studies Latin or Classical Studies will become a teacher, archaeologist, linguist, art historian, or the like – although many will. Students of the humanities, in practice, pursue a broad range of professional careers. Although I am not aware of any data-driven studies on this matter in New Zealand, such studies take place repeatedly in the USA: in the 2019 Kiplinger Newsletter, a business publication by no means inclined toward the humanities, Classics (which in the USA is the term for Classical Studies and Classical Languages) is included among the top 25 most lucrative majors:</p> <p>https://www.kiplinger.com/slideshow/business/7012-5001-best-college-majors-for-a-lucrative-career-2019/index.html?fbclid=IwAR16WojNX4N569rj6QVK0oAwumq2pf8o2nMDDp9PovVYPZD-ESNxsulc4</p>	Yes			2020-06-13 09:58:26	ANON-YFPW-RCYX-X	2020-06-13 09:46:55	2020-06-13 09:58:45
No		Strongly disagree				No			2020-06-13 10:57:05	ANON-YFPW-RCYQ-5	2020-06-13 10:57:05	2020-06-13 10:57:18

Yes		Agree	Students do need to be better prepared for university and a good solid general background is good.	However, I strongly disagree with not including Latin. It is essential for science as I teach at university and helps students understand the roots of our language. I strongly disagree with teaching religion in schools. There are sufficient churches around to cover this teaching and I don't see why non-religious families should have to spend a valuable school period on this.	Creativity in science	No				2020-06-13 10:58:41	ANON-YFPW-RCYE-5	2020-06-13 10:58:41	2020-06-13 10:59:14
No	I was not aware of any changes to the NCEA course. I am appalled.	Strongly disagree	I am absolutely APPALLED at the proposed changes to the NCEA course. In specific I am repulsed by the removal of classics L1. I think classics should remain as it is extremely unrealistic to leave a subject till YEAR 12 till it can be taken.	seems to be a reoccurring theme that schools only predominantly focus on English, maths and science. year 11 is a very experimental age for people and their learning, it is a time where we figure out ourselves as we go through puberty and we learn our interests, we trial and error and experiment with our passions. To have classics taken away, which already is a subject that is not heavily funded not concentrated on by the school, it removes kids opportunities to assess whether they have an interest in classics, it is not fair to leave a subject till L2 to be available as students in year 12 are scared of picking up a subject they don't like. It is important we experiment with subjects when we're younger. Classics is very interesting and deserves its credit	Astrology/astronomy would be incredible to see made available	No	Not familiar			2020-06-13 11:54:48	ANON-YFPW-RCY5-9	2020-06-13 11:54:48	2020-06-13 11:55:03
Yes	But I think the proposals for Science and the removal of separate level 1 sciences is appalling. Most of us regard level 1 as already relative general!	Strongly disagree	Need to retain separate level 1 Science subjects as well as science! Surely the need for well educated students in science is paramount. We don't need some wishy washy qualification at level one for students who do not carry one past here: less choice is preferable with content covering useful facts and skills for scientifically literate citizens.	As above! If you want to wreck level 1 Science then please at least leave level 1 separate Science subjects for us to design a course that meets the needs of our future scientists!	No	No		N/a		2020-06-13 11:55:25	ANON-YFPW-RCYP-4	2020-06-13 11:55:25	2020-06-13 11:55:34
Yes	Aware but in no way on board	Strongly disagree	The concept further alienates our curriculum and assessment from the world. It will further limit our students from future preparedness and future success in other pathways (particularly in regards to science)	Separate sciences are needed and would be the bare minimum for me to think this was even remotely a positive step forward		Yes		No		2020-06-13 11:56:53	ANON-YFPW-RCY7-B	2020-06-13 11:56:53	2020-06-13 11:57:07
Yes		Strongly disagree	Separate Sciences are a MUST for basic subject knowledge in order to transition to Level 2 Separate Sciences.	Separate Sciences are a MUST for basic subject knowledge in order to transition to Level 2 Separate Sciences.	No	No				2020-06-13 12:00:57	ANON-YFPW-RCYF-T	2020-06-13 12:00:57	2020-06-13 12:01:05
Yes		Strongly disagree	Science should continue to have the separation between the different sciences. By including them all as science, you may reduce the number of students engaging in science which in-turn will reduce the number continuing with science at level 2 and 3 and even on to tertiary institutes. It is already difficult to teach some level 2 chemistry concepts as level 1 doesn't encourage students to engage with chemistry in a way that promotes level 2 and 3 content.	Science should continue to have the separation between the different sciences. By including them all as science, you may reduce the number of students engaging in science which in-turn will reduce the number continuing with science at level 2 and 3 and even on to tertiary institutes. It is already difficult to teach some level 2 chemistry concepts as level 1 doesn't encourage students to engage with chemistry in a way that promotes level 2 and 3 content.		No				2020-06-13 12:21:10	ANON-YFPW-RCY1-5	2020-06-13 12:21:10	2020-06-13 12:21:25
Yes	While I still think that specialisation at L2 is important, having a broad range of achievement standards at level one means that courses can be contextualised AND we can offer many different courses (L1 science). Also, making the level one science standards report based will put A LOT of students off	Disagree	I think a change is needed, but this is a huge drastic change which I believe was not thought about thoroughly enough and without enough consultation with people at the chalk face	As above	No	No				2020-06-13 12:30:49	ANON-YFPW-RCYZ-E	2020-06-13 12:30:49	2020-06-13 12:30:59

Yes		Disagree		<p>Science: If you want to have a broad foundation year in Year 11, and only have one science subject, then I am fine with that. The issue is that the current proposed science subject has content that is extremely vague, and will not adequately prepare students to move into their specialist subjects at L2.</p> <p>Currently, students tell me that the jump from L1 Science to L2 Phys/Chem/Bio is already the hardest cognitive leap that they have to make in their school lives. In most cases, what is currently at the excellence standard at L1 is considered known and understood for ALL students as they enter L2 phys/chem/bio.</p> <p>If you are going ahead with only Science at L1, then there needs to be changes in what is being proposed. It currently only addresses the students for which L1 science is the end of their school journey. It needs some clearly stated, and examined content that force students to commit a number of important science ideas to their long term memory. This means they will be cognitively ready to attempt the science specialist subjects in L2. With the current proposed science subject, having no exam, and project based learning, might be fun, but does not give the students ample</p>		No				2020-06-13 12:51:05	ANON-YFPW-RCYH-V	2020-06-13 12:51:05	2020-06-13 12:51:15
Yes		Agree				Yes				2020-06-13 13:09:02	ANON-YFPW-RCYB-P	2020-06-13 13:09:02	2020-06-13 13:09:10
Yes		Strongly disagree		I would like to see Biology, Physics and Chemistry in addition to Science at Level 1. I am a teacher of Science and senior Biology and am deeply concerned that it appears as if all science subjects will be incorporated together. Covid 19 has highlighted the flexibility of the current NCEA system and has reinforced the need for the ability for this flexibility. In general terms, I am happy with the proposed changes but am concerned about this lumping together of all science subjects.	I would like to see Biology, Physics and Chemistry as separate subject in addition to Science in the senior subject areas.	No				2020-06-13 13:13:30	ANON-YFPW-RCYM-1	2020-06-13 13:13:30	2020-06-13 13:14:00
Yes		Disagree		Science at level one narrows possibilities for learning and the potential to create courses for different pathways. Mant schools have more than one science course at level one. Our student evaluations of L2 and L3 students indicate all who have done this previously would still choose to do 2 science courses knowing what they know now	No	No	Not really			2020-06-13 13:27:22	ANON-YFPW-RCYD-R	2020-06-13 13:27:22	2020-06-13 13:27:29
Yes		Strongly disagree		Sciences should be kept separate at NCEA Level 1. The rationale behind NCEA was to allow flexibility for schools to make courses that are tailored to their students needs. This is going against that initial rationale as it is taking away teacher agency to select courses and standards. The proper Level 1 science is actually more social sciences and less scientific ideas.		Yes				2020-06-13 13:30:44	ANON-YFPW-RCYX-C	2020-06-13 13:30:44	2020-06-13 13:30:52
Yes		Agree		I support the proposed change to have a refined and broad level 1 science curriculum. My hope is that these proposed changes encourage a better program which supports students to understand the world around them. I am concerned by the potential for a lack of support limiting the potential complexity of level 2 and 3 topics if students are not given the fundamentals of each discipline at this stage.	No but I would like a greater degree of focused support for teachers in each level 2 and 3 subject.	Yes		An integrated course for understanding the links between biology and the so Maori would be a valuable asset to the program.		2020-06-13 13:33:21	ANON-YFPW-RCYA-N	2020-06-13 13:33:21	2020-06-13 13:33:33
Yes		Disagree	Commerce cannot cover Economics and accounting and business studies. Science too broad separating subjects to sciences such as biology, chemistry etc would be better.		Human biology.	No				2020-06-13 13:34:15	ANON-YFPW-RCYN-2	2020-06-13 13:34:15	2020-06-13 13:34:38
Yes		Disagree	Would prefer to retain option for separate sciences in addition to general science in order to provide students with option for deeper and broader L1 coverage.	Would prefer to retain option for separate sciences in addition to general science in order to provide students with option for deeper and broader L1 coverage		No				2020-06-13 13:39:56	ANON-YFPW-RCY6-A	2020-06-13 13:39:56	2020-06-13 13:40:17
Yes		Disagree	While I dont think specialization is necessary at Level 1, I do like the variety to be able to draw on learner interest and teacher expertise to create courses. Having a more specified standard take a lot of the guess work out of a broad standard and stops teachers having to reinvent everything. Resources are always few and late being developed in my experience.	Science will be too broad grouping all of these subjects together.		No				2020-06-13 13:56:04	ANON-YFPW-RCYR-6	2020-06-13 13:56:04	2020-06-13 13:56:12
Yes		Strongly disagree	Science should remain as separate subjects			No				2020-06-13 14:00:35	ANON-YFPW-RCYW-8	2020-06-13 14:00:35	2020-06-13 14:00:49
Yes		Disagree		Science should be individual not grouped, with the way it could be assessed it does not allow for specialisation.		Yes				2020-06-13 14:03:09	ANON-YFPW-RCY4-8	2020-06-13 14:03:09	2020-06-13 14:03:14

Yes	<p>I am stunned, why would you compress all science into one subject yet not compress all the languages into one "languages?" subject which should include English?</p> <p>Compared to the number of students who use art, music, languages in their career, how many use sciences? Every Doctor, Dentist, Engineer, Electrician, Builder, Architect, Radiographer. Literally tens of thousands.</p> <p>It is ridiculous to assume you can collapse the level one sciences down without suffering the economic consequences further down the track, you will have less of all the hard science professionals that currently generate so much of our national revenue. You should have a look at your own figures (MOE research) on earning by undergraduate degrees and other qualifications. "Hard" sciences make up 15 of the 22 top paying degree pay rates.</p>	Disagree	<p>Your actions will force increased content into the year 12 and 13 curricula for all sciences. At the moment there is only just enough time in a 3 year program to teach Physics and Chem to a level is adequate for university. Especially for Engineering and other specialist degrees.</p> <p>Your decision will force the adoption of 4-year degrees (quote from NZ universities) for bachelors degrees and the addition of a 5th year for The Auckland BE Hons program. (with a huge increase in costs!)</p> <p>Most successful candidates for The Science-based professions will come from schools who abandon L1 Science and this will consolidate the demographics of these high paying fields even further.</p> <p>Schools like Auckland grammar, Mt Albert grammar will abandon level one and therefore dominate the fields even further.</p>	<p>Personally I believe the ability to teach Level one Physics Chem and Bio is a huge advantage for students and provides a significant improvement in outcomes for students over the single science school.</p> <p>For students who are not interested in continuing with science or lacking the ability to specialize (for whatever reason) having a generic science program is a huge advantage.</p> <p>But it has to be remembered that Science, in general, is a hard intellectually demanding subject, especially as a profession, and there is not much to be gained from providing qualifications that have no meaning outside the school gates.</p>	<p>Earth and Space science should be re-named as PLANETARY SCIENCE and should have a low-level mathematical component added.</p> <p>At the moment many students are enrolled in the subject as the last resort after failing in other sciences. This is why the pass rates are so low. A low-level maths component would be of assistance to many of these students as at the moment the literacy content is very demanding.</p> <p>Earth and space science overlaps with aviation, surveying, civil engineering, geology, hydrology and many other fields all of which have a heavy maths component and using maths in the subject would prepare students for their careers.</p>	Yes	<p>To be honest, worldwide, I don't think many laboratories or science based businesses, use Maori at all. Learning Te Reo is great and I have used it a lot in many applications but science is an international endeavour and Maori is not it's language, maths is. I'm not sure that culturally responsible pedagogies have worked. After 30 years of practice, the number of</p>	2020-06-13 14:04:19	ANON-YFPW-RCYT-8	2020-06-13 14:04:19	2020-06-13 14:04:32
Yes		Strongly disagree	<p>There is a discrepancy with Science reduction from 5 sections to 2.</p>	<p>There could remain 1 or two specialty subjects for each of the Science disciplines. This would allow specialist programmes like academies to continue.</p>	<p>Human Biology would be a welcome addition at L2 or 3 Biology.</p>	No		2020-06-13 15:06:59	ANON-YFPW-RCY3-7	2020-06-13 15:06:59	2020-06-13 15:07:13
Yes		Strongly disagree	<p>Science as a subject is too important for the future to be reduced or diminished.</p> <p>Biology is basic to the wider understanding of the world situation in terms of human health, environment, sustainability, climate change. Hence this science is very critical going forward. It must be retained at Level 1</p>			Yes		2020-06-13 15:12:28	ANON-YFPW-RCY2-6	2020-06-13 15:07:06	2020-06-13 15:12:59
Yes		Disagree	<p>Going from individual science subjects (Biology, Chemistry, Earth and Space Science, Physics) to just general Science is the wrong way to go. Other countries split into individual subjects as early as year 5 (Students are 10 years old). Having clearly defined subjects helps students with their focused learning. It also helps them to understand early and clearly where their talents are and where they like to go for education after school.</p>			No		2020-06-13 15:13:24	ANON-YFPW-RCYU-9	2020-06-13 15:13:24	2020-06-13 15:13:44
Yes		Strongly agree				No		2020-06-13 15:35:17	ANON-YFPW-RC1V-5	2020-06-13 15:35:17	2020-06-13 15:35:28
Yes		Disagree			<p>Biology L2 and 3</p>	No		2020-06-13 16:16:26	ANON-YFPW-RC1V-2	2020-06-13 16:16:26	2020-06-13 16:16:33
Yes	<p>This is a move in the wrong direction</p> <p>Specialised subject learning should be an option at level 1</p>	Strongly disagree	<p>Need individual sciences at L1</p>	<p>We need chemistry, biology, physics and earth Space sciences at level one</p>	<p>No</p>	No		2020-06-13 16:18:49	ANON-YFPW-RC1C-F	2020-06-13 16:18:49	2020-06-13 16:19:07
Yes		Strongly agree	<p>Level 1 science should be a general course, accessible to more students. A broad curriculum is required for students in the 21C. Specialist science subjects at level 1 lead to an elitist approach where science is apparently more valued than other subjects.</p>	<p>Level 1 should definitely stay as a general course, then specialization for biology chemistry, ESS and physics at level 2&3</p>	<p>General science to continue at 2 and 3 would be amazing. The proposed 4 standards could be carried up to level 2 and 3, and would be a great general science course for students wanting a science education but not to specialise.</p>	No		2020-06-13 16:21:00	ANON-YFPW-RC1S-Y	2020-06-13 16:21:00	2020-06-13 16:21:07
Yes		Strongly disagree	<p>There is not enough scope in Science, the SEG has come up with 4 NOS standards which are excellent but will not work for a large number of learners. The pandemic has taught us that we need a citizenry that is not only aware of how Science works but also know some of the basic facts</p>	<p>There needs to be more Science subjects covering the knowledge aspects. This could be a range such as Physical Science and Natural Science or it could be four or more individual sciences such as Chemistry, Physics, Biology, Earth and Space Science that currently exist. This would better achieve the goal of breadth at level 1 by allowing students to study a greater range of the curriculum rather than focusing on a single strand</p>	<p>See question 3 my preference would be a Physical Science incorporating aspect mostly from the material and physical world stands of the curriculum and a Natural Science incorporating aspects from the living world and earth and space science strands although some of the divisions may be arbitrary.</p>	No		2020-06-13 16:21:01	ANON-YFPW-RC1B-4	2020-06-13 16:21:01	2020-06-13 16:21:19
Yes	<p>Your proposed changes to science has done exactly the opposite students now wishing to get a broad science base by taking two or more science courses at level 1 can't. In the sciences we are trying to encourage enthusiasm and curiosity for science and with that offer 4 different science courses at level 1 st my school for example. They may take only one, often two and sometimes 3. Your current proposal does not have options for standards in biology, chemistry, physics or earth and space science. You're going from around 36 standards offered- which is broad - to four - which is not. You are doing a disservice to science education. I wouldn't be surprised if more schools looked at alternative options such as Cambridge and IB.</p>	Strongly disagree	<p>You recognise that foreign languages should indeed be their own subject which they should certainly be and not in one subject called languages. And yet you think biology, chemistry, physics and earth and space science should be one subject? This is such a narrow sighted contradiction. When I was at school in year 11 I was able to do while courses in biology, chemistry, physics it was wonderful as I got such a broad knowledge base at 15 years old in order to know how to better specialise in year 12 and 13. For some kids 4 nature of science standards 1 level one will be enough, for others it will be vastly inadequate. Is that what you're aiming for?</p>	<p>Science should have 4 nos standards</p> <p>Biology should have 4 Living world standards</p> <p>Chemistry should have 4 material world standards</p> <p>Physics should have 4 physical world standards</p> <p>And there should be 4 earth and space standards.</p> <p>This means the schools will be able to offer a broad scientific course, and can also offer more then one course in science. Every year the word from universities is that we need more children perusing STEM courses. In order to do that they have to be switched on the the science as kids, we can do that with choice. We can't do that with 4 nos standards.</p>	<p>Obviously I would expect there to be biology chemistry physics and earth and space science subjects available at level 2 and 3, but I also expected them to be at level 1, so it's worth saying again. Kids need to get switched on to science at a young age. They need choose, variety and the ability to practice scientific principals and skills. More standards across the subject streams are required at level 1. I cannot stress enough that if that is the best you can offer we'll very likely not do level 1 so they can actually have opportunity to do a broad science course as yours does not offer what it says it offers.</p>	No		2020-06-13 16:29:46	ANON-YFPW-RC19-5	2020-06-13 16:29:46	2020-06-13 16:29:57
Yes		Disagree	<p>I think a little more diversity in Standards at level one suits our school better</p>	<p>I think the sciences should be split into their respective subjects</p>	<p>The list at level 2 and 3 looks great</p>	Yes		2020-06-13 17:25:21	ANON-YFPW-RC1G-K	2020-06-13 17:25:21	2020-06-13 17:25:32

No	With a full time job to do and a busy family life it is difficult and stressful to take notice of all announcements especially during busy periods.	Strongly disagree	Mashing together 4 scientific disciplines into one 'warm and fuzzy' programme will be a monumental error, probably to be reversed in a few years once the predictable negative effects become apparent. The proposed new standards are so poorly thought through that they will only compound the disaster.	Yes. Physics, Chem Earth Sci and Bio should be there. It is ridiculous that they have been cut when many others (eg all languages) are still on the list. A disaster in waiting for STEM education, but entirely predictable.	No.	No	I have read the Science descriptions, but find the Maori approach indistinguishable from any other approach that I know of, which is patronising to scientists from all cultures, including Maori. Smells of tokenism.		2020-06-13 17:38:06	ANON-YFPW-RC1J-P	2020-06-13 17:38:06	2020-06-13 17:38:34
Yes		Agree		if a broad base is desired, a generic level 1 'language' standard would make more sense as currently this learning area (proposed) is way out of kilter with the others	no	No			2020-06-13 17:54:38	ANON-YFPW-RC1Q-W	2020-06-13 17:54:38	2020-06-13 17:54:47
No		Strongly disagree	Totally disagree with lumping the science specialist areas all together into the one subject. It shows a total lack of fairness and incongruity across the curriculum areas with this approach because other faculty areas are not being merged in this way. Eg Majority of Arts subjects, Languages, Tech subjects are still being treated as separate subjects and yet the 5 sciences are also very different disciplines and thus to consider that they could be blended as one is ridiculous and shows a total lack of understanding.	From my perspective the new Science Standards are catering for those students who are going to leave school at the end of Year 11 OR not take any science in year 12. The focus of these standards is on skills/that is key competences and the NoS. Thus the students who finish with this level 1 qualification will be able to make informed decisions on science events as they hit the media. However, they will not provide an appropriate or useful foundation for those students wishing to go on to further studies in Year 12 and 13. Therefore there is a big need for the specialist subjects to be retained so that these students can establish a good foundational knowledge of key scientific facts and therefore go on and succeed in Level 2. Alternatively if specialist subject standards aren't offered I foresee many schools creating their own course at Year 11.(no level 1).	I would love to see the biology level 3 course have more human biology in it. It is so focused on ecology and evolution and many students are disappointed by the content. Also, a lot of students have an interest in the processes occurring on the human organ systems and are very disappointed by the lack of focus on this area in level 3. Finally, for those students who go on into Health Sciences/BioMed, the NCEA students are disadvantaged when competing against IB/Cambridge students. If students are fortunate enough to be from families who are well off they can pay for extra tuition with MedView/Crimson to support them in their learning during level 3 NCEA and first year at Uni but this isn't an option for students who are from less well off families. Therefore the NCEA level 3 course is actually creating greater inequity for bright students from poorer homes because it makes it even harder for them to compete against the bright, wealthy, privileged students who are getting extra tuition. No surprise that a disproportionate number of second year med students are from private school OR from state schools that are run like traditional grammar schools, found in high decile areas, promote Cambridge and and to that end, can	No			2020-06-13 17:59:45	ANON-YFPW-RC1E-H	2020-06-13 17:59:45	2020-06-13 18:00:04
No	Why does level 1 need to be foundational	Strongly disagree		Each of specialist Sciences need to be kept, not clustered together.	Please stop, all the ministry is achieving is more fragmented version of NCEA.	Yes			2020-06-13 18:35:30	ANON-YFPW-RC1S-1	2020-06-13 18:35:30	2020-06-13 18:35:52
Yes		Strongly agree				Yes			2020-06-13 19:02:29	ANON-YFPW-RC1P-V	2020-06-13 19:02:29	2020-06-13 19:02:38
Yes	Specialisation needs to start earlier. Teachers at Level 2 and 3 will have a difficult job covering all that is needed in their courses. As an example, I don't want to spend time having to tell level 2 physics students that current electricity is actually electrons moving along a wire. In order to be effective in science education we have to build the knowledge base in earlier years so that we can effectively teach the young ones about more complex science.	Strongly disagree	I am speaking from the point of view of a science teacher with 30 years experience. Our school has gone to an integrated approach to education in our junior school and we have had difficulty fitting in the breadth of knowledge and skills necessary for students to succeed at NCEA Levels 1,2 and 3. The plans of eliminating Bio, Chem and Physics from Level 1 has me worried that we will be unable to give the students the necessary knowledge and skills for them to succeed and Level 2 and 3 Physics, Biology and Chemistry.	Do not continue with your plans to provide a broad general programme to Level 1 Science Students. It is so dilute that you are making it virtually impossible for some students to actually succeed in the sciences at Level 2 & 3.	No. Please keep the Level 2 & 3 sciences: Bio, Chem and Physics. Do not replace them with a general science.	No	no comment		2020-06-13 19:10:28	ANON-YFPW-RC17-3	2020-06-13 19:10:28	2020-06-13 19:10:42
Yes		Disagree	The merging of the sciences in particular will reduce the foundational knowledge required for Level Two. I believe that at Level One the single sciences (Biology, Physics and Chemistry in particular) should be stand alone to allow for these to be independent classes.	As indicated above I believe that the Level One science should not be merged but remain independent, stand alone subjects.		No			2020-06-13 19:40:06	ANON-YFPW-RC1F-J	2020-06-13 19:40:06	2020-06-13 19:40:27
Yes	Yes. I was aware of this.	Strongly disagree	Synthesising arguments about science without learning the foundational content is not a way to broaden student learning and certainly does not support the development of a strong foundation that will enable specialisation at Level 2. Exams on content make sense in science.	Reducing sciences down to just science could work with more directed content and specifics. The proposals seem wishy washy at best. How do Geography and History stay separate during this? Are we heading towards one big subject called 'learning'?	In the UK many students in Year 12 and 13 enjoy studying psychology and sociology. I've found it odd that these subjects are not covered in the NCEA system. It may be sensible to develop a sustainability or environmental subject, however this may upset the dairy industry, which we just not do	No	I think this question meant to say question 5.		2020-06-13 20:08:15	ANON-YFPW-RC11-W	2020-06-13 20:08:15	2020-06-13 20:08:41
Yes		Strongly disagree	It seems some areas are being constrained and will make it harder to meet all students' needs.	As said above, the ability to still be able to use a range of standards from biology, physics and chemistry makes it easier for schools to develop suitable programmes for the diverse needs of students.		Yes	A work in progress.		2020-06-13 20:19:10	ANON-YFPW-RC1Z-6	2020-06-13 20:19:10	2020-06-13 20:19:18

Yes	There is a huge jump of concepts and idea (in Science) from Level 1 to Level 2. Specialisation for Science should be split into the three (bio, chem & physics) early on so teachers don't have to play "catch-up" with the kids at Levels 2 and 3.	Strongly disagree	Specialisation for Science should be split into the three (bio, chem & physics) early on so teachers don't have to play "catch-up" with the kids at Levels 2 and 3.	Specialisation for Science should be split into the three (bio, chem & physics) early on so teachers don't have to play "catch-up" with the kids at Levels 2 and 3. I have been teaching for 10 years, and am myself a product of NCEA in its early inception. I say this with confidence have gone through NCEA myself, as well as having taught it for 10 years. I have taught in low decile schools, rural school and am currently in a senior school with a "modern learning environment". This change to collapse all the science learning areas into one will not go down well.	No	No				2020-06-13 21:52:28	ANON-YFPW-RC1H-M	2020-06-13 21:52:28	2020-06-13 21:52:43
Yes		Disagree	Latin should remain as a language study	Latin	Yes					2020-06-13 22:42:44	ANON-YFPW-RC1M-S	2020-06-13 22:42:44	2020-06-13 22:43:01
Yes		Disagree	I disagree with the proposed changes to Science at Level 1. Students need to experience more subject-specific Biology, Chemistry, Physics and Earth Science topics in order to understand and experience the different Science areas if they are to subsequently make an informed decision towards specialisation in the Sciences at level 2 and beyond.	I disagree with the proposed changes to Science at Level 1. Students need to experience more subject-specific Biology, Chemistry, Physics and Earth Science topics in order to understand and experience the different Science areas, if they are to subsequently make an informed decision towards specialisation in the Sciences at level 2 and beyond. The individual Science subject areas should be retained and not merged into a meaningless blurr of Science process, which gives little introduction and foundation to Level 2 studies in the specific Science areas.		No				2020-06-13 23:31:50	ANON-YFPW-RC1D-G	2020-06-13 23:31:50	2020-06-13 23:32:27
Yes	However, we did not ask for the removal of separate sciences. It is important for senior specialist science subjects to have separate standards at level 1	Strongly disagree	The science options are atrocious and will hinder students knowledge and understanding at level 2 and 3	The science options are atrocious and will hinder students knowledge and understanding at level 2 and 3	YES,Keep level 1 science subjects separate	Yes	But these have been forced to fit with what has been described as Western science. Just because the science was not discovered or developed in NZ doesn't make it western science. It is not possible to blend contexts of Te Marautanga o Aotearoa to fit with chemistry or physics. It is stupid to think you can blend them. Leave the sciences as they are and help teachers	Science was not discovered or developed by historic Maori people, leave it as it is to truly reflect the true path of scientific discovery and let us celebrate and learn the subjects for what they are without forging them into Maori context. Can't see how this can be done in teaching chemistry and physics		2020-06-13 23:58:20	ANON-YFPW-RC1X-4	2020-06-13 23:58:20	2020-06-13 23:58:40
Yes		Agree				Yes				2020-06-14 03:05:54	ANON-YFPW-RC1A-D	2020-06-14 03:05:54	2020-06-14 03:06:06
Yes		Strongly disagree			Food science and manufacturing	No				2020-06-14 06:27:49	ANON-YFPW-RC1N-T	2020-06-14 06:27:49	2020-06-14 06:27:55
No	I was aware there were planned changes coming But not that they change were suppose broader more foundational.	Strongly disagree	This new science standards are more an end to the junior school. Rather than a foundation and start to build in the senior sciences. I believe the 4 standards do not allow for all the science foundation for Academic students Wanting to lead into 3 science in L2/3	Should also offer at least 1 specialist science (biology, chemistry, physics, Earth & space) specific standard If it is supposed to be foundation , then allow students to have that option Having at least 8 standards will create a broader selection	Bring back human biology standards. Anatomy physiology And introduce Marine biology - having more students engaged in learning about our oceans, may lead more into oceans. Also An ethics course - cover some of the standard from biology/ health/ Religious Ed/ English/ pysicsology	No		? Did you mean yes to question 5??		2020-06-14 07:19:53	ANON-YFPW-RC1K-Q	2020-06-14 07:19:53	2020-06-14 07:20:16
Yes		Agree				Yes				2020-06-14 08:52:03	ANON-YFPW-RC1R-X	2020-06-14 08:52:03	2020-06-14 08:52:17
No		Strongly disagree	Classics and Latin both provide students with a more nuanced view of history, culture and literature. To deny them this reduces their ability to understand world history, language and how the arts came to be. It will also leave them at a distinct disadvantage when applying to foreign universities to study the humanities, as they will lack the scope other students will have. Lastly, for me classics encouraged a lifelong appreciation of reading and culture, which strengthens my approach to my STEM work, the world needs more generalists, not more specialists.	Classics and Latin both provide students with a more nuanced view of history, culture and literature. To deny them this reduces their ability to understand world history, language and how the arts came to be. It will also leave them at a distinct disadvantage when applying to foreign universities to study the humanities, as they will lack the scope other students will have. Lastly, for me classics encouraged a lifelong appreciation of reading and culture, which strengthens my approach to my STEM work, the world needs more generalists, not more specialists.		No				2020-06-14 09:00:28	ANON-YFPW-RC1W-3	2020-06-14 09:00:28	2020-06-14 09:00:32

No	This looks very damaging to the social sciences. The elimination of the classics is a disaster, not to mention economics and accounting.	Strongly disagree	see above comments.	This looks very damaging to the social sciences. The elimination of the classics is a disaster, not to mention economics and accounting.	just don't eliminate those current.	Yes	none		2020-06-14 09:03:05	ANON-YFPW-RC14-Z	2020-06-14 09:03:05	2020-06-14 09:03:17
Yes		Strongly agree				No		Question 4 was not a yes/no question.	2020-06-14 09:03:49	ANON-YFPW-RC1T-Z	2020-06-14 09:03:49	2020-06-14 09:04:02
No		Strongly disagree		Classics and Latin are important subject. Vital for students who wish to have access to them.	Classics and Latin	No			2020-06-14 09:04:32	ANON-YFPW-RC13-Y	2020-06-14 09:04:32	2020-06-14 09:04:46
No		Strongly agree				No			2020-06-14 09:06:31	ANON-YFPW-RC1U-1	2020-06-14 09:06:31	2020-06-14 09:07:23
Yes	While I agree that Year 11 should be based on a foundational approach, preserving highly specialised learning For Year 12 and beyond, I have two major concerns. 1. Why are some subjects retaining their specialist areas while others are losing them; the inconsistency is troubling. 2. There still needs to be nationwide guidance on foundational knowledge, as well as skills, to adequately prepare Year 11 students for the specialised learning at Years 12 and 13 and reduce ongoing inequities within our education sector.	Strongly disagree	As above; I do not understand the inconsistencies of retaining so many "specialised" subject areas in the Arts, Technology, and Social Science areas whilst removing key learning areas in the Sciences. For example, what makes Geography an area which requires specialised focus in Year 11, but Chemistry does not? If the premise is that a student doing a foundational Science programme will cover the basics of Chemistry, why would a student doing a broad Social Science programme not be able to cover the basics of Geography. Are we really saying that Geography is more individualised and complex than Chemistry? It is the same for the retention of specialised areas in Art and Technology; Science is looking to be reduced to broad "skills-based" learning; all of the Art and Technology areas are largely about skills-based design and composition; why don't they get broad standards around these skills and keep the specialised learning for Years 12 and 13?	Whatever you choose, take a consistent approach. It's simply not equitable otherwise and makes the whole system look like a biased joke. If you are valuing skills-based, foundational learning over specialist subject areas; there should only be 8 subjects - English, Math, Science, Social Science, Languages, Arts, Technology, and Te Marautanga o Aotearoa. If you are acknowledging that foundational learning includes some specialised learning in preparation for Years 12, 13, and beyond; create "sub-courses" within each learning area with specialised standards. For example, the Social Science standards may include skills-based standards of analysing values and perceptions, human behaviours and relationships, and data analysis. In addition there could also be a Geography standard with specific learning requirements for this body of specialised knowledge.	It may not be possible, but it would be interesting to see more, almost thematic, choices at Year 13. I know schools are already developing their own specialised courses around Journalism, Law, Environmental Science, Anthropology etc., but it would be exciting to see suggestions of guided programmes at this level from NCEA. For example, if Year 11 is largely foundational, skill-based learning with sub-topics of specialised learning; Year 12 should be largely specialised learning with the continuation of sub-topics of skills; and Year 13 could consist of specialised programmes focusing of the application of skills and knowledge to real-world problems or careers. Just food for thought.	No	While I am not overly familiar with the content, I not only agree with the option of learning delivery and assessment in te reo Maori, I agree with the further development of standards valuing the skills and knowledge learning in all things Maori.		2020-06-14 09:14:34	ANON-YFPW-RCVY-A	2020-06-14 09:14:34	2020-06-14 09:14:50
No		Agree		Disappointed about removing Latin and Classical Studies. These broad topics, from level one, have helped me immensely in my career as an RNZAF Engineering Officer. Without the broad foundation they have provided, I would not be as successful today in my highly technical role, while maintaining the necessary level of generalization to be a successful officer	Latin at all 3 levels. It is part of NZ History, due to its influence on all European languages	No	No		2020-06-14 09:15:58	ANON-YFPW-RCVY-7	2020-06-14 09:15:58	2020-06-14 09:16:07
No		Disagree	Classics and Latin should not disappear	Classics lay the foundation for understanding our cultural heritage. Latin is a fantastic basis for Romance languages, a great tool for developing mental logic, and a pathway to reading the aforementioned classical literature.		No			2020-06-14 09:16:30	ANON-YFPW-RCVC-M	2020-06-14 09:16:30	2020-06-14 09:16:40
No		Strongly disagree		Do NOT take away Classics and Latin. These are incredibly important and crucial parts of human history and culture.		Yes			2020-06-14 09:17:21	ANON-YFPW-RCVS-4	2020-06-14 09:17:21	2020-06-14 09:17:26
Yes		Agree		I am 100% in support of Media Studies being part of the Social Science curriculum as it has never really fitted in Technology. However I think Science only having one option should have more options.	Combine History, Classical Studies, and Geography into one course.	Yes			2020-06-14 09:18:34	ANON-YFPW-RCV8-9	2020-06-14 09:18:34	2020-06-14 09:18:46
Yes		Strongly disagree				No			2020-06-14 09:21:21	ANON-YFPW-RCV9-A	2020-06-14 09:21:21	2020-06-14 09:21:40
No		Strongly disagree	Latin and Classics should be available and should lead to a degree in their own right.	Latin and Classics are highly relevant and provide the basis for a significant portion of modern language and culture. These subjects are critical for enriching and enhancing understanding in other fields.		No			2020-06-14 09:23:38	ANON-YFPW-RCVG-R	2020-06-14 09:23:38	2020-06-14 09:23:57
Yes		Strongly disagree	Keep latin and classics	Keep latin and classics-they are subjects which teach us so much about our world and history and politics. Latin is really helpful when learning modern foreign languages too. No other subject enhances skills in so many different ways like critical thinking, language learning, political theory, philosophy and linguistics		No			2020-06-14 09:29:11	ANON-YFPW-RCVJ-U	2020-06-14 09:29:11	2020-06-14 09:29:20
No		Strongly disagree		Latin must be included. It is not a coincidence that places like Harvard and Oxford and Cambridge consider Classicists as some of their best students and that the British Foreign Office will always interview Classicists due their clarity of thought and methodical approach to problems.	Ancient Greek would be a great option at these levels.	No			2020-06-14 09:33:58	ANON-YFPW-RCVQ-2	2020-06-14 09:33:58	2020-06-14 09:34:06

No		Strongly disagree	It's difficult to see how less diversity in subject range will lead to anything other than a watered-down lower standard of all those subjects affected. You hurt the individual subject as well as the overall category that it's part of. Sort of like trying to eliminate community transmission of coronavirus while staying at level one, and harming both people's health and the economy at the same time without solving anything.	Latin. Demand for a LANGUAGE subject can certainly be taken into account, but I don't know that it should ever be a leading factor in eliminating it, so long as there is interest. Such logic discriminates against under-represented LANGUAGES, and just because they're under-represented doesn't mean they're unimportant or won't have stronger numbers again in the future. This was a leading philosophy behind not having the res Māori available in all schools for so long, and is symptomatic of systemic racism. Though cutting a dead language such as Latin does fortunately not have the same discriminatory effect upon an ethnic community as cutting living languages can, its instruction is important for that very reason - it is the only dead language available on the curriculum, has important lessons about the life, longevity, and influence of language for that reason, as well as importance for the pedagogy of ALL grammar, and so on. Latin has an immeasurable and disproportionate influence within the language curriculum no matter how many students are learning it. And one might expect an important metric to include would be the proportion of students in each subject that go onto higher education as well as the professions they end up in. Here Latin-takers continue to be over-represented in fields such as law, in the US,		Yes			2020-06-14 09:44:29	ANON-YFPW-RCVE-P	2020-06-14 09:44:29	2020-06-14 09:44:46
Yes		Disagree	Latin and classical studies should remain	Latin and classical studies should be included due to the wide range of learning and development of writing skills.	Classical studies and Latin	No			2020-06-14 09:49:10	ANON-YFPW-RCVS-6	2020-06-14 09:49:10	2020-06-14 09:49:17
Yes		Disagree	Many of the changes are good, but I particularly disagree with the removal of media studies, art history, and classical studies.	Specialisation is a strength. Providing subjects for specific interests means that students who have unique learning requirements or non-mainstream aspirations are not alienated. At my old school there were many people who only decided not to drop out because of passion subjects like media studies, art history, classical studies and musical theatre. If you cut media studies you will disappoint and hinder all the young people who are looking to develop practical skills in the film and creative media production industries. My sister's favourite subject was art history and mine was classical studies. These are both subjects that students flock to for the love of it. We both agree we would have struggled much more with school and possibly left school if we did not have these subjects to keep us motivated and engaged. Level 1 should be a year when students can explore their specialisation options with the freedom to switch in level 2 if necessary, and you are taking this away. It is fairly impossible to switch between level 2 and 3 and develop a sound level of understanding in each topic.	I would like you to consider making Musical Theatre a formal subject. Takapuna Grammar School has been running it for years with great success. It allows students whose strengths are practical to have a place to excel. It also offers a clear career path to students who wish to work in the arts.	No			2020-06-14 09:53:45	ANON-YFPW-RCVP-1	2020-06-14 09:53:45	2020-06-14 09:54:05
Yes		Strongly disagree	Streamlining traditionally more academic subjects disadvantages the people who are strongly academic.	The analytical, research, comprehension, communication and intellectual skills developed by subjects such as classics, latin and art history are invaluable in creating well rounded capable young people. It is hypocritical to argue for diversifying subjects such as dance but in the same breath suggest that classics and art history can be incorporated into history, an already broad subject which deals with the breadth of the area by already ignoring significant events in the rest of the world and preferring to focus on narrow viewed New Zealand-centric events. If the hope is to stem the brain drain from this country, it is imperative that academic children are not marginalised, the expense of children with poor work ethic or ability in academic areas. Increasingly, the best academic leavers are looking abroad for university, enthused by the encouragement for academic success elsewhere in the world, rather than feeling socially pressured to marginalise their own achievements because from the government down, success is based on sport and music rather than intellect or hard work.	Don't develop specialist subjects at the expense of existing ones which have a proven track record in creating smart, empathetic and hireable people.	Yes	No.		2020-06-14 09:59:35	ANON-YFPW-RCVF-Q	2020-06-14 09:59:35	2020-06-14 10:00:07
Yes	Removing Latin and Classics is a travesty.	Strongly disagree	I loath them.	Keep Latin and Classics		No			2020-06-14 10:05:22	ANON-YFPW-RCV1-2	2020-06-14 10:05:22	2020-06-14 10:05:39

No		Disagree		<p>The reduction of classics to a history subject is a gross simplification of what classical studies is, and will likely cause a reduction in students studying and becoming passionate about where our society originated.</p> <p>Classics is less like studying a historical subject, and more like studying an alien society. As such, it is important for students to gain the critical thinking and research involved with classical studies. Many children connect with the mystery and wonder of the classical world more than other subjects because of this reason.</p> <p>Similarly with art history allowing students who are artistically engaged to gain literacy credits in a way that appeals more than other subjects might.</p>		Yes		No	2020-06-14 10:14:03	ANON-YFPW-RCVZ-B	2020-06-14 10:14:03	2020-06-14 10:14:22
Yes		Strongly disagree	Latin and classics MUST be included			No			2020-06-14 10:16:40	ANON-YFPW-RCVH-S	2020-06-14 10:16:40	2020-06-14 10:16:57
Yes		Strongly disagree	I believe that cutting subjects from NCEA can only hurt students. For many people, myself included specialising early on in NCEA. Pushing all science together seems like a terrible idea as different people like different sciences. Furthermore, the removing these subjects will only harm students who decide to take these subjects at a tertiary level as doing a specific level 1 biology course was far more useful for my biology major than any other bio subjects during NCEA. The removal of level one Latin is also rather sad, it is a very useful subject that in my opinion should be expanded so more students can take it. In many fields such as biology a strong base in Latin is recommended for classification of organisms. Cutting courses will only reduce the chance for students to specialise into doing what they love early and would make NCEA a worse system. The current method where schools run what subjects they can works rather well. If a school can support more fringe subjects then they may as well to give their students every opportunity. Meanwhile, if a school does not have the staff to run a subject then they dont need to. Cutting subjects is not the way to go to fix NCEA.	I believe that none of the proposed subjects should be cut. Firstly, merging all sciences together will severely hurt the chances of fostering specialist scientists in New Zealand. My experience with having a diversified science course at level one was very good. We had a biology focused course and a physics focused course, both with half the level one chemistry stuff in each. This helped the maths oriented students as they could do physics at level one and carry it on for the rest of highschool. This was much the same in the biology course, with many people only choosing to do one of the two courses. This system worked incredibly well at Shirley Boys Highschool and gave students a choice that allowed students to go down a science pathway even if they struggled with some scientific subjects.	Biochemistry could be a useful subject at NCEA level 3 but it may be easier just to add a internal or external on some of the basics. It could easily fit into chemistry or biology and would be very useful for students who plan on taking biology or biochemistry at university.	No			2020-06-14 10:17:49	ANON-YFPW-RCVH-K	2020-06-14 10:17:49	2020-06-14 10:18:14
Yes		Disagree		Latin is important! How would we have known about Big philosophers and rulers of the World if we didnt know their language		No			2020-06-14 10:20:13	ANON-YFPW-RCVM-X	2020-06-14 10:20:11	2020-06-14 10:20:20
Yes		Disagree		History is too vast as it is currently combining art history, classics and history would not allow for the interests to develop as they could due to no in-depth topics or areas being able to be covered in all three subjects.		No			2020-06-14 10:25:04	ANON-YFPW-RCVD-N	2020-06-14 10:25:04	2020-06-14 10:25:11
Yes		Disagree		Let Latin be still included, it's a language worth studying because 1) it deepens the understanding of the diachronic linguistic perspective, and b) Latin can be still viewed as a passepartout to all the romances languages.		Yes			2020-06-14 10:28:31	ANON-YFPW-RCVX-9	2020-06-14 10:28:31	2020-06-14 10:28:42
Yes	Yes, however I think less people will take Classics as many students will be intimidated of taking a completely new subject in such a crucial year. (Often many students struggle with the jump from level 1 to level 2 so i am not confident that many learners will want to take Classics without any prior class knowledge).	Disagree	I love the changes you want to make for NCEA level one minus the removal of Latin and Classics.	I love the changes you want to make for NCEA level one minus the removal of Latin and Classics. I think both of these subjects are incredibly useful and enlightening. Students gain skills in analysing and researching, while also honouring mankind's past and keeping the history of Ancient languages and stories alive. This is significantly important as without this subject in level one, less students will want to take the jump into level 2 to begin a completely new subject.	N/A	Yes			2020-06-14 10:29:12	ANON-YFPW-RCVA-J	2020-06-14 10:29:12	2020-06-14 10:29:24
No		Strongly disagree	Latin and Classical History seem to be targeted for exclusion in particular which represents a worrying trend to exclude these subjects which can provide an important linguistic, cultural and historical basis of learning.	See above! Latin is a language that allows access to some great world literature and culture as well as well providing a framework for learning other modern language and a way of improving English comprehension through extending vocabulary and categorising grammar. It is shameful to cut off students' access to this language in New Zealand.	Latin	No			2020-06-14 10:37:21	ANON-YFPW-RCVN-Y	2020-06-14 10:37:21	2020-06-14 10:37:31
Yes		Strongly disagree		Latin and Classics should still be included in the curriculum as many students around the country enjoys learning the subject. Classics is also the root of our history where democracy was first developed and it is important to understand where many of our social values comes from today.		No			2020-06-14 10:39:42	ANON-YFPW-RCVH-V	2020-06-14 10:39:42	2020-06-14 10:39:59

Yes		Strongly disagree	I strongly disagree with not including the basic subjects of Art History and Latin. It is unrealistic to cover them in History classes.	I strongly disagree with not including the basic subjects of Art History and Latin. It is unrealistic to cover them in History classes. Both are key skills to understand the context of European history, modern culture and philosophy. Classical studies have been the basic of education for centuries. Apart from this, summing up the sciences under "science" hinders the students to learn the differences between them and by this hinders to spark their interest.		No			2020-06-14 10:50:52	ANON-YFPW-RCVR-3	2020-06-14 10:50:52	2020-06-14 10:51:05
Yes	It is important not to go too broad.	Agree	For Science - I support this.	In Commerce, I feel it is not broad when you cannot teach more accounting and business studies as stated above, due to the practical constraints. Also reducing classics and Art History into maybe covering it in History. Level 1 History should be more focused on New Zealand History - then you can have a separate classics at L1.		Yes	But not strongly		2020-06-14 10:51:45	ANON-YFPW-RCV6-7	2020-06-14 10:45:55	2020-06-14 10:51:49
No		Disagree	How can you teach any of the fine arts/performing arts without Art History???	Why would you not offer Latin as an option to anyone interested? I myself studied Latin, French AND Spanish in high school; the modern languages are much easier (and my English much improved) after having had Latin.		No			2020-06-14 10:56:40	ANON-YFPW-RCVW-8	2020-06-14 10:56:40	2020-06-14 10:56:51
Yes		Disagree		My NCEA level 1 experience in 2016 was vastly improved by my favourite subject, Classical Studies. Please consider keeping it as an option for L1, it is an entirely different experience from NCEA History (different writing styles, essay structure, content, focus) and, in my opinion, a much better experience. Classics develops valuable skills and is a class of its own in education. Keep the classical subjects because they produce more sophisticated and cultured students.		No			2020-06-14 11:04:24	ANON-YFPW-RCVT-5	2020-06-14 11:04:24	2020-06-14 11:04:35
No		Disagree		I think that it is a disservice to make classical studies only available as part of a general history curriculum. History is too broad a subject to be squeezing the study of a certain time period into. There is a huge difference between cultures and civilisations before and after the common era, and studying politics, art, literature and war from ancient civilisations is vastly different to studying modern ones. While classical studies might be a less popular subject than general history, it is a massive subject to cover and also one that may become lost if NCEA moves to become more generalized.		No			2020-06-14 11:10:29	ANON-YFPW-RCV3-4	2020-06-14 11:10:29	2020-06-14 11:10:44
No		Undecided		Hi, speaking as an American, we dropped classics from curricula ages ago, and do you really want to follow our example in anything?		No			2020-06-14 11:10:32	ANON-YFPW-RCV2-3	2020-06-14 11:10:32	2020-06-14 11:11:01
Yes		Strongly disagree	For people in my field of study i.e. Ancient history, classics, And archaeology, and early understanding of Latin is a crucial and fundamental part of being able to move forward in that area of study since literature is a huge part of study in understanding the ancient world. Having the option available to students will allow them to get an early and important start by the time they arrive at university, instead of only relying on the Universities to teach students everything they need for their careers	Latin should remain an option for the classics and history fields of study for students, as per the previous comment		No			2020-06-14 11:17:40	ANON-YFPW-RCVU-6	2020-06-14 11:17:40	2020-06-14 11:17:58
No		Strongly disagree	It is important science is split into its several elements, and classical studies should remain its own subject otherwise it will get lost	Classics should be it's own subject. It's so interesting and really sheds a light on different history, and a different way of how our culture and learning has been shaped. If it is combined with history, it will simply be completely lost and students will lose out and not appreciate the particular nuances and interest that classical studies provides by itself.		No			2020-06-14 11:23:03	ANON-YFPW-RC7Y-B	2020-06-14 11:23:03	2020-06-14 11:23:31
No		Strongly disagree	Classical Studies deserves its own space to flourish. Classical Studies teaches languages, art history, history of the world, theatre, drama and comedy, and countless other topics which enrich an understanding of the modern world as well as the ancient.	I strongly disagree with the decision to take out Classical Studies for Level 1 and Latin for NCEA. Latin is extremely important not only for understanding English and other modern languages, but also for understanding history and the world. The structure of Latin is also wonderful for learning in general, because its fine building-block structure aids not only with logic but can translate to learning any discipline.		No			2020-06-14 11:45:50	ANON-YFPW-RC7V-8	2020-06-14 11:45:50	2020-06-14 11:46:03
Yes	Don't ditch Latin	Disagree	Keep Latin	Please maintain Latin at L1	Latin	No	Include this, but keep Latin too	I didn't but please keep Latin!	2020-06-14 11:48:21	ANON-YFPW-RC7C-N	2020-06-14 11:48:21	2020-06-14 11:48:39
Yes		Disagree		Classics and Latin should be included	Classics and latin	Yes			2020-06-14 11:57:05	ANON-YFPW-RC7S-5	2020-06-14 11:57:05	2020-06-14 11:57:13
Yes		Strongly disagree				Yes			2020-06-14 11:58:00	ANON-YFPW-RC78-A	2020-06-14 11:58:00	2020-06-14 11:58:06

Yes		Undecided		I am concerned that 'classical languages' (Latin etc.) are not included in the planned changes. Latin is a useful way for students to understand grammar and shared vocabulary across different languages. I know many people who have enjoyed learning Latin and continue to find it useful in their professional lives; there is a danger that it will truly become a 'dead language' if it is no longer taught!		No			2020-06-14 11:58:15	ANON-YFPW-RC79-B	2020-06-14 11:58:15	2020-06-14 11:58:29
Yes		Undecided		Latin should not be removed for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Latin broadens access to technical literacy in English especially in the STEM fields, science, medicine, physics and engineering • Latin improves English literacy for students for whom English is their second language • Latin pedagogy is undergoing positive changes within a social justice context, broadening students' understanding of past and present systems of oppression • Roman history has direct bearing and relevance to the present and is best understood in its original linguistic context <p>For me, Latin has created career opportunities and provided a direct path to postgraduate studies at Cambridge University. It should not be removed.</p>		Yes			2020-06-14 12:11:25	ANON-YFPW-RC7G-5	2020-06-14 12:11:25	2020-06-14 12:11:47
Yes		Strongly disagree	The decision to remove Latin, Classics and Art History as stand alone subjects is deeply disappointing. These are subjects that benefit from being taught individually given the depth and breadth of information within each subject. Covering them as a module within a broader subject would build an insufficient foundation for study at university.	As above. These subjects are too vast to be covered within other subject areas.	I would only like the Ministry to consider retaining Latin, Classics, and Art History as individual subjects at all levels.	No			2020-06-14 12:27:48	ANON-YFPW-RC7J-3	2020-06-14 12:27:48	2020-06-14 12:28:04
Yes		Disagree	Keep Latin	Keep Latin and classics, they are an important part of history that is worth learning and removing them would disqualify a lot of qualifications and an interest in further studies at university		Yes			2020-06-14 12:30:08	ANON-YFPW-RC7E-Q	2020-06-14 12:30:08	2020-06-14 12:30:21
No		Strongly disagree		You should not remove Latin, it is more than just a dead language but an amazing assistant to English, a great way to foster a love for etymology, the only way to truly admire texts like Virgil's Aeneid and other immense works, a way to better understand the mythological and classical allusions littered throughout Literature, and a way to study a language in an engaging and interesting way, not stooped in memorising day-to-day vocabulary or pronunciation, instead focusing on use and literary value.		No			2020-06-14 12:59:28	ANON-YFPW-RC7S-7	2020-06-14 12:59:28	2020-06-14 12:59:36
Yes		Strongly disagree	Shrinking the course list down to encompass more topics does a disservice to the individual topics. For instance, Classics is not only an applied form of history in that it covers a specific time period, but also takes into consideration age-relevant material and texts such as Homer's epics. To combine the two topics would be to dilute the level of information students can learn about either subject, meaning important information may be missed or their importance minimized. Students would also be going into Level 2 courses with less information and knowledge than they would if the courses were taught separately. The same goes for the science and commerce papers.	Keep things as they are! You'll kill student's interest in certain topics if you force them to learn additional material they may not be interested in. Keep student's options open. Don't kill of Art History either.	Create a curriculum for art history. The reason nobody takes it is probably because there are no teachers to take it or people aren't aware they can.	No		I do not know enough information about these subjects to make a comment.	2020-06-14 13:05:53	ANON-YFPW-RC7P-2	2020-06-14 13:05:53	2020-06-14 13:06:05
No		Strongly disagree				No			2020-06-14 13:21:58	ANON-YFPW-RC7F-R	2020-06-14 13:21:58	2020-06-14 13:22:08
Yes		Strongly disagree				No			2020-06-14 13:22:33	ANON-YFPW-RC7L-3	2020-06-14 13:22:33	2020-06-14 13:22:54
Yes	I have been made aware of it.	Disagree	I don't see how removing Latin gives students a broader education. Latin is the backbone to the English language, and in a time of decreasing literacy, I don't see how removing it helps. It also doesn't make sense that Classical Studies would be merged with level 1 History. I teach both subjects, the themes and ideas that are analysed in classical studies don't fit into the causes and consequences model. Classical studies covers not only history but art, philosophy and literature. What does that have to do with History? If this trend were to continue into levels 2 and 3, it would effectively kill the subject.	As above		No			2020-06-14 13:23:09	ANON-YFPW-RC7Z-C	2020-06-14 13:23:09	2020-06-14 13:23:22

Yes		Strongly disagree		<p>Removing Latin is a very harmful idea.</p> <p>If Classical Studies continues to be offered both at secondary and tertiary sectors, how are students supposed to engage with the original texts (where the majority of our information of Ancient Roman and Greek civilisation comes from)? Removing Latin essentially begins slowly killing of Classical Studies as well.</p> <p>As someone who studied both Classics and Latin at high school and university, it provided valuable language and grammar skills that have been incredibly useful to me to this day. My understanding of how the English language works, meanings of words, and sentence structures have all come from my Latin lessons far more than from anything I actually learnt in English (since the latter focuses far more on reading and interpreting texts instead of the language itself).</p> <p>I have also had a much easier time understanding languages that derive from Latin (such as French and Spanish) due to the majority of the word stems being the same.</p> <p>More knowledge is what we need to be providing New Zealand students, not less. If we have</p>	No	Yes		No	2020-06-14 13:33:38	ANON-YFPW-RC7H-T	2020-06-14 13:33:38	2020-06-14 13:33:48
Yes	The concept of broad vs specialised is a difficult one that is open to many interpretations. It seems to be more of a justification for cutting costs in certain areas instead of an across-the-board paradigm shift. If you look at the subject list above it is quite clearly a case of dumping smaller courses like Classics, Media and Art History, or amalgamating courses with too much timetable power like science.	Strongly disagree	The removal of Latin from all levels is a poor decision. Latin is recognised worldwide as both an important and historical subject for areas of further study like Law, Medicine, Philosophy and Classics, while it also provides a huge opportunity for students to develop and increase their own English skills. Latin is one of the most innovative subject areas in terms of pedagogy, its study is specifically linked to improving linguistic and reasoning skills, and also provides students with a context to broaden their experience. Some of the arguments against Latin make no sense. It provides a clear pathway to further study, especially any area that requires succinct writing skills and clear reasoning (almost every University course). It has more specific applications in areas like Law and Medicine, and especially in the United States is seen as a key indicator of student excellence when applying for entry into top level universities. Furthermore, its low numbers in recent times have been a failing of NZQA itself to support and promote the many benefits it provides, but this should not be used to cut it. On the contrary, retaining Latin and giving its cause more public space should provide a boost to the subject nationwide. In many schools there are teachers capable of teaching Latin who are unable to due to misconceptions and difficulties created by the new curriculum, which shoehorned Latin so much that it became too difficult to	<p>Latin should not be cut for the reasons above, which are summarised here:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is an incredibly useful if undervalued subject 2. It has clear pathways and is of tremendous values in most further studies 3. Removing it will severely damage the international reputation of NCEA 4. Cutting Latin will almost certainly prevent any chance of restoring it later <p>Classics should be retained at Level 1 for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is a multi-disciplinary subject that perfectly ties to the goal of a broad range of studies 2. It has clearly established pathways in schools and beyond 3. It has not had a chance to be introduced in a vast number of New Zealand schools yet 4. Again, it will be massively damaging to the international reputation of NCEA 	No	No		No	2020-06-14 13:45:55	ANON-YFPW-RC7B-M	2020-06-14 13:45:55	2020-06-14 13:46:14
Yes		Strongly disagree	The removal of Latin (entirely) and Classical Studies from Level One are disturbing. As a teacher of both History and Classical Studies, I can inform the policy works who made this decision that Classics is an entirely different subject from History. The idea that Classics themes or concepts could be incorporated into History is about as silly as expecting that themes or concepts from Maori can be incorporated into English, as they're both language based subjects, and thus Maori can be removed as a subject until Level Two. Removing Latin entirely from all levels indicates a level of cultural bigotry that in many other cases would be linked to recent BLM protests, except that it's a language supposedly belonging to 'dead white gays' and therefore apparently of no importance. The fact that so much of our Western culture, our thoughts, ideas, science, politics, language are based on concepts from Latin - and are illuminated by an awareness of Latin - seems to have escaped the culling committee. Finally, in this day and age critical literacy is of utmost importance. Removing Media Studies sounds like something an Erdogan, Orban, Putin, or Trump would do - it reduces the ability of students to develop critical understandings of the ways in which media can be used and manipulated. If anything, Media Studies should be expanded.	I recommend the reinstatement of Latin (at all levels) and Classical Studies at Level One. Both subjects are important parts of a rounded education; studying either or both gives the students an insight into aspects and features of today's society and culture, an understanding of the origins of our language and of many phrases which are still in common usage, an appreciation for art, architecture, sculpture and painting, and the platform by which to draw parallels and links with other cultures. In addition, Latin supports logic and problem solving, and supplements not only a greater understanding of English but also the learning of other Romance languages such as Spanish, French, Portuguese, Italian, and Romanian. The case for Media Studies has already been explained in my previous response.	I think Civics and Politics would be worth exploring, but the response would most likely be that they can already be taught as part of a Senior Social Studies course.	No	I neither speak nor teach in te reo Māori.	I doubt I'll ever work in a school which will offer any of these subjects.	2020-06-14 13:58:37	ANON-YFPW-RC7D-P	2020-06-14 13:58:37	2020-06-14 13:58:48

No	I was aware that a review was being undertaken, but not that subjects would be removed in the review.	Strongly disagree	Accounting and Economics are very distinct disciplines teaching very distinct skills, knowledge and learning outcomes. They are separate at University. If subjects like Geography, Dance and Drama can be stand alone, then Accounting is no different. There is no need to create a one size fits all hybrid course when currently each of Accounting, Economics and Business studies courses provide foundational knowledge in their respective disciplines required for further study. Currently schools can choose to create hybrid Commerce courses to suits the needs of their students and the expertise of their teaching staff. Our students demand courses in Accounting and Economics. Why deny schools the ability to choose their own courses to meet the needs of their students as we have? Our students currently have agency in their option choices, why remove this? Schools teach foundational knowledge in the junior school and the students are ready to lay foundations in a wide range of disciplines. A one size fits all hybrid course will result in potential overlap, surface learning and deny students a deep and meaningful learning experience in Level 1 which the current individual subjects provide. We do not teach Accounting to train accountants.	I disagree with dropping Accounting at level 1 and support the status quo, which is to keep Accounting, Economics and Business studies as separate disciplines. This will allow schools the flexibility to "create well designed and coherent local curricula, which support pathways for individual learners." See reasons above. We offer Accounting at Level 1 as a foundation to further study in Accounting at L2 and L3, but study of accounting at level 1 also provides students with meaningful skills they can use to complement other areas of study. The content and skills are distinct from Economics which is a social science. Many of our Accounting students will not cope with introduction of Accounting at L2, thus losing International students and students who need time to practice. Having Level 1 Accounting "supports coherent and robust pathways into NCEA Level 2 and further study or training." There is demand for Accounting and Economics in their own right and we have the ability to deliver it. Learning Accounting from level 1 provides a far better quality of learning and stronger outcomes for students' future study and employment thus "supports the credibility of NCEA as a qualification	No				2020-06-14 14:08:53	ANON-YFPW-RC7X-A	2020-06-14 14:08:53	2020-06-14 14:09:24
Yes		Disagree		Classical Studies is an important and challenging subject in itself, and ought not to be taken over by History. The two are completely separate. To conflate the two would be similar to rolling Maori Performing Arts into Drama, something of which the government can apparently see the idiosyncrasy. Latin is also a valuable subject, it provides an understanding of the classical cultures that are the cornerstone of our society (almost as much as Classical Studies), as well as a basis for improving skills in English Language and English Literature. What's more, it makes learning other languages far easier, and is recognised as an intellectually rigorous and important subject overseas.	No				2020-06-14 14:19:25	ANON-YFPW-RC7A-K	2020-06-14 14:19:25	2020-06-14 14:19:33
Yes		Strongly disagree	Latin and Classics should not be removed from the courses!	Please include Latin and Classics! This is a travesty for education.	No				2020-06-14 14:24:05	ANON-YFPW-RC7N-Z	2020-06-14 14:24:05	2020-06-14 14:24:12
No		Undecided		I think Classical Studies is an amazing subject to study that gives those students who are genuinely interested a way to expand their knowledge. Without this subject, my goal of teaching the subject once my degree is finish is gone.	No				2020-06-14 15:00:19	ANON-YFPW-RC7K-W	2020-06-14 15:00:19	2020-06-14 15:00:37
No		Disagree		Latin education provides unique training in logic and reasoning that proves beneficial beyond the capacity of "utility" Keep Latin alive!	No				2020-06-14 15:04:57	ANON-YFPW-RC76-8	2020-06-14 15:04:57	2020-06-14 15:05:03
Yes		Strongly disagree		Classical Studies (Lvl 1) and Latin NEED to remain in the NCEA curriculum! Ancient History is enriching and highly versatile. These topics broaden thinking and expand academic horizons in nuanced and complex ways. If removed from the NCEA curriculum, you are denying students the privilege of understanding human history. It is not enough to cover 'modern' periods as is done in regular history classes. During my time in NCEA, I studied both History and Classical Studies. History, to me, was often reductive and repetitive. I was learning things that I conceived of as 'common knowledge'. It was not stimulating, and didn't inspire me. Classical Studies, on the other hand, was the most fulfilling course I had ever taken. I found that I was finally being challenged, pushed to explore new concepts and ideas. I have gone on to study Ancient History at the University of Auckland. The skills and thought processes I developed through Classical Studies has allowed me to achieve at an extremely high level both in my Arts and my Commerce degrees.	No				2020-06-14 15:08:46	ANON-YFPW-RC7R-4	2020-06-14 15:08:46	2020-06-14 15:09:00
No		Strongly disagree		Classical Studies (Lvl 1) and Latin NEED to remain in the NCEA curriculum! Ancient History is enriching and highly versatile. These topics broaden thinking and expand academic horizons in nuanced and complex ways. If removed from the NCEA curriculum, you are denying students the privilege of understanding human history. It is not enough to cover 'modern' periods as is done in regular history classes. During my time in NCEA, I studied both History and Classical Studies. History, to me, was often reductive and repetitive. I was learning things that I conceived of as 'common knowledge'. It was not stimulating, and didn't inspire me. Classical Studies, on the other hand, was the most fulfilling course I had ever taken. I found that I was finally being challenged, pushed to explore new concepts and ideas. I have gone on to study Ancient History at the University of Auckland. The skills and thought processes I developed through Classical Studies has allowed me to achieve at an extremely high level both in my Arts and my Commerce degrees.	No		More history!! More languages!! More business!! (International Business studies, Marketing, Management) THESE are the sorts of topics which enrich our students and facilitate their participation in the global economy.		2020-06-14 15:10:40	ANON-YFPW-RC7W-9	2020-06-14 15:10:40	2020-06-14 15:10:51

Yes		Strongly disagree		I strongly advise the inclusion of Latin as a subject in the target list. As a past student I find Latin to be an enriching and valuable subject in many aspects. - important connection to history - provides deeper understanding and aids learning of Latin based languages - relevance in further studies and careers, especially medical and legal		No			2020-06-14 15:12:02	ANON-YFPW-RCT7-6	2020-06-14 15:12:02	2020-06-14 15:12:13
Yes		Strongly disagree		I strongly disagree with the removal of Latin and Classics. I studied both at school before going on to study Law and Politics at Victoria. Both subjects are an important foundation in a well rounded education and certainly relevant in my career as a lawyer. One relevant example currently is a deep understanding of the history of democracy. Life is full of references to ancient history; Aristotle, Plato, the Roman Empire. I believe removing these subjects gives NZ students less opportunity to become interesting and knowledgeable. Personally I still enjoy books and documentaries on ancient history. It enhances travel experiences as well. Education should be an enjoyable and enriching learning experience, not just a factory for getting a job.		No			2020-06-14 15:11:48	ANON-YFPW-RCT4-6	2020-06-14 15:11:48	2020-06-14 15:12:31
Yes		Disagree	KEEP LATIN AND ELEVATE CLASSICS.	Keep Latin and elevate classics, as only through understanding our past can we move beyond it and reckon with our place in the world. Moreover, classics is replete with elitism, and we cannot let academia stand as an Ivory tower when it's as easy as a few classes to break it down.		Yes			2020-06-14 15:17:30	ANON-YFPW-RCT3-5	2020-06-14 15:17:30	2020-06-14 15:17:36
Yes		Disagree	Classical studies should not be removed from Level 1. Classical studies is a pathway which utilises several skills across a range of subjects such as English, history, social studies etc. removing this removes the chance for students to combine interests in a singular class and removes the chance for students to begin exploring an interest in a fascinating and rich subject	As above, reconsider this decision. The skills used in classics are essential and the culture created within classical studies environments are unique and special.		No			2020-06-14 15:18:23	ANON-YFPW-RCT2-4	2020-06-14 15:18:23	2020-06-14 15:18:34
Yes		Undecided			EFS, Forensic science, Biotechnology, marine science, human Biology.	No			2020-06-14 15:29:06	ANON-YFPW-RCTU-7	2020-06-14 15:29:06	2020-06-14 15:29:25
Yes		Strongly disagree	science - kind of speaks for itself. Other subject areas e.g. tech, are split into multiple subjects. 3x science seems to go into one. Basic maths error I think.	see above. Science has been overlooked. Seems that people who know nothing about science think that Physics is the same as Biology is the same as Chemistry. Hmm, back to school for them.	You've not given us the list above, a bit hard to comment.	No			2020-06-14 15:45:20	ANON-YFPW-RCHV-5	2020-06-14 15:45:20	2020-06-14 15:45:41
No		Strongly disagree		Latin is extremely beneficial to many students, throughout high school and also for further education. But taking this completely out of the curriculum forces student to not even have a choice to take Latin. I have taken 5 years of Latin in high school and found it beyond helpful in my university studies. There is no justified evidence that getting rid of Latin is beneficial for students, and the education system should be instead encouraging students to take subjects for their own interest, branch outside of the norm, and expand their horizons.		Yes			2020-06-14 15:47:29	ANON-YFPW-RCHC-6	2020-06-14 15:47:29	2020-06-14 15:47:44
No		Strongly disagree	You are getting rid of specializations which I think are crucially important to helping students focus on subjects they are truly interested in. When I was in school, I only had Science until grade 11. Then it branched out into biology, chemistry, and physics. I only took the lower applied level of science but if there was a category to focus on Earth and Space science, I would have been encouraged to take that route and put more focus into my science education. Perhaps I could have been an astronomer today.	I think the inclusion of Maori performing arts is great, but please include every other category you are trying to remove to "broaden" things. If you go through with these changes, I will have to say "Requiescat in Pace" to your education system.	Art History, Physical education, Latin, Biology, Chemistry, Physics, Earth and Space Science, Classical Studies, Economics, Business studies, Accounting, Social Studies, Media Studies, Psychology. I would also suggest splitting construction and mechanical. Religious studies isn't that important.	No			2020-06-14 15:48:46	ANON-YFPW-RCH5-P	2020-06-14 15:48:46	2020-06-14 15:49:04
No		Agree		I think this whole change is going to be beneficial to Year 11 students going into Years 12 and 13 because it gives them the opportunity to try out a lot of different things at Level 1 and see what things you like and study those further afield!	Transition from School to Tertiary/Employment!	No			2020-06-14 15:52:33	ANON-YFPW-RCH8-U	2020-06-14 15:52:33	2020-06-14 15:52:40
Yes		Disagree		Strongly oppose axing Latin from the curriculum.		No			2020-06-14 15:52:53	ANON-YFPW-RCH9-V	2020-06-14 15:52:53	2020-06-14 15:52:59
Yes		Strongly disagree		Getting rid of art history, classics and latin severely disadvantages students who wish to study those subjects at university. They're popular subjects and there is no reason to exclude them.	Something like linguistics or politics would be useful	No			2020-06-14 15:53:54	ANON-YFPW-RCHG-A	2020-06-14 15:53:54	2020-06-14 15:54:03
Yes		Strongly disagree		Must include Latin	More Classics	Yes	No		2020-06-14 16:04:34	ANON-YFPW-RCHQ-M	2020-06-14 16:04:34	2020-06-14 16:05:55
No		Disagree		Include Latin and classical studies in the proposition	Latin and classical studies	No			2020-06-14 16:07:16	ANON-YFPW-RCH8-E	2020-06-14 16:07:16	2020-06-14 16:07:26

No		Strongly disagree	My main problem is with dropping Latin at all levels, and Classics at level 1.	The suggestion to drop Latin at all levels of NCEA is insulting, and clearly shows that those in charge of this proposal have never studied the subject. It's another step down the path of mediocrity and catering to the lowest denominator, a path which by now NCEA has walked many times. In my experience Latin is a subject with the most inspiring, enthusiastic and skilled teachers, who motivate students to reach for excellence (not the NCEA "Excellence" grade, but rather something actually meaningful). Many top students in top schools take Latin and get more out of it than any other subject. Latin improved my understanding of English more than any English class I ever took, greatly increased my mental flexibility, and gave me a passion for literature that English classes had almost completely stifled. I am so glad that I have already left highschool because if I had not had the opportunity to take Latin, my time in school would have been so much worse.		No			2020-06-14 16:09:00	ANON-YFPW-RCH5-R	2020-06-14 16:09:00	2020-06-14 16:09:16
Yes		Disagree	I think that combining some of the subjects above would make it harder for students going into level 2 because the course would have to cover less of each topic. I think that giving students level 1 to do more general subjects before going into more targeted subjects in level 2 is kind of pointless because year 9 and 10 do that. It also gives schools the opportunity to combine subjects if it better suits their students or keep them separate if that better suits their students. Combining economics with accounting and business studies, I think would actually make it harder on students. This is because the courses are actually very different and the commerce subject would not be able to cover the whole course making it harder for students in level 2 to catch up on what they missed during level 1. Combining the subjects may actually discourage some students from taking the course because they may want to do Economics but not accounting or vice-versa. Social studies and media studies are also very different subjects and again may make it harder on students going into level 2 to actually get to learn the content that was taken out of the original courses.	I think that dropping Latin and Art history is pointless because some students are really passionate about these subjects. Why take the opportunity away from students who really enjoy the subject. Latin also really helps with a lot of other subjects that NCEA covers such as history, classics, English and many more.	I think that not combining the subjects is best for levels 2 and 3 as it gives students the ability to prepare for university better.	No			2020-06-14 16:11:38	ANON-YFPW-RCHP-K	2020-06-14 16:11:38	2020-06-14 16:11:49
Yes		Strongly disagree	Latin and Classical Studies should be kept as distinct, valuable subjects.	Latin and Classical Studies were two incredibly formative subjects in my school years. Studying a law degree now, I have found their lessons to be continually useful, and have always been valuable to me. They are incredibly influential for developing English skills also.		No			2020-06-14 16:19:04	ANON-YFPW-RCH7-T	2020-06-14 16:19:04	2020-06-14 16:19:11
Yes		Undecided		Please retain Classical History, Art History, and Latin. All are crucial.	Art History, Classical History, Latin, Military History, Security Studies, Linguistics, Political Science/International Relations.	No			2020-06-14 16:59:10	ANON-YFPW-RCHF-9	2020-06-14 16:59:10	2020-06-14 16:59:19
Yes		Disagree		Art History and Classics should be included at level 1. They are vital subjects to the arts and culture of the world.		No			2020-06-14 16:59:52	ANON-YFPW-RCH1-M	2020-06-14 16:59:52	2020-06-14 17:00:05
Yes		Strongly agree				Yes			2020-06-14 17:07:13	ANON-YFPW-RCHH-B	2020-06-14 17:07:13	2020-06-14 17:07:25
Yes		Undecided	I am a Technology teacher. There seems to be a lot of change in the area of Technology with "new Technology subjects" and the change of CMT to materials technology. It is hard to comment on these changes when we don't know what they will be.	I would like to know what the proposal for "new technology subjects" is and what materials technology will be.	no	No			2020-06-14 17:10:10	ANON-YFPW-RCHB-5	2020-06-14 17:10:10	2020-06-14 17:10:23
No		Strongly disagree		Taking away Latin is not a good choice. Through the study of that language you can simplify the understanding of so many others. English included of course. It would be a waste to take the possibility of choosing it from students.		No			2020-06-14 18:26:33	ANON-YFPW-RCHX-U	2020-06-14 18:26:33	2020-06-14 18:26:46
Yes		Disagree				No			2020-06-14 18:26:43	ANON-YFPW-RCHA-4	2020-06-14 18:26:43	2020-06-14 18:26:53

No		Disagree		<p>If you're incorporating Classics and History into one History subject, then you should do the same with Religious Studies. No reason why this needs to be separate. Add it in to the History subject.</p> <p>New "Commerce" subject. I don't understand why there will be "very little Accounting content". What are these practical constraints limiting access to this essential understand of basic business skills?</p> <p>Also, keep Latin. If schools want to teach it, they should be allowed. It's a highly academic subject and opens doors to Romance languages.</p> <p>And, wouldn't NCEA be doing a better job at honouring the principles of Te Tiriti if Māori Performing Arts were included in the wider Dance subject? Having it as its own subject decreases the likelihood that Pakeha take the subject. If it were incorporated into Dance, then everyone who takes that subject would learn Māori Performing Arts - therefore, going further to honour the treaty.</p> <p>And what's the reason for Agricultural and Horticultural Science being separate from the Science subject but the rest are lumped into one? This appears random.</p>		No			2020-06-14 18:35:46	ANON-YFPW-RCHN-H	2020-06-14 18:35:46	2020-06-14 18:35:54
No		Strongly disagree	I disagree. Merging subjects like media studies and psychology into social studies just isn't right. It's a fundamental misunderstanding of those subjects. Additionally, please don't remove Latin entirely, or merge Classics and Art History into Art History as that is just unfathomable. Please allow the specializations as they were.		Yes			2020-06-14 18:36:50	ANON-YFPW-RCHK-E	2020-06-14 18:36:50	2020-06-14 18:36:58	
No		Disagree		Removing latin and combining classical studies with history is not a good way to broaden the curriculum. These are subjects at the core of western history, philosophy and art, and should under no circumstance be considered as a specialization.		No		2020-06-14 18:38:31	ANON-YFPW-RCH6-S	2020-06-14 18:38:31	2020-06-14 18:39:10	
No		Disagree		<p>I disagree with the removal of Latin language studies and the prospect of rolling classical studies into a broader history subject.</p> <p>Such focused foundations of world history should remain an option for students to pursue to augment their own historical studies.</p>		No		2020-06-14 18:40:07	ANON-YFPW-RCHR-N	2020-06-14 18:40:07	2020-06-14 18:40:24	
No		Disagree		The study of Latin and classics are foundations for our modern society and still hold relevance today.		No		2020-06-14 18:45:37	ANON-YFPW-RCHW-T	2020-06-14 18:45:37	2020-06-14 18:45:49	
No		Disagree		<p>Latin - should be included as it underpins many other languages, particularly English, French, Spanish.</p> <p>It is a very logical and structured language which helps students organise and think clearly. It also is a fixed language unlike others.</p> <p>Classics - part of a rounded education. Again, the classical world underpins the present one.</p>		No		2020-06-14 18:53:10	ANON-YFPW-RCH4-Q	2020-06-14 18:53:10	2020-06-14 18:53:33	
Yes		Strongly disagree		<p>Latin should be included in order to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) better understand English 2) develop problem solving (through translation) 3) acquire a wider vocabulary <p>Classical studies should be included in order to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) know more about the roots of occidental culture (which is rather widespread) and become more aware of it 2) know and understand the human mind 	Latin and Classical studies	No		2020-06-14 18:54:21	ANON-YFPW-RCHT-Q	2020-06-14 18:54:21	2020-06-14 18:54:33	
Yes		Strongly disagree	Keep Classics at all costs		No			2020-06-14 18:59:32	ANON-YFPW-RCH3-P	2020-06-14 18:59:32	2020-06-14 18:59:43	
Yes		Strongly disagree	I'm very concerned about the changes to Classics and the removal of Latin.	Please don't eliminate Latin and reduce the options for Classics.	No			2020-06-14 19:12:24	ANON-YFPW-RCH2-N	2020-06-14 19:12:24	2020-06-14 19:12:35	

Yes	I am aware and concerned at the merging of some subjects, such as Classical Studies and Business Studies, which are more beneficial as stand-alone subjects .	Strongly disagree		In the case of the clear attempt to erase Classical Studies I must protest. Classical Studies can never be subsumed into 'History' more broadly. The history of Europe, the Americas and post-colonial Oceania are inherently bound up in Christian thinking. Classical Studies exists prior to this and offers an alternative model of thinking about the world, an increasingly vital model in these modern times. Classical Studies address issues such as imperialism, racism, slavery etc from an entirely different angle. It offers vital critical thinking skills to students which set them up in life	Classical Studies - refer to previous answer.	Yes		Good selection.	2020-06-14 19:20:17	ANON-YFPW-RCHU-8	2020-06-14 19:20:17	2020-06-14 19:20:33
Yes		Strongly disagree	Subjects are too broad and so there will not be adequate time to learn them to the standard that specializing in them at level 2 will require	Economics/ business should not be under the same umbrella as classics/history as they are in no way similar		Yes			2020-06-14 19:30:45	ANON-YFPW-RC4Y-8	2020-06-14 19:30:45	2020-06-14 19:31:03
No	Scrapping Classical Studies is a mistake. Students need to be encouraged to learn about the Greek and Roman history including architecture and literature. The Romans are responsible for many innovations which are still in modern use today ie sewers and sanitation, roads and highways and aqueducts.	Disagree	Keep Classical Studies!	As previously stated, students need to learn about Greek and Roman history for the valuable contributions from each. The many historical buildings and ruins still standing are a testament to their durability and the techniques used in construction. The concrete the Romans used is in fact far superior to any modern equivalent. It is important for students to learn how Rome became the city it is, how the Roman empire rose and fell and the impact it has had on the world.		No			2020-06-14 19:31:58	ANON-YFPW-RC4V-5	2020-06-14 19:31:58	2020-06-14 19:32:24
Yes		Disagree	I disagree with the Ministry's decision to cut humanities subjects such as Art History and Classics and languages such as Latin from the curriculum as I believe this limits students' options at a critical decision-making point for their future lives and careers.	I utterly disagree with the decision to axe Classical Studies, Art History, and Latin from the Level 1 curriculum. Subjects taken at Level 1 often determine the pathways students will take in their future careers and lives, and limiting access to the humanities subjects can only harm students' chances at a well-rounded, informed education. Art History is a necessary class for any student serious about the pursuit of an artistic career, as it provides a basis on which to ground themselves and a context in which to see themselves as the future of a millennia old artistic tradition. There is no guarantee this would be taught in an 'Art' class as teachers simply wouldn't have the time to cover it properly. Cutting access to this class harms our future artists. Classical Studies is especially important for students as it offers perhaps the only chance students have at high school to learn anything about what might be called 'world history'. Since the Ministry insists that NCEA History can only cover subjects relating to or based in New Zealand, this severely limits any knowledge of history students may pick up in class, and leads to a populace that is worryingly ignorant of world history and our place within it. Greek and Roman civilisation provides the basis for much of our modern civilisation, making learning at least the	I would like to see Art History, Classics and Latin offered at more schools around the country, and I would like to see more offered in NCEA History beyond just World Wars I and II, and Vietnam, and the Springbok Tour. One has to admit that's not much for students to learn over five years at school.	Yes		As many subjects as possible ought to be available to students in Te Reo	2020-06-14 19:36:34	ANON-YFPW-RC4C-J	2020-06-14 19:36:34	2020-06-14 19:36:54
No		Strongly disagree		Classics and humanistic study in my opinion are penalized. It's impossible compete with the present, or rather the future, with the challenges that globalization offers. It is shocking to think of coming into contact with other people or places, on a global, global level, without taking oneself, one's history, identity, specificity, this is the classics: what makes it possible for you to be yourself consciously and, above all, it enables you to bring innovation, a difference which is richness. Without the study of the classics, ancient or modern they are, we are almost nothing... empty bags that can be filled by anyone with any information... simple automata in the hand of anyone, we do not live to carry out a lifetime task we were created for beauty and passion, our essence is creativity and we cannot kill it by offering people a mere mechanization of life or a simple, albeit important, openness to the world with the study of countless languages. study the classics: in life they will serve you and help you to face the present in all its realities, including a disappointment of love, a passionate passion or an immobilizing fear; the history of the classics is the history of men, young or old who are telling it or being told. Let's not forget the history of man, we always have to learn.	Yes: Latin, Classics Ancient and Modern, and also ancient language of your land.	No		Over music, art, social studies, also Latin language and literature and history Ancient and Modern.	2020-06-14 19:37:38	ANON-YFPW-RC4S-2	2020-06-14 19:37:38	2020-06-14 19:38:09
No		Disagree		Do not remove Classics or Latin, students can still learn from these subjects	Classics and Latin	No			2020-06-14 19:38:20	ANON-YFPW-RC4B-7	2020-06-14 19:38:20	2020-06-14 19:38:42

Yes		Strongly disagree		<p>Don't drop Latin from the NCEA curriculum.</p> <p>It would be an embarrassment for NZ to be the only English-speaking country in the world not to offer it, especially when highly regarded international qualifications such as CIE and IB do.</p> <p>The study of Latin has taught me valuable skills in logic, analysis and attention to detail. These skills have proven to be extremely helpful in my computer science and data science degree, as coding is all based on logic.</p> <p>Studying the complex rules and morphology of Latin grammar has also sparked my interest in linguistics, which is why I intend on specialising in computational linguistics. This is an important field — with applications such as machine translation and reducing internet hate-speech — that I would not at all have considered had I not taken Latin.</p> <p>Latin was by far my favourite subject in high school. It was immensely rewarding to translate and discuss real literature from 2000 years ago. My classmates all felt the same — 60% of us have continued studying classical languages at university, speaking to the enjoyment and</p>	No			2020-06-14 19:41:25	ANON-YFPW-RC49-8	2020-06-14 19:41:25	2020-06-14 19:41:43
No		Strongly disagree			No			2020-06-14 19:45:03	ANON-YFPW-RC4G-P	2020-06-14 19:45:03	2020-06-14 19:45:20
Yes		Strongly disagree	<p>I'm surprised to hear that Latin is being proposed to be abolished as a subject. If implemented, this would mean Latin would no longer be taught in New Zealand schools under the national NCEA qualification. I don't understand the rationale for doing this. Children can learn German and French, Pacific Island languages, and Korean but not Latin.</p> <p>There's a place for learning religious studies, food science, agriculture, dance and other specialist subjects so why not offer Latin as well? Why downgrade a subject that has so many upsides for a young person's learning and understanding of the world?</p>	<p>My 14-year-old son started Latin in Year 9 and it quickly became one of his favourite subjects. He loves it so much, he chose to do Latin in Year 10 along with Mandarin, even though it meant attending an extra 8am Latin class on a Monday morning!</p> <p>It has a dual benefit of providing a wonderful foundation for learning languages and also a way for children to learn about the Roman world and its influence across many disciplines, including politics, history, culture, and architecture.</p> <p>My son says it's a really fun subject to learn and has taught him a lot. He says he would be sad thinking that other children are at risk of missing out on the opportunity to learn Latin.</p> <p>Our son's Latin teacher is amazing and is helping his students explore, understand, and think about the world they live in. Latin offers the opportunity not just to expand children's minds through literature but engenders a love of language, and provides a good basis for learning other languages. It also helps students refine their skills in critical thinking, close reading, analytical reasoning and mental processing.</p>	No		2020-06-14 19:50:04	ANON-YFPW-RC4J-5	2020-06-14 19:50:04	2020-06-14 19:50:15	
Yes		Disagree		<p>Please don't remove classics, this is a very important subject for well rounded New Zealanders.</p> <p>Classics provides a good base for critical thinking. Classical history was the base of Europe which then spread enlightenment including democracy throughout the world, and is why we are here today.</p> <p>If you remove Level 1 classics, it will impact on the number taking up Level 2, or Level 3 classics.</p>	No			2020-06-14 19:51:23	ANON-YFPW-RC4Q-Z	2020-06-14 19:51:23	2020-06-14 19:51:36
Yes		Strongly disagree		<p>Removing Level 1 Classical Studies and Latin at each level completely flies in the face of supporting "a broad, more foundational education at NCEA Level 1." Classical studies is a multi-disciplinary subject which provides the broadest of foundations.</p>	Yes			2020-06-14 19:57:01	ANON-YFPW-RC4E-M	2020-06-14 19:57:01	2020-06-14 19:57:15

No		Strongly disagree	I strongly disagree with the omission/ removal of Latin, Classics and Art History (See below).	With removal of Latin and Art History, and with Classical Civilisation apparently absorbed into History, all content which specifically pertinent to Nz's European linguistic and cultural heritage is removed. The omission of Latin in particular, singular among all the languages, is a loss, since Latin offers a different experience from learning modern languages - it gives an insight into a past world and the roots of English. It is also intellectually challenging for the able, and at beginner level accessible to all.	If the decision to axe Latin were overturned, I propose that Classical Greek is added at levels 2/3, so that New Zealand students can access Classics as a discipline. If it is not overturned, then perhaps Greek could be considered as an alternative Classical language to offer. Either way, offering no classical language is a serious omission.	No		Yes to qu. 5?	2020-06-14 19:59:00	ANON-YFPW-RC45-4	2020-06-14 19:59:00	2020-06-14 19:59:31
Yes		Strongly disagree		The proposed removal of all Latin as well as NCEA level 1 Classics is a terrible idea. Latin and classics are key subjects to understanding our history. A knowledge of Latin provides a foundation that can give understanding of almost all European languages, making it incredibly valuable for those seeking to learn more widely used languages.		No			2020-06-14 19:59:37	ANON-YFPW-RC4P-Y	2020-06-14 19:59:37	2020-06-14 19:59:51
No		Strongly disagree				No			2020-06-14 20:02:10	ANON-YFPW-RC47-6	2020-06-14 20:02:10	2020-06-14 20:02:31
Yes		Strongly disagree		Latin should still be included as it helps student to learn other modern languages derived from Latin. It also helps students with English as they are able to recognise nouns, pronouns, and verbs. Classics is a important subject in level one NCEA. It helps students to develop key skills such as interpreting historical sources and understanding other cultures. At level one, students are also able to examine Greek and Roman myths and compare them with Maori mythology.		No			2020-06-14 20:02:23	ANON-YFPW-RC4F-N	2020-06-14 20:02:23	2020-06-14 20:02:32
No		Disagree		Please reconsider including Latin. It is a valuable subject that teaches essential transferable skills such as careful analysis, problem-solving, critical thinking, the ability to synthesise and apply knowledge. It strongly supports other subjects such as English, certain modern foreign languages and science.		No			2020-06-14 20:02:42	ANON-YFPW-RC41-Z	2020-06-14 20:02:42	2020-06-14 20:02:52
No		Disagree				No			2020-06-14 20:10:02	ANON-YFPW-RC4Z-9	2020-06-14 20:10:02	2020-06-14 20:10:11
No		Strongly disagree		The decision to remove Latin entirely from the qualification will seriously effect its standard and quality. Classical Studies plays an integral role in the foundation of any Western education and provides a deeper understanding of both our culture and the development of all Western knowledge. The decision to essentially provide a limited, generalised programme for our learners will stunt their understanding of the world and seriously undermine the importance of our foundational history.		No			2020-06-14 20:12:07	ANON-YFPW-RC4H-Q	2020-06-14 20:12:07	2020-06-14 20:12:30
Yes		Undecided		Continue to include Latin. It has immense linguistically value across subjects and is relevant to many pathways for future careers.		No			2020-06-14 20:13:27	ANON-YFPW-RC4B-H	2020-06-14 20:13:27	2020-06-14 20:13:47
No		Strongly disagree	Latin and the classics need to be kept on the syllabus.	Latin and classical studies are both important cultural building blocks. Latin, as the base of all romance languages is especially important as learning it proficiently allows a basic understanding and an easy slide into any romance language a student may wish to learn from there. Having studied Latin I can easily understand a lot of Italian Spanish and French, but more than that it allows me the understanding of a base language and an in depth understanding of language structures and etymology. This all put inside the cultural and historical context of ancient Rome and gaining knowledge of one of the most inventive and influential periods of western history.		Yes			2020-06-14 20:15:31	ANON-YFPW-RC4M-V	2020-06-14 20:15:31	2020-06-14 20:15:58
Yes		Strongly disagree	It is absolutely horrific that you're getting rid of Latin and Classics.	Latin and Classics teach fundamental life skills to students, skills applicable to a large variety of career pathways. Latin, as a language that is not spoken aloud and promotes a unique formulaic understanding of grammar, also provides a much easier option for students with certain learning barriers. Not to mention, if you stop offering Latin, uni entrance into the subject would drop. We need to be promoting New Zealand's growth, not hindering it.	Yes, Ancient Greek.	No			2020-06-14 20:21:53	ANON-YFPW-RC4D-K	2020-06-14 20:21:53	2020-06-14 20:22:11

Yes		Strongly disagree		<p>The removal of Latin and the homogenisation of the sciences is a poor choice in my opinion.</p> <p>Latin as an important step for many people in the process of choosing to study classics (or converting to Law from there). Latin forms a basis to language comprehension and improves understanding of logic and grammatical structure. Losing this window into the ancient world risks losing appreciation for classic literature and ancient history.</p> <p>As an engineering student, I can attest that it was a love for physics and maths that led me to my subject. Studying a general science subject prior to specialising led me to confusion about the different fields and how they interact; not knowing when I would be studying what I enjoyed meant that I enjoyed none of it.</p>		No			2020-06-14 20:25:40	ANON-YFPW-RC4X-7	2020-06-14 20:25:40	2020-06-14 20:26:37
Yes		Strongly disagree	Latin and the study of the Classics is fundamentally important to any education and should not be scrapped from the curriculum. Any child should be able to pursue their interests in various times of history, especially including the ancient Greek and Roman ages, as they have continued to shape and influence philosophy, culture, politics, and experimentation throughout history into the present.	<p>Make sure to include the language study of Latin and the classics, allowing the study of ancient Greece and Rome. These texts and authors are fundamental to our current understanding of the world, and their influence can be seen in our languages, politics, cultural references, and method of experimentation.</p>	Latin, ancient Greek and Roman playwrights, enlightenment philosophers	No			2020-06-14 20:30:58	ANON-YFPW-RC4A-G	2020-06-14 20:30:58	2020-06-14 20:31:07
Yes	I don't agree with the proposed changes in science L1 - has not worked as I expected it too. Dropping content and increasing 'english/writing' content (in Science) not helpful for students. Won't facilitate learning of science across the full range of student ability.	Disagree	Only interested in the science (and maths).	<p>Still need specific sciences at L1!!</p> <p>Science philosophy without content will not suit many, and will not facilitate entry into the Physics/Chem, Bio streams. Proposed standards, in themselves, will put many students off.</p>		No	Not especially		2020-06-14 20:32:41	ANON-YFPW-RC4N-W	2020-06-14 20:32:41	2020-06-14 20:32:59
No		Strongly disagree	Classics and Media studies are very important and can be gateways to other learning and education down the track. Accounting is also incredibly important and should be incorporated into learning at some point of secondary education for all students	<p>Classics and media studies should STAY. I Personally gained a lot from these classes and learnt more about English and writing skills than I did in English. It is creative, opens doors and leads to many opportunities that could not be found in generic social studies and English classes</p>	More commerce subjects, classics and media studies.	No			2020-06-14 20:54:18	ANON-YFPW-RC4K-T	2020-06-14 20:54:18	2020-06-14 20:54:34
Yes		Disagree		<p>I believe that subjects such as Classical Studies and Art History should continue to be taught in NCEA. Classical Studies covers a whole range of topics, from history to politics to art to literature, and allows us to understand why our current society is the way it is.</p> <p>Art History is similar to this, however, it also provides us with the many different ways people have been represented throughout history and the impact of that representation, as well as the development of creativity and resources. To not teach these subjects would be turning our backs on the arts.</p>	Classical Studies and Art History	No			2020-06-14 21:03:11	ANON-YFPW-RC46-5	2020-06-14 21:03:11	2020-06-14 21:03:27
No		Strongly disagree	I very strongly believe that Classical studies should be kept as its own individual subject in all NCEA levels.	<p>Classical studies should absolutely be kept in all NCEA levels - it teaches what history does not and in my opinion is both more interesting and more important than much of modern history.</p>		No			2020-06-14 21:20:25	ANON-YFPW-RC4R-1	2020-06-14 21:20:25	2020-06-14 21:20:35
Yes	There was a general outrage amongst the classics and history communities that littered my social media pages.	Strongly disagree		<p>I believe that the proposed subject changes will simplify the subjects in a way that will harm both students and teachers. Classics and History develop similar skills but are completely different subjects with completely different contexts. There is no way that any history teacher will be able to comprehensively cover either subject if they are combined. The same applies to the proposed combination of economic subjects. I understand the removal of Latin, it is a relatively unpopular subject. However, if it is removed you are taking away opportunities for students. Latin is a valuable language for the way that it relates to English, amongst many others.</p> <p>Reducing or diluting knowledge if not the way that a student should learn.</p>	I think that it would be better to split history into two subjects: General History and New Zealand History. This would ensure that students comprehensively learn the history of New Zealand rather than a snippet of NZ History being temporarily learnt for a small internal.	No			2020-06-14 21:23:19	ANON-YFPW-RC4W-6	2020-06-14 21:23:19	2020-06-14 21:23:27
No	Latin and Classics should not be scrapped.	Disagree	Latin and Classics should not be scrapped.	Latin and Classics should not be scrapped.	Latin and Classics should not be scrapped. Ancient Greek would be nice too.	No			2020-06-14 21:24:05	ANON-YFPW-RC44-3	2020-06-14 21:24:05	2020-06-14 21:24:16
No		Disagree		<p>Removing Classics and Art History is absolutely the wrong decision. These are important subjects that are far more than a small part of overall history, and teaching them in such a way would trivialise their importance.</p>	<p>Political Science. According to this list, this subject is not covered at all. Yet it is not only valuable academically, it is information that is important for young people to understand. By allowing students to learn about politics and the workings of government, they will emerge with a greater capability to actively participate in society.</p>	No			2020-06-14 21:28:34	ANON-YFPW-RC4T-3	2020-06-14 21:28:34	2020-06-14 21:28:40

Yes		Undecided	The rationalisation for much of this is unclear. The discussion above (and in the links included) provide very little information as to how the transition between the current and the proposed subjects is to be designed. My suggestion is that rather than focussing on the specific subjects to be taught, more consideration be given to the WAY they are taught. The notion that level 1 should be broad in scope and that specialisation should occur at levels 2 and 3 seems very reasonable, but this is, in my mind, unrelated to the specific topics listed above. Fiddling with the titles of what is taught without considering the way it is taught is unlikely to achieve the goals that are to be achieved by these changes.	Some of the changes may address the issues set out above (and in the supporting material) but it is difficult to assess how a change of title actually translates into what is taught. I note that a handful of subjects are not to be continued, among them, Latin. If the intention of these changes is to encourage a broader perspective at level 1, I'm unclear why Latin has been dropped. For many students, Latin provides a fairly broad insight into many areas that are current. These include much insight into languages (and not only those with a latin component), but science, the basics of logic, and the origins of much modern politics and history.	As noted above, I'm not sure the details of the subjects are so important as the way they are taught to encourage a broad perspective rather than to narrow the scope too early in students careers.	Yes	This will be interesting as regional variation in te Reo and in tikanga will be a challenge to capture.	See above.	2020-06-14 22:32:24	ANON-YFPW-RC43-2	2020-06-14 22:32:23	2020-06-14 22:32:41
Yes		Disagree		The merging of some subjects is reasonable, but in some cases it results in a reduction of the offer with no clear benefits. E.g.: Art History is something different from Visual Arts. It enables a cultural understanding which Visual Arts, although being valuable for other reasons, do not provide. The exclusion of Latin and Classical Studies prevents pupils from approaching such disciplines, which have a great interest for the understanding of New Zealand's cultural, political and philosophical heritage, also at a later stage in education. The study of Latin could benefit those interested in learning French/Spanish (or other Romance languages) providing a great historical perspective on how languages evolve. The Science area is way too broad.		No			2020-06-14 22:56:36	ANON-YFPW-RC42-1	2020-06-14 22:56:36	2020-06-14 22:57:00
No		Strongly disagree	Save Latin!		Greek and Classical Civilisation too	No			2020-06-14 23:04:05	ANON-YFPW-RC4U-4	2020-06-14 23:04:05	2020-06-14 23:04:12
No		Strongly disagree				No			2020-06-14 23:12:09	ANON-YFPW-RCQY-5	2020-06-14 23:12:09	2020-06-14 23:12:21
No		Strongly disagree		This type of a system will literally turn students stupid, every subject should be its own story, especially classics and scientific studies. Students are there to learn, how come it was functional 20 years ago? People need to know classics - either in history or in philosophy, it's where it all started, you don't teach people mathematics starting from trigonometry, you teach them from 1+1. People need to learn chemistry, biology and physics separately, you can't fit something people are studying for 2000 years in one subject and expect people to have a quality understanding of it.		No			2020-06-14 23:15:02	ANON-YFPW-RCQV-2	2020-06-14 23:15:02	2020-06-14 23:15:21
No		Agree		Please include classics and Latin		No			2020-06-14 23:35:08	ANON-YFPW-RCQC-F	2020-06-14 23:35:08	2020-06-14 23:35:23
No		Disagree		Include Latin and Classics- give foundational knowledge of the world. Latin useful for legal and medicinal degrees as well as understanding how languages developed. Classical studies important aspect of history and give understanding how how advanced literature and plays were written and performed in Ancient Greece and Rome, helping to understand eg fate and free will, hubris, etc		No			2020-06-15 00:05:37	ANON-YFPW-RCQS-Y	2020-06-15 00:05:37	2020-06-15 00:06:09
No		Strongly disagree		Latin and classical studies should not be cut. Besides offering students an invaluable linguistic and historical background, studying Latin promotes critical analysis in a way that studying the other languages does not. Students who have studied Latin consistently score highest in post secondary entrance exams such as entrance to law school and medical school. Many tech companies including Google specifically look for Latin majors at the other Humanities Majors when hiring.		No			2020-06-15 00:46:57	ANON-YFPW-RCQ8-4	2020-06-15 00:46:57	2020-06-15 00:47:20

Yes		Strongly disagree	Really disappointing to see that Latin is being removed, and classical studies subsumed into history. Both Latin and classical studies are incredibly valuable subjects in a holistic education. Latin offers an opportunity for mathematically minded students to engage with a language, as well as being incredibly beneficial in terms of helping students understand our language today, develop analytical skills, and engage with a different society. Classical studies offers a "huge" range of opportunities for inter-disciplinary study, including philosophy, history, culture, art and literature, all of which make it a very useful pathway for students to learn how different disciplines can work in tandem and compliment each other. Furthermore, classical studies is the arguably the subject which best allows students to engage with today's world. Discussing many issues which also have contemporary applications, such as the nature of democracy, the morality of warfare, the position and treatment of women and foreign cultures, and what it means to be a good citizen, is integral to the education of today's new generation of citizens. Furthermore, Latin gives students the opportunity to engage with the ancient world and these issues also through the language, helping them develop critical thinking and analytic skills, and explore a culture through its literary works and history.	Really disappointing to see that Latin is being removed, and classical studies subsumed into history. Both Latin and classical studies are incredibly valuable subjects in a holistic education. Latin offers an opportunity for mathematically minded students to engage with a language, as well as being incredibly beneficial in terms of helping students understand our language today, develop analytical skills, and engage with a different society. Classical studies offers a "huge" range of opportunities for inter-disciplinary study, including philosophy, history, culture, art and literature, all of which make it a very useful pathway for students to learn how different disciplines can work in tandem and compliment each other. Furthermore, classical studies is the arguably the subject which best allows students to engage with today's world. Discussing many issues which also have contemporary applications, such as the nature of democracy, the morality of warfare, the position and treatment of women and foreign cultures, and what it means to be a good citizen, is integral to the education of today's new generation of citizens. Furthermore, Latin gives students the opportunity to engage with the ancient world and these issues also through the language, helping them develop critical thinking and analytic skills, and explore a culture through its literary works and history.		No			2020-06-15 01:45:39	ANON-YFPW-RCQ9-5	2020-06-15 01:45:39	2020-06-15 01:45:52
Yes		Strongly disagree		I cannot see any justification for the removal of Latin and how this would benefit any learner.		No			2020-06-15 02:20:38	ANON-YFPW-RCQJ-P	2020-06-15 02:20:38	2020-06-15 02:20:46
No		Strongly disagree		Classics. It seems impossible to think of any modern educational system without fundamental knowledge of the history of our own thought. Classical antiquity is a major base on which our cultures have been set and without solid relative knowledge we are condemned to an ignorant and vague conceptualisation of our world.	Classics.	No			2020-06-15 02:57:06	ANON-YFPW-RCQJ-W	2020-06-15 02:57:06	2020-06-15 02:57:16
No		Strongly disagree		By dumping Latin you dump 2,000+ years of history, science, and philosophy, as well as the cultural heritage of the west. It cannot be done.	Latin	No			2020-06-15 03:53:34	ANON-YFPW-RCQE-H	2020-06-15 03:53:34	2020-06-15 03:53:47
Yes		Strongly disagree		Latin is a fundamental part of education, we cannot truly understand modern society without learning about ancient ones.		No			2020-06-15 04:44:05	ANON-YFPW-RCQ5-1	2020-06-15 04:44:05	2020-06-15 04:44:12
No		Strongly disagree				No			2020-06-15 05:10:09	ANON-YFPW-RCQP-V	2020-06-15 05:10:09	2020-06-15 05:10:28
Yes		Strongly disagree	Studying Latin will give students an access to culture and languages of the past that will help students contextualize human culture and knowledge.	I have a degree in Classics and I wish I had the opportunity to study it as a teenager. Learning Latin would have give me a strong academic basis for the study of humanities, understanding English and aspects of language. These topics are immensely important and save students time learning any other subject. This knowledge is not taught in modern languages to the same degree.		No	I am curious, and inclined to think it is wonderful to study local culture and any culture!		2020-06-15 05:54:52	ANON-YFPW-RCQ7-3	2020-06-15 05:54:52	2020-06-15 05:55:09
No		Disagree		I studied Latin for 3 years in high school and believe it gave a great basis for languages in general but also a part of history. Classical studies was also an important subject for me which is also an introduction to history and philosophy. Still important subjects at University.		No			2020-06-15 06:37:53	ANON-YFPW-RCQF-J	2020-06-15 06:37:53	2020-06-15 06:37:59
No	You need Latin it is important for learning.	Strongly disagree	You need the Latin it ties in with Greece and romantic studies.	Latin have it available	Yes you should have home ec like Japan does	No			2020-06-15 07:05:55	ANON-YFPW-RCQ1-W	2020-06-15 07:05:55	2020-06-15 07:06:33
No		Strongly disagree		It's tragically sad that Latin is at risk of being taken away.		No			2020-06-15 10:23:15	ANON-YFPW-RCQH-M	2020-06-15 10:23:15	2020-06-15 10:23:29

No	We already have a broad curriculum - it is called Yr 9 and Yr 10. Students see Yr 11 as finally a chance for them to spend more time and to more depth in the subjects that they are excited by rather than another year of one-size-fits-all programmes. Anyone teaching in a school can tell you that there is a high risk of non-engagement if students are presented with limited choices and so they feel forced to choose a subject that they do not want to do. This means they school as a waste of time. Why is the proposal setting these students to become disengaged rather than hooking them into something they want to do? It appears that 'broad' is selective - some highly specialist subjects (often with low numbers) remain whilst some other popular subjects have been scaled back. This is especially true in the Commerce area - in 2019 from 33 subjects offering external assessment, Economics was the 6th most popular, Accounting the 9th and Business Studies the 13th. This proposal virtually removes Accounting from the curriculum at this level - 10500 students choose to do externals in 2019 in Accounting compared to 81 in Korean - but we are keeping Korean. What comes as particularly surprising is that teachers were basically blind-sided by this release. The opportunity was not taken for thorough discussion in working groups last year.	Strongly disagree	The general feel I get from those around me (parents, students, teachers) is that this represents a dumbing down of the curriculum. Our current NCEA allows schools to design courses to meet the needs of their students. An example of this is provided different science courses - one to support students who need it for science and another to extend students who respond and engage to this. Cutting it back to just Science is limiting and does not provide the challenge to those who need it. We constantly call for more to take STEM subjects so why make it so students don't engage with them? The same for Commerce. This is an area that a good number of students are excited by. The three areas of Accounting, Economics and Business Studies are all very different and what engages one student does not necessarily engage another so a one-size-fits-all Level 1 Commerce package won't allow students to work to their strengths.	As we see our economy weaken through covid, it is now more than ever that we need more students with a wide variety of Accounting, Economics and Business skills. Commerce is the life blood of our country and we need to have the opportunity for students to engage with the different elements so they can make informed decision later on regarding running businesses and understanding economic policy. A vastly pared back 'Commerce' will not allow students to gain the basic knowledge to support learning at a higher level and put the subjects on a back foot in senior school and we will have less Commerce literate students. The idea of Accounting being basically removed is short sighted and has no grounding. Accounting is the language of business and the more members of the population we have understanding ideas like liquidity, debt, profitability, budgets then the stronger our future businesses will be. Level 1 Accounting is a subject often taken by those wanting to enter Trades training with the idea of owning their own business and want to understand the financial side (problems with money is the #1 reason for business failure) and by removing Level 1 Accounting we are denying them this opportunity. They are unlikely to pick it up at level 2. We have had an ongoing demand for Accountants in NZ -	No			2020-06-15 10:37:34	ANON-YFPW-RCQB-E	2020-06-15 10:37:34	2020-06-15 10:37:46	
No		Agree		I like the simplification of "target subjects" in the social sciences. The five subjects cover a range of crucial subjects of study.	No.	No		2020-06-15 10:37:35	ANON-YFPW-RCQM-S	2020-06-15 10:37:35	2020-06-15 10:37:48	
Yes		Strongly disagree	At NCEA Level one, students are already capable of being challenged and stretched by the curriculum. Simplifying the curriculum by streamlining it in the way outlined above dumbs it down and prevents students who are already mature and structured thinkers to prepare for study at a higher level. See Question Three for a more detailed analysis.	Eliminating Latin, and having Classical Studies absorbed at a minimal level into History, not only dumbs down learning but prevents keen students, of which there are many, to prepare adequately for more in-depth study in Classical Studies at NCEA Levels Two and Three. The proposed elimination of Latin from the NCEA syllabus at all three levels is a cultural tragedy. While we are a multicultural society at the bottom of the Pacific Ocean, this does not mean we should turn our backs on the roots of Western culture, which a large percentage of us, including Maori and Pasifika people of mixed descent, derive an important part of our identity from. Removing Latin altogether, and Classical Studies as a full subject at NCEA Level One not only destroys or undermines the study of these subjects at school but indicates that we have little care for our European whakapapa. This is highly ironic, given that we are, at the same time, learning to embrace and celebrate the importance of Maori culture and ancestry, and that we are increasingly aware of the richness which other nationalities and social groups bring to our population mix. There is much to be learned from the strong cultural parallels between the Ancient Greek Homeric "hero" culture, as found in The Iliad and	I strongly oppose the elimination of Latin at NCEA Levels Two and Three, and I am very concerned that this move is part of a mindset that will also undermine or eliminate Classical Studies at these higher levels.	Yes	I am very supportive of The New Zealand Curriculum in Maori because I believe in strengthening fluency in Maori Language and deepening students' understanding of and connection to their own culture. It is for this very same reason that I support the overall retention of Latin and the continuation of Classical Studies at	I find the Curriculum website http://nzcurriculum.tki.org.nz/Curriculum-resources/Career-education/Career-management-and-curriculum/Te-Maraunga-o-Aotearoa-some-what-opaque-about-content,_once-one-progresses-past-the-initial-page,_so-I-am-not-able-to-comment-on-this-in-detail .	2020-06-15 10:47:28	ANON-YFPW-RCZV-3	2020-06-12 10:41:48	2020-06-15 10:47:43
Yes		Undecided		Strange that most of the collapsing of subjects seems to be in Science and not in other areas		No		2020-06-15 11:26:09	ANON-YFPW-RCQD-G	2020-06-15 11:26:09	2020-06-15 11:26:17	

Yes		Agree	I support a generalised level 1. But I DO NOT support the loss of level one art history entirely. It should be encompassed under the umbrella of another subject at level such as visual art. I currently use art history standards for level one visual art. I prefer them to visual arts 1.1. They support students to engage with the aspects of art that they are really interested in. In this way they are really flexible. I also believe that they promote a better quality of writing than visual arts 1.1. I have found that where students have engaged with the art history standards, they have tended to do better over all in their visual art.	Level one art history should be retained. To me the art history standards are a great option for students who are marginal in terms of the number of literacy credits they are going to get in other subjects, but are passionate and motivated about their art. Level one art history made the difference between getting their literacy/level one or not. This has been a valid and valuable pathway for my students. I have used standards like media and methods with level one students as it is more straightforward than visual arts 1.1 and also encourages students to engage with artworks more deeply and critically. I have previously used level one art history standards with year 10 students who really enjoyed this and continued to engage with the visual arts (and art history at level two and three) as a result. I believe that removing level one art history will remove a really valuable pathway for students. I don't see any indication that art history will become a pathway in history or visual arts. If art history is allowed to be cast aside we will be culturally poorer as a result.	No			2020-06-15 11:30:33	ANON-YFPW-RCQX-4	2020-06-15 11:30:33	2020-06-15 11:30:50
Yes		Strongly disagree		Classics and Latin should continue to be offered as separate classes, they can not be covered in full depth in a single history class. They are also a popular subject among many students, and an important subject for people to learn	Na	No	Na	2020-06-15 11:39:25	ANON-YFPW-RCQN-T	2020-06-15 11:39:25	2020-06-15 11:39:41
Yes	Classics is a broad foundational course at Level 1 as it currently exists and Latin is the basis for our English language.	Strongly disagree	Classics is a broad foundational course at Level 1 as it currently exists and Latin is the basis for our English language.	Classics is a broad foundational course at Level 1 as it currently exists and Latin is the basis for our English language. It is also foundational in the sense that it is the very foundation of so many of western civilisation and other subjects. Latin does fit this model. It increases a student's ability to use vocabulary and to understand the language structures within their own language e.g. they know not to say 'would of' but 'would have'. Skeptics' would say use a spell checker, but in the above example, as in others, it would not come up because 'of' is a word. By mastering the vocabulary and grammar at Level 1 it sets a student up for life, without putting a further burden on teachers of English - an example where one subject area can support another. Latin covers the particular areas, highlighted below, from the Learning Languages area of the NZ Curriculum. It links us to the past through written and visual forms of the language, giving access to new and different streams of thought. It is an organised system that is used to achieve meaning. It helps a student find, interpret and challenge his/her place and identity in the world, by looking at and interpreting either words in a	No			2020-06-15 11:40:57	ANON-YFPW-RCQA-D	2020-06-15 11:34:45	2020-06-15 11:41:07
Yes		Strongly disagree	I don't think Media Studies should be removed as an NCEA subject. There is good fluidity at our school from year 9 right to year 13 (and has been for many years). To remove it is to interrupt that fluidity.	Media Studies is more important now than ever. With Fake News, Deep Fakes and the immersive media culture students and adults alike find themselves in, critical literacy about how to make sense of media texts has never been so important.	Philosophy.	No		2020-06-15 11:50:24	ANON-YFPW-RCQK-Q	2020-06-15 11:50:24	2020-06-15 11:50:34
Yes	I am aware of this. I feel like there is plenty of time to have broad foundational education in years 7 to 10. In all honesty I think specialising and giving 2 years to complete level 2 is a far better option than level 1.	Disagree	Removing subjects like media studies and forcing it into a social studies window seems misguided. We should be aiming for a more and more media literate society. Especially with more dangers than ever of young people getting trapped within their own echo chambers. We need to make sure they are weary of these dangers.	I'll reiterate the above. Removing subjects like media studies and forcing it into a social studies window seems misguided. We should be aiming for a more and more media literate society. Especially with more dangers than ever of young people getting trapped within their own echo chambers. We need to make sure they are weary of these dangers. Also with subjects like Latin being a gateway to several other languages why do we not just leave it open as an option at least.	I think political sciences could be something to explore. With more onus on young people being ready using activism as an avenue for change in a world of climate change and #blacklivesmatter. We also need to make sure students are informed of policy as parties are looking to recruit younger career politicians (not that I agree with this).	Yes	This is important an needs to continue work in making sure it is culturally responsive to Māori needs.	2020-06-15 12:19:06	ANON-YFPW-RCQ6-2	2020-06-15 12:19:06	2020-06-15 12:19:39
Yes		Agree				No		2020-06-15 12:32:01	ANON-YFPW-RCQR-X	2020-06-15 12:32:01	2020-06-15 12:32:19

Yes		Strongly disagree		Classics, Art History, and Latin are all extremely important subjects and should definitely not be removed from level 1. Level 1 allows for an introduction to these subjects before grades become more important in level 2 and 3. It would be a huge mistake to remove them, and would be an extreme disadvantage for those who want to pursue those subjects further.	No	Yes			2020-06-15 13:51:29	ANON-YFPW-RCQW-3	2020-06-15 13:51:29	2020-06-15 13:51:42
No		Strongly disagree	I believe that removing Classical Studies at Level 1 and Latin at all levels would be detrimental to the education of New Zealand students. In terms of the criteria: 1. Classical Studies provides a broad and rich understanding across multiple disciplines and greatly benefits the understanding and interest in such subjects. Latin is fundamental to our history and such understanding is crucial today in all work sectors. 2. Classical Studies and Latin encourages curiosity, important analytical skills and deeply enriches learning. 3. Studying Classical Studies at NCEA level has directly led me to further my study at university level, which has advanced the skills and interests developed at school. Additionally, the wide applicability and introduction of Classical Studies at Level 1 would allow for a more nuanced and richer pathway and learning at Level 2 and 3. The study of Latin at NCEA level would provide a robust and coherent pathway to further study in Latin and other subjects. The study of Classical Studies and Latin also provides a richer pathway to further education in subjects such as Law, Medicine, Theatre, Philosophy, Literature, Design 4. The wide applicability and opportunities of interest in Classical Studies allows for a well designed and coherent curricula for individuals e.g. the ability to			No			2020-06-15 13:56:17	ANON-YFPW-RCHZ-W	2020-06-14 17:04:48	2020-06-15 13:56:27
Yes		Strongly disagree		Not joining all science subjects. They are not the same and do not deserve to be treated as such		No			2020-06-15 14:07:10	ANON-YFPW-RCQ4-Z	2020-06-15 14:07:10	2020-06-15 14:07:18
Yes		Disagree		Latin opens up a world of learning, as many scientific and linguistic pathways rely heavily on Latin, and teaching that fosters better and deeper understanding.		Yes			2020-06-15 14:28:48	ANON-YFPW-RCQ3-Y	2020-06-15 14:28:48	2020-06-15 14:28:55
Yes		Strongly disagree	The subjects need to be kept separate, for example Media Studies can not be taught as a part of social studies. They are very different subjects with no cross over between them.	Media Studies is an important subject for the age in which we live where we are saturated by the media. It is important that students who are preparing for a future we don't yet no, have all the tools we can give them at their disposal. To include Media Studies with a generic subject like social studies that only focuses on history and geography is short sighted and will limited how our film industry and arts sector develop.	Leave Media Studies alone	No			2020-06-15 14:29:15	ANON-YFPW-RCQ2-X	2020-06-15 14:29:15	2020-06-15 14:29:24
Yes		Disagree	In most instances I agree - though I 1 Disagree with the exclusion of Latin 2 Am not sure about the combination of all sciences. 3 Disagree with the combination of Classical Studies with History 4 Disagree with the Social Studies including Media Studies and Psychology. 5 Schools should also have the option of adding subjects that come out of the communities in which they live if they do not already exist in the curriculum.	See above. 1 Presumably the later Latin is begun to be taught, the lower the standard at the end of secondary schooling. The Latin language is key to much higher education, medicine, law etc. 2 Science combination could exclude some children whose preference may be, for example, environmental sciences but not chemistry, physics etc. 3 History and Classical Studies - each would be done in less depth. Also this reduces the subject choices available and hence possibly engagement with education. 4 They are very disparate subjects and cannot be combined effectively. My experience is that a child who enjoys media studies or psychology may not be engaged by social studies at all. They should remain separate. Also reduces subject choices available and hence possibly engagement with education. 5 Enhances educational options and hence likely engagement with education.	Only in relation to community need or preference as above.	No			2020-06-15 14:39:09	ANON-YFPW-RCQU-1	2020-06-15 14:34:26	2020-06-15 14:39:34

Yes	Overall I think the changes are positive, but there are areas which need reconsideration/review.	Undecided		NCEA L1 accounting should be retained in the curriculum, rather than being merged into the new commerce subject where very little (if any) of it will be taught. Reasons include: •Accounting is a good general knowledge subject and a basic knowledge is very useful. A number of students who take L1 accounting, do not continue with it as a specialist subject in Y12/13 (in my experience about half of them do), but the skills learned in Y11 are useful life skills to have. Not having the subject available for L1 will mean a large number of students missing out to their detriment. •Financial literacy skills are very important and there is an emphasis on these due to a lack of financial capability. Therefore, I cannot understand why a vital subject such as accounting will be dropped from the curriculum at L1. •The foundational background acquired in Level 1 helps students to further develop their understanding in L2 leading to successful results in NCEA. •Accounting L1 is a popular subject (over 10,500 students sat accounting standards in 2019), far more popular than some other subjects which are being retained. Over 16,500 tackled L1 economics		No			2020-06-15 15:27:34	ANON-YFPW-RCFY-T	2020-06-15 15:27:34	2020-06-15 15:27:59
Yes		Agree	I support the simplification the five subjects biology, chemistry, physics, earth and space science and science into a single subject.	I would like to see the option of taking Latin at Level 1 retained to give students who enjoy the logical structure of the language an opportunity to engage with a non-STEM subject.		No		2020-06-15 15:41:57	ANON-YFPW-RCFV-Q	2020-06-15 15:29:31	2020-06-15 15:42:01	
No		Agree				No		2020-06-15 16:20:39	ANON-YFPW-RCFC-4	2020-06-15 16:20:39	2020-06-15 16:20:50	
No		Strongly disagree		Keep Latin and classics		No		2020-06-15 16:32:07	ANON-YFPW-RCF8-5	2020-06-15 16:32:07	2020-06-15 16:32:26	
No		Strongly disagree	Classics and art history combine with English (and latin) to form a basic foundation to most other learning. We learn from the past so to avoid repeating huge mistakes in the future. It is also amazing how much these subjects influence students in later life. Not all students I know, but encourage a thirst for learning.			No		2020-06-15 17:14:17	ANON-YFPW-RCF9-T	2020-06-15 17:14:17	2020-06-15 17:14:40	
Yes		Disagree	I am wary that in particular the simplification of science and allowing students to leave after level 1 combined means that students could possibly never learn anything about certain specializations of science. While in general I trust the profession to advocate for a wider scope, some school under pressure for grades will skip them.	Specialist science topics at level 1 to ensure that students who leave at the end of level 1 have the opportunity to experience them.		No		2020-06-15 17:17:41	ANON-YFPW-RCFG-8	2020-06-15 17:17:41	2020-06-15 17:17:52	
No	For many students the diversity of level 1 is what is exciting. This feels like a step back.	Strongly disagree	For many students the loss of crucial subjects that promote critical thinking, reflection and broader perspectives such as classics, art history, media studies etc... will mean having to take subjects that don't promote wider thinking, reflection, creativity or appreciation for collective approaches.	Please keep the diversity in social sciences and arts. in fact, expand it.	Philosophy, Sociology, Anthropology, Youth Development, Leadership and those at risk noted above - classics, art history, media.	No		2020-06-15 17:46:03	ANON-YFPW-RCFQ-J	2020-06-15 17:46:03	2020-06-15 17:46:10	
No		Disagree		Don't completely scrap Latin please. It's not a vital skill, and it's assuredly not as important as Te Reo or English, but it gives so much insight into the history of a big part of our culture and much of our common language from a source that is a more than two millennium old. So many of the words we use every day have classical roots. And if we want our kids to be doctors or lawyers; they might appreciate it even more. I didn't learn Latin in high school decades ago, it wasn't even in the curriculum of my high school back then. I picked it up as a hobby much later. But it gave me a deeper etymological grounding that I still appreciate every day, and it makes it easier to understand other Romance languages too.		No		2020-06-15 18:50:44	ANON-YFPW-RCFE-6	2020-06-15 18:50:44	2020-06-15 18:50:55	
No		Disagree	Latin should be included!			No		2020-06-15 19:11:48	ANON-YFPW-RCFS-P	2020-06-15 19:11:48	2020-06-15 19:12:16	
Yes		Strongly disagree	Classics is the reason I went to university! It is a subject more than worth saving!	Classics is the reason I went to university! It is a subject more than worth saving!	Classics is the reason I went to university! It is a subject more than worth saving!	Yes		2020-06-15 21:17:17	ANON-YFPW-RCF7-R	2020-06-15 21:17:17	2020-06-15 21:17:23	

Yes	I consider that the Learning Area "The Arts" comprises 5 'nice to know' subjects that are not really fundamental to general education, when compared to "Learning Languages". They are in the 'hobby' category, or after-school activities. The broad range of subjects appears to promote dabbling, rather than focused learning.	Disagree	I am appalled at the deletion of Latin from "Learning Languages". <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Latin is fundamental to learning grammar, including English grammar. •Latin is the basis of the Romance languages, French, Spanish, Portuguese, Italian and Romanian, spoken by 900 million people. •Latin promotes thinking logically and helps studies in mathematics. •Latin greatly assists understanding of biological and medical sciences. •Latin facilitates learning other languages, their knowledge and culture. •Learning Latin takes 3 years for proficiency; it takes 8 years for languages such as Mandarin, Japanese, Korean. •NZ should continue to take part in the US National Latin Exam which is held worldwide. •Translation programmes don't assist in learning other cultures; only language learning does. Such programmes can still make fundamental mistakes. I do know, being tri-lingual. 	Latin should be retained among "Learning Languages" for reasons outlined above. Moreover, the learning of the Malay-Indonesian language, spoken by 215 million people, should be included, and Korean should be deleted. In the Target Subject list "Commerce", greater emphasis should be given to budgeting and personal financial planning.	As indicated under question 1, I consider that there are too many subjects in the hobby category which should be offered at specialised training centres, AFTER obtaining a solid grounding in core STEM subjects. My previous comment about dabbling should be interpreted as my concern about the dumbing down of the education system.	No	But I support learning te reo Maori as a means of learning language skills, and of creating greater cultural awareness, hopefully leading to a more cohesive society.	No.	2020-06-15 22:41:37	ANON-YFPW-RCFB-B	2020-06-15 17:39:03	2020-06-15 22:42:11
Yes	It seems reasonable. NZ students lack depth in their subject knowledge at level 2 and 3.	Strongly disagree	I disagree with some of the subject changes.	By dropping Latin (and classical studies) you are dropping two subjects that are the foundation of the study of so many European languages. Latin develops grammatical skills & analytical reasoning. Students who are more scientifically minded often find Latin an enjoyable and accessible language to study. Both Latin and classical studies allow students to study the foundations of society, democracy, politics etc in an interesting and engaging way. To remove these subjects contravenes all the criteria listed above since it would narrow the curriculum and remove completely the study of important unique subject areas (you say yourselves classical studies can only be included in history to a very limited degree.) It certainly reduces the credibility of NCEA internationally. I say this as someone with experience of overseas study and university lecturing both in NZ and overseas, as well as university admissions panels.		No			2020-06-16 00:03:24	ANON-YFPW-RCFF-7	2020-06-16 00:03:24	2020-06-16 00:04:12
No		Strongly disagree				No			2020-06-16 01:51:21	ANON-YFPW-RCF1-J	2020-06-16 01:51:21	2020-06-16 01:51:27
No		Strongly disagree	Latin should be kept as an option.			No			2020-06-16 04:12:31	ANON-YFPW-RCFZ-U	2020-06-16 04:12:31	2020-06-16 04:12:37
No		Strongly disagree				Yes			2020-06-16 05:00:11	ANON-YFPW-RCFH-9	2020-06-16 05:00:11	2020-06-16 05:00:23
No		Strongly disagree		Keep Latin. 65% of English vocabulary comes from Latin. It is the parent of 5 official languages of the EU; Portuguese, Spanish, French, Italian, Romanian and many minority languages. 1.3 billion people on the planet speak one of the above languages. It is the language of Law and the technological language of the sciences, particularly medicine.	Classical Greek. All scientific terms are from Greek. When a new species is discovered or a new drug is compounded, a Greek is found and then Latinised. The Greeks founded European civilisation and the Romans spread it around their empire.	No			2020-06-16 05:13:37	ANON-YFPW-RCFB-3	2020-06-16 05:04:35	2020-06-16 05:14:21
No		Disagree	Leaving out latin and Classical studies would be a shame	Latin and classical studies are crucial in shaping critical thinkers. Both subjects provide students with transferable Skills and provide a base for Learning about other languages and cultures. Without this prior knowledge, a less clear accurate picture of the past will be provided.		No			2020-06-16 07:35:34	ANON-YFPW-RCFM-E	2020-06-16 07:35:34	2020-06-16 07:35:48
Yes		Disagree		Science is increasingly important in this high-tech world, yet students are less and less prepared – and motivated – to study it. A rocket and a coronavirus don't have much in common. Might as well group all Languages into one.	None of these are "Specialist subjects", nor could they possibly be at that age. Education theory should be the framework to guide this process, not a poll of "what flash topic sounds important, do you reckon?"	No			2020-06-16 08:25:31	ANON-YFPW-RCFD-5	2020-06-16 08:25:31	2020-06-16 08:25:53

Yes		Strongly agree		Once NZ comes out the other end of post-covid economic hardship, there will be a great need and opportunities for New Zealanders to move into the tourism and hospitality industries. Tourism as a multi-disciplinary, multi-method field of study is well suited to meet the changing complexities of societies. Tourism provides the platform for exciting, stimulating and highly relevant programmes of study' (Airey, 2019, p.261). The NZ tourism industry, until Covid-19, was a \$45B industry representing 20% of exports, 10% of GDP and 400,000 jobs. Tourism is a remarkably resilient industry that has withstood previous global challenges and, many countries, including NZ are now taking the opportunity to reimagine tourism while focusing on the environmental, economic and socio-cultural benefits tourism can provide. Tourism study is not only about training a service-delivery workforce but needs to also be about producing critical, creative and strategic thinkers to address the local and global challenges and opportunities in tourism. Achievement standards would recognise the importance of tourism as a context to explore, analyse and critique some of the biggest questions facing society (mobility, poverty, equity, resource allocation, sustainability, consumption, connectivity).	As highlighted above, the need for tourism achievement standards in the secondary NCEA pathway is essential for the NZ economy coming out of hardship, and a great opportunity for employment and career pathways. Apart from the overarching "tourism" banner, there are other specialist areas such as: adventure tourism, sustainability, destination marketing, logistics, supply chain, facilities, travel and services. The NZ tourism industry, until Covid-19, was a \$45B industry representing 20% of exports, 10% of GDP and 400,000 jobs. Tourism is a remarkably resilient industry that has withstood previous global challenges and, many countries, including NZ are now taking the opportunity to reimagine tourism while focusing on the environmental, economic and socio-cultural benefits tourism can provide. Tourism study is not only about training a service-delivery workforce but needs to also be about producing critical, creative and strategic thinkers to address the local and global challenges and opportunities in tourism. Achievement standards would recognise the importance of tourism as a context to explore, analyse and critique some of the biggest questions facing society (mobility, poverty,	Yes		Manaaki or manaakitanga can be implemented and closely aligned to the principles of tourism and hospitality.	2020-06-16 08:34:15	ANON-YFPW-RCFX-5	2020-06-16 08:34:15	2020-06-16 08:34:31
Yes		Undecided	I WOULD LIKE TO KEEP THE LEVEL 1 ART HISTORY AS IT WORKS IN WELL WITH VISUAL ARTS. THEY ARE REALLY ACCESSIBLE AND VERSATILE AS - THAT LINK ACROSS SUBJECTS. AS A SCHOOL THAT IS CROSS CURRICULAR AND EXECTS TEACHERS TO INTEGRATE WITH OTHER SUBJECTS	I WOULD LIKE TO KEEP THE LEVEL 1 ART HISTORY AS IT WORKS IN WELL WITH VISUAL ARTS. THEY ARE REALLY ACCESSIBLE AND VERSATILE AS - THAT LINK ACROSS SUBJECTS. AS A SCHOOL THAT IS CROSS CURRICULAR AND EXECTS TEACHERS TO INTEGRATE WITH OTHER SUBJECTS		No			2020-06-16 08:40:08	ANON-YFPW-RCFA-2	2020-06-16 08:40:08	2020-06-16 08:40:14
Yes	But not until after proposed level 1 Science standards were published. I feel the process has not been transparent and that the developers of the standards in Science had knowledge of the subject list and this was not clearly communicated to Science teachers. This is the first opportunity to address the proposed changes to the subject list.	Strongly disagree	The options of providing standards in Chemistry, Biology, and Physics provides the opportunity to design science courses to cater for the interests and abilities of students at level one. At my school we offer 3 different science options at level one to cater for this. The options allow teachers and students match content and type of assessment to their needs and interests. It is good for students to develop skills required for developing content knowledge at Level 1 if they intend to do Level 2 and 3 Chemistry, Biology etc.	I would like to see Level One have Biology/Chemistry/Physics retained. This provides more scope for courses to meet students needs and interests.		No			2020-06-16 08:57:02	ANON-YFPW-RCFN-F	2020-06-16 08:57:02	2020-06-16 08:57:14
Yes	Accounting, Economics and Business are very individual and differing subjects. The skills and knowledge in each of these areas are very different. The skills taught at Level 1 underpin the foundation of success in Level 2 and Level 3. As a pathway into future success in Level 3 and Scholarship Accounting and Economics, students require knowledge that is embedded during teaching during Level 1. There is a clear future career pathway in all of these areas and they are INDIVIDUAL at University. Nationally student numbers in Accounting and Business at Level 1 are increasing (or being maintained). Students financial capabilities are a concern nationwide, and this proposal limits students access to varied pathways where this is a predominant idea. It appears that Commerce subjects, and Accounting in particular, will be a step behind with respect to learning as it is not able to be accessed at Level 1, or will need to be condensed significantly to fit in the other subject's ideas (trying to cover the key foundational ideas of 3 subjects in one is just not feasible). These subjects can be accessed by a variety of students which allows choice and voice, by narrowing this area we reduce student access. Finding 'specialists' who can create lessons which	Strongly disagree		I believe the status quo for Accounting, Economics and Business as individual subjects, should remain.	No.	No			2020-06-16 10:04:56	ANON-YFPW-RCFK-C	2020-06-16 10:04:56	2020-06-16 10:05:16
No	Only aware now as a friend teaches Latin.	Disagree	Shortsighted understanding of relevance demonstrated	Dropping Latin cuts off a valuable insight into later languages, including English, as well as an understanding of history and cultural development	Ancient Greek, Hebrew, Aramaic, Sanskrit as an adjunct to history, social studies, religious studies	No	My schooling was in the 80s and 90s. I hope we've moved on to a more comprehensive and compulsory Te reo component	Question 4 was not a yes/no question	2020-06-16 10:15:41	ANON-YFPW-RCFG-Q	2020-06-16 10:15:41	2020-06-16 10:15:52

No	Only when a friend shared information.	Disagree		Latin is an important cornerstone of European language culture. And understanding it's structure helps with linguistic acuity. Which in these times of change and people trying to express how they want to reshape society is very important.		No			2020-06-16 10:16:28	ANON-YFPW-RCFR-K	2020-06-16 10:16:28	2020-06-16 10:16:39
Yes		Agree				No	I'm not Maori so it shouldn't effect me		2020-06-16 10:27:01	ANON-YFPW-RCFW-R	2020-06-16 10:27:01	2020-06-16 10:27:16
Yes		Strongly disagree	<p>The above proposal does not meet our student needs and interests and significantly disadvantages both Health and Physical Education as specialised and creditable subjects on their own. Our student's voice highlights the potential loss in numbers and engagement if subjects were to be combined as it would dilute the meaningful connections students have with a particular subject area. A health student who is passionate about social change and evaluating the impacts of health issues on society and community, now having to complete standards that align with Physical Education will be driven out of the subject altogether.</p> <p>Furthermore, we challenge the point that combining subject areas will enable breadth and prepare students for specialisation at L2 and L3. Not only does this contradict the overall intention to eventually combine the subjects at all levels, but it will also limit the depth and subject knowledge that students require to succeed at L2, L3. Prioritising breadth is not attainable when teachers will be expected to cover achievement standards of Health, PE and Home Economics. Consequently, students will be forced out of the subject due to it not meeting their needs, impacting tertiary pathways and potential employment opportunities in future.</p>	<p>Physical Education and Health> combining as one Subject area.</p> <p>The above proposal does not meet our student needs and interests and significantly disadvantages both Health and Physical Education as specialised and creditable subjects on their own. Our student's voice highlights the potential loss in numbers and engagement if subjects were to be combined as it would dilute the meaningful connections students have with a chosen subject area. A health student who is passionate about social change and evaluating the impacts of health issues on society and community, now having to complete standards that align with Physical Education will be driven out of the subject altogether. Similarly, over 70% of our current Yr 11 Physical Education students indicated they would not select PE as an option if they had to learn about Health concepts as it takes away from the very essence of them choosing PE in the first place. The Junior Health and PE curriculum provide students with the breadth of subject knowledge to support students in selecting their specialised subject options when they are Yr 11. They do not want more breadth at Yr11.</p> <p>Furthermore, we challenge the point that</p>		Yes			2020-06-16 10:29:34	ANON-YFPW-RCF4-N	2020-06-16 10:28:25	2020-06-16 10:30:23
No		Strongly disagree	the merging of all 3 commerce subjects at level 1 will make it more difficult for students to excel in the individual subjects at higher levels. Especially, the lack of the accounting will make the subject more difficult for students in higher levels. Level 1 accounting leads on directly to levels 2, 3 and even university and it is important for students to get a solid understanding of the basic principles as they remain very similar as students progress to higher levels.	The three commerce subjects shouldn't be combined.		No			2020-06-16 10:35:29	ANON-YFPW-RCFT-N	2020-06-16 10:35:29	2020-06-16 10:35:38
Yes	But only because I heard about it from NAME members	Strongly disagree	I disagree with the degrading Level 1 Media Studies. This is an incredibly important, valid and relevant stand alone subject that should not be subsumed into other social sciences	Level 1 Media Studies should be a stand alone subject. Degrading this would have a direct and detrimental affect on Level 2 and Level 3 Media Studies. This is a popular course with students who learn media literacy and how to deal with the dangers of the internet and social media. Students learn the way in which media influences society allowing them to recognise good information from bad. Students adapt their way of viewing the world to a more educated and informed perspective. This subject teaches invaluable life skills and to suggest that Level 1 Media Studies is only taught as a unit under another subject would serious disadvantage many students.	No	No	N/A		2020-06-16 10:58:27	ANON-YFPW-RCF3-M	2020-06-16 10:58:27	2020-06-16 10:58:46
Yes		Strongly disagree	New Zealand is a small part of a global economy and it is very important that we have a workforce that has a high level of understanding of commerce in order to have a productive economy. The merging of Economics, Business Studies and Accounting into one subject at Level One when they are all diverse disciplines means that there is a watered down understanding of the components of commerce in New Zealand.	The footnote that suggests there will be very little Accounting at Level One is a real concern. There are very few jobs in New Zealand that don't require an understanding of financial statements and ability to move forward by focussing on the components of a business that can be improved (interpretation and the understanding of financial statements (including profitability and the stability of a business) is a large part of Level One. Accounting in New Zealand schools is NOT about training chartered accountants, nor should it be. It is about giving students a broad understanding of financial information in order to be confident, enterprising citizens.		No			2020-06-16 11:04:56	ANON-YFPW-RCF2-K	2020-06-16 11:04:56	2020-06-16 11:05:03
Yes	Only through the wider visual art teacher community - it has not been widely publicised elsewhere.	Undecided	There are little resources and example achievement standards to make a clear judgement around this change. There is so much else going on with COVID and getting our students through NCEA during lockdown that any personal research into this has been parked.	No	No	Yes		Just in regards to how students can submit/attain evidence should be carefully looked into - if we are going to offer a culturally inclusive curriculum we should be offering a culturally inclusive ways of gathering evidence.	2020-06-16 11:48:17	ANON-YFPW-RCFU-P	2020-06-16 11:48:17	2020-06-16 11:48:29

No		Strongly disagree	Media Studies should not be a 'context' within such a broad subject as social science especially in a day and age of media consumption. Students gain an excellent foundation of skills and knowledge at level 1 which allows to them be more critical and conscientious media students at level 2 and 3.	Media studies MUST be included as a level 1 subject.	No				2020-06-16 11:59:29	ANON-YFPW-RCMV-1	2020-06-16 11:59:29	2020-06-16 11:59:40
Yes		Strongly disagree	I strongly disagree with the exclusion of Latin teaching at Level 1, and the subsuming of Classical Studies Level 1 into History Level 1. (Classical Studies covers topics beyond mere Greek and Roman history.)	NZACT (New Zealand Association of Classics Teachers) ensures the sector's capability to deliver the subjects of Latin and Classical Studies. Learning the Latin language promotes the skill of intellectual analysis. Classical Studies directly introduces students to significant features of the Western European heritage that figures prominently in New Zealand culture.	No				2020-06-16 12:12:09	ANON-YFPW-RCMV-X	2020-06-16 12:06:57	2020-06-16 12:12:23
Yes	However the broad base proposed shows a lack of understanding of some subjects. It will not provide an adequate foundation for Media Studies because the media product aspect which makes up more than half the course cannot be taught in Social Studies - it is important practical work which builds the future of film makers, journalists, radio staff, social media staff... In addition to the production work, media specific skills and knowledge which help students to be media savvy and literate are more important than ever in a digital age will be lost if it is absorbed by a traditional subject.	Strongly disagree	Please see above. A major re-think is needed because some of the areas have few connections.	Media Studies is not the same as, or a subset of Social studies. It is more important than ever with social media being used to bully others and with the low self esteem, body issues and anxiety young people face that they learn how to use, analyse and produce media texts. The critical thinking and practical production aspects of Media Studies cannot be covered even in a token manner by Social Studies standards.	Instead of putting time into developing new subjects, why not develop the ones you have at level one?	No			2020-06-16 12:13:10	ANON-YFPW-RCMC-B	2020-06-16 12:13:10	2020-06-16 12:13:21
Yes		Disagree	Specifically, Media Studies and Classics deserve to be their own subjects at Level 1. I graduated high school in 2010 after receiving NCEA Levels 1, 2, and 3 with endorsed excellence. I studied both Media and Classics right through high school, and they each contributed to a rich and vital education in the arts and critical thinking, which went on to help me at university in achieving my Masters degree with First Class Honours. NCEA already faces issues with being seen as an internationally competitive qualification, with many considering it "inferior" to IB or Cambridge. Removing more specialist subjects (especially within the arts, that teach students critical thinking and research skills that are absent from other subjects) will only further this stigma. Religious Studies has no place being prioritised over subjects like Media and Classics. It has nothing to contribute as a prelude to a university level education.	Remove Religious Studies, and maintain Media Studies and Classics as their own subjects.	Yes				2020-06-16 12:14:03	ANON-YFPW-RCMS-U	2020-06-16 12:14:03	2020-06-16 12:14:12
Yes		Strongly disagree	Students require the foundation of Media Studies taught at Level 1, so they can use this understanding and knowledge as they progress further up the levels. Its a base to build upon. When they are into L2and L3 they are honing their skills and taking further creative risks. You HAVE to have a base to work from, by the time they get to L2 its too late.	Please retain Level 1 Media Studies- our students are immersed in Media how can they be expected to understand the world they are surrounded by if they don't understand that a lot of what they see ,hear and understand is a construct? We need them to be intelligent consumers of Media.	No				2020-06-16 13:01:25	ANON-YFPW-RCM9-1	2020-06-16 13:01:25	2020-06-16 13:01:54
Yes	Family Planning supports teachers and schools to deliver relationship and sexuality education. We offer a range of teaching resources up to year 10, but also provide professional development and advice for teaching and learning throughout secondary schooling years.	Strongly disagree	Family Planning is concerned about the proposal for Health and Physical Education to be combined into one subject area. We raise the following issues: -Health topics, including relationships and sexuality, may be overshadowed by physical education topics, which generally have greater visibility and resourcing in schools, leaving little room in the timetable for these topics; -Young people interested in health topics may not be interested in continuing with physical education and may be reluctant to continue this subject area if they are combined; -While there is some cross-over between health topics and physical education, in many areas there is not (eg relationship and sexuality is good example); -Feedback we've had from the health education community indicates that health education teachers do not support the decision to combine the subjects.	Family Planning supports Health and Physical Education remaining two separate subject areas for Level 1.	n/a	No			2020-06-16 13:41:59	ANON-YFPW-RCMG-F	2020-06-16 13:41:59	2020-06-16 13:42:35

Yes		Disagree	I am very disheartened to see that Media Studies is not on the subject list for Level 1. I feel that this is a mistake. Media Studies is very much a twenty first century subject, allowing students to prosper in the four key 21st century skills of critical thinking, collaboration, creativity and communication. Why would we remove a subject that is so grounded in developing key future skills?	As I mentioned above, I think that removing Media Studies from the Level 1 scheme is not a good idea. Not only does it remove a subject which develops students' skills with regard to the '4 C's' but, as a smaller subject, inflates the risk of the subject being pushed into a corner and forgotten within the Level 1 programme, with key players like English, Geography, History and Social Studies likely to dominate the curriculum. Furthermore, the subject allows students to build skills in a field which is becoming increasingly ubiquitous.	No				2020-06-16 13:57:26	ANON-YFPW-RCMJ-J	2020-06-16 13:57:26	2020-06-16 13:57:39
Yes		Strongly disagree	Students could choose 3 arts or 3 languages subjects but cannot choose more than one commerce or science subjects. This does not support a broad curriculum. This disadvantages students who are good at and like either science or commerce subjects, as they cannot study more than one. This will have flow on effects to their results in level 2 and beyond. Accounting, Business Studies and Economics all have large student numbers nationally in their own right, yet other, highly specialized subjects, have far fewer students choosing them, yet are left as stand alone subjects. I cannot understand why Economics, Accounting and Business Studies would be combined while these others are not.	Accounting is a very good life skill to have. It will help the students in the future if they ever have to run their own business. There are a large number of students who choose to do accounting in level one because they or their parents think it will be helpful for them in the future. They are not intending on becoming accountants. These students will no longer have the option of studying accounting in level one. I think accounting should be offered in level 1, 2 and 3. There are no practical constraints which would limit it being taught in level one. Combining Accounting, Business Studies and Economics into one subject at level 1 would water down the learning, leaving students unprepared for level 2. Consequentially this could then weaken the learning at Level 2 and Level 3. Accounting, Business Studies and Economics are all popular subjects for international students, who provide a significant source of income both for many individual schools, and also as export receipts for the nation. These students may no longer come to NZ because of the proposed changes.	No				2020-06-16 14:18:56	ANON-YFPW-RCMQ-S	2020-06-16 14:18:56	2020-06-16 14:19:22
No		Strongly disagree	Classical studies and Latin are vital courses that are paramount to a modern understanding of ancient humanities. Those humanities are reflected by the people of today, thus granting unparalleled insight into our own history as a species	As written above, Latin and Classics must stay in the NCEA programme	No	Yes		They appear to be fine and will prove extremely beneficial to our Māori Whānau in their early studies. Furthermore, awareness and discipline surrounding the Māori language is extremely valuable!	2020-06-16 15:21:46	ANON-YFPW-RCME-D	2020-06-16 15:21:46	2020-06-16 15:21:59
Yes	I'm all for education reform though this approach discounts everything that is taught at Years 7-10. Isn't the intermediate and early secondary years the area for broad foundational education? That's 2-4 years of developing keys skills, numeracy, literacy, and interest in areas of future study. By saying that Year 11/Level 1 is where the stakes are for brought in for foundational education and nullifies those foundational years. This in turn pretty much makes Years 7-10 babysitting and in the eyes of students, pointless. NCEA Level 1 should include specialisation. To not have it there is detrimental to student success and the future of education.	Strongly disagree	The inconsistency in the table is staggering. To remove certain subjects - Media Studies and Classical Studies - and relegate them to contexts while the technology subjects remain individual is staggering. Having taught technology, there is so much overlap of skills in the design, prototyping, testing, production, and evaluation phases that those could easily be placed in different contexts depending on the school resources or culture. However, I'm a media studies teacher and the notion of not having this subject at Level 1 is actually offensive. Our students are so connected to the media, influenced by it, shaped, molded, and often undermined by it that they need guidance to critically engage with it. Parents don't do this. They should. But they leave their kids to devices and that's how mental health suffers, suicide increases, echo chambers thrive, and we end up in a societal culture like we have today. To not see this subject as vital to 21st Century teaching and learning (especially as more than an outcome) is an indefensible backward step.	See above my for view on individual technologies versus sidelined social sciences. But since you've allowed me more space, I don't mind if I do... I've taught Media Studies for 18 years and I will admit that there are some limitations within the sector opting for 'easier/softer' approaches but with the RAS, SEG, and what have you the limited standards and blank canvas can be so incredibly rewarding for how students engage with the media. Society (not just NZ) has exhibited huge deficiencies in understanding and engaging with the media. Do we want that for New Zealand? At the foundation of the subject is critical thinking. By removing it at Level 1, we stunt students from starting a journey that is only going to pay off for them, for their overall achievement, and their future. Our future. Not seeing Media Studies as a part of a broad foundational education in the 21st Century is myopic. Understanding and decoding media messages and providing new and different voices might have prevented much of the hegemonic restrictions we see repressing identity and culture.	Yes				2020-06-16 15:30:37	ANON-YFPW-RCM5-W	2020-06-16 15:30:37	2020-06-16 15:30:46
Yes		Strongly disagree	* Media studies does not align well with social sciences. * Media strand "produce media" is not catered to by the social science stands/assessment matrix. * Social Science does not cover all of the Media Studies curriculum, therefore, not fit for purpose.	* Media studies does not align well with social sciences. * Media strand "produce media" is not catered to by the social science stands/assessment matrix. * Social Science does not cover all of the Media Studies curriculum, therefore, not fit for purpose. * Media studies is an ever-more vital area of our curriculum.	No				2020-06-16 16:16:30	ANON-YFPW-RCMP-R	2020-06-16 16:16:30	2020-06-16 16:16:44

Yes	It seems like a pity to diminish the number of options students have as a consequence of this desire. We have a six option line where students at level 1 have to select 6 subjects to complete. By narrowing it down so much, students will be hard-pressed to find six subjects. In addition, this narrowing down could lead to staff attrition. I find this, given our current climate of trying to allow students more opportunity to find their learning pathways deplorable.	Disagree	While I support the idea of following the curriculum, the beauty of it was that it gave choice. As far as I can see, it is now becoming so constricted that we will not have the option of exploring a wealth of options which make our students rounded and knowledgeable. Having only 4 standards for the subject means that we will not be able to offer a variety of courses.	In my instance, we offer Media Studies under the umbrella of English, not Social Sciences. Our school will no longer be able to offer this as an option at level 1 because the standards will be used for the Social Sciences who will be scrambling to meet their needs. The same goes for Technology. What happens when someone is wanting to take both hard and soft technology and the standards are offered in, say, hard tech. It means that potentially the skills learned in soft tech will have to be dropped. For our less academically able students or our more practically able students, this will have a huge impact.	Not at this point	No			2020-06-16 17:34:37	ANON-YFPW-RCM7-V	2020-06-16 17:34:37	2020-06-16 17:34:57
Yes	Yes, but only because a friend who happens to be a Latin teacher told me. So it could've slipped by unnoticed ie sneakily.	Disagree	Mostly seem okay, but the exclusion of Latin is a gaping hole.	Latin should be a core subject. It is highly useful in adult life. It is fundamental to a full understanding of Western Civilization. It is helpful in learning any Romance language. It is crucial in order for the Sciences to thrive. Without learning Latin, one would be a lot poorer.	no	No			2020-06-16 18:15:15	ANON-YFPW-RCMF-E	2020-06-16 18:15:15	2020-06-16 18:15:31
Yes		Strongly disagree		I have already provided feedback		No			2020-06-16 19:37:46	ANON-YFPW-RCM1-S	2020-06-16 19:37:46	2020-06-16 19:37:59
No	I was not aware this level 1 change had been proposed. Whilst I can see the intention of remaining broad I would be concerned that this would intensify the content and learning needed at levels 2 and 3 to acquire sufficient specialisation knowledge before beginning tertiary or vocational training. As I am aware years 9 and 10 in the curriculum are already very broad in subject exposure and foundational knowledge I still see no significant changes in topic breadth to include life skills based learning	Disagree	Whilst I can see the intention of remaining broad I would be concerned that this would intensify the content and learning needed at levels 2 and 3 to acquire sufficient specialisation knowledge before beginning tertiary or vocational training. I still see no significant changes in topics to cover important life skills based learning especially around financial capability and financial literacy which is increasingly very important in our current society and is not covered at all in the mathematics curriculum.	Particularly science and social studies have already had 2 years of general broad curriculum in years 9 and 10 and so need to become more specialised from year 11 to cover the required content before tertiary admissions.	Currently Accounting Levels 1-3 needs to be reviewed in line with modern Accounting Industry Practice, tools and platforms. Current curriculum specifies 'spreadsheets' as the method of production for Accounting NCEA assessment, however, spreadsheet accounting specifically hasn't been widely used as an Accounting System tools for over 10 years. More correct language would be to say 'use computer based' accounting tools and systems. Which would enable the use of accounting systems such as Xero and MYOB that have been used in the field for 15-20 years. I know for a fact that Xero has NCEA aligned and verified content that is widely used across the NZ schools sector for Level 2 NCEA. However this tool is unable to be used in other standards due to the current NZQA stipulation that 'spreadsheets' be used. This phrasing is limiting the learning and employability skills of NZ students and is not reflective of the governments support of using online, software solutions for greater business productivity.	No	I am not familiar with this curriculum		2020-06-16 22:13:10	ANON-YFPW-RCMH-G	2020-06-16 22:13:10	2020-06-16 22:13:43
Yes		Strongly disagree		Latin, classics and art history should be included, they're subjects completely separate from history and are important in world heritage.		No			2020-06-16 23:26:03	ANON-YFPW-RCMB-A	2020-06-16 23:26:03	2020-06-16 23:26:11
Yes	I despise history so as a student this seems like a major disadvantage to me when I just want to classics.	Strongly disagree	I believe level 1 is a great time to experiment so although this may appear like people get more experimentation it depends on the teacher, and I believe that a teacher that specialises in classics is much better.			No			2020-06-16 23:39:14	ANON-YFPW-RCMN-N	2020-06-16 23:39:14	2020-06-16 23:39:46
No		Strongly disagree	Please do not cut Latin	Latin should be included	Latin, Ancient Greek, Classics	No			2020-06-17 01:31:34	ANON-YFPW-RCMD-C	2020-06-17 01:31:34	2020-06-17 01:31:43
No		Strongly disagree	Pushing Media Studies in the same subject as Social Studies and Psychology, pushing Classical Studies as the same subject as History, not to mention removing Latin entirely, are all very bad ideas. Media Studies covers so much and is a subject that should always be relevant. It needs to be a subject of its own. I understand that you're saying these subjects would eventually branch out for specialisations for NCEA Level 2 and 3, but these need to stay as established individual subjects in level 1.	Media Studies and Classical Studies are AMAZING subjects; they carry so much depth. Media Studies is a subject that will always be relevant as it discusses the media, its evolution, themes and tropes behind them, theories of how we interpret media, and so on. It is so much to cover, you cannot reasonably expect to have Media Studies covered to what it deserves when it is smushed with Psychology and Social Studies. Classical Studies is also NOT irrelevant to today just because it 'only' covers BC and early AC. The mythologies and stories helped build our modern stories, it's important to understand these and it uncovers the values of the cultures. Learning about their political and social structures, and their architecture helps us see their influence that is still very relevant today in our modern world. People say it is important to learn our history to understand our present and prepare for the future, this also applies to Classical Studies, as that is still our history.		No			2020-06-17 01:56:10	ANON-YFPW-RCMX-Z	2020-06-17 01:56:10	2020-06-17 01:56:20
Yes		Disagree		Latin should remain.	Horticulture should be mandatory.	Yes	No		2020-06-17 07:14:25	ANON-YFPW-RCMA-9	2020-06-17 07:14:25	2020-06-17 07:14:40
No		Strongly disagree				No			2020-06-17 09:06:58	ANON-YFPW-RCMN-P	2020-06-17 09:06:58	2020-06-17 09:07:04
Yes		Disagree				No			2020-06-17 09:37:08	ANON-YFPW-RCMK-K	2020-06-17 09:37:08	2020-06-17 09:37:20

Yes	Aware of proposed changes but not the detail	Disagree	Where is tourism? Why is this not recognised for NCEA? Prior to Covid19 this was our biggest export earner, and will come back in time,	Tourism needs good people too! Change the perception of it being a subject for non academic students and include Tourism AS in NCEA. Many students with an interest in tourism do not pursue it as they cannot get the credits for UE. Once the borders open we will be reliant on tourism income again. Recognise this subject for what it is and give students credits that count	As above - tourism. Tourism needs good people. Many students are put off because they don't get UE credits if they study tourism. Change the perception and raise the status of tourism study. It is so important that tourism gets good students progressing into this field	No			2020-06-17 10:49:38	ANON-YFPW-RCMR-T	2020-06-17 10:49:38	2020-06-17 10:49:51
Yes		Strongly disagree		Classics should be included- it is an important part of history, provides in-depth knowledge of Ancient Civilisations and helps students discover different career and study paths.		No			2020-06-17 10:57:23	ANON-YFPW-RCMW-Y	2020-06-17 10:57:23	2020-06-17 10:57:30
No	I had some information from the school about specific subject changes but have not seen any communications from the Ministry of Education about the proposed changes or the reasoning behind them.	Disagree	I'm disappointed to see the loss of Latin and the downgrading of Classical Studies and Art History. Latin is a great foundation for learning Romance languages and developing a better understanding of English grammar and etymology.			No			2020-06-17 11:51:30	ANON-YFPW-RCMT-V	2020-06-17 11:51:30	2020-06-17 11:51:37
Yes	There is broad foundational knowledge for science that is content based. In addition to the research and investigative skills. All students need to know about virus and vaccine, inertia and the physics of driving, the basics of chemistry. These are not taught only to students who intend on going into related fields - but ALL students.	Undecided	If the Science standards are the only standards on offer (not going to be supplemented by Physics 1, Chem 1, and Bio 1, then no I don't believe these four standards are aligned with the NZC. I am a huge proponent of Nature of Science - but it is one of 5 strands - not the ONLY strand. Our lower-decile students are getting locally-designed programmes that do not set them up for a fair and equitable opportunity to participate in senior science.	I really like two of the four standards. We need Two more that prescribe YES PERSCRIBE minimum content expectations for a functioning adult in modern society. YES there is CONTENT know skills that adults need some familiarity with to not be DISADVANTAGED in the world. And again, I GET the nature of science stuff - I am a big proponent of it. But it was never intended to wash out content entirely and it appears that it has. So disappointed in this wasted opportunity.	A Trade directed Science pathway, a blend of measurement and basic torque etc from physics, health and safety stuff from bio (mould, dust, etc) and measurement and health and safety stuff from chemistry (ie. water quality testing, first aid, working with ethanol or other hydrocarbons, etc).	No			2020-06-17 11:57:09	ANON-YFPW-RCM3-U	2020-06-17 11:57:09	2020-06-17 11:57:16
Yes	I am aware of this but I do not think it is a good idea because it is taking away opportunities for extension for those who wish to push themselves and those who wish to specialise early.	Disagree		The "one size fits all" approach to the subject that I know best, Science, is (in my view) an error. At the moment, we are able to tailor programmes for students who are aiming vocationally (Horticulture, Primary Industries) and also those who are aiming at tertiary study (Physics, Chem, Bio...) We already have able students who are publicly denouncing the system as being something that teaches you nothing. We need challenges for the top end and we need opportunities for those who don't "get" some of the concepts in the core subject classes.	Not that I can think of just now. However, please do not erase any more opportunities for students to find courses that cater to their needs.	Yes	Ki oku whakaaro nei, ahua rite etahi wahanga o te Marautanga o Aotearoa ki etahi atu wahanga o te NZC. Engari, ahua rereke etahi o nga mea e pa ana ki te Ao Maori. Ko tenei taku awangawanga; te awihina o nga kaupapa Maori (tikanga, Putaiaio, Pangarau, Hanganarau...) ki nga kaupapa Paikaha (culture, Science, Mathematics, Technology). Tapiri atu, i	Look at my comments in the box above.	2020-06-17 12:12:08	ANON-YFPW-RCM2-T	2020-06-17 12:12:08	2020-06-17 12:12:25
Yes		Agree		Latin needs to be included!!!!		No			2020-06-17 12:49:00	ANON-YFPW-RCKY-Y	2020-06-17 12:49:00	2020-06-17 12:49:13
No		Strongly disagree	The exclusion of Latin is a fundamentally flawed decision. Admittedly there will only be small numbers studying this subject but it is necessary to maintain students skilled in this subject as it is a critical skill to studying classical subjects at a higher level. It is also an important base to understand both the grammar and structure of not only the English language but also other foreign languages (Spanish and French). Latin has also had a marked influence not only of Western literature but also science, philosophy, religion and mathematics. By abandoning this option for students, future scholastic performance of NZ on the world academically will be substantially undermined.	Latin should definitely remain an option of New Zealand want to retain credibility of its education system internationally	No further comments	Yes		No	2020-06-17 14:02:07	ANON-YFPW-RCKV-V	2020-06-17 14:02:07	2020-06-17 14:02:18
Yes		Disagree		Latin is extremely useful for those interested in any science field, as it provides a background knowledge of how scientific terms are used and what they mean	Latin and Classics	No			2020-06-17 14:52:39	ANON-YFPW-RCKS-S	2020-06-17 14:52:39	2020-06-17 14:52:46

Yes	While I support a broad, foundational education, this often occurs at highschool during years 9 and 10. Pushing foundational education back to year 11 and NCEA Level 1 will see changes (such as those proposed above) which will limit the time and detail that students have for greater specialisation.	Strongly disagree	As above, I do not believe that the changes will promote greater specialisation at higher levels. By limiting the subjects available early on, you are reducing the likelihood that they will be taught at higher levels.	The aim of NCEA Level 1 is to "support broad foundational education" with specialisation at higher levels. Classics is a multi-disciplinary subject, which introduces students to history, art, literature, philosophy, politics, and religion. My Classical education allows me to engage with all these subjects from an informed perspective, without having to have studied these fields individually. Although it may appear that Classical Studies designates a small period of history it applies to a much wider context. Not only are the skills learnt in Classical studies applicable to other topics and fields, but the subject matter has been the basis for education for centuries. That is, Classical education has shaped the mindsets of people throughout time. As part of the Crown's obligations under the Treaty of Waitangi, we must aim to protect and uphold the cultures of both partners to the Treaty, especially the cultural heritage and languages that have been integral to their development. The proposed change to make Classics only a potential context (to a low degree) under the banner of History, increases the likelihood that it will be left out of the curriculum and not picked up at higher levels. Likewise, Latin is a foundational language for many European languages but has even wider implications for students' knowledge of English		Yes			2020-06-17 15:37:14	ANON-YFPW-RCK8-X	2020-06-17 15:37:14	2020-06-17 15:37:29
Yes		Undecided			I wish to support the submission of TTA-NZ. The addition of achievement standards in Tourism Management at NCEA levels 2 and 3 would enable secondary teachers to more easily cater for the needs of academically-focused students who wish to pursue a career in the tourism industry. Our current reliance on just unit standards in NCEA is constraining for both course construction and in teachers' ongoing efforts to attract into our classes the critical thinkers and strategic decision-makers our country will need as we reimagine and rebuild our tourism industry post-Covid 19. Michelle Buckham, TIC Tourism, St Kevin's College	No			2020-06-17 16:00:25	ANON-YFPW-RCK9-Y	2020-06-17 15:59:16	2020-06-17 16:00:34
Yes		Agree	I do support the introduction of broader achievement standards at Level 1, as long as they are flexible enough to be implemented in a range of contexts and can combine cohesively with other broad standards.	I am concerned that the core skills of my discipline, Media Studies, are not even minimally covered under current Social Studies standards, so any new standards should not be based solely on the current Social Studies package. They should include a multi-context practical assessment based on AS90993/90994 where the end product is not specified but basic production skills are assessed. One of the unique qualities of Media Studies as it is currently supported in NCEA is that it blends academic, and practical, learning, and the both are assessed. Stating that Media Studies can be a "context" for L1 Social Studies, without including a standard where practical media production skills are assessed, removes the essence of our subject completely at L1. There is a big difference between teaching and assessing theoretical understanding in a practical context, and actually assessing the practical skills. A choice to remove assessed practical learning from Media Studies would seem out of step with many developing career pathways, where practical video, audio, print and web skills are blended into many jobs where traditionally they were not important. It would also encourage unhelpful		No			2020-06-17 17:09:07	ANON-YFPW-RCKG-D	2020-06-17 17:09:07	2020-06-17 17:09:16

Yes	In a world of increasing uncertainty about career pathways, subjects should be chosen for their transferable skills as much as for their capacity to lead to specific careers or trades. As a teacher at an art school I value students who have studied across the board: across the sciences and the arts, and across languages, across the curricula of the kura kaupapa Māori. Students who know about the world are more likely to be of use to it.	Undecided	I disagree with the exclusion of Latin at Level 1.	I disagree with the exclusion of Latin at Level 1. Languages are best learnt as early as possible. Latin forms one of the bases of many European languages and its study offers students an understanding of the building blocks of syntax as well as etymological richness. The nuancing of tense and mood demonstrate the ways that language can convey subtle transformations in thought, the thought of alternative futures and of alternative histories. Adolescents are keen to play with such possibilities. In addition, the language offers direct access to the legal and political histories that inform Western cultural life, including its emphasis on colonization.	I am worried by the apparent division between the Māori curriculum and the pakeha one. Can they not intersect more?	Yes	Te Marautanga o Aotearoa is a clearly stated and convincing argument for the relevance of te reo and tikanga for Māori cultural resilience. The approach here appears to support a divided curriculum. I do not fully understand how this curriculum intersects with the New Zealand Curriculum nor how Cook Island Māori can be taught as a separate subject while	Toi Ataata is vital. Toi ataata helps to integrate different kinds of knowledge, creating a synthesis that embeds learning. Schools have been deprived of sufficient art subjects. Contemporary Māori artists work with the intersection of digital and traditional forms. Support for Toi Ataata supports the new generations of younger artists by enabling vocational pathways that enhance the life of the community. Hangarau is also vital for the development of a community that understands sustainability for the uncertain future.	2020-06-17 17:37:37	ANON-YFPW-RCKJ-G	2020-06-17 17:15:15	2020-06-17 17:37:48
Yes	Years 9 and 10 provide the foundation education at College. I believe that 'specialisation' if you want to call it that can definitely start at Level 1.	Strongly disagree	I am currently teaching senior Economics and in my teaching career have taught Geography, Accounting Economics and Business Studies. These subjects have distinct skills associated with them. Maths is more strongly linked to Accounting, and Geography to Economics for example, so saying that Accounting, Economics and Business Studies should come under the umbrella of Commerce is not going to be effective. Students do have a passion for a particular area and after two years at Secondary School they should be allowed to pursue/true them. They are certainly not exempt from changing from Level 1 to Level 2 into a different subject area. I believe it is more favourable to have an interesting introduction at Level 1 Economics then moving onto a Level 2 Business Studies course than doing a level 1 'Commerce' course which may be so lacking in depth that a student doesn't get a 'feel' for either subject.	Further to my comments above- not sure why Economics, Accounting and Business studies face merging when other subjects with much smaller student numbers are kept separate.		No			2020-06-17 17:41:13	ANON-YFPW-RCKQ-Q	2020-06-17 17:41:13	2020-06-17 17:41:33
No		Strongly disagree	Removing L1 Accounting for a generic commerce course is arbitrary and is not consistent with other subjects that have been alone such as drama and dance. Similarly, disciplines such as Geography and History have not been condensed into Social studies. Accounting is just as much a valid course as these others. I know this from my own and my students experience. I was fortunate enough to take Form 5 Accounting when I was at secondary school. After a junior commerce course, I was ready to embark on learning the basics of Accountancy. It was my favourite subject and one I was most successful in, whilst others I struggled with. Accounting improved my numeracy and literacy skills. I also took Economics, which required a totally different mindset. Accountancy is an information science and Economics a social science. Such was my passion for education and accountancy, I became a Commerce teacher specialising in accountancy. After 30 years of teaching accounting, I have seen the teaching of L1 Accounting move with the times. Level 1 Accounting has provided a foundation to a wide range of students. Some have gone on to become accountants, but so many others have gone into Law, Engineering and not for profit organisations. These all require a knowledge of Accounting, even if just for a	L1 Accounting must be retained in it's own right. The skills and content are NOT the same as Economics or Business studies. If schools can offer L1 Accounting, their students should not be denied the opportunity to learn these skills. (Both numeracy and literacy) L1 Accounting lays the foundation and without it as a separate L1 subject our students will be disadvantaged.		No			2020-06-17 17:49:14	ANON-YFPW-RCKE-B	2020-06-17 17:45:17	2020-06-17 17:49:27

No	It was vague that physics, chemistry, biology, ESS and science would be squashed into 1 general science course. The word broad is vague and simply means superficial learning of a very wide pillar of learning.	Strongly disagree	It will be a one size fits all students, the reality is that in a class of 30 students it will be difficult to ensure all 4 previous sciences are available for students to be exposed to,	The option to offer the 4 core sciences allows for an opportunity to allow students with that particular interest to follow their passion. Have the separate sciences at level 1 also allows students to have a taste of what they are committing to as this allows them to grasp the depth of understanding and the range of what is in the subject, there are many students that make course changes in level 1 when they are trialling different sciences. Its a training for them to have a reasonable understanding of what the course actually is about as many start in L1 with little to know understanding of what the courses entail. If we push this back a year to Level 2 it will shift that to a time when losing a month or two in the wrong course will adversely affect their performance in science. Worse case if they are in the wrong course and they find out by the end of the year. AT the end of L2 its almost impossible to pick up a L3 physics/chemistry without having it in L2. Level 1 allows the space for the students to make a swap in L2 which will allow for a much easier switch	NO, but Please leave PHYSICS, CHEM, BIO and ESS	No			2020-06-17 19:27:08	ANON-YFPW-RCKS-U	2020-06-17 19:27:08	2020-06-17 19:27:48
No	My children already have the opportunity of a broad curriculum at year 9 and 10. My daughter loved being able to choose more specialist subjects at year 11 and to be able to drop the subjects she didn't like and wasn't happy studying. This includes Accounting which is not included in the new subject list. This was a new subject to her and she loved it and is continuing to study it in Year 12. I doubt this would have happened if the combined Commerce subject is made as there isn't any Accounting in it. I am very unhappy that my son won't have the same opportunities to choose as there will be more limited options. Why shouldn't our children have the opportunity to embrace their strengths? Why make school more miserable for them by forcing less choice upon them? Why treat them as small children for longer instead of the young adults they have become?	Strongly disagree	You are limiting student choices and it feels like a dumbing down of the curriculum which will undermine the value of our education system. I also believe we should offer variation in the science curriculum to provide extension to the students who want the challenge (I think having only the 'science' option will not inspire our next generation of future scientists). Over all very unhappy with the changes proposed to the system as a whole - the current system provides flexibility for schools to design their own courses, whereas this system is a one size fits all model.	Extremely disappointed with the lack of Commerce individual subject options in Level 1. Each aspect of Commerce is very different so squashing them all into one subject does not do them justice. With our economy heading for a recession, it is important that students get a solid understanding of how our economy works at all levels and one subject won't do that, particularly with no Accounting. Accounting is about the micro of business, the cash management, the understanding the finances and this is vital business knowledge and the more who have it the better. By only making it a level 2 option so many will miss such important information. Our economy NEEDS businesses to survive and be financially viable - we should be doing as much as possible through schooling to encourage students to learn as much as possible for this.		No			2020-06-17 19:33:16	ANON-YFPW-RCKP-P	2020-06-17 19:33:16	2020-06-17 19:33:46
Yes	Losing classics and Latin narrows the curriculum, not broaden it.	Disagree	See above comments	Latin and classics teach democracy and law. They are also helpful for those taking languages and biology. Art history teaches social history and this aspect of history should not be assumed to be covered by a history cause. Allow all of these to be continued if schools want to teach them		No			2020-06-17 20:49:37	ANON-YFPW-RCK7-W	2020-06-17 20:49:37	2020-06-17 20:50:01
No		Disagree	As an ex science and specialist physics teacher I agree with the general science approach proposed. The specialisation in higher NCEA levels needs to be founded on a clear awareness of how it fits into the larger picture and how it identifies itself amongst the other science disciplines. And also to turn your back on a branch of science that you are scarcely acquainted with in order to specialise in another branches that you think you know is a wrongly conceived move. A broad base is best to build on. For the same reason I am bothered by the removal of Latin. A subject which which has a role to play in providing the same broad foundation upon which other areas of knowledge in language, in law, in botany, biology, history, western culture being some. Whatever our current NZ culture is the evolution has strong connections to ancient Europe whether we want to hold on to it or not, adapt it or improve. We need to know how we got to this place. If in some way it is an enemy it helps to know it if it is a help to a generally civilised citizen then intimacy with its characteristics is helpful too.	I think I put this into the previous box. Latin to my mind is a part of a generally educated knowledge base. To expand on this in a more general way I believe that a subject that expands the ability to structure thought, to memorise efficiently, to make neurological architecture which can be occupied by different tenants should they come to the mental doorstep in later learning is a useful one.		No			2020-06-17 20:55:35	ANON-YFPW-RCKF-C	2020-06-17 20:54:20	2020-06-17 20:55:50
Yes		Strongly disagree		Latin should not be excluded. We must not to stop teaching the language that connects us to such an integral part of western history. Learning Latin is also relevant to all English speakers (as Latin is one of the languages that English originated from), all speakers or learners of Romantic languages, and people studying medicine, science and law (these subjects use Latin regularly).		No			2020-06-17 20:59:15	ANON-YFPW-RCK1-Q	2020-06-17 20:59:15	2020-06-17 20:59:33

Yes		Disagree		Art History works to support students as well as allowing cross subject assessment provided as a project based approach. I use it to support Visual Arts and Technology as well as allowing students to engage in writing for a purpose.	"collections of works" in contemporary practical arts. This could be considered as multi media as a discipline.	No			2020-06-17 21:02:16	ANON-YFPW-RCKZ-Z	2020-06-17 21:02:16	2020-06-17 21:02:24
Yes		Strongly disagree		To limit students' opportunity to explore subjects they may not necessarily encounter beyond a school curriculum seems selfishly and cruelly limiting. We do not know what we don't know and any limitations on the potential to expand personal knowledge is myopic. We should not be limiting the breadth of the curriculum, we should be changing the requirements for unnecessary assessments in STEM subjects - that is the real problem. Look at the numbers of credits needed for each subject. Rationalise that. The inequities in credits available, work required and number of assessments in each subject needs to be rectified.	Latin and Art History	No			2020-06-17 21:04:14	ANON-YFPW-RCKH-E	2020-06-17 21:04:14	2020-06-17 21:04:45
Yes		Strongly disagree	I strongly disagree with the removal of Latin at NCEA Level 1. I support all the additions.	It's better to learn languages sooner rather than later. Learning Latin at NCEA Level 1 contributes to a broad, foundational education. Your consultation documents provide no evidence to support its removal. On the contrary, Latin provides the fundamentals of grammar that support learning of all other languages at Level 2 and 3, and vocabulary and syntax that support learning of French, Spanish, and to an extent, German, at these levels. Latin at NCEA Level 1 provides access to specialist subjects such as Medicine, Pharmacy, Dentistry, Zoology, Botany and Law at tertiary level. Non-state schools that recognise the value of Latin will continue to offer it, contributing to increased inequality of opportunity across all these subjects. Latin at NCEA Level 1 introduces language and narratives of how P'akeh'a systems of governance and law operate, essential for the decolonisation of Aotearoa New Zealand. Learning Latin at NCEA Level 1 helped me to learn Te Reo M'aori, German, French and Mandarin. Please ensure that the proposal to remove Art History and Classical Studies is balanced by teaching of them as part of other subjects	I'd like to see more interdisciplinarity at Level 2 and 3, including between the P'akeh'a and M'atauranga M'aori curricula. Increased specialism is a neoliberal doctrine that enforces the commodification of education, and increases inequality.	No		I strongly support development of this curriculum. I'd like to see work happen that creates dialogue between the M'aori and P'akeh'a subject areas (P'utalo / Science, Toi P'uoro / Music etc).	2020-06-17 21:11:59	ANON-YFPW-RCKB-8	2020-06-17 21:11:59	2020-06-17 21:12:12
Yes		Strongly disagree	Latin is the basis of so many academic study lines and should be retained to keep our culture broad and with basis. Its important to the more academically able students			Yes			2020-06-17 21:12:46	ANON-YFPW-RCKM-K	2020-06-17 21:12:46	2020-06-17 21:13:20
Yes	It is important to keep a subject like Latin. It helps with the correct use of spelling and other associated Language techniques. It is especially useful for all the Latin based languages.	Undecided	Please check that Latin is included	Keep Latin. It is important as a tool to learn Modern foreign languages. Latin is the foundation of all the work done in all subjects, ranging from Music through to French and beyond.	Latin!	Yes			2020-06-17 21:17:45	ANON-YFPW-RCKX-X	2020-06-17 21:17:45	2020-06-17 21:18:04
Yes		Strongly agree		I'm in favor of the reduction to science and the addition of Maori performing arts. I can also see the Food Science is an added advantage.		No			2020-06-17 21:21:28	ANON-YFPW-RCKN-M	2020-06-17 21:21:28	2020-06-17 21:21:35

Yes	Yes but I disagree with the interpretation of broad and more "foundational". Is that a new buzzword? What exactly is wrong with the present system? I doubt that it is possible to cater for every individual without massive investment in staffing.	Strongly disagree	Can see no educational reason to exclude Classical Studies, Art History and Latin. As long as the subjects are "made available" and students who do not want to learn Dance, Drama, Music and Visual Arts are given options, that is fine. They are all worthy subjects but not for everyone, just as languages or mathematics are not.	I think Latin in particular should be included at Level One. Latin gives a very sound base to learn other languages e.g. Italian, Russian, Portuguese which are not included on the list, or for lifelong learners to pick up languages not offered at school level. With massive fall off in basic vocabulary, grammar and literacy skills it provides access to all of that. Few would dispute how much it adds to an understanding of English. Latin is actually one of the best subjects for general knowledge around, covering history, some geography, art, archaeology and literature as well as the language. I assume the reason for exclusion is financial (Korean also has low numbers) or maybe the tall poppy syndrome which NZ has developed to a startling degree for the academically inclined. Classical Studies and Art History are also very enriching subjects. Why delay their introduction? Why not make History a minor part of Classical Studies or Art History? Does the Ministry have some special knowledge of future careers denied to the rest of society? I believe Latin is deemed as having no pathway. It has been drummed into our society ad nauseam that we are preparing students for careers that don't exist yet. They didn't when I was a student, either, yet with a good basic education which	Latin could well be developed for Level 2 and 3. No matter what the Ministry does the curriculum will not suit every learner.	Yes	Do you mean can I read it in Te Reo? No but I have read about them.	Good subjects.	2020-06-17 21:25:34	ANON-YFPW-R9AV-8	2020-02-20 17:11:14	2020-06-17 21:26:11
Yes		Disagree	Cutting latin is a massive step.	Latin is more than just a dead language. It's a way of thinking. I develops your analytical thinking. It gives you an insight into philosophy and history. It develops your linguistical skills. I'm concerned about how backward that would send New Zealand compared to the rest of the world. Latin is still compulsory for some university studies in Europe. Latin has been taught for thousands of year. Do we really want to cut this back NOW, when there are still some passionate teachers around New Zealand, ready to share this well-rounded subject?		Yes			2020-06-17 22:09:12	ANON-YFPW-RCKK-H	2020-06-17 22:09:12	2020-06-17 22:09:27
Yes		Disagree		Latin and Art History should continue. Latin is foundational for language development in English and modern languages. Art history complements art, literature and history. The arts have never been more needed!		No			2020-06-17 22:34:16	ANON-YFPW-RCKG-V	2020-06-17 22:34:16	2020-06-17 22:34:31
Yes		Strongly disagree		Latin should be included		No			2020-06-18 05:44:14	ANON-YFPW-RCK4-T	2020-06-18 05:44:14	2020-06-18 05:44:21
Yes		Disagree	Some of the subject combinations are going to put many students off subjects they would otherwise enjoy.	Removing subject such as Latin and Media Studies does not 'broaden' the L1 scope. Yes, these are very specific subjects, but they cannot be taught in the context of another subject and still retain while interest. We need to be catering to our students individual needs and some of these new combinations go against everything we as teachers are trying to achieve, especially with some of our hard to engage students who are at risk of leaving school with no qualification.		No			2020-06-18 06:28:08	ANON-YFPW-RCKT-T	2020-06-18 06:28:08	2020-06-18 06:28:17
Yes	I don't see any benefit to reducing student choice - it doesn't address the actual issue of assessment. Terrible idea.	Strongly disagree	To favour some subjects and dispose of others is unwise - it does the opposite of the intention to offer a "broad, more foundational education". Reduce assessment, not subject choice.	I don't see any benefit in any of the changes. They don't achieve the aim of the educational review; the intended outcome is not achieved by reducing subject choice. Reduce assessment.	I think it should probably focus more on reducing assessment and not waste time erroneously on the wrong business of "subject choices". Keep the subjects; reduce the assessment.	Yes			2020-06-18 06:52:53	ANON-YFPW-RCK3-S	2020-06-18 06:52:53	2020-06-18 06:53:16

No		Strongly disagree		Under these reforms, Latin would no longer be taught. As a Classics student in the UK - having studied Latin for eight years now - such a removal deeply saddens me. The field of Latin encompasses a breadth of topics unrivalled in many other subjects - included in the study of Latin is Latin language, Latin literature and Classical Civilisation. Hence, such range enables one to develop a deep understanding of Roman society, culture and politics. Considering the extent to which the modern world has been directly influenced by the actions of those in ancient Rome, it is evident that continuing to learn about the ancient world is paramount in allowing us understand our roots and consequently learn from the past. Furthermore, the transferable skills obtained and refined through learning to translate Latin (having great attention to detail, having a methodical approach, being able to analyse texts thoroughly and having the ability to solve difficult problems) are too beneficial to ignore. When considering also how greatly learning Latin improves one's understanding of the function and nature of the English language itself, and also how much easier it makes learning additional languages, it should be clear that to remove Latin from the curriculum at all levels would be to the deepest detriment of our society.		No			2020-06-18 07:12:04	ANON-YFPW-RCK2-R	2020-06-18 07:12:04	2020-06-18 07:12:51
No		Strongly disagree	Keep Latin alive!	Keeping Latin and Classical Studies would promote a greater understanding for other languages being taught, a deep and thorough insight to history, etymology, and the basic background needed for many careers (doctors, lawyers, teachers, historians, etc.)	Latin and Classical Studies	No			2020-06-18 08:45:55	ANON-YFPW-RCKU-U	2020-06-18 08:45:55	2020-06-18 08:46:14
Yes		Strongly disagree	Accounting, Business Studies and Economics are all popular subjects for international students, who provide a significant source of income (when border restrictions are relaxed) both for many individual schools, and also as export receipts for the nation. Many students currently choose one of the three subjects without choosing the others, international students included, and students have voiced they have found a passion for one of these subjects having taken it at Level 1, but would not have taken it in the first place if it meant they had to also do the other two. This potentially means students miss out on finding these passions.	Keep Accounting, Business Studies and Economics as separate subjects. Combining Accounting, Business Studies and Economics into one subject at Level 1 would water down the learning, leaving students unprepared for Level 2. Consequently this could then weaken the learning at Level 2 and Level 3. The skills and concepts covered in Accounting, Business Studies, and Economics are distinctly different. Combining them into one will not eliminate the perceived overlap between subjects.		Yes			2020-06-18 08:51:56	ANON-YFPW-RCNV-2	2020-06-18 08:51:56	2020-06-18 08:52:34
No		Strongly disagree				No			2020-06-18 09:15:33	ANON-YFPW-RCNV-Y	2020-06-18 09:15:33	2020-06-18 09:15:46
No		Strongly disagree	As someone who did level 1 last year, we wait long enough to specialise as it is - you would be better if you introduced summer catchup courses to allow us more flexibility between courses. We want specialisation and a wide variety of courses at level one, the more the better.	This clumping attempt is nothing more than a cover-up for an excuse to spend less on education. These subjects are specialised for a good reason - students want to be able to specialise earlier, as it gives them more control. Year 9 and 10 are plenty of time to explore, and giving us the full range of options - and not removing any is what helps NZers towards better career choices - ones that earn more taxes. I took economics in level one and I'm glad I had to make the choice between economics, business studies and accounting because that meant I didn't have to sit through accounting or business lessons when all I wanted to learn was economics. It is proven that the younger you specialise, the better you will be in your field, owing to being more absorbent of new knowledge at younger ages.	I and many other students I know would like an engineering course in level two and three provided it wasn't an achievement standard. I and many others took physics, chemistry and math to get into engineering at university. Although there is an electronics course, because we tend to be the sorts of people that look to get merit and excellence endorsements we would like to be able to get merit and excellence subject endorsements in an Engineering course. Don't hold back the future of this country! I can name at least 10 people from the top of my head who are interested in one field of engineering or another and would really like to learn the ropes in high school.	No			2020-06-18 09:31:37	ANON-YFPW-RCNC-C	2020-06-18 09:31:37	2020-06-18 09:31:51
No		Disagree		Latin is valuable subject that should be retained. It functions a core understanding of a broad range of other subjects and enable sophisticated historical learning to occur at school and outside of the classroom.		No			2020-06-18 09:33:11	ANON-YFPW-RCNS-V	2020-06-18 09:33:11	2020-06-18 09:33:18
Yes		Strongly disagree	Keep the commerce subjects separate, for NCEA level 1			No			2020-06-18 09:41:31	ANON-YFPW-RCN8-1	2020-06-18 09:41:31	2020-06-18 09:41:49
No		Strongly disagree		nope	not sure	No		not sure	2020-06-18 09:42:23	ANON-YFPW-RCN9-2	2020-06-18 09:42:23	2020-06-18 09:42:51
Yes		Strongly disagree				Yes			2020-06-18 09:48:59	ANON-YFPW-RCNG-G	2020-06-18 09:48:59	2020-06-18 09:49:44

Yes		Strongly disagree	Although Health and PE have the same curriculum and a small handful of concepts can be used in both subjects it should not mean that we combine them as not all students who take Health like or want to do PE and vice versa. They are not the same students who take these subjects. I have been teaching senior Health and PE for 16 years now and most students dont take both subjects. If it was combined students might not achieve as much as they might disengage and not achieve when it comes to the other subject content they have no interest in. Once again you are making the assumption that all students who take PE take Health and vice versa when this is not the case at all! I also believe that this would have implications on their overall achievement and we would not be doing right in those students who do have a passion in both subjects as we currently provide them with the opportunity to excel in 2 separate subjects and the opportunity to gain 2 course endorsements and twice as many credits towards their Level 1 Certificate. We take all of this way if it was combined which is completely unfair to them. Our course numbers would also drop and student retention over the rest of L2 and L3 Health and PE classes would also decrease due to lack of interest	No	No except for I would hate to see you thinking of combining Health and PE at Level 2 and 3.	No		no	2020-06-18 09:55:27	ANON-YFPW-RCNJ-K	2020-06-18 09:55:27	2020-06-18 09:55:53
Yes		Strongly disagree		I'm deeply saddened by the fact that Latin is not included. Whilst there are clear questions to be answered around how to make the subject more inclusive and more appealing to a broader base, I do not believe removing it from the curriculum is the answer. Learning Latin (and indeed being introduced to the Classics) was a pivotal part of my school career, teaching me linguistic and reasoning skills. I would like that for future generations as well.	Latin and the Classics	No			2020-06-18 10:05:00	ANON-YFPW-RCNQ-T	2020-06-18 10:05:00	2020-06-18 10:05:16
Yes	I consider a broad, more foundational education to be at Y9 and 10	Strongly disagree	I find the reduction of science courses from 6 to 2 abhorrent and decidedly anti STEM	the abolition of science specialist subjects at Level 1 is an incredible disservice to students who are passionate about science at a young age, and is totally counter productive to addressing the shortage of scientists world wide	this list has not yet been viewed	No			2020-06-18 10:20:37	ANON-YFPW-RCNE-E	2020-06-18 10:20:37	2020-06-18 10:20:47
Yes		Strongly disagree	Science seems to have been singled out here for radical change. Biology, Chemistry, Physics, and Earth and Space Science are as different as Spanish, French, and German but all the languages still have separate content standards. The nature of the proposed L1 Science standards will make it extremely difficult to design courses to meet the needs of Year 11 students. In particular, those students who have a desire to go into the fields of medicine, engineering etc will lack the specific skills and knowledge to enable success in L2, because courses will also have to cater for those students for whom L1 may be their last experience of Science in a classroom. If we want world leading scientists, doctors, and engineers to help us overcome challenges such as COVID-19, they need to have the best preparation possible.	Please include Biology, Chemistry, Physics and ESS standards at L1, so that they are treated equally with other subjects such as the Languages. The flexibility this provides allows for course design to meet the needs of ALL students, not just those who "average". Teaching to the middle went out of favour a long time ago!	No	Yes	Familiar with its existence	No	2020-06-18 10:23:41	ANON-YFPW-RCNS-X	2020-06-18 10:23:41	2020-06-18 10:23:58
Yes		Strongly disagree	Incorporating all 5 current Science topics into 1 general Science seems crazy. These are all very different specialties. Statistics and calculus are separate because it is acknowledged they are very different branches of Mathematics - physics, bio, chem and ESS are the same and so should also be kept separate.			No			2020-06-18 10:26:56	ANON-YFPW-RCNP-S	2020-06-18 10:26:56	2020-06-18 10:27:04
No	Not until I heard from my teacher	Strongly disagree	You keep changing Ncea from Cambridge it's so unfair. It doesn't work leave it the same classics need to be done in year 11	I really enjoyed classics in Level 1 and I used year 11 to try new subjects, and classics especially it enabled be to pick up very valuable information and skills that will help me for the rest of my life.		No			2020-06-18 10:32:12	ANON-YFPW-RCNF-F	2020-06-18 10:32:12	2020-06-18 10:32:31
No		Strongly disagree		I disagree with this, as I am a year 12 student studying NCEA level 2 who enjoys classics, and would not have got into it without year 11 classics, and neither would most of my class. It is just decreasing opportunities to get into these subjects and while doing this, is removing students' abilities to choose the subjects they enjoy.		No			2020-06-18 10:32:10	ANON-YFPW-RCN7-Z	2020-06-18 10:32:10	2020-06-18 10:32:34
No		Strongly disagree		Please keep Latin and classical studies!		No			2020-06-18 10:32:23	ANON-YFPW-RCN1-T	2020-06-18 10:32:23	2020-06-18 10:32:37
No		Strongly disagree	Health and PE should stay separate	Pe and Health should be separate		Yes			2020-06-18 10:32:41	ANON-YFPW-RCN2-3	2020-06-18 10:32:41	2020-06-18 10:32:46

Yes		Strongly disagree	I strongly disagree with the scrapping of Latin at all levels and aligning Classical studies into a shared history category. This will result in the death of Latin in New Zealand and essentially scraps Classics in Level 1 as well as History is already a very board subject in which Classics does not fit into.	I believe that in combining Classical studies into history into level 1 will result in the subject not being taught at all as history as a subject focuses mainly on modern history (mostly the last 500 years) while classics covers a much wider time period (of thousands of years) that allows subjects to not just focus on the historic nature of events, but religion, culture, language, art and many more. For many, Classics gives the same educational qualities to English when looking at ancient texts, authors purpose etc. While giving them more interesting topics to study. By my year 13 year, at an all girls school, we had 3 classics classes and only 2 English classes as both provide literary skills. However, Classics offers much more then just literary, but art, culture etc as well as the origins of our political systems. Additionally, Latin is the basis for nearly all European languages and allows students to learn more about their own language then English as a subject ever does. This is in terms of grammatical constructions, origins of words and writing styles. To cut Latin from all levels would completely kill the subject for New Zealand as a whole.	If you are going to scrap Latin in NCEA, one possible option would be to add some standards into Classics so to have the option available for students.	No			2020-06-18 11:17:24	ANON-YFPW-RCNH-H	2020-06-18 11:17:24	2020-06-18 11:19:53
Yes		Strongly disagree	This is in reference to collapsing Science. By the time students have finished Year 10 most of them know which science they like/are good at. So, forcing them to do a branch of science they do not like or are not good at is counterproductive. The current system of separate sciences works very well for our students. Having only one science will severely limit their options.	The proposed Science standards are woefully inadequate. They are lacking in substance and their method of assessment is disadvantageous to boys. Also, the amount of work required of them in the pseudo-externals is nowhere near sufficient enough to allow for any meaningful judgement of the students level of understanding.		No			2020-06-18 11:32:15	ANON-YFPW-RCNB-B	2020-06-18 11:32:15	2020-06-18 11:32:36
Yes		Strongly disagree	While I do understand the Ministry's vision of wanting a broader experience at L1, I strongly believe that Health & Physical Education should continue as separate NCEA subjects for the following reasons: *Despite the two subjects sharing a learning area and underlying concepts - they are both unique subjects drawing on quite separate disciplinary fields. Health and PE also utilise and interpret the underlying concepts in specialised ways and draw upon different key areas of learning. *In physical education the focus is on learning in, through and about MOVEMENT. This is not the case with health education and therefore it would be very difficult to write combined standards that reflect the essence of both subjects. * Combining health and PE would mean reducing a total of 15 level one standards (9 PE and 6 Health) down to only 4. This has huge ramifications for local curriculum/programme design and also impacts on the way that schools design their option choices. While I support the ministry's intent for a broader, foundational NCEA experience at level one, I strongly believe that offering four standards for two separate subjects is not sufficient and would result in a severe narrowing of the curriculum.	While I do understand the Ministry's vision of wanting a broader experience at L1, I strongly believe that Health & Physical Education should continue as separate NCEA subjects for the following reasons: *Despite the two subjects sharing a learning area and underlying concepts - they are both unique subjects drawing on quite separate disciplinary fields. Health and PE also utilise and interpret the underlying concepts in specialised ways and draw upon different key areas of learning. *In physical education the focus is on learning in, through and about MOVEMENT. This is not the case with health education and therefore it would be very difficult to write combined standards that reflect the essence of both subjects. * Combining health and PE would mean reducing a total of 15 level one standards (9 PE and 6 Health) down to only 4. This has huge ramifications for local curriculum/programme design and also impacts on the way that schools design their option choices. While I support the ministry's intent for a broader, foundational NCEA experience at level one, I strongly believe that offering four standards for two separate subjects	It would be beneficial to further investigate the option of offering an Outdoor Education matrix at level 2 & 3.	Yes			2020-06-18 11:44:16	ANON-YFPW-RCNM-P	2020-06-18 11:44:16	2020-06-18 11:44:29
No		Agree		Having a taste of the commerce subjects altogether, I think is a good idea as you don't necessarily need level 1 to do level 2 commerce subjects such as accounting, business, and economics. It would give students a taste in each subject so when moving to level 2, they would know how each separate subject would work and can choose without mistaking their chosen subjects. I also think it would encourage students to choose more commerce subjects as they are not separate subjects. A con of this would be that they would have to jam in all of the 3 subjects and some students may find it too hard to work with. Personally I think that right now, they raised too much time on each topic as it can be learned in a week but teachers spend nearly over 3 weeks on each topic. Therefore by conjoining the commerce subjects together, they won't have time to waist and will be able to use time wisely.	nothing ;)	No	not interested.	-----	2020-06-18 12:55:54	ANON-YFPW-RCND-D	2020-06-18 12:55:54	2020-06-18 12:56:14

Yes		Agree			<p>We believe the Ministry should consider the subject of 'Tourism' as a further specialist subject .</p> <p>Crown Institute of Studies has been delivering level 3, 4 and 5 programmes in Tourism and Travel for over 25 years. We believe that if the subject of Tourism in secondary schools becomes a specialist subject at level 2 & 3 then students will be better prepared for tertiary study in this subject area.</p> <p>Tourism Industry Aotearoa's initiative Tourism 2025 (www.tourism2025.org.nz) predicts similar growth and has created a framework which outlines areas identified for their critical importance to the sustainable growth in the NZ Travel and Tourism industry. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Productivity - Visitor Experience - Sustainable Air Connectivity - Insight and Progress Tracking - Target for Value 	No				2020-06-18 13:13:08	ANON-YFPW-RCMU-W	2020-06-17 12:18:45	2020-06-18 13:13:27
No		Undecided				No				2020-06-18 13:51:59	ANON-YFPW-RCNX-1	2020-06-18 13:51:59	2020-06-18 13:52:16
No		Undecided			<p>Response from 7 Level 2 Travel and Tourism students from Macleans College:</p> <p>Travel and Tourism is a subject which does not have a very good reputation in schools for being a valid subject. It isn't taken seriously by students outside of the class, even some of the students within the subject take it only for 'easy' credits. This is most likely attributed to the fact that it is a unit standard-based course, also it isn't complex and academic compared to other more mainstream achievement standard subjects. The U.S factor means students are deterred from the subject as they cannot gain university entrance credits, and aren't able to gain merit and excellence credits to go towards endorsement. If the subject included achievement standards it would interest more students and would carry over more students from Level 2 into Level 3.</p> <p>A key change is needed within the subject to include more complex content and thinking and testing need to have more of an academic focus. For example, taking data from a table, logging it into another is not a constructive way for students to learn the things they need</p>	No				2020-06-18 14:08:23	ANON-YFPW-RCNA-A	2020-06-18 14:08:23	2020-06-18 14:08:35
Yes		Strongly disagree	The current four standards for L1 Science do not adequately cover the key components of the essential learning in Chemistry as defined by the NZC.	L1 Chemistry must be retained as a subject. The standards presented do not appropriately cover the chemistry curriculum.	No	Yes				2020-06-18 14:23:25	ANON-YFPW-RCNK-M	2020-06-18 14:23:25	2020-06-18 14:23:37

No		Strongly disagree		<p>We believe that level one Classical Studies be left as an independent subject. While we do have an historical focus, our inclusion of; art, literature, religion and philosophy means that the enrichment we supply would be lost under History.</p> <p>NCEA Level 1 is to be 'broad' and 'foundational' with specialisation at higher levels. In our institution History has a focus on the modern era, whereas, Level 1 Classics lends itself to bridge the gap into Level 2.</p> <p>The subject supports rich learning from the National Curriculum and it is especially relevant given recent social trends and changes in thinking around gender and status of different groups within society.</p> <p>The subject supports coherent and robust pathways into Level 2 and beyond and follow into study at Universities throughout the world. Furthermore, it has deeply historical links to the study of tertiary specialisations like Law, Medicine and Philosophy.</p> <p>The subject should have well-designed local curricula with support pathways for individual learners. The curricula for Classics is well established, and pathways are clear.</p> <p>Our institution has run Level 1 Classics for 6 years and currently has 85 students (3 classes) running.</p>	No.	Yes			2020-06-18 14:41:03	ANON-YFPW-RCNN-Q	2020-06-18 14:22:38	2020-06-18 14:41:20
Yes	<p>Only through other email groups. The intentions of the revised level 1 ethos and standards has not been well publicised or advertised.</p> <p>Additionally, it is difficult to truly see and understand the broader, more foundational version of NCEA Level 1 if the standards for each subject are not yet confirmed. Although this process is near completion for some subjects, one needs all the pieces in place to be able to see the full picture (a necessary occurrence for a truly foundational course). Another aspect that needs to be considered is that as level 1 usually occurs in year 11, this is a transitional year between level 5 of the curriculum and level 7 of the curriculum (through level 6). Thus, where the students have come from (and what with) needs to be part of the foundation, and where students can possibly go (and what they need to do this successfully) should be considered so the foundation (level 1) can be tailored to provide stronger, more fluid progression into level 2 and beyond.</p>	Agree	<p>While this slimming down of some areas (e.g. science) and not having the specific areas (e.g. biology, chemistry, earth and space science, and physics) does align with the ethos of level 1 as a foundational year, it then significantly increases the step/jump between levels 1 and 2.</p>			No			2020-06-18 14:53:38	ANON-YFPW-RCN6-Y	2020-06-18 14:53:38	2020-06-18 14:53:47
Yes		Strongly agree	<p>The current four standards for L1 Science do not adequately cover the key components of the essential learning in Physics as defined by the NZC.</p> <p>Need to keep broad base subjects such as media studies because it is in everything we do.</p>	<p>Yes, L1 Physics must be retained as a subject. The standards presented do not appropriately cover the physics curriculum</p>	No	Yes	No		2020-06-18 14:56:07	ANON-YFPW-RCNR-U	2020-06-18 14:56:07	2020-06-18 14:56:26
Yes		Disagree		<p>Media is our world today it has to be a stand alone subject. It need to look at production and things like representation. Imaging of BLM is a great example.</p>	<p>Food technology, Building technology, Earth science, environmental studies. There needs to be a practical component in all subjects.</p>	No			2020-06-18 14:57:31	ANON-YFPW-RCNW-Z	2020-06-18 14:57:31	2020-06-18 14:57:49
Yes	<p>I suggest that there is a certain irony of providing a broad and more foundational education by reducing a huge number of subjects available to students.</p>	Strongly disagree		<p>Areamble It is important to recognise that the desire for emphasis and educational focus on the study of Maori language and culture does not need to be and should not be exclusive of other cultural and linguistic foundations of our society in New Zealand. The study of Latin allows those who take up the option a ready means of accessing one set of foundational elements in both language and culture in New Zealand.</p> <p>BThe linguistic benefits of Latin •Latin has formed the basis for much of the English language, in both vocabulary and grammatical constructions. A knowledge of Latin enables a better understanding of English. •Even more than in English, Latin is the basis for all the Romance languages: Italian, French, Spanish, Portuguese, and Romanian. A knowledge of Latin makes it relatively easy to learn any of these languages, and certainly enables one to read texts in these languages with comparative ease. •Linguistically, as a heavily inflected language, Latin also helps the learner to develop an awareness of the significance and system of inflections in other heavily inflected languages, such as the Germanic and Slavic groups. •It is therefore very important to retain Latin as an</p>	<p>No, but in relation to Religious Studies, I suggest that there definitely needs to be a component addressed to atheism and why atheism is a clearly a reasonable and rational choice as compared to a religious belief.</p> <p>From my children's feedback, religious classes are dominated by the faithful with little critical discussion of the negative aspects of religion. Only the positive aspects are discussed.</p>	No			2020-06-18 16:03:20	ANON-YFPW-RCN4-W	2020-06-18 16:03:20	2020-06-18 16:03:37

Yes		Agree		It would be good to see a subject that dealt with basic societal understanding and participation - what used to be called Transition of life skills - learning that is tied to being a functioning member of society where students can gain recognition and credit for this. Many of these aspects are part of level 2 Unit Standard courses I think these need to be mainstreamed in order to give such knowledge relevance and value such that it connects with the learners.	The Tourism Teachers Association - NZ (TTA-NZ) We encourage the Ministry of Education to include "Tourism Management" as part of the achievement standard (AS) framework at level 2 and 3. The TTA-NZ has the support of tertiary tourism educators, the tourism industry and the ITO for tourism – Service IQ, in advocating for "Tourism Management" achievement standards. "Tourism as a multi-disciplinary, multi-method field of study is well suited to meet the changing complexities of societies. Tourism provides the platform for exciting, stimulating and highly relevant programmes of study" (Airey, 2019, p.261). The NZ tourism industry, until Covid-19, was a \$45B industry representing 20% of exports, 10% of GDP and 400,000 jobs. Tourism is a remarkably resilient industry that has withstood previous global challenges and, many countries, including NZ are now taking the opportunity to reimagine tourism while focusing on the environmental, economic and socio-cultural benefits tourism can provide.	No			2020-06-18 16:38:53	ANON-YFPW-RCNT-W	2020-06-18 16:38:53	2020-06-18 16:39:04
Yes	Good. Keep subject choice broad.	Undecided	Looks excellent, but why ditch Latin. Classical Studies well merits being a subject choice.	Correspondence for those you ditch or abbreviate.		Yes	Brilliant.		2020-06-18 16:45:05	ANON-YFPW-RCN3-V	2020-06-18 16:45:05	2020-06-18 16:45:23
No	Put Latin Back!!!	Strongly disagree	We need Latin to return	Put Latin back! I really want to study it, and I don't see why it isn't included.		No			2020-06-18 17:02:15	ANON-YFPW-RCN2-U	2020-06-18 17:02:15	2020-06-18 17:02:23
Yes		Strongly disagree	The proposal to get rid of Latin completely and Classics at Level 1 is fundamentally flawed and completely at odds with the designated criteria. It would be hard to find a language that is more broadly foundational than Latin, the study of which teaches an understanding of English and language in general that is barely touched on in the rest of the curriculum. Latin also has a broad cultural approach which looks at the foundations of Western civilisation in every single aspect. Classics at all existing levels teaches a huge range of disciplines - there is simply no more broadly foundational study - from history, literature, art, science and politics. It is a subject students love of great worth. I also disagree strongly with the sciences being 'condensed' into one subject at Level 1. It shows little understanding of the huge range of knowledge and importance of sciences in a successful and forward thinking society. I think the proposal to offer Māori Performing Arts is awesome. But NOT INSTEAD of most of Sciences, Latin and Classics.	The proposal to get rid of Latin completely and Classics at Level 1 is fundamentally flawed and completely at odds with the designated criteria. It would be hard to find a language that is more broadly foundational than Latin, the study of which teaches an understanding of English and language in general that is barely touched on in the rest of the curriculum. Latin also has a broad cultural approach which looks at the foundations of Western civilisation in every single aspect. Classics at all existing levels teaches a huge range of disciplines - there is simply no more broadly foundational study - from history, literature, art, science and politics. It is a subject students love of great worth. I also disagree strongly with the sciences being 'condensed' into one subject at Level 1. It shows little understanding of the huge range of knowledge and importance of sciences in a successful and forward thinking society. I think the proposal to offer Māori Performing Arts is awesome. But NOT INSTEAD of most of Sciences, Latin and Classics.	No.	No			2020-06-18 17:31:50	ANON-YFPW-RCNU-X	2020-06-18 17:31:50	2020-06-18 17:32:10
Yes		Undecided	Latin should stay.	Latin is a foundational subject which supports knowledge of English grammar, etymology and culture. It helps when learning Spanish, French and Italian. It supports excellence in spelling and with word meaning.		No			2020-06-18 17:58:37	ANON-YFPW-RCPY-4	2020-06-18 17:58:37	2020-06-18 17:58:54
Yes		Disagree	Maybe keep the consultation going for a couple more years as this year hasn't allowed teachers to fully appreciate the changes and hence give suitable feedback.	The ability in the current curriculum to teach both specialist and general science must be retained. This has allowed teachers to deliver science in a general manner to those students who may not require it in the future but getting an overview allows these students to understand and appreciate science that is present all around them. And those students who have a greater affinity for specialist sciences in terms of just being enthused/awed by how science makes our everyday lives easier or those who like to continue in a profession that require sciences in the future would get the benefit from the specialist sciences at Level 1.	No	No			2020-06-18 18:47:49	ANON-YFPW-RCPCE-E	2020-06-18 18:47:49	2020-06-18 18:48:18
Yes	KEEP CLASSICAL STUDIES AND ART HISTORY in NCEA level 1!!!!	Undecided	KEEP CLASSICAL STUDIES AND ART HISTORY in NCEA level 1!!!!	KEEP CLASSICAL STUDIES AND ART HISTORY in NCEA level 1!!!!	KEEP CLASSICAL STUDIES AND ART HISTORY!!	No		KEEP CLASSICAL STUDIES AND ART HISTORY in NCEA!!!!	2020-06-18 19:50:38	ANON-YFPW-RCPB-3	2020-06-18 19:50:38	2020-06-18 19:50:45

Yes		Strongly disagree	I strongly disagree with removing biology, chemistry & physics at level one based on the proposed standards that Level 1 Science have. There are no standards that focus on explicitly assessing content knowledge in Level 1 Science, which would not be such an issue if we had some content based standards from the 3 main disciplines (and ideally earth and space science too). Yes, I agree that the Nature of Science is hugely undertaught in New Zealand schools, and is vital so should be a part of the Level 1 Assessments, but I do not believe that we are doing the right thing to completely remove content in order to accommodate the NoS assessing. To me, the key thing that science is about is explaining the world around us. Explaining things like how a chemical reaction takes place, or what DNA is, is a vital part of science. I am very concerned that by removing any specific content assessments at NCEA Level 1, students will not be gaining a broad education in science CONCEPTS, only an education of about what science is, with a very random mixture of concepts attached to that.	I would highly recommend that Biology, Chemistry, Physics & Earth & Space Science be included at NCEA Level 1 alongside Level 1 Science. This would be a much better representation of our curriculum (all 5 strands could be represented that way, as opposed to just the NoS strand by Level 1 Science). I feel that by not having the opportunity for different content based learning to be covered in these different areas, students are going to be disadvantaged when they move onto Level 2, and we will not be ensuring that students are learning specific important content for each subject area (which I can see happening with the Level 1 Science standards, as teachers could add any content they like, which could vary considerably from school to school & could result in some students gaining a very narrow spectrum of knowledge). Even if there were only 2 standards available for these subjects (if 4 is not possible like Science) that would allow 1 external that could assess key concepts that are important to know about that area and 1 internal that allows students to experience practical aspects of that discipline. Alternatively, there could be 2 subjects - a 'physical sciences' subject that incorporates physics & chemistry, and a 'natural' sciences subject incorporating biology & earth and space science.	No			2020-06-18 20:15:01	ANON-YFPW-RCP9-4	2020-06-18 20:15:01	2020-06-18 20:15:07	
No		Agree		I agree mostly, but Classical Studies. does not need to be combined with History. Having taken these subjects and achieved highly in them across levels 1-3, it is imperative they are kept separate. Whilst they are of the same subject area, I always felt as though History took a different application than that of Classical Studies. History was analysing key events of history and their causes and consequences, whilst Classical Studies was interpreting ancient material against today. I also knew that Classical Studies was an alternative for English, for my classmates who struggled with the latter and preferred to take the former. My main concern is that ancient society cannot be lost, and it needs to be taught. Perhaps, the requirements for the achievement standards require revising, in order to uplift the subject to a more contemporary standing. This would appeal to students, should numbers taking Classical Studies dwindle.	No			2020-06-18 20:56:20	ANON-YFPW-RCPJ-1	2020-06-18 20:56:20	2020-06-18 20:56:27	
No		Disagree		Latin should be taught	Latin	No			2020-06-18 21:06:56	ANON-YFPW-RCPJ-N	2020-06-18 21:06:56	2020-06-18 21:07:19
Yes	The Ministry of Education's approach is flawed: how can "a broad, more foundational education at NCEA Level 1" be supported by a reduction in subject choices? The very definition of broad is to cover a large and wide range and scope of subjects. I'm very disappointed to learn and feel very sorry that students will have less subjects to choose from at Level 1. My favourite memories and more importantly, greatest times of learning, were from my senior years based upon the unique subjects I was able to specialise in.	Strongly disagree	For the reasons expressed above, it is integral to a young person's education and the best preparation for life that they are able to pick from a broad range of subjects, which reflect their strengths, aspirations for the future and most importantly, those subjects that they enjoy the most. The provision of a choice is essential to the best development and growth of young people's education and character. How will we benefit from a generation that has all been taught in the same approach? Differences and diversity are values which ensure society is equipped with a wide range of people from all different backgrounds of education and skillsets. We must provide for everyone, which will be achieved through enabling choice.	I support the introduction of new subjects for the reasons stated above: variety and choice are vital to ensuring young people are able to pursue the subjects they are drawn to. I utterly disagree with and cannot support the removal or consolidation of those subjects which are proposed. The sciences are each unique and completely different disciplines. The proposed abolishment of Latin is a complete travesty and utter insult to the principles of multiple languages (which I note are all proposed to be continued despite the proposed removal of Latin). How can New Zealand's educational curriculum hold any weight in a global context when students are denied from learning the disciplines of logic, coding, strategy and complex problem-solving which underpin one of our country's three languages? I completely support the continued integration of Te Reo Maori into languages and other disciplines such as the arts. However, I'm opposed to denying students the choice to specialise in areas that are best suited to their goals and aspirations.	Yes, specialist subjects are vital, but must start from Level 1. Senior secondary education is about opening up choices and opportunities to specialise. The creation of choice and provision of a wide range of disciplines and skillsets best prepare secondary students for their post-high school years, whether that next stage takes the form of further training in trades, territory studies, travel or directly into work. The Ministry of Education must seriously consider the benefits and importance of providing choices for Aotearoa's young people from Level 1. Senior students deserve to be provided with three full years to explore different fields and be exposed to multiple faculties of learning. I hope the Ministry will reconsider its proposal to consolidate and remove subjects entirely across all three levels of NCEA, then realise the invaluable benefit of providing its young people with a greater series of choices. In doing so, future students will be able to look back on their senior school subjects with pride and appreciation, as I still do for my education.	No	As previously stated, I support and am proud of the continued enrichment and integration of the Te Reo Maori and Te Ao Maori into schools. I hope we only continue on this path as a bi-cultural nation. What I cannot support is the justification for loss of a language subject when the Ministry is advocating for diversity and a well-rounded approach.	No feedback, as I do not have the expertise to comment, however I look forward to learning.	2020-06-18 22:23:17	ANON-YFPW-RCPQ-V	2020-06-18 22:23:17	2020-06-18 22:23:36
No		Strongly disagree	Don't remove Latin and Classics!	The study of ancient languages not only humanises the lives of those peoples but also gives much deeper understanding of the mechanisms of all languages as well as understanding of the modern world! It is worth learning!	No			2020-06-18 22:57:00	ANON-YFPW-RCPE-G	2020-06-18 22:57:00	2020-06-18 22:57:10	

Yes	but not the specifics	Agree	<p>1.As long as existing subject specialist like Latin and Art History as able to still function as courses under their new subject domain.</p> <p>2.Would be nice to see Pacifica be acknowledged under Social studies and be promoted more consistently to be incorporated within Performing Arts(Dance)</p> <p>3.As long as the Performing Arts subjects of Dance, Drama and Music and Maori Performing Arts have no adjustments to their assessments. (Do not fix what isn't broken) Kia Ora!</p>	see answer for question 2		Yes		Toi Puoro can also support opportunities for assessment in Performing Arts(Music, Dance, Maori Performing Arts)	2020-06-19 00:48:05	ANON-YFPW-RCP1-U	2020-06-19 00:48:05	2020-06-19 00:48:19
No		Strongly disagree		Removal of Classics and Latin are disappointing. Not only are both classics and Latin essential in understanding the development of, inter alia, the modern world, English language, western political systems, great works of literature, history, but are fundamentally excellent academic preparation for future study. The ability to manipulate language that Latin, for example, teaches has benefits that expand across disciplines. Similarly, Classics, more so that other forms of history, force students to interrogate evidence, sources and conclusions from academics of previous eras. This information processing skill is essential in an increasingly digital age which the proliferation of increasingly unreliable media. These subjects, though seemingly archaic or irrelevant, could not be more relevant to the studies of students of today and tomorrow.	Ancient Greek	No			2020-06-19 01:04:56	ANON-YFPW-RCP7-2	2020-06-19 01:04:56	2020-06-19 01:05:10
Yes		Strongly disagree	Strongly disagree that a subject as important and relevant as Media Studies would only be supported as possible context for Social Sciences.	<p>Our akonga see the world through media lens. Keeping Media Studies as it is supports the inclusion of important and rich learning from the National Curriculum, - Social Sciences does not have the time, breathe and depth to consider how Media operates in our world today and impacts on our students.</p> <p>Although Media Studies is not vocational, it offers a credible, vitally important coherent and robust pathway into NCEA Level 2 and further study or training.Communication, using mass media tools are part of todays world, Students who are proficient and have critical media skills offer analytical skills which are required in many areas. In this way the subject contributes to supporting schools to create well designed and coherent local curricula, which support pathways for individual learners.</p> <p>The subject supports the Crown's obligations under Te Tiriti o Waitangi because Media Studies supports looking at media from different perspectives. Is the only subject that offers a sociological/ cultural critique of representation,ex/inclusion and bias in current media. History deals with the past, Media studies deals with the present.</p>	A broad based civics subject that deals with the role of governments, types of government, obligations of government, the voting process, law and human rights- This is important as those students who, at Level 3 are at voting age, need some basic information before their first voting experience. This subject could also examine critically human rights, our relationship with our Pasifika neighbours, role of immigrants and 'guest workers'. Could also look at the role of unions and both the ideology in capitalism, socialism and neo liberalism theory. History does not do this and with the broadening of NZ history, they will be full of subject content.	No		2020-06-19 06:00:49	ANON-YFPW-RCP1-V	2020-06-19 06:00:49	2020-06-19 06:01:11	
Yes		Strongly agree		tourism		No			2020-06-19 06:56:20	ANON-YFPW-RCP2-5	2020-06-19 06:56:20	2020-06-19 06:56:55

Yes		Undecided		<p>I encourage the Ministry of Education to include 'Tourism Management' as part of the achievement standard (AS) framework at level 2 and 3. The TTA-NZ has the support of tertiary tourism educators, the tourism industry and the ITO for tourism – Service IQ, in advocating for 'Tourism Management' achievement standards.</p> <p>'Tourism as a multi-disciplinary, multi-method field of study is well suited to meet the changing complexities of societies. Tourism provides the platform for exciting, stimulating and highly relevant programmes of study' (Airey, 2019, p.261).</p> <p>The NZ tourism industry, until Covid-19, was a \$45B industry representing 20% of exports, 10% of GDP and 400,000 jobs. Tourism is a remarkably resilient industry that has withstood previous global challenges and, many countries, including NZ are now taking the opportunity to reimagine tourism while focusing on the environmental, economic and socio-cultural benefits tourism can provide.</p> <p>Tourism study is not only about training a service-delivery workforce but needs to also</p>	Yes		Not currently as I feel there has been limited information. I have attended two information sessions now held by the Ministry and at both they told us they were not yet ready to provide the information as it was still being discussed	2020-06-19 07:35:36	ANON-YFPW-RCPH-K	2020-06-19 07:35:36	2020-06-19 07:35:43
Yes		Disagree	<p>My main concern is that they are removing Bio/Chem/Phys from NCEA Level 1, which wouldn't concern me so much, but after seeing the 4 Achievement Standards that we will be working with it would be terrible. The 4 standards that we have are all Nature of Science type assessments. None of the standards have any basis in content. So it means that kids could do an academic pathway in year 11 without knowing what DNA is or by only doing random topics here and there etc. I do not see it allowing students to gain a broad education in science, at least without the teacher doing a lot of teaching that is not directly related to the standards, which as we know, when it isn't worth credits, it doesn't often happen.</p> <p>If we have Chem/Bio/Phys & ESS as Level 1 Subjects, it would mean we could have some other standards to work with which would ensure our academic kids will still have standards centered around important content in our areas (eg. mechanics, acids bases & genetics) and it would help us to be able to design different courses - as with only 4 standards available it is going to make our high and low ability science classes very tricky.</p>	No			2020-06-19 07:59:46	ANON-YFPW-RCPB-D	2020-06-19 07:59:46	2020-06-19 07:59:59	
Yes		Undecided		<p>The below statement is written by the chairperson of The Tourism Teachers Association - NZ (TTA-NZ) and I totally agree with what is said so I repeat it here.</p> <p>'We encourage the Ministry of Education to include 'Tourism Management' as part of the achievement standard (AS) framework at level 2 and 3. The TTA-NZ has the support of tertiary tourism educators, the tourism industry and the ITO for tourism – Service IQ, in advocating for 'Tourism Management' achievement standards.</p> <p>'Tourism as a multi-disciplinary, multi-method field of study is well suited to meet the changing complexities of societies. Tourism provides the platform for exciting, stimulating and highly relevant programmes of study' (Airey, 2019, p.261).</p> <p>The NZ tourism industry, until Covid-19, was a \$45B industry representing 20% of exports, 10% of GDP and 400,000 jobs. Tourism is a remarkably resilient industry that has withstood previous global challenges and, many countries, including NZ are now taking the opportunity to reimagine tourism while focusing on the environmental, economic and socio-cultural benefits tourism can provide.</p> <p>Tourism study is not only about training a</p>	No			2020-06-19 08:06:06	ANON-YFPW-RCPM-R	2020-06-19 08:06:06	2020-06-19 08:06:24
No		Strongly disagree	Subjects such as Level One PE and Level One Health should stay as they are and not be combined.		No			2020-06-19 08:19:21	ANON-YFPW-RCPD-F	2020-06-19 08:19:21	2020-06-19 08:19:35

Yes		Disagree		<p>The Wellington School of Business & Government at Victoria University of Wellington are concerned about the proposal to remove level 1 Accounting, Economics and Business Studies as individual subjects, replaced with a single Commerce subject.</p> <p>Many students will have taken a general, broad based commerce curriculum at Years 9/10 and the current suite of Level 1 subjects enables them to begin to specialise. While related, accounting, economics and business studies are distinct subject areas within the wider study of commerce. These three subjects are popular choices at Level 1, and provide a foundation into the specialisms at Levels 2 and 3, and beyond into tertiary study. The subjects appeal to different students, who are seeking different study and career pathways. This includes students taking Level 1 subjects to lead into non-commerce pathways.</p> <p>The reduction in choice at Level 1 potentially impacts on the perception and attractiveness of the subjects at higher levels and into tertiary study, as well as influencing business-focused career aspirations.</p> <p>The proposed absence of accounting for the Level</p>	No			2020-06-19 08:29:56	ANON-YFPW-RCPX-3	2020-06-19 08:29:56	2020-06-19 08:30:05
Yes	<p>It has always been the case that between Levels 1, 2 & 3 greater specialisation has been promoted incrementally. It seems disingenuous that Level one has to remove subjects like Latin and collapse other humanities in order to achieve this move to greater specialisation. The existence of these subjects at Level 1 (Classical Studies, Latin, commercial subjects, science subjects) ensures breadth. They are also foundational in that they begin to provide rich deep learning in Western civilisation, which is increasingly under threat in favour of a more introspective approach to curriculum design. I am uncomfortable with the collapsing of the individual sciences into one course. As mentioned above incremental specialisation is needed and Level 1 is a good place to start after students have received a good foundational course in Year 9 and 10.</p>	Strongly disagree	<p>Latin will be killed off at the stroke of a pen. Classical Studies will be under threat and Science courses dramatically weakened. Especially in the case of sciences what students can do by the end of their schooling will be reduced. I believe that in part the 'new mode' reflects the descent of Years 9 and 10 curricula into chaos in recent times, where in many schools subject choice has become a smorgasbord of courses which largely lead nowhere but promote a feel-good factor for students. Whilst this is not a bad thing I have viewed in my current place of employment students selecting a path of least resistance in their subject courses. Anything that requires real work, deep rich learning and engagement is to be avoided by many. Instead of watering down Level 1 it should be maintained at least as is and the efforts of the MoE should be directed to creating stronger Year 9 and 10 curricula, instead of harking on about essential skills. Subjects do contain content as well. Coming back to Latin, I understand that NZ will be out on a limb in not offering courses leading to qualifications in this subject - perhaps the only country in the OECD not to offer it someone has said. If the qualification is killed off then the subject will disappear. Questions I have are: is there a political motive behind this? Is Latin viewed as elitist and does not fit the mould of NZ egalitarianism? Is it viewed as</p>	<p>Do not get rid of Latin. Reasons why:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •It offers a multitude of opportunities of language enrichment in English, particularly in the broadening of vocabulary. •It assists in the acquisition of any Romance languages in the curriculum such as French and Spanish. •By providing a meta language it assists with the acquisition of all other languages in the NZ curriculum. It also gives students a understanding of grammar and language morphology. •Many scientific and medical terms are Latin words and students arrive quickly at making connections with a knowledge of Latin. •It acquires Latin one develops great skills in logic. The combination of language and logic provide a deep rich set of analytical tools for the student. •It trains the mind in ways other subjects don't and this is because it provides such a rich panoply of intellectual threads: language, history, culture, grammar, literature, insight, discipline - to name but a few. It is an integrated subject. •It is a linear subject and skills and knowledge are acquired cumulatively. Once acquired you don't forget it. It is not like a subject which is studied in modular format. •It can be a transformational subject for students 	Yes	<p>If there is any subject in which an integrated approach to the sub-disciplines is possible it is this one. How that is organised should be decided by those who know.</p>	<p>If these subjects are not integrated into current programmes, then they may be difficult to staff in schools that aren't Kura, as there is a dearth of staffing.</p>	2020-06-19 08:34:51	ANON-YFPW-RCQT-2	2020-06-15 14:09:13	2020-06-19 08:35:09
No	<p>I am not aware of any discussion from Teachers of Accounting, Economics and Business Studies for these subjects to be combined as one subject - Commerce. This was not a suggestion from NZCETA or any of the NZCETA representative on the RAS. The proposed change was also not ever mentioned by any Ministry of Education or other official at any of the various meetings held with NZCETA representatives. The first many of NZCETA members heard of the proposed "commerce" subject was via the press release.</p>	Strongly disagree	<p>1. I strongly oppose the combination of Accounting, Economics and Business Studies at Level 1 becoming Commerce because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Demand by students/popularity for these 3 courses is strong in NZ. In 2019 external exam entries/student numbers are evident of this: by external exam entries - Economics 16818 / 6th popular, Accounting 10501 / 9th and Business Studies 5917 / 13th out of 36 subjects Why take away courses that students want to take while courses that are less popular are retained as standalone courses eg Dance, drama, Maori Performing Arts? 2. Combining the 3 courses weakens opportunities for students to develop financial literacy – a much needed area in today's society for young people and has very different learning skills from one course to another. 3. Combining 3 courses and especially further diluting Accounting in the proposed course will by far not prepare students adequately for Years 12 and 13. All of our students agree that they NEED to have Level 1 skills in Accounting before Yr 12 and 13 and would find it extremely difficult to manage these levels without prior knowledge. Foundational learning in each course is critical to underpin the learning required for a seamless transition into Level 2 and beyond. 4. Each course has very different and distinct 	<p>1. Leave the 3 Commerce subjects as they are - they are each very different courses and do not overlap each other. The proposal is suggesting that by combining Accounting, Economics and Business Studies that they overlap in content, learning outcomes and skills. They do not overlap in Accounting and Economics. If anything remove Business Studies from Level 1 altogether as this can more easily be taken from Level 2 without prior knowledge and keep Accounting and Economics as separate and distinct courses for Level 1 which ensure that these courses are foundational for moving to Level 2 and 3.</p> <p>2. Science - this is taking away choices students want to have at Level 1 and has similar reasons as the 3 Commerce courses.</p> <p>3. Why not combine Dance and Drama as one course or some of the languages courses and give students a more broad coverage of languages?</p> <p>4. The proposal suggests that languages individually give a broad coverage of knowledge in each language - there are too many languages on offer in Level 1, cut some of these instead of Accounting, Economics and Business Studies?</p>	No			2020-06-19 08:51:36	ANON-YFPW-RCPA-C	2020-06-19 08:51:36	2020-06-19 08:51:53
No		Strongly disagree			No			2020-06-19 09:02:20	ANON-YFPW-RCPN-S	2020-06-19 09:02:20	2020-06-19 09:02:24

No	Specialisation is better to start earlier to create a stronger foundation of information for future years of study.	Strongly disagree		Classics need to stay at level 1	Physiology	No			2020-06-19 09:07:32	ANON-YFPW-RCPK-P	2020-06-19 09:07:32	2020-06-19 09:07:37
Yes		Undecided		No	<p>I encourage the Ministry of Education to include "Tourism Management" as part of the achievement standard (AS) framework at level 2 and 3. The TTA-NZ has the support of tertiary tourism educators, the tourism industry and the ITO for tourism – Service IQ, in advocating for "Tourism Management" achievement standards.</p> <p>"Tourism as a multi-disciplinary, multi-method field of study is well suited to meet the changing complexities of societies. Tourism provides the platform for exciting, stimulating and highly relevant programmes of study" (Airey, 2019, p.261).</p> <p>The NZ tourism industry, until Covid-19, was a \$45B industry representing 20% of exports, 10% of GDP and 400,000 jobs. Tourism is a remarkably resilient industry that has withstood previous global challenges and many countries, including NZ are now taking the opportunity to reimagine tourism while focusing on the environmental, economic and socio-cultural benefits tourism can provide.</p> <p>Tourism study is not only about training a service-delivery workforce but needs to also</p>	Yes		No	2020-06-19 09:13:17	ANON-YFPW-RCP6-1	2020-06-19 09:13:17	2020-06-19 09:13:26
No	no, I was not aware that people were intending to change the subjects in NCEA level 1.	Agree	most of the changes make sense to me eg history and classical studies combining together. but there are my subjects that should be kept individual eg business studies, accounting, and economics, as these subjects are harder to pick up altogether.	I reckon that there should be an option for tourism in NCEA level 1, as it shows a broader perspective on our economy and our country is viewed all over the world. there is a wide variety of jobs on offer for the future, which will be very useful. New Zealand's tourism study is a world leader that allows leaver to be equipped to face a rapidly changing world.	NO	No	Never heard of it		2020-06-19 09:19:26	ANON-YFPW-RCPW-W	2020-06-19 09:19:26	2020-06-19 09:19:39
No	No, but it is a very good idea	Undecided	I am undecided because it does not effect me because I am a year 12 student	No comment	<p>Yes !! The Ministry should include Tourism Mangement as part of the achievement standard in level 2 and level 3 because tourism as a multi-disciplinary, multi-method field of study is well suited to meet the changing complexities of societies. Tourism provides the platform for exciting, stimulating and highly relevant programmes of study. It would be very good to add this achievement standard now because the tourism industry is hitting the reset button because of Covid. This would be the best time because students would be able to share idea about what they think would be good for the tourism industry and be able learn and understand the history of industry.</p>	No		No, I don't	2020-06-19 09:20:46	ANON-YFPW-RCPW-2	2020-06-19 09:20:46	2020-06-19 09:20:58
No		Disagree		Classics and Art History should not be merged into History. They are too specific and important to blend/remove. History has a huge amount of content as it is - this places too much pressure on History teachers to cover such a wide range of content if it includes Classics and Art History.	<p>I encourage the Ministry of Education to include "Tourism Management" as part of the achievement standard (AS) framework at level 2 and 3. The TTA-NZ has the support of tertiary tourism educators, the tourism industry and the ITO for tourism – Service IQ, in advocating for "Tourism Management" achievement standards.</p> <p>"Tourism as a multi-disciplinary, multi-method field of study is well suited to meet the changing complexities of societies. Tourism provides the platform for exciting, stimulating and highly relevant programmes of study" (Airey, 2019, p.261).</p> <p>The NZ tourism industry, until Covid-19, was a \$45B industry representing 20% of exports, 10% of GDP and 400,000 jobs. Tourism is a remarkably resilient industry that has withstood previous global challenges and many countries, including NZ are now taking the opportunity to reimagine tourism while focusing on the environmental, economic and socio-cultural benefits tourism can provide.</p> <p>Tourism study is not only about training a service-delivery workforce but needs to also be about producing critical, creative and strategic thinkers to address the local and global challenges and opportunities in tourism.</p>	No			2020-06-19 09:37:40	ANON-YFPW-RCP4-Y	2020-06-19 09:37:40	2020-06-19 09:37:50

Yes		Strongly disagree			<p>This submission is on behalf of TEFA – Tourism Educators Forum Aotearoa; our members are educators in the secondary and tertiary sectors, including at Universities, the NZ Institute of Skills and Technology, and Private Training Establishments.</p> <p>We strongly support the submission from the Tourism Teachers Association – NZ to include TOURISM MANAGEMENT in the Achievement Standards framework at Levels 2 and 3.</p> <p>Tourism is recognised globally as an academic pathway, and New Zealand is a world-leader in tertiary tourism education. Our tertiary institutions feature in the QS World University Rankings Top 50 for Hospitality & Leisure Management (which includes tourism). However, with only Unit Standards, NCEA tourism is positioned as a vocational rather than academic pathway, whereas both are important and offer opportunities for a diversity of students.</p> <p>Perceptions research shows that tourism is not seen as a positive education or career option by young New Zealanders or their parents. Tourism was seen as a school</p>	No			2020-06-19 10:48:54	ANON-YFPW-RCP3-X	2020-06-19 10:47:23	2020-06-19 10:49:13
Yes		Strongly agree		Tourism needs to be considered at achievement standard level and as a stand alone.	Tourism	Yes		Our culture plays a pivotal role in Tourism and has its own pathways within it. To add emphasis to this for not just Maori but all students would be so valuable.	2020-06-19 10:51:22	ANON-YFPW-RCP2-W	2020-06-19 10:50:46	2020-06-19 10:51:28
Yes	Broad should not mean removing whole subject areas with content which is foundational for later specialised study (such as physics, chemistry and biology which have content required for further study in science.	Strongly disagree	The science area deserves a greater value if NZ wants to produce more scientifically competent citizens not to mention engineers, medical workers technicians etc.	<p>If social science is still to have separate areas of geography and history why has all of science been compounded into just a few standards with no "content" and no "exams", only loose process based standards which are basically writing "about science", but with no agreed content. These standards are definitely biased towards the learning style of girls rather than boys. It would be a very good way to put boys off further study in science. Is that what we want?</p> <p>As a physics teacher I see that my students need to have a solid foundation in a content rich subject. It is not easy to integrate the concepts and write coherently, without that knowledge base.</p> <p>Without an "agreed" knowledge base it would not be possible to progress further and it would appear that students doing the proposed L1 science standards would have been sidelined into a "science for dummies" course which could not lead onto further study.</p> <p>The marking of the proposed science standards would be horrendous.</p>	<p>Electronics! We lost this subject when it became "integrated" int technology as we moved away from unit standards and teaching the NCE1. This was a subject enjoyed by my students of all abilities, from those who went on to being automotive technicians to those who were high fliers at university. There is currently very little electronics taught in NZ schools - it has disappeared completely from the physics standards.</p>	Yes	No		2020-06-19 11:18:41	ANON-YFPW-RCP4-Z	2020-06-19 11:18:41	2020-06-19 11:19:03
No		Strongly disagree		<p>I strongly disagree with getting rid of Art History at NCEA Level 1. I majored in Art History at university and being able to study it throughout high school was a huge advantage and allowed me to have a much broader knowledge of the subject.</p> <p>I personally don't think that either NCEA Level 1 History or Art would sufficiently cover Art History. Especially given the fact that not all students go on to attend university, or even to complete high school, it seems unfair to deprive those who are interested in the subject from the opportunity to learn about it.</p>	N/A.	No	I don't know enough about it.		2020-06-19 11:33:08	ANON-YFPW-RCSV-9	2020-06-19 11:33:08	2020-06-19 11:33:28
Yes		Agree		The possibility for students to choose to specialise in favourite subjects should be retained in some form. For example, Level 1 Science should be compulsory for all students but any students who wish to gain better understanding in a subject of choice should still have the opportunity to do so e.g. options for Phys/Chem/Bio/ESS as additional options. Similarly in other subjects.		No			2020-06-19 11:42:31	ANON-YFPW-RCSV-6	2020-06-19 11:42:31	2020-06-19 11:42:46

No		Undecided			TIA encourages the Ministry of Education to include Tourism Management as part of the Achievement Standard Framework at NCEA levels two and three. The 2019 report, Careers in Tourism - A Business Case identified a series of initiatives to attract a diverse and skilled future workforce and to change the perception of tourism as only providing low-value, vocational roles. Unsurprisingly it identified that including Tourism Management in the AS framework at schools would help address these perception issues. It will also improve pathways between secondary and tertiary education, supporting the government priority within Change Six of the NCEA Change Package. Many secondary schools currently offer tourism, however the credentials on offer are unit standards, whose credits do not contribute towards University Entrance. This has reinforced negative perceptions amongst students, parents and schools, creating a barrier to building a strong and diverse tourism workforce. Tourism is a significant part of the New Zealand economy, contributing over 20% of exports, 10% of GDP and employing nearly	No			2020-06-19 11:43:25	ANON-YFPW-RC5C-K	2020-06-19 11:43:02	2020-06-19 11:43:29
Yes		Undecided	It seems inequitable to have learning areas such as Social Sciences split into several separate subjects when Science has only one subject. One could argue that there are common aspects, 'Nature of Social Science' as there are in science's 'Nature of Science'. I'm also not sure that the L1 science standards have captured the spirit of NoS. See next answer.	It would be good to see science subjects being forward thinking, by having standards that taught and encouraged the learning of science that would underpin local, national and global problems. For example, Chemistry teaching the carbonate chemistry required to understand ocean acidification, Physics teaching the heat transfer required to understand Climate Change, Earth and Space Science teaching the tectonics required to understand natural hazards and Biology teaching the understanding of disease spread and immunity. Many of these global problems are taught too early without good underpinning of science and evidence. NCEA L2 and L3 could build on this prior knowledge to develop an understanding of these issues. While this is being done 'fake news' could also be pointed out. Fake news is too difficult to raise awareness about without this under-pinning.	No, not in the sciences	Yes	Earth and Space Science standards, including the Planet Earth and Beyond ones at NCEA L1 are able to assess many topics that are complimentary with the Te Marautanga o Aotearoa objectives. E.g. 'Earth Science/Papatūā-nuku', Astronomy/Ranginui, which are part of the Natural World strand. The aims of these overlap with the NZC (2007) aims in the Planet Earth	No, because I'm not too sure where to find Pūtaiao other than Te Marautanga o Aotearoa. ESS would be happy to work along side Pūtaiao. We have started this process by developing two culturally responsive tasks as part of our NEX funding initiatives. We are planning to develop more, especially when the new standards are finalised.	2020-06-19 11:53:26	ANON-YFPW-RC5S-3	2020-06-19 11:53:26	2020-06-19 11:53:54
Yes		Strongly disagree	1. The problem is not the subjects, but the one-size-fits all approach. High schools vary in New Zealand, and so it makes sense that subject availability will also vary. This helps support "well-designed and coherent local curricula that support pathways for individual learners." 2. Taking a market approach to subjects (eg low enrolments = low interest) misses the point. The MoE would do well to review the status of foreign languages (all of them) in New Zealand, and consider that requiring all students to study a foreign language at NCEA levels 1-3 (at least) would meet several goals in the RAS for the following reasons: Learning a foreign language is important for young minds and thus "fits with the policy vision of a broader, foundational NCEA level 1 and supports the credibility of NCEA as a qualification among stakeholders". •There are proven physiological benefits—better brain development and increased neural pathways. •As a result of better brain development, students who know or are fluent in two languages succeed in mathematics and music, and in other academic subjects. •Students who learn a second (or third) language develop a better command of the structure of English and Te Reo Māori, as well as grammar. These students become better writers, without having to	Latin should remain: Learning Latin delivers all the benefits listed above in comment to question 2, but is particularly beneficial to English speakers. It also supports the Crown's obligations under Te Tiriti o Waitangi: •Learning about the Romans through Latin helps students to identify and discuss some of the problems that persist in all human societies, especially racism and sexism. •There are many transliterated English words in Te Reo Māori: identifying these words and discussing them in the context of Latin helps students to understand the effect of colonisation on language. Learning Latin develops better prepared students, and so "supports the credibility of NCEA as a qualification" and "supports coherent and robust pathways into NCEA level two and further study or training": •Over 50% of English words are derived from Latin: learning Latin vastly increases the learner's English vocabulary. •When students learn Latin, they gain a huge command of English grammar by default. •Learning to translate Latin sentences increases awareness of sentence structure: Latin students routinely report that they become better writers	Yes		Many teachers are able to connect all subjects to subjects in Table 2 above. Because they are able to do this, they support obligations under Te Tiriti by weaving bi-cultural content and examples throughout the entire curriculum. This process is also happening at tertiary level. The MoE would do well to learn what educators in NZ are doing in order to develop a more nuanced approach to educating biculturally.	2020-06-19 12:03:03	ANON-YFPW-RC5S-8	2020-06-19 11:58:29	2020-06-19 12:03:13	

Yes	Although, I think it is quite ridiculous to get rid of such a fascinating and intriguing subject. If it were ever to occur, wouldn't there be at least a decent amount of year 11 students who would be interested in such a topic? If they get rid of the subject and by the time they reach yr 12 and are still interested in taking the subject, wouldn't they be confused with a few information that is common and knowledgeable to others who had previously taken classics in year 11? I've experienced this and I was confused at the beginning of my first day of taking classics. If the government were to remove classics completely for the year 11 students, wouldn't they suffer from the same confusion as I had gone through as well? As others (previous year 11 students who had taken classics) would state that the information being taught is general knowledge, it wouldn't be seen like that to the yr 11 students who are new to the subject and perhaps interested in it as well.	Disagree	I would disagree with the government's decision to remove the subject, because Classical studies is a subject where you can learn about fascinating historical background based on Roman mythologies along with Greek mythologies. Also, its a subject where students can learn about new things aside from New Zealand history or maths, English, geography and all other subjects. Classical studies can help benefit the year 11 students to learn new things about such topics and perhaps can motivate them into choosing their career that involves Latin and Classical Studies.	Classical Studies is a fascinating and interesting subject, its where students get the opportunity to learn more about Ancient Rome and Greek. I would absolutely agree with this statement because I am new to the subject and I believe that this subject could provide students more knowledge about such interesting topics and also achieve excellent grades.	No				2020-06-19 12:04:45	ANON-YFPW-RC5G-9	2020-06-19 12:04:45	2020-06-19 12:04:58	
Yes		Strongly disagree	Some subjects have merged, and some have not. There will be a considerable amount of content not covered in some subject areas. It is apparent that there is a shift in focus from content-based teaching and learning towards context-based teaching and learning. I fear that this is shifting it too far in this direction, and that students could possibly get NCEA Level 1 without a thorough understanding of key concepts required to succeed in NCEA Level 2. I have yet to see any evidence of context based learning being any more effective than content-based learning in terms of students becoming better problem solvers, and asking more open-ended questions.	I strongly disagree with the proposal to remove all level 1 standards for Physics, Chemistry, Biology and Earth and Space Science. It has just four achievement standards for all of Science, and these all fall under the Nature of Science branch. Many students will go into the specialist Science areas in NCEA Level 2 ill-equipped, as the content covered in Level 2 courses build on what was introduced in NCEA Level 1. With the proposed changes, there will be little incentive for many teachers to teach this content, if there is no formal assessment attached to it. Retaining the specialist Science standards at Level 1 (Achievement Standards in Physics, Chemistry, Biology and Earth and Space Science) will be highly beneficial for students intending on pursuing further study at tertiary level in the Sciences or Engineering.	No				2020-06-19 12:09:52	ANON-YFPW-RC5G-Q	2020-06-19 12:09:52	2020-06-19 12:10:02	
Yes	NCEA at Level 1 should be broader and at Level 2 and 3, great specialisation should occur with tourism related studies to have achievement standards made available. Tourism should be identified early as an employment and career option and Achievement standards written to give 'weight' to it being a viable and successful career option for young people to consider.	Agree	I would like to see tourism as an industry with successful business case studies threaded more throughout the curriculum subjects (at all levels) of business, economics, accounting, geography and social studies. Tourism as an industry is often not considered and if you take the example of business and economic studies, international big brand companies like Nike, Nescafe, IKEA etc are studies rather than NZ brands like AJ Hackett Bungy, Skyline Enterprises, Whalewatch NZ, Shotover Jet etc. To assist mainstream New Zealand, students, teachers and parents to understand the depth and breathe of tourism, we need to have business cases highlighting the benefits of tourism and employment opportunities.	I couldn't see any tourism specific subjects and this should be promoted more as tourism is a key employer and economic driver for the country.	Yes I would like to see Achievement Standards written for tourism as currently there are only Unit Standards available. This creates a barrier and perception to teachers, students and parents that it is not a useful or valued industry/profession for young people to aspire to. The most effective way improving the awareness of tourism's value to the economy and viable employment options is to thread it through the school curriculum. With AJ Hackett Bungy New Zealand, our company (Tourism Business Advice Ltd) has written some AS Business Standard resources demonstrating how easy this can be done. After considerable research of which standards to choose, we chose two Business standards for the following reasons. a.They are achievement standards and UE approved b.They are internally assessed c.They are 3 times more students who study business rather than tourism at Level 2 and 3 The Achievement Standards chosen were AS 91382 - Develop a Marketing Plan, and	No				2020-06-19 12:11:06	ANON-YFPW-RCPY-T	2020-06-19 10:14:23	2020-06-19 12:11:21
No		Disagree		I support keeping the study of Latin and the Classics	No				2020-06-19 12:16:54	ANON-YFPW-RC5J-T	2020-06-19 12:16:54	2020-06-19 12:17:04	
Yes		Disagree	Why have you included Religious Studies but not Latin at Level1. Latin is a good foundation subject for Classics and is great linguistic discipline. Having Science undifferentiated is a step back as it is already hard to get the students to Level 2 specialisation with the way they are now.	Refer to above.	No				2020-06-19 12:19:54	ANON-YFPW-RC5Q-1	2020-06-19 12:19:54	2020-06-19 12:20:32	
No		Strongly disagree		There should be Latin	No				2020-06-19 12:23:19	ANON-YFPW-RC5E-N	2020-06-19 12:23:19	2020-06-19 12:23:37	

Yes	I was aware, however I believe they have made it too broad in some areas. In particular science is now too broad. With no specific content covered in level 1 (based on the proposed assessments) it will limit the specialization of level 2 and 3 as teachers will be teaching a lot of fundamental knowledge at these levels which will reduce the time spent to specialize. Also with such a broad level 1 there will be many students who leave school at 16 with gaps in their knowledge which will reduce the populations scientific literacy further. This will impact their ability to understand and make informed choices around massive issues that are impacting us daily and in the future, such as infections and global warming.	Strongly disagree	The changes proposed for science do not align with the NZ curriculum. It has 4 strands with nature of science as an overarching strand. All the strands are equally important and embedded together. Without all 4 represented in assessments then it disrupts the balance, causing major changes in the value of certain knowledge. Instead I believe that the biology, chemistry, physics and earth science strands need to stay with a focus on the core concepts underlying these subjects so that all students have a chance to learn and understand these areas so that they are well rounded and informed future citizens.	Science should NOT be restricted, but should include the biology, chemistry, physics and earth science strands. For the following reasons: - will align it to the curriculum - ensure all areas of knowledge are taught and given importance to - allow students learning to grasp basic scientific principles - produce students who are well rounded and informed future citizens, with sound scientific literacy to be able to deal with the current and future issues in the world Assessments are a driving factor in determining what knowledge is important. limiting assessment content in science WILL lead to key content knowledge being dropped in schools. This will put our most at risk students further behind in life, as they will not understand basic scientific terms in order for them to engage in the current and future world problems. For example: if they do not understand how microbes grow and spread then how will they understand the importance of covering their face - Its as simple as that. We have to look out for the future citizens scientific literacy.	no.	No		no.	2020-06-19 12:26:03	ANON-YFPW-RC55-5	2020-06-19 12:26:03	2020-06-19 12:26:14
Yes		Strongly disagree	In regard to the combination of Accounting, Economics and Business into one subject Commerce.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accounting, Economics and Business are very individual and differing subjects. The skills and knowledge in each of these areas are very different. The skills taught at Level 1 underpin the foundation of success in Level 2 and Level 3. As a pathway into future success in Level 3 and Scholarship Accounting and Economics, students require knowledge that is embedded during teaching during Level 1. There is a clear future career pathway in all of these areas and they are INDIVIDUAL at University. Nationally student numbers in Accounting and Business at Level 1 are increasing (or being maintained). Students financial capabilities are a concern nationwide, and this proposal limits students access to varied pathways where this is a predominant idea. It appears that Commerce subjects, and Accounting in particular, will be a step behind with respect to learning as it is not able to be accessed at Level 1, or will need to be condensed significantly to fit in the other subject's ideas (trying to cover the key foundation ideas of 3 subjects in one is just not feasible) This will have a negative impact on student's numbers and therefore teaching numbers. 	No	No			2020-06-19 12:35:17	ANON-YFPW-RC5P-Z	2020-06-19 12:35:17	2020-06-19 12:35:58
Yes		Strongly disagree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accounting, Economics and Business are very individual and differing subjects. The skills and knowledge in each of these areas are very different. The skills taught at Level 1 underpin the foundation of success in Level 2 and Level 3. As a pathway into future success in Level 3 and Scholarship Accounting and Economics, students require knowledge that is embedded during teaching during Level 1. There is a clear future career pathway in all of these areas and they are INDIVIDUAL at University. Nationally student numbers in Accounting and Business at Level 1 are increasing (or being maintained). Students financial capabilities are a concern nationwide, and this proposal limits students access to varied pathways where this is a predominant idea. It appears that Commerce subjects, and Accounting in particular, will be a step behind with respect to learning as it is not able to be accessed at Level 1, or will need to be condensed significantly to fit in the other subject's ideas (trying to cover the key foundation ideas of 3 subjects in one is just not feasible) This will have a negative impact on student's numbers and therefore teaching numbers. There is concern around maintaining our profession 		No	No	No		2020-06-19 12:35:59	ANON-YFPW-RC57-7	2020-06-19 12:35:59	2020-06-19 12:36:10

Yes	But this will not happen in Accounting - it will just make it more difficult to teach the content in Years 2 and 3. I am not sure of the reasoning for these decisions. My Level 1 students have loved accounting and 98% of them have carried on with it into Year 12. By not having Level 1 Accounting this narrows students options and is financial literacy which is what all students should have access to.	Strongly disagree	Removing financial literacy from students in Year 11. Why??	Why remove Accounting - it will just make it more difficult to teach the content in Years 2 and 3. I am not sure of the reasoning for these decisions. My Level 1 students have loved accounting and 98% of them have carried on with it into Year 12. By not having Level 1 Accounting this narrows students options and is financial literacy which is what all students should have access to.		Yes			2020-06-19 12:40:27	ANON-YFPW-RCSF-P	2020-06-19 12:40:27	2020-06-19 12:40:40
Yes		Strongly agree				Yes		It should be compulsory from year 0 to year 9 because it is our culture , our history and our identity .	2020-06-19 12:40:49	ANON-YFPW-RCS1-1	2020-06-19 12:40:49	2020-06-19 12:40:55
Yes		Strongly disagree	Retain Latin and other non included subjects	Board range, foundation for other subjects		No			2020-06-19 12:40:56	ANON-YFPW-RCS2-A	2020-06-19 12:40:56	2020-06-19 12:41:11
Yes		Disagree			We encourage the Ministry of Education to include "Tourism Management" as part of the achievement standard (AS) framework at level 2 and 3. The TTA-NZ has the support of tertiary tourism educators, the tourism industry and the ITO for tourism – Service IQ, in advocating for "Tourism Management" achievement standards. "Tourism as a multi-disciplinary, multi-method field of study is well suited to meet the changing complexities of societies. Tourism provides the platform for exciting, stimulating and highly relevant programmes of study" (Airey, 2019, p.261). The NZ tourism industry, until Covid-19, was a \$45B industry representing 20% of exports, 10% of GDP and 400,000 jobs. Tourism is a remarkably resilient industry that has withstood previous global challenges and, many countries, including NZ are now taking the opportunity to reimagine tourism while focusing on the environmental, economic and socio-cultural benefits tourism can provide. Tourism study is not only about training a service-delivery workforce but needs to also be about producing critical, creative and strategic thinkers to address the local and global challenges and opportunities in tourism.	Yes			2020-06-19 12:41:57	ANON-YFPW-RCSH-R	2020-06-19 12:41:57	2020-06-19 12:42:05
No		Agree	No issue with what has been included, but believe Tourism Management should also be included.	Tourism Management should be included.	Tourism Management It is the position of SkyCity Entertainment Group that: - including Tourism Management in the Achievement Standards framework at schools would help change the false perception the the Tourism industry only offers low-value roles. - schools, including those already offering unit standards in tourism, should be able to offer Achievement Standards in this subject area. The absence of achievement standards reinforces negative perceptions of Tourism as a low-value choice. - tourism is a significant part of the economy and in our business is supported by diverse professional roles and executive management career paths that are less visible than our frontline teams. - there is an opportunity, while the industry rebuilds, to close the gap in workforce development for the tourism sector.	No		No further comments	2020-06-19 13:03:01	ANON-YFPW-RCSB-J	2020-06-19 13:03:01	2020-06-19 13:03:13
Yes		Strongly disagree			Outdoor Education	Yes			2020-06-19 13:03:22	ANON-YFPW-RCSM-W	2020-06-19 13:03:22	2020-06-19 13:03:30

Yes		Strongly disagree	<p>There are some good combinations of subject areas such as Sciences, PE and Health History and Classics which has been proven to work.</p> <p>However, Commerce and Social Studies do not!</p> <p>Economics and Business Studies are ok but as indicated in the Note, Accounting does not work in that combination so is effectively removed from the Level One curriculum. The same is true of Social Studies where in actual fact, both Media Studies and Psychology are gone.</p>	<p>Removing Accounting does not make sense.</p> <p>Accounting is broader and foundational at NCEA Level 1 with increasing specialisation at Levels 2 and 3. It teaches the financial cycle, it teaches keeping records, GST, managing money, making informed decisions, understanding financial choices - life skills in any future pathway. Surely we want our young people equipped with these skills as isn't a common complaint about our education system that we are not preparing them for the 'real world'. Many students only take Level 1 Accounting to get this basic understanding as they are not interested in the career pathway of being an Accountant but know that Accounting is important wherever they end up.</p> <p>There are rich and relevant contexts with very little overlaps with other subjects. Basic Numeracy skills are reinforced in authentic, meaningful contexts.</p> <p>The subject supports very coherent and robust pathways into NCEA Level 2 and further study or training.</p> <p>Over 10,000 students enrolled in an External Examination for Level 1 Accounting in 2019 yet</p>	No			2020-06-19 13:19:01	ANON-YFPW-RC5D-M	2020-06-19 13:19:01	2020-06-19 13:19:14
Yes		Agree			No			2020-06-19 13:26:53	ANON-YFPW-RC5X-8	2020-06-19 13:26:53	2020-06-19 13:27:19
Yes	Tēnā koutou. Proposed deletion of NCEA Latin at all three levels undercuts both the claim that Level 1 offers a "broad" or "foundational" education, and that Levels 2 and 3 will offer "specialisation" (Criterion 1, above). Latin is a foundational subject for learning many European languages, and for understanding our own; well over half of English words are from Latin, directly or indirectly. Latin is also a foundational subject in the sense that it has clear pathways into Level 2 and 3 courses and tertiary study (Criterion 3, above), as well as providing relevant grounding to those who pursue other disciplines including (but not limited to) sciences, medicine, law, history, literature, linguistics, philosophy and theology.	Strongly disagree	I strongly disagree with the deletion of Latin. Given how it intersects with our culture in multiple spheres, it is clearly an "important and rich" subject (Criterion 2, above). Access to the Latin language helps us grasp White House "quid pro quo", and why "Coronavirus" is called that, and the meaning of "Per Ardua ad Astra" on the number plate of the car in front of us, and why _definitely_ isn't conventionally spelled _definitely_. The notion that Latin is a dead language because there are few Latin speakers is mistaken - just as, conversely, Pākehā were wrong to devalue te reo as a language transmitted orally rather than through writing. Both languages are taonga, enabling people to engage with their cultural heritage and identity, and both need to be supported and nurtured. This obligation is enshrined in Te Tiriti o Waitangi, which requires the Crown to protect and uphold the cultures of both Treaty partners, and particularly the cultural heritage and languages integral to their development (Criterion 6, above). Deleting Latin studies would not only shirk this Treaty obligation, but also damage the credibility of NCEA qualifications here and abroad, among all other English-speaking countries which recognize the ongoing cultural significance of Latin and continue to teach it at their schools (Criterion 7, above).	<p>Aside from the strong reasons noted above to maintain Latin at all three NCEA levels, it is difficult to see reasons why it should be excluded. The curricula for Latin are well-designed and well-established, with clear support pathways for individual learners (Criterion 4, above), and there are sufficient, well-qualified teachers to deliver the subject (Criterion 5, above). Latin as a subject has suffered unfairly from an association with elitist education systems of the past, and this has paradoxically made access to Latin even more exclusive. Policymakers need to see past the reductive cliché to avoid throwing out our shared cultural heritage. Please, move away from this constant round of demoralizing "reviews" and make a positive commitment to preserving and promoting access to this cultural treasure for everyone. Ngā mihi nui.</p>	No	(Some knowledge, but not familiarity).		2020-06-19 13:38:13	ANON-YFPW-RC5A-H	2020-06-19 13:38:13	2020-06-19 13:38:28

Yes		Strongly disagree		Accounting - Is a very useful subject, not only for career pathway, but also for developing students on-going financial capability. All of the Commerce (Accounting, Economics & Business) Subjects should be separate subjects as each offer a different range of essential skills for students and their future. If Geography is considered to be a stand-alone subject and not combined with History, Classics and Social Studies, then Accounting should also be a stand-alone subject. There seems to be a lack of consistency and rationale in what is considered a stand-alone subject and what needs to be combined with other things.		No			2020-06-19 13:48:20	ANON-YFPW-RCSN-X	2020-06-19 13:48:20	2020-06-19 13:48:33
Yes	I was aware of this but absolutely horrified to see that the MOE wants to get rid of Latin and Level 1 Classical Studies and Art History. These are foundational subjects and should be retained at all levels of the NCEA system.	Strongly disagree		Classical Studies is a fundamental subject, giving students an understanding of the beginnings of civilization in the West. I would argue that it is therefore more important even than History. Classics, being an inter-disciplinary subject, includes the study of history as well as art, literature, society, philosophy and other aspects. Therefore study of it gives students a broad basis from which to study further and understand the world we live in and where we have come from. Latin has a very special place in Western education and must not be removed from the curriculum or qualifications. As a language it is vital that it is taught at each year level in secondary schools. It is a subject which my students LOVE to study, and they widely report that they can see enormous benefit from studying it. Their English and associated literacy skills improve, they have an understanding of how English works and a greater English vocabulary. The benefits of reading Latin literature in the original are also immense. This is now the Roman communicate with us, and what they have said still resonates with us today. Understanding Roman culture also allows us to critically engage with important questions about society, values, attitudes and perspectives. It is invaluable and a taonga that we must treasure.	No	No			2020-06-19 13:50:07	ANON-YFPW-RWUV-W	2020-03-20 14:27:33	2020-06-19 13:50:23
Yes	I think it is a very bad idea. Limiting the years in which students choose to specialise means that those who choose the wrong thing at first (an inevitability) will now have no room to change course.	Undecided	Some of these are good choices but the limitation of options is very harmful. Cutting out subjects at the root will kill them in the long term because many schools cannot provide enough hours for a specialist teacher only teaching levels 2 and 3.	Do not cut classical studies and latin. The fact that your decision making body deems these as unimportant subjects shows great ignorance. School is not about getting qualified for a job. It is about becoming a well-educated person in all parts of life. If we stop passing on to young people the information we know about the ancient world, our society will lose that invaluable knowledge, whether it be related to politics, geography, art, literature, modern language studies, psychology, science, religion or any other vital field of information. Classical studies allows one to see the world with a wider perspective. It is endlessly applicable in every career. New Zealand has a great tradition of excellent classical study but our university departments will die if you stop allowing school students to become interested in the subject.		No			2020-06-19 13:52:42	ANON-YFPW-RCSK-U	2020-06-19 13:52:41	2020-06-19 13:52:54
No	I live in the UK and have discovered this questionnaire via facebook. I have studied the Classics for the past six years and it is safe to say it has enhanced my life through the history and the comparisons I am able to draw between then and now.	Undecided	Study Classical Civilisation and keep it on the curriculum.	Don't want to be pedantic but first off it is fewer than 300, not less than 300. That is something I learnt through strengthening my English language skills through Latin. Hence, I believe that the teaching of Classics has bettered me linguistically, politically and historically.	Ancient History, Classical Literature and Myths, Ancient Rome, Ancient Greece, Mary Beard (especially 'Women and Power')	No	I am from the UK and am only concerned with the continuing of teaching Classics		2020-06-19 14:03:15	ANON-YFPW-RC56-6	2020-06-19 14:03:15	2020-06-19 14:03:35

No		Strongly disagree	See comments on subjects not included.	<p>1. The exclusion of Latin "alone" from a long list of languages does not contribute to the "broadening" of a foundational curriculum at Level 1.</p> <p>2. The exclusion of Latin from Level 1 will effectively eliminate Latin from secondary level education in New Zealand.</p> <p>3. Students can take up Latin at tertiary level; but (a) they can equally take up the other languages at tertiary level, (b) languages are taken up more effectively at secondary level than at tertiary level, and (c) leaving Latin to be taken up at tertiary level will reduce the number of New Zealanders who have even a simple understanding of the language.</p> <p>4. What someone gets from Latin (or any language) develops in the time they give to it. At secondary level it is likely to be sixth and seventh form before a student begins to appreciate 'literature' in Latin (or any second language). But already in third and fourth form a student will get much from the language itself: (a) the vocabulary enlivens a student's awareness of English vocabulary, much of which descends from it, especially in the 'serious' registers that</p>	No	No			2020-06-19 14:43:35	ANON-YFPW-RC5W-7	2020-06-19 14:43:35	2020-06-19 14:44:16
Yes	Limits the options of students. I work with mainly Maori and Pasifika students and they do well in Accounting. They get their foundation at Level 1 which enables them to attain higher grades at Level 2 and Level 3. It would be detrimental to these students if they could not take the subject of Accounting at Level 1.	Disagree	There is no need to make these changes. A broad education occurs at this level anyway. You are reducing students choice.	Economics, Accounting and Business Studies should stay separate and not be grouped as Commerce. The students I teach (mainly Maori and Pasifika) enjoy the learnings of Economics and Accounting and are successful in these areas. Schools may combine these specialist subjects under the commerce heading to enable classes to be combined. This is cost saving to the detriment of the students.	No	No			2020-06-19 14:45:24	ANON-YFPW-RC54-4	2020-06-19 14:45:24	2020-06-19 14:45:32
No	Julie McDougall of the Tourism Teachers Association informed us.	Disagree	Go with Tourism would like to argue a case for "Tourism Management" as a Achievement Standard curriculum.	Go with Tourism would like to argue a case for "Tourism Management" as a Achievement Standard curriculum.	Yes		Te reo 100% plays an important role in Tourism Management.		2020-06-19 15:12:03	ANON-YFPW-RC5T-4	2020-06-19 15:12:03	2020-06-19 15:12:18

Yes		Strongly disagree	Merging Accounting, Business and Economics into one subject called Commerce at Level 1 will reduce the quality and depth that can be taught in each subject. This will compromise the courses offered at L2 and 3 as students will not have the prior knowledge that is required to excel in these courses.	Accounting, Business and Economics are very different subjects that require different skills and knowledge. These subjects have links to clear career pathways and would students still select Commerce in Level 1 if they are all merged into one subject? Nationally student numbers enrolled in Accounting and Business are increasing - with Level 1 subjects indicating that Economics is 6/36 Accounting 9/36 and Business 13/36. Currently there is a shortage in industry of students with Accounting skills. This refers to both the senior management level and those processing accounts for firms such as debtors and creditors. These critical skills to keep business operating will be lost with industry suffering in the long term. Financial literacy, as learned in Level 1 Accounting is not learned in any other subject area. The skills associated with financial literacy in Mathematics are superficial from a financial literacy point of view and do not support the individual and household literacy that is needed to develop successful households. Accounting Level 1 does this. A large proportion of family breakdowns are	No			2020-06-19 15:24:51	ANON-YFPW-RC53-3	2020-06-19 15:18:44	2020-06-19 15:25:05
No	This was not communicated to me.	Strongly disagree	There is a need for Accounting which incorporates a lot of literacy at Level 1. Often students specialising in Science or Engineering are unable to take Accounting at a higher level.	An Accounting background is important in all walks of life - for those students who become apprentices and run their own business, for those students who work as employees and for personal use. Time and time again I have met students who have said that the Accounting course was very useful to them.	No			2020-06-19 15:27:26	ANON-YFPW-RC52-2	2020-06-19 15:27:26	2020-06-19 15:27:46
Yes		Strongly disagree	Keep Latin and Classical Studies. Found them to be the most valuable subjects at school and taught me a lot about critical thinking.	Keep Latin and Classics. I studied both Classics and History and found both to compliment each other, yet they are separate in discipline and gained a broad and deep understanding of the classical world and it can't just be crammed into history as a conglomerate subject. Latin also provided me with great critical thinking skills, and taught me more about the English language than English. I think it's abhorrent the ministry is trying to get rid of it.	No			2020-06-19 15:51:39	ANON-YFPW-RC5U-5	2020-06-19 15:51:39	2020-06-19 15:52:03
Yes	This feedback is from the Media Department of Northcote College, Auckland. We were aware on a surface level but were not ready for the level of change. Especially not ready for our subject, Media Studies, being removed from Level 1. We had provided feedback on the vision for NCEA L1-3 document but before that went any further and the feedback from that was shared this Level 1 subject list superseded it. Another area of concern was the fact that we, or any of the teaching community, did not get a chance to give feedback on the Change Package. It was presented as a done deal. If it did happen it was not robust enough to reach schools and everyday teachers.	Strongly disagree	We strongly disagree with the proposed subject list for NCEA Level 1. We believe there is an inequity across subjects and learning areas. Some subjects seem to be prioritised over others. Why have some Arts subjects remained specialised but some Social Sciences have been condensed? Why is Dance considered a foundational subject but Media Studies is not? Despite a criteria, there appears to be no clear explanation why some subjects have been retained and some have been condensed and removed when many of the removed subjects do in fact meet the criteria.	Media Studies needs to be included as a Level 1 subject. Each subject within the Social Sciences learning area has their own specific skills and foundation knowledge. It would put students at a disadvantage and restrict pathways if Media Studies was removed at Level 1. Therefore, it is really important that each specific subject within the Social Sciences has their own place in Level 1. Media Studies is one of the few subjects that has clear and varied pathways beyond school both in further study and employment pathways. Media Studies offers opportunities for students to reflect their identities and tell their own stories and understand how they are represented. If we are going to produce graduates that are diverse learners and participate in learning and assessments that reflect their identity - we must retain specific subjects in Level 1.	We want our subject to be available at all levels - 1, 2 and 3.	No		2020-06-19 16:04:09	ANON-YFPW-RC3Y-7	2020-06-19 16:04:09	2020-06-19 16:04:29
Yes		Strongly disagree		Home Economics firmly belongs in the Health Curriculum, and should not be moved. Many of the issues and skills that people used during the Covid lockdown can be directly linked to the HPE content and curriculum. It is essential that this is not lost in a 'watering down' of the Health curricular content. I suggest the curriculum be renamed to include HE and be named HEHPE.		No		2020-06-19 16:07:27	ANON-YFPW-RC3V-4	2020-06-19 16:07:27	2020-06-19 16:07:33
No		Undecided			Classics should remain as a subject	No		2020-06-19 16:25:39	ANON-YFPW-RC3C-H	2020-06-19 16:25:39	2020-06-19 16:25:53

No		Strongly disagree		I believe that Latin should be included, because it is extremely helpful for people learning multiple European/Romance languages (It is their common root-language). In my personal experience, Latin has also proven very helpful in biology (most scientific terms are derived from Latin), and even for my career. I am a classical singer, music teacher and cathedral choir director - and a large proportion of the repertoire I've had to use is in Latin. I understand that Latin is a niche subject - but it is vital to those who wish to fit into niches such as this. It might not suit everyone, but it should definitely be an option. I also believe that Classical Studies should be more strongly supported as a subject, for many of the same reasons.	Students should have the option of taking classics and/or Latin up to Levels 2 and 3 if they wish.	No	Although I am not familiar with it, as an adult trying to improve my Te Reo, I think it is still vitally important.		2020-06-19 16:34:19	ANON-YFPW-RC35-1	2020-06-19 16:34:19	2020-06-19 16:34:34
Yes		Strongly disagree	I do not believe it is in the best interests of either the subjects or students to collapse Classical Studies into History at Level 1 and/or to remove Latin from the subject list altogether. These are foundational subjects for Western Civilisation, let alone for secondary-aged students in 21st century NZ.	I am a teacher of Latin and Classics. I have never, in my entire teaching career, been told by a student that they regret taking either of these subjects. Without exception former students I meet tell me that these subjects have not only enriched them but also been absolutely invaluable to them in a myriad of ways: language acquisition and vocabulary enhancement; creative and analytical thinking; problem solving; providing oral and written literacy at advanced levels; teaching knowledge, understanding, appreciation of literature, history, art and architecture, philosophy, major events and personalities of previous civilisations (Greece/Rome/their neighbours) with a view to helping them value lessons from the past as a way to help navigate the present and the future; offering opportunities to explore key issues facing peoples of all times e.g. power, status, inequality, alienation, belonging, war, suffering, poverty, politics, living conditions, social influences, international relations and the like; above all exploring what it is to be a human being. My own life has been enriched a thousand-fold by my learning (I am still learning!) and teaching Latin and about the ancient world. As well as being a secondary teacher, I have also practiced Law in a large national law firm for 15	No		Not presently	2020-06-19 16:40:23	ANON-YFPW-RC38-6	2020-06-19 16:40:23	2020-06-19 16:40:40	
No	This approach was never perceived as happening by the sector during consultation. This proposal has blindsided teachers and subjects' associations. The proposal is one of the worst ideas I have seen mooted by the Ministry of Education in over 25 years of teaching. Its implementation would be a disaster for specialist education in this country and would destroy the hard won reputation New Zealand has for educational leadership and excellence.	Strongly disagree	The merging of subjects into broader blocks of learning creates certain subjects as 'winner' subjects while others become losers. This is a two tiered approach which selects (and who makes these decisions on who wins and loses) certain subjects as 'worthy' (how is this decided, clearly only those subjects which are perceived as providing some doubtful economic benefit) remain. This approach does not take into account the integrated nature of specialist learning from pre-NCEA years into NCEA.	The loss of liberal arts subjects such as Classical Studies and Art History as separate subjects within the range of subjects on offer to be subsumed under History (clearly now the winning subject under this system) is appalling. By attaching perceived economic value to certain subjects and attaching status only to those ignores the very values the Ministry of Education supposedly espouses. Why is Religious Studies accorded separate status but Classical Studies not? To completely destroy one language, Latin, at the stroke of pen is akin to cultural genocide. This subject underpins our New Zealand culture (as part of bi-cultural society). There are other subjects with fewer numbers and yet they are provided support. I am outraged by this proposed structure. Classical Studies, Art History and Latin must remain as separate supported subjects as they have the same status any of the subjects currently taught. Ministry functionaries are not the arbiters of their value.	I refer to my comments above. Latin, Classical Studies and Art History must remain as subjects that are supported in their entirety as they currently stand. These remain vital parts of the way we value our culture and understand our society. Economic value is only one element in the way we educate our students. They deserve the opportunity to study subjects which they have a passion for. To shrink the richness of what we currently offer and distill it into some slender choices will inevitably mean students will have a dimmer view of the world. The citizens of this country deserve better than what has been offered up here.	No		2020-06-19 16:42:29	ANON-YFPW-RC39-7	2020-06-19 16:42:29	2020-06-19 16:42:48	
Yes		Strongly disagree	I took Latin in college. It was (and still is) a subject that I valued - both for the cultural and grammatical learning components.	As mentioned above, I strongly disagree with the decision to remove Latin. Although not many students choose to take Latin - primarily due to a lack of teachers - it is such an interesting and important subject.	Latin	No		2020-06-19 16:49:27	ANON-YFPW-RC36-N	2020-06-19 16:49:27	2020-06-19 16:49:40	

Yes		Strongly disagree	The desire to combine Business Studies, Economics and Accounting into one course will in my opinion disadvantage students who wish to develop their interest in a particular subject area for example business studies. Students will not develop the basic levels of understanding in any of the three subjects which will disadvantage them in terms of their ability to specialise at Level 2. If the foundations are not laid at Level 1 then we can expect less students to be interested in developing their business/entrepreneurial skills as the demands of the subject at Level 2 will be greater than other subjects where they are able to develop skills at Level 1 for example History. This could disadvantage the country which is reliant on entrepreneurship to drive the economy forward and generate increased wealth.	N/A	No				2020-06-19 16:59:19	ANON-YFPW-RC3J-R	2020-06-19 16:59:19	2020-06-19 16:59:37	
No		Strongly disagree							2020-06-19 17:05:56	ANON-YFPW-RC3Q-Y	2020-06-19 17:05:56	2020-06-19 17:06:04	
No		Strongly disagree							2020-06-19 17:18:54	ANON-YFPW-RC3E-K	2020-06-19 17:18:54	2020-06-19 17:18:59	
Yes		Undecided	Agree that there is a need for a foundational education platform at NCEA L1 but note that Financial Capability and entrepreneurial skills are not included as necessary skills to be developed at NCEA L1. These skills are essential in today's world and an understanding of Commerce and financial capability are fundamental to day to day activities of all citizens.	Business skills and financial capability should be included at NCEA L1 as these skills are necessary for everyday living and will strengthen the ability of teenagers to make their choices for level 2 and 3, and the decisions they make as part time workers in their higher secondary school years.	Financial Capability. Inclusion of Financial Capability as a Achievement Standards based subject will enable students to acquire skills to make effective decisions that impact on their daily living and also on the more substantive decisions that will impact on their future eg. use of Kiwisaver, raising of mortgages and loans and hire purchase and rental situations.	No			2020-06-19 17:27:14	ANON-YFPW-RC35-3	2020-06-19 17:27:14	2020-06-19 17:27:36	
Yes		Disagree	The principles of selection are sound, but the implementation is misguided. See below for why Latin and Classics should be retained at all levels.	Latin and Classical Studies should be retained throughout NCEA 1-3; their omission completely contravenes the ministry's own criteria for the inclusion of subjects. 1. Classics and Latin are in themselves broad and foundational subjects. Students get to examine the underpinnings of Western civilisation through a wide range of academic approaches: through history, art, language, archaeology, literature, linguistics, and the critical theory which knits these all together. Learning to use these approaches in tandem is a valuable skill, one which encourages flexible thinking, academic creativity, and attention to detail. 2. The subject matter of Classics and Latin is rich and important. The proportion of pre-20th Century western literature which lies steeped in Classical learning is enormous, and rendered more difficult and inaccessible to those without a grounding in Classics. Latin is practically important too: a great deal of ordinary and especially professional language is of Greco-Latinate derivation, which can be tough to learn without knowledge of their origins. Understanding even the most basic of Latin words can do wonders for reading ability and communication, two things		No			2020-06-19 17:27:41	ANON-YFPW-RC3P-X	2020-06-19 17:27:41	2020-06-19 17:28:01	
Yes		Undecided			As a teacher of tourism in a New Zealand secondary school I encourage the Ministry of Education to include 'Tourism Management' as a part of the achievement standard (AS) framework at level 2 and 3. 'Tourism as a multi-disciplinary, multi-method field of study is well suited to meet the changing complexities of societies. Tourism provides the platform for exciting, stimulating and highly relevant programmes of study' (Airey, 2019, p.261). At present, the depth of Tourism study in New Zealand schools is limited by the inflexible nature of unit standards in the requirements set, the content and methods used for assessment. This positions tourism as only a vocational rather than an academic pathway, however, both are important and offer opportunities for a diversity of students. Many students wish to be involved in considering issues critically and analytically and thinking creatively with their responses to a wider range of issues facing the tourism industry. Tourism is a remarkably resilient industry that has withstood previous global challenges; many countries, including NZ, are now taking the opportunity to reimagine tourism while		No			2020-06-19 17:29:20	ANON-YFPW-RC37-5	2020-06-19 17:29:20	2020-06-19 17:29:35

No		Strongly disagree	Speaking as a BSci university student, being able to 'specialise' science subjects as early as level one was extremely helpful. Looking back, the extra time spent learning these subjects (three subjects instead of all grouped together) gave me so much more insight and I'm shocked that this is even being considered. Like many students, I knew early on what I wanted my career to be and the old system gave an opportunity to harness this.		No				2020-06-19 17:33:18	ANON-YFPW-RC31-Y	2020-06-19 17:33:18	2020-06-19 17:33:32
Yes		Strongly disagree	I am concerned that the L1 Science Standards do not include important physics concepts. While I am fully supportive of initiatives to introduce options for projects which allow students to appreciate the relevance of science, it must not be the case that teachers/students have the option to not include key physics.	Physics is essential to addressing many of the challenges facing society whether it is climate change or solutions in health enabled by medical physics, and physics underpins many of Aotearoa NZ's leading technology companies such as Fisher and Paykel. I recognise that physics can be challenging for some teachers but the answer is not to be able to avoid or remove physics, but instead to support and resource all teachers so they are able to teach the extremely valuable skills which are gained through physics study. It is vital that the basic physics concepts and notion of mathematical modelling of phenomena is included at L1 to provide a grounding in these concepts for the majority of NZ youth.	Yes		No.		2020-06-19 18:14:15	ANON-YFPW-RC3Z-8	2020-06-19 18:14:15	2020-06-19 18:14:33
Yes		Strongly disagree	I do not support the proposed changes to no longer offer Classics at Level 1 and to no longer offer Latin at all.	Classics should be included at Level 1. It is not a specialised subject. Rather it is a multi-disciplined subject that provides students with a broad based education in an incredibly wide range of disciplines such as religion, psychology, philosophy, drama, art and architecture, literature, science and history. No other subject provides this. Classics at Lv 1 is not offered at our school because students only have either 1 or 2 options left after their compulsory subjects - which often includes 2-3 science subjects. The move to a more generalised science course finally provides the opportunity to offer a Lv 1 Classics course. Latin is the basis for the English language. At a time when it is acknowledged the importance of language to a understanding culture, I cannot fathom how this subject should be dropped. If anything it should be made compulsory to improve student command of the English language and thereby, for many, their ability to articulate themselves in a more meaningful way.	No				2020-06-19 18:16:48	ANON-YFPW-RC3H-P	2020-06-19 18:16:48	2020-06-19 18:17:13
Yes	This proposed system does not allow students to prepare adequately for a career in science, which requires two science options at level one in order to reach their potential. My students have often come from difficult backgrounds, and need opportunity to be exposed to more science at level one in order to prepare them for level two science. This plan will have serious knock-on effects to senior science subjects, and I am concerned that it will lead to 'dumbing down' senior sciences.	Strongly disagree	This proposed system does not allow students to prepare adequately for a career in science, which requires two science options at level one. There are three very academic level two subjects at level three, and any student from a disadvantaged background will not be prepared after one year eleven science course. My students have often come from difficult backgrounds, and need opportunity to be exposed to more science at level one in order to prepare them for level two science. This plan will have serious knock-on effects to senior science subjects, and further on to University and science development in New Zealand. Furthermore, limiting the number of science standards in the way seriously limits the ability for combined assessment, with is a significant benefit of the NCEA system.	This proposed system does not allow students to prepare adequately for a career in science, which requires two science options at level one. There are three very academic level two subjects at level three, and any student from a disadvantaged background will not be prepared after one year eleven science course. My students have often come from difficult backgrounds, and need opportunity to be exposed to more science at level one in order to prepare them for level two science. This plan will have serious knock-on effects to senior science subjects, and further on to science and technology development in New Zealand. Students can still come from several Arts subjects and many languages. While these subjects are important, keeping these options negates, in my mind, the theory of a board level one year, and it is very difficult to comprehend how this subject list came from the same theory that brought us one science class. I would love to see at least two sets of science standards. Possibly a set of Earth and Space Science standards that could include teaching ESS in biology/chemistry/physics contexts? This would allow us to mix and match courses between the proposed (disappointing) set of standards and a new set to form at least two science classes at level one for interested students to enroll in.	There absolutely must be all current science options at level two and three.	No			2020-06-19 18:40:36	ANON-YFPW-RC3B-G	2020-06-19 18:40:36	2020-06-19 18:41:04

Yes		Undecided		Travel and Tourism (Unit Standards) should be supplemented with a selection of Achievement Standards which will lead to university entrance.	I encourage the Ministry of Education to include 'Tourism Management' as part of the achievement standard (AS) framework at level 2 and 3. In advocating for 'Tourism Management' achievement standards I believe that Tourism Management offers opportunities to prepare students for a changing future which demands complex problem solving, critical thinking and creativity (World Economic Forum). 'Tourism as a multi-disciplinary, multi-method field of study is well suited to meet the changing complexities of societies. Tourism provides the platform for exciting, stimulating and highly relevant programmes of study' (Airey, 2019, p.261). In a post-Covid period tourism will play a vital role. "Tourism at international level is expected to grow in the coming years. This presents both an opportunity and a challenge at the same time. The opportunity is to invest and create quality job opportunities in the tourism sector. The challenge is that, in order to support the expected growth and to achieve tourism sector competitiveness and sustainability, UNWTO Member States need the right tourism human capital base that meets current and future market demands	No		No	2020-06-19 18:48:00	ANON-YFPW-RC3M-U	2020-06-19 18:45:56	2020-06-19 18:48:07
Yes		Strongly disagree	As a subject specialist, I strongly disagree with the removal of Latin and Level 1 Classics. I general, I would like to see the curriculum planned in partnership and with respect for the opinions of classroom teachers - I know my Science colleagues are concerned about changes in their subject area, and I wish for their voices to be heard. I am concerned that educational opportunities be viewed not solely as pathways to employment but as a way to build well-rounded people who are of benefit to society	I strongly disagree with the exclusion of Latin from the proposed NCEA subject list. Learning Latin to NCEA Level 3 has led me directly to a lifelong love of languages and to studying French, German, Te Reo Maori, Mandarin Chinese and Japanese. The linguistic analysis skills that Latin taught me have led to confidence with languages, and a rich, interesting and useful life teaching English in France, teaching Latin in New Zealand, and now also teaching French and Japanese as a secondary school teacher. I do not believe I would have learnt the grammatical meta-analysis skills that gave me that confidence if I had not learnt Latin at high school. Latin provides the fundamentals of grammar that support learning of all other languages at Level 2 and 3, and vocabulary and syntax that greatly facilitate the learning of all Romance languages. Latin at NCEA Level 1 provides access to specialist subjects such as Medicine, Pharmacy, Dentistry, Zoology, Botany and Law at tertiary level. Schools that recognise the value of Latin will continue to offer it if they can afford to, contributing to increased inequality of opportunity across all these subjects. Learning Latin at NCEA level contributes to a	Yes			2020-06-19 19:14:18	ANON-YFPW-RC3D-J	2020-06-19 19:14:18	2020-06-19 19:14:30	
Yes	One of the advantages of NCEA is the ability to specialise in a particular learning area of skill and interest. To generalise the curriculum and effectively eradicate important subjects including art history, psychology, media studies, Latin and classics is to completely counteract this advantage of the curriculum which, in my and many fellow students' cases, led to the selection of NCEA as the secondary qualification of choice over IB and Cambridge. Students have plenty of opportunity to study disciplines at a general level before commencing NCEA. To generalise necessarily sacrifices valuable content that could be taught in a dedicated subject throughout a whole year. Moreover, for certain subjects it is ideal to have as much time as possible developing subject-specific skillsets before going on to one's tertiary education and eventual career. Specialisation at school is directly transferrable to a tertiary level, where papers become even more specialised based on expected knowledge from secondary school and associated skills.	Strongly disagree	Subjects should be kept separate as they have been previously rather than generalised. Being able to specialise earlier from Level One or Two gives students the opportunity to have greater depth of understanding of the subjects they are passionate about. That may be studying double science, or multiple types of social science or commerce subjects. Each particular discipline, while seemingly similar, has its own skillset available - it is naive to conflate many of the proposed new, general subjects. For example, classical studies and modern history entail very different types of media in their primary skill analysis. Biology, chemistry and physics each entail different logical skills entirely - it is necessary to cultivate each skillset early for several careers including medicine and engineering. In the case of science, I think it is important to offer generalised core science for students who may feel less confident or want to broaden their disciplines (as I did), but should also be offered in individual subjects. When I was at school, double science for Level One was one of the most popular option choices and led directly to tertiary excellence in the sciences.	- As the historical foundation of Western society's politics, art, literature, architecture, philosophy, and language, I am horrified that the New Zealand Ministry of Education plans to discontinue NCEA classics at Level One and Latin at all levels. - Latin forms the linguistic roots of over 60% of English words, including over 90% of scientific or technological terms. Accordingly, the study of Latin can directly assist several tertiary degrees and careers in modern languages, medicine and law (to name a few). - Latin and classics have aided and enriched my university degrees and hugely contributed to my academic success, including study of advanced French and essay writing. As a postgraduate law student, it is because of Latin that I am able to recall the names and content of legal concepts with Latin names with relative ease compared to the rest of my cohort. When learning new languages in my free time, I am quick to pick up new phrases and sentence structure because of the key grammar lessons learnt in the Latin classroom. - Studying Latin is concurrently beneficial to other secondary subjects. Because I studied Latin	No			2020-06-19 19:32:59	ANON-YFPW-RC3X-6	2020-06-19 19:32:59	2020-06-19 19:33:21	

Yes		Strongly disagree	Do not agree with getting rid of accounting at level 1. What on earth is meant by "practical constraints" at level 1? The subject is taught using a manual accounting process. And access at level 2? No idea, unless you mean one standard of doing computer accounting. My concerns are that accounting is a discipline in its own right. Students will be taught a watered down version if they are lucky as some teachers without the requisite knowledge (through no fault of their own) teach economics and business studies. If you get rid of accounting at level 1 then students will find it much more difficult to take it up at level 2 or level 3.	Do not get rid of accounting at level 1. If this goes, then the subject may very well die, as students will be less likely to pick it up at level 2. You may as well call Commerce just Business Studies.		No			2020-06-19 19:36:40	ANON-YFPW-RC3A-F	2020-06-19 19:36:40	2020-06-19 19:36:54
No	I was not aware of this change to the curriculum, and quite frankly it is disappointing to see subjects like Latin and Classical studies being removed.	Strongly disagree	The removal of Latin and Classical studies is extremely disappointing to see, as these are subjects enjoyed by a diverse range of students. The insights gained through learning Latin and learning about the ancient world are unmatched, giving students a far greater understanding of the mechanics of civilisations, history and the whole human condition. As a student who studied both these subjects, I find it offensive that NZQA is removing the choice at Level 1 to explore one's intellectual curiosities through fascinating and stimulating subjects such as Latin. Being LGBT+, this decision particularly offends me, as I am all too familiar with the erasing of diversity for 'the common good'. Instead, mediocrity and generalisation is being encouraged. I would hope that NZQA will see sense and encourage students to 'branch out'.	I strongly disagree with the removal of Latin and Classical Studies. Latin provides an insight into the language and culture of Ancient Rome, which many students take a lot out of. Learning about the Ancient World provides insight that not many other subjects offer, and we can learn how similar and different ancient peoples were to us. Latin also taught me proper grammar, which I have found very useful in studying English and French at high school. Along with these reasons please refer to my above comment for further reasons for my support of Latin.	Latin should be retained and developed at these levels, and should also be retained at Level 1.	No		I think it is fantastic that Te Marautanga o Aotearoa is being developed and expanded, the curriculum requires more subjects focused on Maori topical areas, as we are a bicultural/multicultural nation bounded by Te Tiriti. I support the development of the whole curriculum, and I do not think that Latin should be axed at Level 1 to cap the number of subjects, just because new subjects are being added.	2020-06-19 19:40:30	ANON-YFPW-RC3N-V	2020-06-19 19:40:30	2020-06-19 19:40:35
Yes	Have been aware as I'm a member of the classics community and have been aware of the anger of people who don't want classics and Latin to be cut.	Strongly disagree	Latin and classics shouldn't be cut at any level and it's important that students get to try these courses at level 1 for education and because many students do enjoy these courses and should get the opportunity to take subjects they enjoy.	Keep classics and Latin have said reasons above.	More content and interest in furthering Latin and classics. Civics courses should be introduced as it's important for students to understand politics.	No			2020-06-19 19:40:52	ANON-YFPW-RC3K-S	2020-06-19 19:40:52	2020-06-19 19:41:05
No	I had no idea that the change to a broad, more foundational educational education at Level 1 had been mooted.	Strongly disagree	I am very disappointed at this plan. By Year 11 students are ready for subject specialisation. It is disappointing to see some subjects dropped off the current list. I believe that the proposal will make it harder to engage students. For example, I am opposed to the idea of merging Level 1 Classical Studies into a broader History subject. This move will deprive students of taking both Classical Studies and History at Level 1. I am also opposed to the idea of merging the merging of Commerce subjects into a single Commerce subject.	I think it is a retrograde step to merge Classical Studies into a broader History subject. I teach both of these subjects. While some of the skills needed are common to the two subjects, I believe that the subjects are too different to be merged successfully. Classical Studies does contain some Ancient History. But it also contains some art and literature which would not fit neatly into History. What we will probably be left with will be a watered down version of the two subjects that does neither full justice. The students that currently take Classical Studies at Level 1 do so because they enjoy the idea of learning about the history and culture of Ancient Greece and Rome in some depth. It is disappointing that they might be denied this in future because some panel somewhere has decided that Classical Studies should not be on the Level 1 list. I am in favour of adding new subjects such as Maori Performing Arts to the Level 1 list. I just wish that these new subjects were not being added at the expense of others. It makes no sense to me that Religious Studies is retained as a separate subject while Classical	I would urge those making the decisions to retain subjects like Classical Studies, Latin and Art History as separate subjects. I would also like subjects like Economics and Accounting to remain as separate subjects.	No			2020-06-19 19:52:28	ANON-YFPW-RC3G-4	2020-06-19 19:52:28	2020-06-19 19:52:54
Yes		Disagree		don't get rid of Latin	Latin and ancient Greek Classics are a great platform to learn from	No			2020-06-19 19:54:42	ANON-YFPW-RC3R-Z	2020-06-19 19:54:42	2020-06-19 19:54:49
No		Undecided				No			2020-06-19 21:05:10	ANON-YFPW-RC3W-5	2020-06-19 21:05:10	2020-06-19 21:05:29

Yes	I teach Home Economics and I was aware of the RAS but I was surprised for it to be replaced by Food Science which seems specialised at Level 1 when Science at level one is going to be generic and not specialised??	Agree	NZC is a great document that should underpin our subjects	If we are to think future focus and the thought of Home Economics seems a bit old fashion then change it but don't change the core of a subject that is essential learning for our youth in a country that has such poor levels of health being the third most obese country and a high rate of diet related diseases. We need to be teaching nutrition and the basic skills of cookery so they can learn the fundamentals that will last students a lifetime. Specialising with food science at level 1 is narrowing and why would students take a specialised subject. We don't need an over supply of food scientists and this students will take the three sciences physics, I'm perplexed to know why there hasn't been any consultation with our subject association. Why such a major shift. At our school we teach nearly 300 students a week at Palmerston North Girl's High School in our Dept. We are the biggest option subject in our school. We call it Food and Nutrition and we make it fun, enjoyable and relevant to our students. Many students lack the knowledge and skill to understand the nutrition behind the food they eat or how to prepare balanced healthy meals. Losing this would be a huge detriment to our youth. We need to prepare them for the future and Home Economics is a subject still taught in over 75	Course that offer a wide variety of applications from different faculties. High order shining and problem solving along with having to be adaptable. Future focus.	No			2020-06-19 21:58:25	ANON-YFPW-RC34-2	2020-06-19 21:58:25	2020-06-19 21:58:52
Yes	However I would like to state according to the NZC The core strand, Nature of Science, is required learning for all students up to year 10. The other strands provide contexts for learning. Over the course of years 1-10, science programmes should include learning in all four context strands. Students in years 11-13 are able to specialise in one or more science disciplines, depending on the choices offered in their schools. The achievement objectives in the context strands provide for strand-based specialisations, but a wider range of programmes is possible, for example, schools may offer programmes in biochemistry, education for sustainability, agriculture, horticulture, human biology, or electronics. (see, p29) A huge change has been proposed which will massively reduce the flexibility of science learning in schools. This will do nothing to raise the entry of students into STEM careers which really require a strong secondary background in science. This is a problem world wide and will place in a much worse position than the rest of the world when it comes to students being encouraged to pursue science based careers. Furthermore the change is being made (especially with the new ideological science standards) without any attempt to back map the	Strongly disagree	These changes are completely at odds with the NZC. These changes will not provide the high quality foundations for the future sciences of chem, bio, phys and earth science. The new proposals have totally flipped the focus to be more about assessing the Nature of Science Strand . This is poor decision. Good interweaving of NOS strands in content teaching and learning provides that quality of science learning and building capability for the future. The knowledge is more important than assessing the skills as build a scientist of the future. This will force many schools to make y11 science optional and therefore cost our future standing in the world.	Chemistry, Biology, Physics and Earth and Space Science should stand with equal importance to Agricultural and Horticultural Science and Science General. You are dumbing down the learning if you do this and committing the country to greater limitations in science careers. Examination of the content of these key disciplines are essential learning in level 1. I can quote Sir Peter Gluckman: There are at least two distinct objectives of science education at secondary school – the first is that of pre-professional education which is traditionally for careers needing science, usually arranged around mathematics, physics, chemistry, biology and perhaps general science. The second is the citizen-focused need for all children as they mature to have a clear understanding of the complex world of science that they will confront as citizens over the next 60 years of their lives. Whilst some of the proposed changes may focus on increasing some of the citizen science capability it will come at the expense of the essential body of knowledge needed for students to be able to specialise in year 12 and beyond. Trimming science (thats what this is) will only serve to make the jump into year 12 even harder	No nothing new. You must retain the bio, chem, phys and ESS areas of study and appropriate standards in line with what we have. This change is absolutely pointless. Interesting that Digital technology is retained at level 1. Does this mean you see website design and coding as more important than bio, chem, ess and phys. If so that is a mistaken vision for the future. Students need to know stuff and understand stuff and be able to explain across the science disciplines. What we have now does the job perfectly well. General Science, Phy, chem, bio, ess need to stay.	No		2020-06-19 22:19:53	ANON-YFPW-RC3T-2	2020-06-19 22:19:29	2020-06-19 22:20:01	
Yes	In principle this sounds good. In practice the removal of subject areas creates issues with assessment in Unit and Achievement Standards. Potentially I was expecting the Ministry to put forward a solution that was not the "Removal" of subject areas but to alter process of how students accomplish L2. Fewer Standards and Units in L1 or altering these to focus them as a ladder. As is the proposal does not address what will happen with content from L1 e.g. Accounting/Economics.	Strongly disagree	The proposal as itself is incomplete and demonstrates a lack of understanding of where our learners are at. There is no "broadening" within the proposal rather a "trimming" of certain subjects. The most obvious in my area of Business, Accounting and Math. The proposal assumes that the skills and characteristics of a student interested in Accounting are the same as a person in "Business". As is most students already have a relatively strong understanding of what they like or don't like at Y10, by L1 if forced into a subject then motivation is the largest challenge. Y10 already has a plethora of broad content for student to decide between so "broadening L1" or trimming it is not going to help.	Business - Accounting - Economics changes to Commerce. These are three distinct areas and at L1 could be bolstered by using these to support low end Math achievers. All three subjects require basic Mathematics. Your three types of students are vastly different. If you continue to mix these in L1 then essentially the Ministry is guaranteeing the decline of these subjects. If you wish to provide breadth the list needs to increase not decrease. An obvious area would be in the appropriate use of software for desired applications. E.g. Report writing for Word, Excel for graphing or Tables. These skills are lacking entirely. After 17 years in the private corporate sector it is now evident why students don't have the "basic" technological skills.	No specifically. The focus needs to be at L1 and how it prepares for L2 and L3	No		2020-06-19 22:28:00	ANON-YFPW-RC33-1	2020-06-19 22:28:00	2020-06-19 22:28:15	

No	No, but I agree with the decision.	Undecided	I agree and disagree.	I find the removal of classics a missed opportunity for students. I completed this in level 2 as it was not offered in level one but feel as though having the opportunity to complete it in level one would have made for a smoother transition to level two. This is a very interesting subject which provides a diverse culture that students may have never considered learning about. Additionally, I disagree with the combination of Health and Physical Education. These being joined prior to NCEA makes sense, but when students get older they should be able to choose one or the other. In my opinion, although they can cross over, they are very different.		No			2020-06-19 23:22:05	ANON-YFPW-RC32-Z	2020-06-19 23:22:05	2020-06-19 23:22:27
Yes		Undecided				No			2020-06-20 01:00:25	ANON-YFPW-RC3U-3	2020-06-20 01:00:25	2020-06-20 01:00:52
No		Strongly disagree	Classics (including Latin and Greek) are ESSENTIAL subjects and teach many more transferable skills than Modern Languages. Classics subjects should be taught at all levels!	Latin should NOT be removed! It is one of the most important subjects a child can learn and provides many useful skills that cannot be gained from modern languages		No			2020-06-20 01:08:43	ANON-YFPW-RCDY-R	2020-06-20 01:08:43	2020-06-20 01:08:49
No		Strongly disagree		I am extremely concerned about the proposal to remove Latin from the target subject list and to merge Classical Studies with History. I strongly urge retaining both Latin and Classical Studies as separate subjects for the following reasons: 1. General: I reject the commonly expressed view that the teaching of the classical Greco-Roman world, including the Latin language, is irrelevant to the New Zealand experience or – worse – that it is elitist. I would urge anyone sceptical about the extent of the cultural connection between the two worlds to read, for introductory purposes, the excellent collection Athens to Aotearoa: Greece and Rome in New Zealand Literature and Society (ed. Burton, Perris and Tatum, Victoria University Press, 2017). The essays in this volume argue persuasively that the classical tradition is in fact foundational to everyday life in New Zealand, and permeates it in a variety of diverse areas. These range from the more well-known literary influences to New Zealanders' memorialisation of their war dead, and even to locally produced television series such as Xena: Warrior Princess. 2. Linguistic: A considerable part of everyday English vocabulary derives ultimately from Latin. Knowledge of Latin also complements and assists		No			2020-06-20 02:08:42	ANON-YFPW-RCDV-N	2020-06-20 01:38:04	2020-06-20 02:10:23
Yes	The criteria for breadth 'should' be more transparent. How exactly is the elimination and merging of certain subjects encouraging breadth? Surely, streaming students down fewer avenues serves to do the very opposite? The decisions which have been proposed seem to align more appropriately to financial rationalisation rather than 'breadth' or 'foundational' education. If that's the true reason, then be plain rather than try to gaslight the community into thinking that the abolition of certain subjects, students' learning avenues and teachers' livelihoods is somehow founded in a greater good...	Strongly disagree		It is deeply disappointing to see Art History and Latin be removed wholly from the curriculum. I'm concerned for the students' rights to a liberal education that can augment their intellect overall. How exactly are the foundations of art interpretation and understanding its historical context, or the foundational language of western civilisation still in use in scientific, academic and linguistic contexts not appropriate for Level 1? What of the teachers of these subjects? What provisions are being left to them? The motivations here appear arbitrary rather than borne from an actual desire to develop students further.	Will art history become a strand of history, then? Classics and Classical languages generally should be standalone and not as a subset of history. To cut these subjects out of the curriculum entirely is to do a disservice to current and future students in giving them an avenue of knowledge that links them to the wider global community let alone helps them understand centuries of western thought.	Yes			2020-06-20 03:57:40	ANON-YFPW-RCD2-C	2020-06-20 03:57:40	2020-06-20 03:58:25
Yes		Disagree		I support keeping classical studies		Yes			2020-06-20 04:04:04	ANON-YFPW-RCDS-J	2020-06-20 04:04:04	2020-06-20 04:04:25
No		Strongly disagree	Latin should not be removed from the curriculum and Classics should also have a more prominent place. I am Classically educated and have found it gave me a good general basis to ensure success in an ever changing market.	Latin should not be removed from the curriculum and Classics should also have a more prominent place. I am Classically educated and have found it gave me a good general basis to ensure success in an ever changing market.		No			2020-06-20 06:13:03	ANON-YFPW-RCD8-Q	2020-06-20 06:13:03	2020-06-20 06:13:11
Yes		Strongly agree				Yes			2020-06-20 08:00:28	ANON-YFPW-RCD9-R	2020-06-20 08:00:28	2020-06-20 08:00:45
No		Undecided		Latin really should be included. Learning Latin taught me so much as a child - a range of skills I hadn't picked up anywhere else and a deeper understanding of language and history.		No			2020-06-20 08:57:34	ANON-YFPW-RCDG-6	2020-06-20 08:57:34	2020-06-20 08:57:46
No		Strongly disagree		Latin should definitely be included. I was an English teacher and it is such a fundamental help when learning/expanding knowledge and use of English. It should not be compulsory, but definitely offered. Also, I spent much of my career teaching gifted and talented students, and saw a distinct correlation between those good at maths and/or music, especially boys, and enjoyment of Latin. Just my opinion - but it appears that you want to dumb things down. Latin is not for everyone, but for some it is a very important subject, especially those going on to study other languages.	Not sure if this is the right place for this feedback but science needs to be taught in its separate strands, in my opinion.	No			2020-06-20 09:13:27	ANON-YFPW-RCDQ-G	2020-06-20 09:13:26	2020-06-20 09:13:35

No		Undecided		There are a great many subjects and elements of these subjects that are important to give students a balanced knowledge of our history and how it intersects with broader world history (for instance Latin is the language from which almost all modern phraseology is derived. Language, linguistics, and the cultural changes they informed are very much a part of our history and should be taught in schools. As should the history of our Constitutional Monarchy; the Treaty shows us how we came to have a Monarchy but it does not teach how that Monarchy and Western Democracy evolved over centuries before spreading to NZ. The origins of NZ's constitutional arrangements are crucial to understanding our history itself and should also be taught. The life of King Charles I and the Reformation period etc all informed the system of Government that was later adopted by NZ when the Treaty was signed.)	Civics Education is crucial if we are to get more young people actively involved and interested in politics and the affairs of our country. This also complements the need for NZ history to be taught in a broader global context, we must compare and contrast our own history with that of other nations and peoples to understand it better.	No				2020-06-20 09:15:10	ANON-YFPW-RCDE-4	2020-06-20 09:15:10	2020-06-20 09:15:20
No		Strongly disagree		Latin is a language that has helped me develop my English grammar, and understand more about how languages work. It is a language I truly enjoy taking at school, as do my peers. I disagree strongly with taking Latin out of the curriculum as it is really important that we continue to study our languages' roots so that we may all become better at speaking and presenting ourselves. A large proportion of the widely thought "most intelligent" people in positions of power have taken Latin during their time at school. Not only will taking Latin out of our curriculum lower the amount of people who are able to learn lots of languages fast, it will take many Latin teachers out of one of their beloved jobs.		No				2020-06-20 09:45:54	ANON-YFPW-RCDE-M	2020-06-20 09:45:54	2020-06-20 09:46:09
No		Undecided	I support the inclusion and improvement of te reo and tikanga learning. I am uncertain why religious studies should be included in the national curriculum, in a country where almost 50% of people state they have 'no religion' (2018 Census). I do not support the inclusion of religious studies at state schools.	I strongly oppose the removal of Latin from NCEA Level 1. Students going on to study any science benefit hugely from a grounding in Latin. Botany, zoology and medicine - and law - all require an understanding of Latin, without which a student is trying to learn a completely unfamiliar language and its conventions on top of the subject matter of their chosen field. This disadvantage would be greatly increased for ESOL students and first-generation English speakers, reducing opportunity even further for many who are already disadvantaged and under-represented in STEM, and in law. Additionally Latin is the root of French, Italian, Spanish, and much of English. Students who learn it will be able to pick up a whole suite of other languages with ease. I note that French and Spanish are still included on the proposed curriculum (which is a Latin word btw). I also oppose the weakening of art history and classical studies. These subjects provide a broad understanding of history - politics, social justice, religions, power structures and class struggles, in a way that allows a personal, not abstract, connection. An appreciation of other cultures and other times is at the root of tolerance, social justice and anti-racism in our society.		No				2020-06-20 09:53:07	ANON-YFPW-RCDF-F	2020-06-20 09:53:07	2020-06-20 09:53:21

Yes		Strongly disagree	A broad foundational Level 1 suggests that subjects provided at Level 1 will enable students to specialise into a wide variety of subjects in Levels 2 and 3. However, some of the subjects that have been removed at Level 1 don't allow for students to start those subjects later in life. They prevent students from ever being able to study those subjects. There is no broader subject for Latin at Level 1, enabling students to start it/continue it at Level 2.	Latin should not be removed at Level 1. This means it will not be available at Levels 2 or 3. New Zealand wants its education to be world-class. By removing latin, NZ education will no longer be world-class seeing as other countries in the world have not removed latin. This means that from now on, no one in NZ will even learn latin. Have we therefore seen the last generation of NZ latin knowers? In 60-ish years, there will not be a single person in NZ who knows latin! When in the rest of the world, people have still been learning latin? They will be a step ahead of us forever. Latin requires hard-work and is seen by world-wide, prominent employers as the bonus on someone's CV. It's not only the knowledge of latin that employers seek, but the skills that someone must have developed to learn it. Someone who has learnt latin shows that they understand meticulous details, that they can work hard, that they have strong language skills and it shows they don't fit into the normal mould. Furthermore, students who choose latin, love it. Many of the latin students are people who struggle to find their niche and latin provides it for them. They find people who are like them, whose brain works like theirs - they find their family at school when they haven't been able to find them in other subjects. NZ education is supposed to help	Philosophy would be a good subject to develop. It is a subject which is included in some curricula around the world and it has shown to broaden students' minds and understand various perspectives.	No			2020-06-20 10:35:40	ANON-YFPW-RCD7-P	2020-06-20 10:35:40	2020-06-20 10:35:54
No		Strongly disagree		Classics and art history are very important subjects on their own. I disagree with these subjects becoming a part of History as History is already a very broad subject.		No			2020-06-20 10:36:52	ANON-YFPW-RCDF-5	2020-06-20 10:36:52	2020-06-20 10:37:01
No		Undecided		I would be very sad to see Latin no longer available at high schools. Having studied Latin during the 1990s I can say it was an excellent foundation for learning other languages and for English grammar. Studying classical poetry was also far more useful for future text analysis than high school English, and I found my Latin classes provided a deeper and more enjoyable introduction to Greek / Roman history and mythology than Classics.	No comment-	No			2020-06-20 10:37:53	ANON-YFPW-RCD1-G	2020-06-20 10:37:53	2020-06-20 10:37:58
Yes	I think offering more subjects would be a better choice. The current number of subjects a student can take at high school level is too low and does not give them enough choices or a broad enough education. More subjects with fewer lessons would be more efficient and more effective at disseminating knowledge.	Disagree	I think that Latin is a very important option as it is a foundational language for many European languages and makes these easier to learn at a later stage or at the same time. It is also very useful for understanding the meaning of technical words, such as those used in science and medicine, amongst other subjects. In addition, Latin teaches a lot about ancient history, philosophy and legends, which are a good way of understanding people and the world. Similarly, Art History is an important subject which helps students understand aspects of people, history and psychology, as well as forms of expression, what lead to these, what resulted from them, and technological innovations. This subject should also continue to be offered, and likewise Classical Studies. Science is a very broad subject, and cutting it down to only one subject minimises its importance and the amount of learning taking place in science. Science is vitally important, and a knowledge of science is useful to everyone to avoid people being conned by unscientific claims, and to support innovation.	I think that Latin is a very important option as it is a foundational language for many European languages and makes these easier to learn at a later stage or at the same time. It is also very useful for understanding the meaning of technical words, such as those used in science and medicine, amongst other subjects. In addition, Latin teaches a lot about ancient history, philosophy and legends, which are a good way of understanding people and the world. Similarly, Art History is an important subject which helps students understand aspects of people, history and psychology, as well as forms of expression, what lead to these, what resulted from them, and technological innovations. This subject should also continue to be offered. Science is a very broad subject, and cutting it down to only one subject minimises its importance and the amount of learning taking place in science. Science is vitally important, and a knowledge of science is useful to everyone to avoid people being conned by unscientific claims, and to support innovation.	In addition to the subjects I mentioned above, I think psychology would be a good addition to the curriculum. Likewise, some basic understanding of law would be useful for students.	No	But it's obviously important.		2020-06-20 11:13:33	ANON-YFPW-RCDZ-5	2020-06-20 11:13:33	2020-06-20 11:13:44

Yes		Agree		<p>Latin and Classics - I use Latin to teach students how to spell in English and how to understand what complex words mean. I see every day how it helps students make fundamental connections both in language and in culture, and I would hate to see this opportunity be limited only to students who can afford private tutoring or who attend schools that can afford to bring someone in to teach a unit of Latin, or who come from an educated background in which they have access to this knowledge at home.</p> <p>Latin, like Classics at NCEA level introduces a study of the history of Pakeha systems of governance and law which have their roots in Roman culture. This is essential for the Pakeha cultural knowledge and self-awareness needed to understand Aotearoa New Zealand today and to be equipped to critique our colonial history.</p>	No				2020-06-20 11:25:01	ANON-YFPW-RCDH-7	2020-06-20 11:25:01	2020-06-20 11:25:22
Yes		Strongly disagree	See comments under 3	<p>There are 9 spoken and written "learning languages" listed. Virtually no student will have spoken or written fluency at the end of their school career. The value of their learning lies in a broadening of awareness of how language works, and in introducing other cultures. Most language study heavily favours the second. Latin exceptionally favours the first.</p> <p>For those with language interest and ability, Latin is brilliant at revealing how mental activity, both rational and emotional, works through language, and how language can channel thinking. On the cultural side, the increased emphasis on te reo and Maori culture is admirable, but as long as English is by far the most used language of our country, we must keep alive aspects of its own cultural history. Classes may be small but will contain students for whom this will be of lifelong benefit to themselves and to our country.</p>	No				2020-06-20 11:35:05	ANON-YFPW-RCDH-1	2020-06-20 11:35:05	2020-06-20 11:35:40
Yes		Strongly disagree	see comments under 3	<p>There are 9 spoken and written "learning languages" listed. Virtually no student will have spoken or written fluency at the end of their school career. The value of their learning lies in a broadening of awareness of how language works, and in introducing other cultures. Most language study heavily favours the second. Latin exceptionally favours the first.</p> <p>For those with language interest and ability, Latin is brilliant at revealing how mental activity, both rational and emotional, works through language, and how language can channel thinking. On the cultural side, the increased emphasis on te reo and Maori culture is admirable, but as long as English is by far the most used language of our country, we must keep alive aspects of its own cultural history. Classes in Latin may be small but will contain students for whom this will be of lifelong benefit to themselves and to our country.</p>	no				2020-06-20 11:42:38	ANON-YFPW-RCDH-C	2020-06-20 11:42:38	2020-06-20 11:42:55
Yes		Strongly disagree		<p>Need to include level 1 accounting. This provide the base skills for level 2 accounting. If you only provide economics and business studies in level 1 this will servey impact on accounting numbers at level 2 and 3.</p>					2020-06-20 11:44:38	ANON-YFPW-RCDD-3	2020-06-20 11:44:38	2020-06-20 11:44:51
Yes		Strongly disagree		<p>You must include accounting at level 1. This discipline is very different to Economics and business studies and skills taught at level 1 provide a vital foundation for level 2 onwards.</p>					2020-06-20 11:47:00	ANON-YFPW-RCDX-Q	2020-06-20 11:47:00	2020-06-20 11:47:05

Yes		Disagree	Please see my answer to question 3, below.	<p>I would like to protest the proposed exclusion of Latin as a subject for Level 1.</p> <p>I'd like to focus on four points here, but, briefly, a bit about me. I am getting admitted as a lawyer in July. I did Latin at school to year 13 in 2010; I have a BA/LLB(Hons), majoring in Latin and History, and a Diploma of Languages in Spanish and Russian.</p> <p>1. Latin cannot be taken up 'ab initio' at Level 2. Latin is a language which requires a considerable amount of basic knowledge before a learner gets to the fun part of translating Catullus or the Aeneid. At the moment, that basic knowledge is accumulated throughout years 9, 10 and 11, with most of the complex syntactical knowledge being taught in year 11. It is only in year 11 that students even begin to translate excerpts of classical authors' works. It would be absolutely impossible, even with the most motivated students in the world, to condense that grammar learning into two years in years 12 and 13.</p> <p>2. Latin still has significant relevance today.</p> <p>(a) In learning languages: I studied Latin and Spanish all through high school. My studies of Spanish were made significantly</p>	No				2020-06-20 11:51:32	ANON-YFPW-RCDZ-Z	2020-06-20 11:51:32	2020-06-20 11:51:45
No		Strongly disagree	Latin must be available as a subject	Latin must be available as a subject	No				2020-06-20 12:53:45	ANON-YFPW-RCDN-D	2020-06-20 12:53:45	2020-06-20 12:53:56
Yes		Strongly disagree	I disagree with the removal of Latin from the curriculum.	<p>Disagree with the removal of Latin. Removal at level 1 removes the subject from the curriculum. Languages are built on year by year and, unlike generic subjects such as history, cannot be picked up at later stages.</p> <p>Latin is more than a language course (great as that is). Latin teaches students about poetry, history, politics and art history; in this respect it is perhaps one of the most comprehensive subjects. It is one of the few subjects in which students learn grammar, and key skills in decoding, which are readily transferable to other coding/decoding areas. There is a strong evidence base for Latin correlating with improved study outcomes across all subjects (see US initiatives for teaching Latin to low decile area students).</p>	Continue Latin.	Yes	No		2020-06-20 12:56:40	ANON-YFPW-RCDK-A	2020-06-20 12:56:40	2020-06-20 12:57:00
No		Strongly disagree		<p>Art History should be considered a core subject for students to take. My college did not offer art history as a subject for NCEA in 2011. I decided to take it by correspondence on my own. I ended up furthering my education in the arts by majoring in Art History at Victoria University of Wellington. It teaches students important skills that are beneficial in the work force. To be able to think creatively, analyse and reflect on the past, allows you to offer different perspectives.</p>		No			2020-06-20 13:40:32	ANON-YFPW-RCD6-N	2020-06-20 13:40:32	2020-06-20 13:40:45
Yes		Strongly disagree	Disagree with the exclusion of Latin.	Latin is an extremely important language as a base for other languages and also understanding of ancient cultures.	No				2020-06-20 13:42:49	ANON-YFPW-RCDR-H	2020-06-20 13:42:49	2020-06-20 13:42:57

No		Strongly disagree		<p>I'm saddened at the prospect of Latin, Art History and Classics being removed from the curriculum. These are all subjects that enjoyed immensely at high school, and have, in some ways, proved more ongoing benefit over the years than things like chemistry! Perhaps they may seem 'dated' but not only are the subjects still interesting and relevant (in the right context) they offer a lot in terms of teaching how to think, research etc.</p> <p>My reasons for favouring these subjects include: - Classics is a unique topic, in that it combines studies of society, myths and legends, literature, poetry, language, art history, history, and architecture. Maybe I'm biased, because I went on to do Classical Studies (and Medieval studies) university, but I think it's a fascinating subject and an excellent base for a broad range of topics.</p> <p>- Art History is so useful for understanding art. I'm not artistic myself, so never pursued any subjects where I would have "done" art, but I got a lot from studying art history. It's made visits to galleries and museums over the years infinitely more interesting, gave me a structure for understanding how to learn about art, and I think it's tremendously valuable to understand the context and history around well-known works of</p>	No				2020-06-20 13:59:19	ANON-YFPW-RCDW-P	2020-06-20 13:59:19	2020-06-20 13:59:31
Yes	Yes I am, but I do not understand how this accounts for abolition of Latin	Strongly disagree	<p>No case has been made for the abolition of Latin. There is no information given in the consultation materials why Latin has been deselected.</p> <p>I'm the first to agree that Latin is not for everyone, and indeed at the moment is for very few. But that is not a reason in itself for deciding that no New Zealand children should study it at state schools.</p> <p>I like many who have studied Latin regard it as a great gift that I have treasured since I learnt it at Aotea College, Porirua in the 1980s. That school also gave me the gift of learning in a multi-cultural society. Both equipped me for an educational career that has taken me to great universities, and to serve as a law commissioner and law professor. They are both parts of my soul. I could write about what it taught me about languages and language learning, or grammar or logic, or helps me read ancient law books, but the most important thing is that it lit a love of learning. I have watched over the last 4 years with joy while I have seen my sons have the same experience. The sports of their large boys' college are not for them, but they have been privileged to have enjoyed the same gift that I had, and the teaching of gifted teachers. It is just not the role of the Ministry of Education to take that away from NZ kids like my sons. Yes there are other subjects that they ought to</p>		Yes				2020-06-20 14:25:04	ANON-YFPW-RCD4-K	2020-06-20 14:25:04	2020-06-20 14:25:29
Yes		Undecided	<p>I agree with the simplification of level one in science and mathematics. I disagree with the removal of Latin as a language option.</p>	<p>Removing Latin as a level one language option is short-sighted. While Latin is a small option in terms of the number of students who opt to learn it, all the reasons to teach, learn and test it remain. I studied Latin in high school two decades ago. I work in STEM. I still use frequently the skills I learnt through studying it, which no other subject choice covered.</p>	No				2020-06-20 14:39:19	ANON-YFPW-RCDT-K	2020-06-20 14:39:19	2020-06-20 14:39:29
Yes	I am aware of the proposed change but do not agree that the special characteristics of Physics Chemistry and Biology should be lost in Science.	Disagree	<p>The Science approach will mean some schools having a skewed curriculum towards one particular science rather than a broad balanced coverage of all three disciplines.</p>	<p>If there has to be a single Science subject then the matrix for completion of the award "Science" must include curriculum coverage of elements from all three major disciplines.</p>	No				2020-06-20 15:01:13	ANON-YFPW-RCD3-J	2020-06-20 15:01:13	2020-06-20 15:01:33

Yes	AUT Tourism Advisory Board submission The AUT Tourism Advisory Board (the Board) strongly encourages the Ministry of Education to include "Tourism Management" as part of the achievement standard (AS) framework at level 2 and 3.	Agree		AUT Tourism Advisory Board submission The AUT Tourism Advisory Board (the Board) strongly encourages the Ministry of Education to include "Tourism Management" as part of the achievement standard (AS) framework at level 2 and 3.	AUT Tourism Advisory Board submission The AUT Tourism Advisory Board (the Board) strongly encourages the Ministry of Education to include "Tourism Management" as part of the achievement standard (AS) framework at level 2 and 3. The Board is comprised of senior representatives from the private sector and has the unanimous support of its members in advocating for "Tourism Management" achievement standards. The Board has long recognised the importance of training a tourism workforce capable of creative, strategic, adaptive, and critical thinking. The sector is multidimensional, and our tourism education system must reflect this. It is not only about training a service-delivery workforce we must strive to produce visionary skilled leaders, managers, planners, and implementers. To be truly successful this must start at the secondary school level. Tourism is a significant part of the New Zealand economy, contributing over 20% of exports, 10% of GDP and employing nearly 400,000 people directly and indirectly. Although COVID-19 has impacted the tourism sector significantly there is little doubt it will recover over the coming years. To truly innovate and flourish in the future the sector	Yes			2020-06-20 15:08:25	ANON-YFPW-RCD2-H	2020-06-20 15:08:25	2020-06-20 15:09:03
Yes		Disagree	I agree with the principle but disagree with some of the decisions about dropping subjects altogether	I do not agree that Latin should be dropped from level 1. Learning a language is cumulative and by dropping Latin at level 1 it would effectively be cutting it out from the NCEA curriculum altogether. While Latin might not appear to be directly vocationally oriented because it is not a language spoken today, the skills and knowledge that are gained through learning Latin are in my view, useful for jobs that exist today and will exist in the future. The knowledge of word origins and the detailed use of grammar assist in improving written and spoken English communication skills - an essential skill today. As well, the identification of patterns, sequencing and attention to small details support skills needed in mathematics, other sciences and in my view provide a foundation for the types of skills needed in programming. Our child is likely to pursue a degree in science but is keen to continue Latin at university because her view is it helps her with both English and her Science		No			2020-06-20 15:20:23	ANON-YFPW-RCDU-M	2020-06-20 15:20:23	2020-06-20 15:20:34
No		Disagree	Seems like NCEA is continually being modified to suit the lowest common denominator. There needs to be challenge for above-average students. This is why top-schools and private schools are offering IB and Cambridge. Even if a subject is only being taken by a small number of students, it needs to be included if it can challenge our top academic students (eg Latin)	Latin should be retained. It has been a traditional academic school subject for teenagers for many generations past - for many reasons. It teaches logic, intellectual skill, problem solving, perseverance, grit and it widens students' worldviews. It's the basis of the West's intellectual and academic heritage. It helps with the learning of grammar and other languages. Much of English is derived from Latin. Many Latin words are used in fields such as medicine, science, horticulture, agriculture, veterinary studies. It has relevance to religious studies. It provides a challenge to learners. It's not for the majority of students but should be retained as an option for our brightest students. Our top-achieving state schools as well as the elite private schools continue to offer Latin through Cambridge or IB. Students whose parents can't afford to send them to those schools should be given equal opportunities to learn subjects such as Latin.		Yes			2020-06-20 15:26:59	ANON-YFPW-RCRY-6	2020-06-20 15:26:59	2020-06-20 15:27:15
Yes	A broad foundation should mean integrating all strands of the curriculum equally, serving as a sound stepping stone to specialisation in levels 2 and 3.	Strongly disagree	While I don't mind the idea of integrating all sciences together at level 1, I wholeheartedly disagree with the way the standards are constructed.	Integrating all sciences is fine, but the standards constructed defeat what I believe is their intended purpose. They require students to critically analyse foundational knowledge ideas that even year 13 students can struggle with. This will force us to choose very narrow, specific aspects of the curriculum so we have the time to teach the ideas deeply enough for this type of analysis. Much of the content we currently teach as a foundation for level 2 would be left out as a result, and students will therefore find it a very steep hill to climb into the various specialist subject areas.	Please keep Earth and Space Science, Physics, Chemistry and Biology as specialist subject areas. Physics standards should also include teaching heat/thermodynamics and buoyancy/Bernoulli's principle.	No			2020-06-20 15:27:24	ANON-YFPW-RCRV-3	2020-06-20 15:27:24	2020-06-20 15:27:44

Yes		Disagree	I disagree with the removal of Latin	Latin should be retained. Although Latin is not a spoken language anymore it enables students to develop many skills that will be useful for future employment. These include proficiency at English, knowledge of other languages, critical thinking, analytical reasoning and problem solving. It does this in the context of a rich insight into our historical foundations. There does not seem to be any reason why Latin could not be continued to be offered by schools that wish to do so and it is not clear from the rationale why this subject has been chosen for discontinuance.		No			2020-06-20 15:37:00	ANON-YFPW-RCRC-G	2020-06-20 15:37:00	2020-06-20 15:37:13
Yes		Disagree		It would be good to see Latin retained. Our students enjoy the challenge of Latin and want to be able to continue to study Latin.		Yes			2020-06-20 16:04:21	ANON-YFPW-RCRS-Z	2020-06-20 16:04:21	2020-06-20 16:04:30
No	I would query the word support..I was aware of discussions and note there was little consultation	Strongly disagree	My proposal is that the new technology subjects be named the following: Digital Technologies, Design and Visual Communication, Industrial or Product Technologies, Fashion and Textiles Technologies, Food Technologies. The NZQA insight data proposes to give an overview of subject usage trends for the subjects associated with the Technology Learning Area of the New Zealand Curriculum. However, the data actually shows student entries in Technology Achievement Standards strands - Digital Technologies and Hangarau Matihiko , DVC, Construction and Mechanical Technologies, Processing Technologies and not technology subjects where achievement standards may be selected across the Technology matrix and not from just one strand It is essential too that subjects are future focused, show progression from Y9 -13, representative, and reflect subject specific skills across Technology curriculum Rationale The rationale for the following subject changes are illustrated below which shows that subject specific knowledge is unique to each subject.	Justification for both Fashion and Textiles and Product/Industrial Technologies Both subjects are offered at Curriculum level 4 - 5 Each has specific knowledge and skills is unique to each subject Students are engaged in subjects where quality teaching and learning exists Students currently choose both subjects Y9-10 - where is the progression Students engage in authentic subject programmes where learning is specific to the subject area Enables discipline knowledge and capabilities At WGC students are engaged in a range of technologies and often choose multiple technologies When Fashion and textiles programmes are authentic , engage the local community ; students choose the subject. WGC is a decile 10 school yet Fashion and Textiles along with Product & Spatial design, Design Digital, Digital technologies are thriving Currently @ WGC - my departmental has three Fashion teachers which indicates the values of the programmes both from BOT, Board of trustees, Principal and Senior management. Fashion and textiles programmes not only offer an academic curriculum but also well being is a focus where students develop through their work	Generic technologies - why not have local curricula - school develop technology learning programmes and names which at WGC we currently do	Yes	Programmes of learning that reflect inclusivity/diversity/culture/ethics/identity	2020-06-20 16:12:25	ANON-YFPW-RCZK-Z	2020-06-10 09:29:06	2020-06-20 16:12:42	
Yes		Disagree	I do not support any dropping of Classical Studies	Level 1 students really enjoy Classical Studies. Removal would de-motivate students		No			2020-06-20 16:58:36	ANON-YFPW-RCR8-5	2020-06-20 16:58:36	2020-06-20 16:59:00
No	I know there is a change but not properly informed of the extent of it	Agree	Great ideas and initiatives	Latin should be included because this is part of the language used in law, and is highly valuable to those students seeking a law degree in university.	Include language studies such as Filipino because it is a growing migrant population in New Zealand and learning their culture will enhance the knowledge and appreciation of the Philippines	No	I haven't got to know about it since I studied in Year 12 when I arrived to study		2020-06-20 17:22:08	ANON-YFPW-RCR9-6	2020-06-20 17:22:08	2020-06-20 17:22:26
Yes		Strongly agree		No	This submission is on behalf of the School of Hospitality and Tourism at Auckland University of Technology (AUT) and advocates for the development of level 2 and 3 achievement standards in Tourism Management as part of the current review of achievement standards. The School of Hospitality and Tourism at AUT is ranked 34th in the world in the QS World University Subject Rankings 2020 and the Master of International Tourism Management is ranked the 18th best master's degree in the world for tourism by the Eduniversal Group. The School delivers tourism programmes at both undergraduate and postgraduate levels including PhD. The delivery of standalone tourism programmes at bachelors and masters level is recognition of AUT's commitment to tourism as a highly relevant field of study. Furthermore, the Bachelor of International Tourism Management has TedQual accreditation from the United Nations World Tourism Organisation (UNWTO). TedQual is the only international quality certification issued by the UNWTO for higher tourism education, training and research programmes. The importance of tourism to the economy and to the sustainable development of regional communities has never been more	Yes	Not at this time	2020-06-20 17:37:42	ANON-YFPW-RCRG-M	2020-06-20 17:37:42	2020-06-20 17:38:11	

Yes		Strongly disagree	I disagree that some areas of learning are being condensed into single areas. The main example being Science. Moving from 5 distinct areas to 1. This restricts the development of specialist focused courses, or extensions within science for interested students. This also limits the ability for schools to develop differentiated courses based on student needs.	I disagree that some areas of learning are being condensed into single areas. The main example being Science. Moving from 5 distinct areas to 1. This restricts the development of specialist focused courses, or extensions within science for interested students. This also limits the ability for schools to develop differentiated courses based on student needs. There should be specialist 'content/concept' based science standards offered. I am also appealed that there is not top down (back mapping) applied in the development of these standards. Surely it is important to review what skills are needed for success at levels 2 +3 and beyond. This is likely to generate an even greater step between level 1 and 2 sciences, and greater gaps in students conceptual knowledge. There is great risk that this will see a reduction in students pursuing STEM careers.	I disagree that some areas of learning are being condensed into single areas. The main example being Science. Moving from 5 distinct areas to 1. This restricts the development of specialist focused courses, or extensions within science for interested students. This also limits the ability for schools to develop differentiated courses based on student needs. There should be specialist 'content/concept' based science standards offered. I am also appealed that there is not top down (back mapping) applied in the development of these standards. Surely it is important to review what skills are needed for success at levels 2 +3 and beyond. This is likely to generate an even greater step between level 1 and 2 sciences, and greater gaps in students conceptual knowledge. There is great risk that this will see a reduction in students pursuing STEM careers.	No			2020-06-20 17:53:12	ANON-YFPW-RCRQ-Q	2020-06-20 17:53:12	2020-06-20 17:53:21
Yes		Strongly disagree	The current four standards for L1 Science do not adequately cover the key components of the essential learning in Physics as defined by the NZC. They also seem to be a poor fit for Chemistry. Parts of the changes are good, but the complete removal of previous skills is a worry and the lack of alignment to the essential learning required to move forward with the Sciences is a real problem.	L1 Physics, Chemistry and Biology should be retained as a subject. I am replying with the Physics content in mind. The current draft does not seem to guarantee any physics in the curriculum. Many teachers may opt Physics. The subject draws on both mathematics and requires conceptual understanding and the current standards do not assess either of these two essential areas directly. Moving onto more advanced physics in Level 2 will be problematic if core content from L1 is omitted, or not assessed adequately.	No.	Yes	No		2020-06-20 18:17:49	ANON-YFPW-RCRQ-X	2020-06-20 18:17:49	2020-06-20 18:18:03
No		Strongly disagree		I think it absolutely wrong to remove Level 1 Accounting, this is the first opportunity students get to take this subject and so much foundation is built in Level 1 for them to achieve good grades in Level 2 and 3. Students will be at a disadvantage if they have to learn all the content from Level 1 in the Level 2 programme. Accounting is a specialist subject with fantastic career opportunities. By taking out Accounting at Level 1 you are denying students the opportunity to experience this subject. My students love this subject and do very well and I have had many students go on to have great careers in the industry as a result of being exposed to it at Level 1. If Accounting is only available at Level 2 many students who have not been exposed to it at Level 1 will be reluctant to take it as a new subject as they also have to decide which of the sciences to take as that subject now splits into 3 different options which places Accounting at a huge disadvantage for so many reasons. Why would any student put them under pressure in year 12 to take on a completely new subject they have not had any exposure to.	No	Yes	No		2020-06-20 18:27:35	ANON-YFPW-RC5R-2	2020-06-19 14:25:43	2020-06-20 18:28:45
No		Strongly disagree	Latin needs to be retained to allow students to understand the 1000s of years of culture that they inherit	Latin is more than a subject for private schools. It opens more worlds and prepared the mind for the future. It is not a dead language but I've that resounds throughout history. It is not only the language of the Romans but that of the later western world.		No			2020-06-20 18:47:43	ANON-YFPW-RCRE-J	2020-06-20 18:47:43	2020-06-20 18:48:00
Yes	I think there needs to be a significant focus on numeracy, literacy, digital literacy and financial literacy.	Disagree	I am very worried there is now less choice for students.	I am very concerned that Accounting appears to disappear in this new structure. Young people's lack of financial literacy is well documented and this will make the problem worse. Without specific Commerce subjects being available at Year 11, the risk is that a "Commerce" course will become a watered down version of all three, and Accounting will disappear. There are clear tertiary pathways for all 3 Commerce courses, and a shortage of Accountants both in New Zealand and internationally. By combining all 3 subjects into a course called "Commerce" it restricts student choice, and I fear that we will lose specialist teachers who are vital in education.	Financial literacy	No			2020-06-20 18:49:07	ANON-YFPW-RCR5-2	2020-06-20 18:49:07	2020-06-20 18:49:19

No		Disagree	See comment at 3.	<p>I have comments on the removal of Latin and the partial removal of Art History and Classical Studies. Presumably this is a change based on the principle "Show clearer pathways to further education and employment". I'd like to speak briefly to how Latin and Art History do in fact provide such pathways. I am not surprised to see these subjects listed for exclusion and I recognise that there is currently limited uptake of these subjects in many New Zealand schools. However, I think it's important that we maintain even these less popular options exactly because they encourage those few students to imagine a career that our education system and probably our national culture as a whole would not otherwise suggest to them.</p> <p>Art History is crucial for any artist, any art curator, and any student of history. An international perspective on the history of art, not just in the West, but globally, is important for the development of any artist or curator. Artistic appreciation often goes in lockstep with artistic production and allows students to understand their artistic visions in context with the world around us. These are 'careers' and are careers in one of NZ's most important sectors and exports: the arts. Art History is also a form of 'history'.</p>	See above for the re-inclusion of Latin, Classics, and Art History.	No		It is my belief that any new subjects or subject groupings should not come at the cost of a core sense of what 'content' should be treated. Educational inequality is also in part an inequality of knowledge and any fair curriculum must make sure to address the disparity between the content knowledge of high and low decile students.	2020-06-20 19:18:13	ANON-YFPW-RCRP-W	2020-06-20 19:18:13	2020-06-20 19:18:29
Yes		Agree	credit worth is another aspect I would like to see change on. A lot of work is expected for relatively little achievement standard credits in level 1 Geography for example.	I notice that there is a lot of subject changes for some learning areas and not others. (e.g. science). Is a single science at level 1 going to be sufficient in building student capacity for specialist areas in level 2?	what might integrated studies in level 1,2, 3 look like vs UR requirements at level 3 ?	No			2020-06-20 20:40:37	ANON-YFPW-RCRP-4	2020-06-20 20:40:37	2020-06-20 20:40:44
Yes		Strongly disagree	Some of the proposals make sense (such as consolidating the different science subjects under one general science subject), but I strongly oppose removing Latin from the list of NCEA level 1 subjects, and also oppose removing Classical Studies.	<p>Learning Latin has been hugely influential for me - being able to read Latin has given me access to a wealth of literature, which has been both a joy and an important avenue of intellectual inquiry. It has been a window via primary sources into centuries of history. Perhaps most importantly, learning Latin sparked a lifelong love of languages and literature.</p> <p>Learning Latin also gave me a foundation for understanding and analysing English grammar which was lacking in English courses at school. The analytical tools that come from internalising a linguistic structure markedly different from English have also been assets in learning other languages, not only in my studies of French and Spanish at school alongside Latin, but also in my more recent studies in te reo Māori. Learning Latin need not compete with learning modern languages; in my experience, it makes the language learning process easier, even when learning a language unrelated to Latin.</p> <p>Latin and Latin texts are foundational to European literature, philosophy, science, law, and other intellectual traditions, and direct access to texts in the original language is crucial to a deep understanding of these texts. The best time to</p>		No			2020-06-20 20:46:32	ANON-YFPW-RCRP-K	2020-06-20 20:46:32	2020-06-20 20:46:40

Yes		Agree	<p>The following discusses the proposal to combine Biology, Chemistry, Earth and Space Science, and Physics into a single Science subject.</p> <p>Combining Biology, Chemistry, Earth and Space Science, and Physics into a single Science subject and giving students equal exposure, emphasis is on "equal", could in theory mean that students keep their pathway options into any of the 4 science disciplines open. It could further encourage interdisciplinary thinking and allow to show case the connections between the different disciplines of science. Science as a subject lends itself also well to incorporate Mātauranga Māori. It could mean that there is some overlap between content taught in Sciences and Agricultural and Horticultural Science, both agriculture and horticulture being strongly linked to biology, however the overlap would not be substantive enough to warrant concerns. There is no overlap in assessment standards.</p> <p>My concern with the current proposal is with regards to how Science will provide a robust pathway into NCEA level 2 and this is closely linked to the sector's capability to deliver Science as one subject in a way it is intended. (Please, see question 3, for rationale)</p>	<p>It has been noted that Science as a subject finds little uptake at NCEA level 2 and NCEA level 3. In 2018 only 141 (or 325) students chose Science as a subject level 2 and 18 (or 43) students at level 3. (Numbers were taken from the Insight Report Summary-Science learning area, there seems to be a discrepancies between numbers in Figure 1 and Figure 2) So, in itself Science does not constitute a robust pathway into a subject "Science" at level 2 and level 3 and thus the subject Science at level 1 was only examined below with the question in mind "does it provide a robust pathway into Biology, Chemistry, Physics or Earth Sciences?"</p> <p>The proposal for a single Science subject at level 1 does not exist in isolation and does need to be read in conjunction with the National Curriculum and with the proposed RAS – Trial-Level1 Science. And herein lies the problem. The RAS Trial -Level 1 Science document was released before the proposed subject list was released and in my opinion it is impossible to treat those two proposals independently. I would argue that if the assessment of Science stands as it has been proposed and the proposed combination of Biology, Chemistry, Earth and Space Science, and Physics goes ahead it could actually lead to greater inequality between different communities</p>	No				2020-06-20 21:04:29	ANON-YFPW-RCR1-X	2020-06-20 21:00:43	2020-06-20 21:04:35
No		Disagree		<p>Because languages require continuous, sequential study, if Latin is taken out at Lv1, there will be no pathway for it at secondary school. It simply won't be taught. This would be a huge loss, as Latin feeds into so many different areas, of which science, law, religion, history and politics are just a few. Furthermore, grappling with its grammar teaches you to conceptualise and analyse language in a completely different way. I have studied some Te Reo, Japanese to NCEA Lv2 and majored in French at Latin at university after beginning them in primary and high school. Latin has developed my critical thinking and overall language skills the most, and the practical applications, whilst not as obvious, have been on a par with the modern languages. Confining Latin to university study will make it inaccessible to many, many people.</p>	Yes				2020-06-20 21:12:17	ANON-YFPW-RCR2-7	2020-06-20 21:12:17	2020-06-20 21:12:23
Yes		Disagree		<p>We believe Latin and Classical Studies are important NCEA options because the knowledge derived from these can be applied in broad aspects of later life situations. If not included, New Zealand would be the only English speaking countries that don't offer advanced Latin, marking a sad indictment of the NZ education system.</p>	No				2020-06-20 21:23:03	ANON-YFPW-RCRH-N	2020-06-20 21:22:08	2020-06-20 21:23:23
No		Disagree			No				2020-06-20 21:46:58	ANON-YFPW-RCR8-F	2020-06-20 21:46:58	2020-06-20 21:47:29
Yes		Strongly disagree		<p>I am writing to register my opposition to the proposal to cut Latin at all levels as part of the Review of Achievement Standards.</p> <p>Having recently retired and passed my 80th birthday I have found the time of the recent lockdown for the pandemic a good period to review my working life and consider the effect of my Latin studies. Upon reflection I am in no doubt that my learning Latin at school has benefited me in a number of ways, and it would be a great shame to deny the same opportunities to future generations of New Zealand students.</p> <p>My study of Latin aided me immensely in learning French and Italian, due to the close relationship of the Romance languages to Latin, but also in learning German and Russian thanks to the solid grounding in accidence and syntax that Latin provides, a tremendous aid to mastery of the Germanic and Slavic language groups.</p> <p>This same linguistic understanding is invaluable in its application to the English language. My career has encompassed several different fields, all requiring the ability to write correct, concise, and persuasive English prose. It is evident by a casual perusal of the New Zealand media that this is a</p>	No				2020-06-20 22:28:09	ANON-YFPW-RCRM-T	2020-06-20 22:28:09	2020-06-20 22:29:08

Yes		Strongly disagree	I think it a retrograde step that Latin be not included at NCEA Level 1. Please see next panel for my feedback.	I think it a retrograde step that Latin be not included at NCEA Level 1 : * Unlike modern languages which mostly teach conversation, Latin students are reading real literature by the first 2 levels of NCEA. * Since so much English technical vocabulary is derived from Latin, school leavers have remarked to me how much Latin has given them easier insights into scientific and technological terms as well as into the approx 60% of general English words of Latin origin. * Yet the structure of Latin is so "light" and so different from English that it encourages different patterns of thinking in a student as well as intellectual rigour, which must be beneficial. * Some of the poems of New Zealand poets, such as C K Stead and R A K Mason (as well of course of a host of European writers) cannot be properly understood without a knowledge of Latin literature. * A major benefit of learning Latin is that it gives a sense of a deeper history. Apart from the optional topic of Elizabethan and Parliamentary history in		No			2020-06-20 22:51:49	ANON-YFPW-RCPS-Z	2020-06-18 23:46:59	2020-06-20 22:53:05
No		Strongly disagree		The 3 commerce subjects should stay separate, just like dance and drama or History, Geography and social studies. They are all different skills, so they should remain separate subjects. Accounting is nothing like Economics.		No			2020-06-20 22:59:40	ANON-YFPW-RCRD-H	2020-06-20 22:59:40	2020-06-20 23:00:13
Yes		Strongly disagree	Both Latin and Classical Studies must continue to be available at Levels 1, 2 and 3.	1. Latin is a foundational language for many European languages, but has even wider implications for students' knowledge of English grammar, vocabulary and writing style, as well as their analytical and problem solving abilities, thereby assisting both literacy and numeracy skills. At higher levels, the range of genres, personalities and history studied further underscore its value Classics is a multi-disciplinary subject, which introduces students to history, art, literature, philosophy religion and more in one course. It therefore meets the criteria of being 'broad' and 'foundational'. 2. It is irrefutable that both Latin and Classical Studies provide 'important and rich learning'. See 1. above. 3. Both Latin and Classical Studies lead directly into Level 2 and 3 courses, and follow into study at Universities throughout the world. Furthermore, Latin has deeply historical links and practical		No			2020-06-20 23:57:56	ANON-YFPW-RCRX-5	2020-06-20 23:57:56	2020-06-20 23:58:20
Yes	There is no need for a broad, foundational education to preclude the possibilities for students to study in areas that interest them. Latin and Art History are foundational humanities disciplines with long histories, and ongoing interest and applicability to New Zealand students. There is 0 reason to take these options away.	Strongly disagree	There is 0 reason to cut Latin and Art History. For the students that take them, these are of huge interest and broad applicability to their lives and intellectual frameworks.	Latin: why cut this? It is a vital opportunity for students (frequently excellent students) to learn grammar, language, history, and cultural competencies that will take them forward into all sorts of arenas. As a university humanities teacher, I can report that many of my very best students have studied Latin through school. Both of my children have chosen and love it. Why take this opportunity away from New Zealand students.		Yes	No.		2020-06-20 23:58:46	ANON-YFPW-RCRA-E	2020-06-20 23:58:46	2020-06-20 23:59:03
Yes		Agree				No			2020-06-21 00:44:47	ANON-YFPW-RCRN-U	2020-06-21 00:44:47	2020-06-21 00:44:54
Yes	Concern that this broad approach ignores concept that students need to move from surface to deep thinking i.e. you need to know something before you can think about it. Refer to SOLO taxonomy	Disagree	Greatest concern is with proposed changes to Science			No			2020-06-21 08:19:57	ANON-YFPW-RCRK-R	2020-06-21 08:19:56	2020-06-21 08:20:06

No		Undecided		<p>Latin must be included. It is foundational to the romance languages and to English. It is foundational to the study of law (my discipline) even though there has been a move away from using Latin phrases. Latin remains an underlying element in law, even as we also emphasise other sources of law and thinking such as te ao Māori.</p> <p>Of course, not all students need to learn Latin but some should. I personally gained enormously from taking Latin. It should be included in the list. Its exclusion is a sign of a narrow vision.</p>		No				2020-06-21 08:31:23	ANON-YFPW-RCR6-3	2020-06-21 08:31:23	2020-06-21 08:31:51
Yes	<p>SUBMISSION</p> <p>From: Tourism Export Council of New Zealand By: Lynda Keene, Chief Executive Email: lynda@tourismexportcouncil.org.nz</p> <p>—</p> <p>•The Tourism Export Council of New Zealand (TECNZ) strongly supports the Ministry of Education (MoE) to include Tourism Management as part of the Achievement Standard Framework at NCEA levels two and three.</p> <p>•We support the review and are happy to be involved in any further discussion or development to help create stronger career pathways for students. I.e. The Ministry of Education as part of the Review of Achievement Standards (Provisional NCEA Level 1 Subject List) has opened a questionnaire and is seeking input. TIA and Tourism Teachers Association (TTA) have both submitted, encouraging Tourism Management to be included in the Achievement Standard (AS) Framework for NCEA Levels 2 and 3.</p>	Strongly agree	<p>TECNZ believes it is critical tourism is promoted and identified early in a student's considered career option as a credible employment sector. Tourism is not just a job people do to earn extra cash. In NZ, there are almost 400,000 direct and indirect jobs in the tourism industry, across many business sectors.</p> <p>Educating parents, teachers and students on the range and types of jobs will assist with an improved and greater awareness of the role tourism plays in NZ's economy. TECNZ would like tourism case studies threaded more throughout the curriculum subjects (at all levels) of business, economics, accounting, geography and social studies.</p>	<p>Yes.</p> <p>If there is a topic or subject heading for Tourism it needs to include or demonstrate the range of jobs from back office (accounting, graphic design) human resources, front office, customer facing (tour guide), the role Health & Safety plays, sales and marketing and supervision and management type roles. And, across all the various sectors. e.g. cruise, inbound, international, domestic, business events (conferences), retail travel agent (outbound) youth and education, event management, senior travel, digital marketing etc.</p>	<p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes, TECNZ would like to see Achievement Standards written for tourism as currently there are only Unit Standards available and threaded throughout the school curriculum. The education system needs to remove barriers that create the perception to parents, teachers and students that tourism is not a useful or valued industry/profession. It is important teacher and parents identify the value of tourism as a career path and this can only be done if tourism careers are threaded throughout the curriculum and discussed as a viable employment path for youth to consider in the future. Tourism is a valued profession that provides students and employees with many skills that can benefit long-term employment in any country around the world. Tourism studies can (and has in many cases) lead to longevity and gainful employment.</p> <p>TECNZ fully supports the work that AJ Hackett Bungy New Zealand has done with writing 'Achievement Standards' demonstrating how easy this can be done. e.g. The Achievement Standards chosen were AS 91382 - Develop a Marketing Plan, and AS91383 - Analyse a</p>	No		not as yet	2020-06-21 10:01:05	ANON-YFPW-RCRR-Y	2020-06-21 09:58:26	2020-06-21 10:01:19	
No		Undecided		<p>Latin is important for every area that you could study. Don't eliminate!</p>		No			2020-06-21 12:40:27	ANON-YFPW-RCRW-4	2020-06-21 12:40:27	2020-06-21 12:40:35	
Yes		Disagree		<p>Tourism Management should be added - Tourism is one of NZ's largest industries, and the career path and opportunities are underrepresented and underestimated.</p> <p>The fact that it is not an Achievement Standard subject demonstrates that it is 'dumbed down' and does not encourage students wanting UE to consider it.</p> <p>It is essential for Tourism as a subject to be taught as Achievement Standards.</p> <p>Pre COVID, Tourism and associated hospitality made up over 20% of New Zealand's exports, 10% of its GDP, and supported almost 400,000 jobs. COVID-19 stalled domestic and international tourism almost overnight, the sector was hit hard by the global pandemic. However, history tells us that the sector rebounds well. With domestic tourism forecast to recover first, followed by the Trans-Tasman bubble being introduced, it is likely the sector will reach 70% of pre COVID-19 levels by summer 2020.</p> <p>Tourism was a \$45 billion industry in NZ pre COVID-19. That will not disappear, it may look different, but it is already returning and is vital to the Aotearoa's economic recovery. To be part of</p>	Tourism Management	Yes		No	2020-06-21 13:55:29	ANON-YFPW-RCR4-1	2020-06-21 13:52:56	2020-06-21 13:55:44	
No		Disagree		<p>Latin should be kept or at least included in other subjects. Latin is the root of so many words used in the English language and is used in all the sciences.</p> <p>Art History should be kept too - paintings, tapestries, embroidery, architecture are visual perceptions of society at the time. Often too it is how women could have a voice.</p>		No			2020-06-21 14:21:09	ANON-YFPW-RCRT-1	2020-06-21 14:21:09	2020-06-21 14:21:19	

Yes	<p>I think the changes are good</p> <p>I feel it gets rid of some subjects that require students to specialize too early eg accounting</p> <p>And also bring some subject that need to be brought in to be at Level 1</p> <p>Great that subjects like Latin that drain staffing and are under subscribed are going - makes it easier for schools to make decisions around this</p>	Strongly agree		<p>Good that Latin and accounting are going ... very future focused</p>	Environmental studies	No			2020-06-21 18:43:53	ANON-YFPW-RCR2-Y	2020-06-21 18:43:35	2020-06-21 18:44:07
Yes		Strongly disagree	<p>I particularly disagree with the suggestion to drop Latin entirely and to only offer classical studies 'as possible contexts within history to a low degree'. Latin and classical studies are not equivocal, I am concerned at the proposal to restrict students' choices by omitting the forefather of most modern European languages and to only consider classics from one perspective - namely what it can teach students about history therefore neglecting what it can teach us about art, literature, law, religion and philosophy amongst others. This seems to be at odds with the objective of the NCEA level 1 to be broad and foundational.</p>	<p>If New Zealand were to omit Latin from its curriculum we would be the only English speaking country in the world to do so. This is not a first that New Zealand should be proud to achieve. I am concerned that this decision will result in generations of children disadvantaged on the increasingly global workforce. I make use of the life lessons I have learned from studying Latin on a daily basis - I am a junior doctor - and have found it to be my most useful school subject. In this computer age knowledge is easy to acquire, what is more precious is the experience of broadening one's perspective through studying a multidisciplinary subject like Latin or Classical Studies.</p> <p>There are well designed local pathways for both Latin and Classical Studies and more teachers qualified to teach these subjects than schools which offer Latin as many have not yet introduced Level 1 Classics which was only recently added. It is not therefore possible to estimate students' demand for these subjects and assumptions should not be made. It will be more than a shame to throw these valuable gifts away and to drop subjects which have underpinned Western civilisation.</p>		No			2020-06-21 21:11:38	ANON-YFPW-RCRU-2	2020-06-21 20:22:15	2020-06-21 21:11:44
No		Disagree		<p>Accounting, Economics and Business are very individual and differing subjects. The skills and knowledge in each of these areas are very different. The skills taught at Level 1 underpin the foundation of success in Level 2 and Level 3. As a pathway into future success in Level 3 and Scholarship Accounting and Economics, students require knowledge that is embedded during teaching during Level 1.</p> <p>There is a clear future career pathway in all of these areas and they are INDIVIDUAL at University. Nationally student numbers in Accounting and Business at Level 1 are increasing (or being maintained). Students financial capabilities are a concern nationwide, and this proposal limits students access to varied pathways where this is a predominant idea. It appears that Commerce subjects, and Accounting in particular, will be a step behind with respect to learning as it is not able to be accessed at Level 1, or will need to be condensed significantly to fit in the other subject's ideas (trying to cover the key foundational ideas of 3 subjects in one is just not feasible).</p> <p>These subjects can be accessed by a variety of students which allows choice and voice, by narrowing this area we reduce student access. Finding 'specialists' who can create lessons which</p>		No			2020-06-22 09:19:58	ANON-YFPW-RCGY-U	2020-06-22 09:19:58	2020-06-22 09:20:09

Yes		Strongly disagree		The abolition of Latin is of serious concern. The potential benefits of the study of Latin are significant, though not widely appreciated or understood. I am currently conducting doctoral research into the value of Latin in Australian secondary schools, and I am one of a number of researchers internationally who are currently exploring the benefits of Latin using both quantitative and qualitative methods. The following are included amongst such benefits: first and foremost, the enhancement of functional, cultural and critical English literacy skills (including a greatly enhanced and more flexible academic vocabulary), breadth and depth of understanding of the history and culture of western civilisation and its contributions to contemporary Australian (and NZ) society; greater ease in learning modern languages, and numerous other benefits besides these. Overseas initiatives such as the Latin for Literacy programs in the UK and USA are only just beginning to address a need for more research and clarity surrounding the (not necessarily obvious or immediate) "usefulness" of this subject. I would urge NZ to think very carefully before eradicating Latin (and therefore any potential future teachers of this subject) from its curriculum.		No				2020-06-22 18:29:53	ANON-YFPW-RCGV-R	2020-06-22 18:29:53	2020-06-22 18:30:11	
Yes		Strongly disagree		I have taught in schools with science subject-specialist teachers at level 1, that is biology teachers teaching biology, chemistry teachers teaching chemistry and physics teachers teaching physics. I have also taught in schools where level 1 science was taught in its entirety by a science teacher (maybe biology, chemistry or physics specialist). I suggest you look into this, because it is an eye opener in regards to students achievements. Students who were taught by subject-specialist teachers were extended and the gap between level 1 and level 2 which is very significant was made more approachable. Students understood the subject better and received better grades at level 1 and then at levels 2 and 3. This proposal would be a disaster for science subjects and is bound to lower the quality of science education in New Zealand. Adding to this the joke that is the physics component of the proposed curriculum and levels 2 and 3 will become a nightmare for physics students when they will be faced with a mountain of learning to climb. It is hard to believe that much thought has been put into this project for the science area of learning, a cornerstone of the future for the country. Honestly, the proposal is ridiculous and offensive.	The changes in level 1 are going to make level 2 physics a step too far for most students. The gap is already huge, so I guess you thought: "let's make it wider and see if the students can jump".	No				2020-06-22 21:43:01	ANON-YFPW-RCGC-5	2020-06-22 21:43:01	2020-06-22 21:43:08	
Yes		Strongly agree		I support the proposal to merge accounting, economics and business studies into a broader commerce subject. This will keep pathways open for longer, allowing students to get a taste of a more diverse set of subjects before they have to specialise. It ensures they won't miss out on valuable learning and cut off pathways they may later wish they'd taken.	No.	No				2020-06-23 10:13:25	ANON-YFPW-RCGS-N	2020-06-23 10:13:25	2020-06-23 10:13:39	
Yes		Disagree	Accounting, Economics and Business are very individual and differing subjects. The skills and knowledge in each of these areas are very different. The skills taught at Level 1 underpin the foundation of success in Level 2 and Level 3. As a pathway into future success in Level 3 and Scholarship Accounting and Economics, students require knowledge that is embedded during teaching during Level 1.	There is a clear future career pathway in all of these areas and they are INDIVIDUAL at University. Nationally student numbers in Accounting and Business at Level 1 are increasing (or being maintained). Students financial capabilities are a concern nationwide, and this proposal limits students access to varied pathways where this is a predominant idea. It appears that Commerce subjects, and Accounting in particular, will be a step behind with respect to learning as it is not able to be accessed at Level 1, or will need to be condensed significantly to fit in the other subject's ideas (trying to cover the key foundational ideas of 3 subjects in one is just not feasible).		No				2020-06-23 13:21:00	ANON-YFPW-RCG8-T	2020-06-23 13:19:27	2020-06-23 13:21:08	
No		Agree		I would suggest keeping health and PE subjects separate, while there is crossover between the two, having them as one subject may limit the time able to be spent on each subject at schools across the year.	.	No					2020-06-24 13:38:42	ANON-YFPW-RCG9-U	2020-06-24 13:38:42	2020-06-24 13:38:57

Yes		Disagree		Completely removing the ancient language Latin from schools in New Zealand should not go ahead, there are so many reasons for us to continue to teach Latin in schools. Firstly, Latin is the root of all the Romance languages, a group of languages that includes French, Spanish, Portuguese, Romanian and Italian. Learning Latin will help you to pick up these languages considerably faster. Ninety percent of the words in the Romance languages come directly from Latin, so speaking Latin before you learn any of these will cut your workload in half and make things a lot easier. In my Latin class there is a kid called Nathan, Nathan is learning French as well as Latin. Most people, myself included, thought that this would confuse him. However, Nathan says it's actually easier, especially because French, as a Romance language, is descended from Latin. As you can see, this is a great reason for Latin to be taught in schools. Studying Latin will enhance students' ability to pick up other languages in the future. As well as being the origins of the Romance languages, sixty percent of English words originated from Latin. Because so much of English comes from Latin, learning Latin increases a		Yes			2020-06-24 20:19:39	ANON-YFPW-RCGG-9	2020-06-24 20:19:39	2020-06-24 20:20:22
Yes		Strongly agree		I agree that Media Studies could be assessed under a broader subject specialism, but I still don't believe that Media should be in the Social Sciences curriculum. I agree that general Science is a better option than splitting it as it currently is.		Yes			2020-06-25 12:10:21	ANON-YFPW-RCGJ-C	2020-06-25 12:10:21	2020-06-25 12:10:28
Yes		Disagree	Although I like idea of a broad Commerce subject I don't think it is possible to fit the key aspects of Accounting, Business and Economics in one course to allow the average Level 1 student to be prepared for Level 2 and 3, unless we lower the level expectation at Level 2 and 3. This may have issues for UE.	No	No			2020-06-25 12:30:10	ANON-YFPW-RCGQ-K	2020-06-25 12:30:10	2020-06-25 12:30:22	
Yes		Strongly disagree	As an accounting teacher, I could not disagree more with the proposed changes. The recent pandemic has shown the need to good financial skills and business knowledge that come from the accounting course is needed more than ever. The reasoning behind the subject having 'practical constraints' seems like a sweeping phrase that gives no reason behind the change. These are three subjects that cannot be merged as they require completely different skills and different vocabulary. This would then impact the likelihood of taking the subject in level 2 and 3 as you would not have the exposure to it earlier. I do not know enough about the other subjects to make an informed comment.	No	Yes		I am aware but am not involved in using of it so would not make an informed comment.	2020-06-26 12:15:52	ANON-YFPW-RCGE-7	2020-06-26 12:15:52	2020-06-26 12:15:59	
Yes		Disagree	Regarding Technology: Processing Technologies cannot just become Food Science. It is used by the materials areas of Technology to create products that have chemical reactions such as concrete and resin etc.... This area does need extended as it only has one practical standard and it could offer so much more - but it should not be narrowed and turned into a 'Food Science' strand - that is a very narrow perspective of what this area offers and could offer.	It's time to make a clear decision around Food Technology, in it's essence it sits within Technology so students learn how to develop food products, the technological knowledge strand enables it to use the science of food, knowledge of the ingredients etc... as part of this and the nature of technology strand brings in the societal and environmental, as well as historical issues. It is time to break away from 'Home Economics' and for food teachers to embrace 'Food Technology'. 'Food Science' is a very narrow name that suggests a narrow perspective that will be taken on board by many teachers. It does the area a injustice. There is nothing in 'Home Economics' that does not already have a place within the three strands of the Technology curriculum. Too many teachers forget to come back to the Technology curriculum, and it's three strands which fit together so well, especially when talking about senior assessment. If NCEA is going to be a tool to assess the students progress / ability within the Technology curriculum it should start at the curriculum. It has so much breadth and depth. I hope the conversations start with the strands, and how more than one can be assessed in a piece of work, to encourage teachers to truly use the flexibility and adaptability the Technology curriculum truly has, and how it offers such	No			2020-06-26 13:08:49	ANON-YFPW-RCGS-Q	2020-06-26 13:08:49	2020-06-26 13:08:56	
Yes		Agree			No			2020-06-26 15:18:37	ANON-YFPW-RCGP-J	2020-06-26 15:18:37	2020-06-26 15:18:45	

Yes	I do believe that the consolidation of subjects at level 1 is a good idea but a 2 year Level 2 structure would be better.	Agree		I would prefer a kete of subject assessments across the social sciences rather than losing Classics, media or psychology assessments altogether.		Yes			2020-06-26 21:03:28	ANON-YFPW-RCG7-5	2020-06-26 21:03:28	2020-06-26 21:03:36
Yes		Undecided		Schools should have choice to meet the local needs of their students.	Leave them as it is. We can mix standards to meet student needs.	No			2020-06-27 09:42:49	ANON-YFPW-RCGF-8	2020-06-27 09:42:49	2020-06-27 09:43:20
Yes	totally against what is planned for Science level from Specialist to broad. how long can we go on teaching Nature of Science. so as a school with about 500 students doing level 1 and science being a subject that all level 1 students do, we decided to go on it on our own and not offer any achievement standards for credits, but prepare them for level 2 Physics, Chemistry, Biology, Education for Sustainability and Earth and Space Science. we think we would be doing a great dis-service to the future of New Zealand going down that pathway of doing just Nature of Science. so we offer half year courses of specialist Sciences and students may do upto a maximum of 4 x half year courses in Science. Our results are really good.	Strongly disagree	see comments above. totally disagree with the broad based Science. NZIP and NZIC have strong opinions and I hope MoE will listen to reason.	Suggest allow students to learn content in Physics, Chemistry, Biology, Environmental Science as well as Earth and Space Science in level 1. I can talk about Physics ; suggest give them opportunity to learn Mechanics, Waves, Electricity, Atomic and Nuclear Physics and have a practical component in there as well. Students need to know the basics before going into to level 2.	I am quite happy with status quo of having Physics, Chemistry, Biology, EFS and ESS. those are the ones my school offers.	No	I trust the content will be the same.		2020-06-28 14:24:41	ANON-YFPW-RCG1-K	2020-06-28 14:24:41	2020-06-28 14:24:59
Yes		Strongly disagree		Science at Level 1 should include options for students to study Biology, Chemistry, Physics, Earth and Space Science.		Yes			2020-06-28 17:24:46	ANON-YFPW-RCGZ-V	2020-06-28 17:24:46	2020-06-28 17:25:03
Yes	We have many students that (at the end of Year 10) are far too anxious over option selections, precisely because they broaden too early. Although it could be argued they are better prepared for specialities in Year 12, this actually makes it harder for students to enter into those specialist pathways if they haven't properly considered at the end of Year 10. Also, smaller schools are unable to offer that specialisation in Year 11, having to divide a smaller population over a greater number of subjects, and so the current list of Year 11 subjects only benefit students at large schools.	Strongly agree	There needs to be a rationalisation of curriculum offerings and doing much better in the delivery of fewer subjects with improved support for each.	I'm surprised that a programme in Mātauranga Māori is not included, as this would provide an impetus to schools to offer a similar programme in junior years.	See my answer to number 3.	Yes			2020-06-28 19:05:20	ANON-YFPW-RCGH-A	2020-06-28 19:05:20	2020-06-28 19:05:36
Yes		Strongly disagree		The absence of Biology, Chemistry, Physics is a concern. No mention (specifically) of content strands in the proposed Science standards a concern. Suggest including these subjects with specific content objectives. Shift away from content driven standards not supported. Inconsistencies across schools is a likely product of a lack of prescribed content.		Yes			2020-06-28 19:51:23	ANON-YFPW-RCGB-4	2020-06-28 19:51:23	2020-06-28 19:51:37
Yes		Strongly disagree	Science needs specialisation as formative learning to Level 2 pure sciences. Level 1 should therefore allow this for those students intending to specialise in the 3 main sciences	Science needs specialisation as an option for students in each of the 3 main sciences. A significant number of students follow this science-based pathway. Level 2 is too late to introduce the formative ideas needed for progression to the pure sciences.	Nil	No			2020-06-28 21:18:03	ANON-YFPW-RCGD-6	2020-06-28 21:18:03	2020-06-28 21:18:10
Yes		Disagree	Keep Latin! Classical scholarship matters!	A grounding in the Classics connects our children's future with their past.		No			2020-06-29 07:21:52	ANON-YFPW-RCGX-T	2020-06-29 07:21:52	2020-06-29 07:22:01
No		Strongly disagree				No			2020-06-29 08:48:22	ANON-YFPW-RCGA-3	2020-06-29 08:48:22	2020-06-29 08:49:55
Yes		Agree		I think that Science should have more scope for specialisation at Level 1. This could be done by including one or two standards from each of the specialist science subjects that schools could choose to include in their Science courses (that count as Science credits so that students can still gain endorsements for the course).		No			2020-06-29 10:09:49	ANON-YFPW-RCGN-G	2020-06-29 10:09:49	2020-06-29 10:09:59
Yes		Strongly agree	Encourages a more general approach where students dont specialise too early and can keep their options open. Also gives better options for students to keep studying languages and not be squeezed out by multiple science options.			No			2020-06-29 15:58:15	ANON-YFPW-RCG6-R	2020-06-29 15:58:15	2020-06-29 15:58:26

Yes	<p>Waikato CETA Branch Submission</p> <p>Waikato CETA have a number of serious concerns regarding the proposed changes to Level 1 Curriculum. We believe that it will narrow the curriculum, in particular for Social Sciences if it reduces from 10 subjects on offer to 5. It is important for schools to have a choice - for example, whether they offer a composite course of Economics and Business Studies by blending standards together or offer a pure Accounting, Economics and Business Studies course as this best suits their ākonga.</p> <p>Waikato CETA have a number of specific concerns which are addressed below.</p> <p>These concerns are not the only concerns Waikato CETA have regarding the proposed changes to the Level 1 course. But without seeing the full construct of all three courses we feel we are unable to direct these concerns in the appropriate manner.</p> <p>There is a lot of confusion amongst the teaching profession as a whole, as to why these changes are taking place and that these are simply a compromise designed to satisfy a small number of unknown contributors. Without fully knowing the</p>	Strongly disagree	<p>Waikato CETA Branch Submission</p> <p>Waikato CETA have a number of serious concerns regarding the proposed changes to Level 1 Curriculum. We believe that it will narrow the curriculum, in particular for Social Sciences if it reduces from 10 subjects on offer to 5. It is important for schools to have a choice - for example, whether they offer a composite course of Economics and Business Studies by blending standards together or offer a pure Accounting, Economics and Business Studies course as this best suits their ākonga.</p> <p>Waikato CETA have a number of specific concerns which are addressed below.</p>	<p>Increased Specialisation</p> <p>The changes to Level 1 indicates a generic approach to teaching and learning. Will the jump between Level 1 and 2 be too difficult for students? The approach at Level 1 will only provide a surface level understanding of for example, the "commerce" subjects and not provide the ability for depth? Also, how likely is it that students who have not been able to experience a subject until Year 12 are going to take a risk with it? Especially students who may struggle with learning – they are more likely to stay with what they started than take a chance on something new. In addition, some students have a keen interest in Business Studies but no interest in Economics – surely this will turn them off?</p> <p>Lack of detail and delivery of Level Two and Three courses</p> <p>Remembering that no one in the teaching profession nor any other stakeholders have been provided any information about what Level 2 may look like apart from - increased specialisation, so we are assuming that Level 2 for Social Sciences Faculty will remain status quo. No Waikato CETA member feels that the level of detail provided</p>	NA	No			2020-06-29 16:30:12	ANON-YFPW-RCGR-M	2020-06-29 16:28:54	2020-06-29 16:30:16
Yes		Disagree		Media studies should be available from junior level to enhance critical media literacy		No			2020-06-29 16:57:27	ANON-YFPW-RCGW-S	2020-06-29 16:57:27	2020-06-29 16:57:37
Yes		Disagree	I think Subjects promoting healthy are important. Food Science seems to be a wasted opportunity where perhaps a focus on nutrition through Home Economics might be better. Other subject seem to be OK.	Home Economics have many more doing their standards than Food technology yet it appears the Food Science subject will be Food Tech dominated.	No	No			2020-06-29 19:58:18	ANON-YFPW-RCG4-P	2020-06-29 19:58:18	2020-06-29 19:58:27
Yes	my opinion is merging Accounting, Business Studies and Economics will not intend to support a broad foundation as the aim is.	Strongly disagree	Combining 3 subjects to make commerce will mean some valuable foundation skills are taken away from all the 3 subjects. My view is merging 3 subjects is not ideal at all when looking at the curriculum rationale and objectives.	I am thinking probably merging some business studies standards in Economics to make one subject and then using the other business studies standards to have another commerce option. Now the question is where does Agribusines fit in. At the moment Agribusines is sitting with Business Studies. I have had a quick browse of these standards and definitely there are some accounting included in these standards.	I do not have any but I am thinking at Level 2 there will be 3 subjects: Accounting, Economics and Business Studies on it own.	No			2020-06-29 21:43:39	ANON-YFPW-RCGT-P	2020-06-29 21:38:29	2020-06-29 21:43:51
Yes		Agree				Yes		Kao	2020-06-30 07:47:11	ANON-YFPW-RCG3-N	2020-06-30 07:47:11	2020-06-30 07:47:23
Yes		Disagree		Science: to have more specialism at Level 2 and 3 we need to teach all 4 strands at Level 1 to provide knowledge to build on. No5 does not provide this. Having no separate standards for the 4 science strands makes it confusing for the students who then are not able to separate them into the different strands. This will impact their ability to select the correct Level 2 science subject.	It would be good to develop a general science course with its own standards. At the moment low ability students are unable to access the science curriculum at Level 2 and 3.	No			2020-06-30 09:27:21	ANON-YFPW-RCGU-Q	2020-06-30 09:27:21	2020-06-30 09:27:43
Yes		Agree		I question the rationale for combining all Food subjects into Food Science. This is not a title that I would support. Perhaps, look at Nutrition and Food Technology as separate entities given they are different curriculum areas. Where is Textiles fitting within the proposed subject list?	I would strongly recommend that Nutrition is something that is considered for Levels 2 and 3. I can not see the benefit in combining technology with HPE to pursue Food Science. The subject is not taught in a laboratory setting which is implied when including the word Science in the title.	No			2020-06-30 10:22:05	ANON-YFPW-RCTV-8	2020-06-30 10:22:05	2020-06-30 10:22:19

Yes		Strongly disagree	Combining Accounting, Economics and Business Studies into one subject Commerce will severely water down the understanding of these subjects in New Zealand education.	I am part of the SEG Accounting group. My rationale is that New Zealand students need a strong understanding of financial literacy, accounting, economics and business studies. These are diverse and separate subjects. The community needs to have these subjects available so that they can have the option of having these in their school. Accounting is a completely different skill to Economics and Business Studies. Yes when students run a business activity in school they will calculate their profit, but they do not have the capability to prepare full financial statements that they would need if they were a builder, plumber, hairdresser with a wide range of expenses. Student numbers are stated as a rationale for amalgamating these subjects - in the ranking of students taking Level 1 courses, Accounting is higher than many of the subjects in the Provisional List that are separate (dance, languages etc) Most subjects are having declining numbers from Level 1 to Level 2 due to the wider range of subjects available at Level 2. This is not a reason to not give students an in-depth understanding of these subjects at Level 1. It is imperative for New Zealand to have a productive economy, we need people to have an understanding of the fundamentals of all types of	We haven't seen the list at Levels 2 and 3 yet.	Yes	Accounting focusses on the future at Level 1 - currently - preparing a cash budget, interpreting financial statements in order to better the business - this exemplifies the principle of future focus. Principle of community engagement - Level 1 Accounting has a unit on preparing financial statements for a community organisation, encouraging students to be treasurers in		2020-06-30 10:33:30	ANON-YFPW-RCTV-5	2020-06-30 10:33:30	2020-06-30 10:33:41
Yes		Disagree	The Technology generic standards are very important, and enable us to combine them with the specialist standards to create courses for students rather than just a 'subject'. There should only be one Technology group initially so the bigger picture is developed first rather than the standards. There needs to be a group ensuring that their is consistency across the specialist technology areas, and that the subject area as a whole is coherent and consistent, and still enables students to study more than one technology course.			No			2020-06-30 11:25:12	ANON-YFPW-RCTC-J	2020-06-30 11:25:12	2020-06-30 11:25:16
Yes		Agree		Some of the commerce and social science subjects are very very different so combining them together will do each discipline a disservice and would be very challenging. However combining sciences together is a good idea - too much specialisation at Level 1 currently.	Geospatial (GIS) technology and physical science field skills subject. This is too large to be able to be offered within a geography, science or technology course.	No			2020-06-30 12:20:03	ANON-YFPW-RCTB-7	2020-06-30 12:20:03	2020-06-30 12:20:20
Yes		Disagree				No			2020-06-30 14:59:16	ANON-YFPW-RCT9-8	2020-06-30 14:59:16	2020-06-30 14:59:25
Yes	I do agree that Level 1 should be a chance for students to study a broad range of subjects, in order to keep their options open and to have a wider range of skills if they choose to leave school after Year 11. However, I believe the rationale for some of the subject choices or lack thereof is flawed. The subjects under consideration do not appear to necessarily take into account our rapidly changing digital world, the demand for specific skill sets, the relationship between tertiary institutions and secondary schools and the levels of media saturation in the 21st century.	Disagree	I strongly oppose the idea for Media Studies to be absorbed into Social Studies. These two have been separate entities basically from Media Studies' introduction to the curriculum and to leave Media Studies as a small branch of a Social Studies course will greatly disadvantage students moving into Level 2 and 3 Media Studies. It also doesn't take into consideration the growing presence of the media in the lives of students today. Absorbing the sciences under one General Science will have impacts on students' moving into the specialist courses in Level 2 and 3 and could potentially disadvantage them in their pursuit of these fields at tertiary level.	- The removal of Media Studies at Level 1. Absorption into Social Studies. - Considering the state of our world, the state of our media and the level of media saturation in our students' lives, Media Studies is an essential subject for teaching students digital literacy, digital competency and just as importantly, how to use, read and create media products. How can we expect students to be able to understand the multi-faceted aspects of a media product such as Instagram , how to use it safely and competently if we are not teaching them? There are a multitude of media products that our students interact with and new ones emerging all the time. Shouldn't they understand how best to use, read and produce these? The foundation skills learned at Level 1 set students up well in Level 2 and Level 3 and beyond. By removing the foundation aspect of this subject, we are disadvantaging our students. This subject, more than ever, is an essential part to the curriculum and should not be absorbed into others when it has a very specific and broad curriculum in itself.		Yes			2020-06-30 15:52:00	ANON-YFPW-RCTG-P	2020-06-30 15:52:00	2020-06-30 15:52:13
Yes		Strongly agree				Yes			2020-07-01 08:54:58	ANON-YFPW-RCTJ-5	2020-07-01 08:54:58	2020-07-01 08:55:04
Yes	this is NOT well thought through in Economics.	Strongly disagree	With Economics ...I have yet to see and haven't been able to figure how the curriculum would work. There is no way a student could form a thorough and rounded understanding of Y12 and 13 economics without the foundation formed at L1. Please freely send me through how you might structure an NCEA Economics course.	Did anyone with an Economics background have any input into this decision?		Yes			2020-07-01 08:59:50	ANON-YFPW-RCTQ-Z	2020-07-01 08:59:50	2020-07-01 09:00:04

Yes		Strongly disagree	Combining accounting, economics and business studies at level 1 with severely impact on students learning especially with accounting, students who do not study accounting at level 1, really struggle trying to pick it up at level 2	Combining accounting, economics and business studies at level 1 with severely impact on students learning especially with accounting, students who do not study accounting at level 1, really struggle trying to pick it up at level 2		No				2020-07-01 09:00:41	ANON-YFPW-RCTE-M	2020-07-01 09:00:41	2020-07-01 09:00:50
Yes	We already have a broad, foundational education at Y9 and Y10.	Strongly disagree	"Consultation" is an empty word. Those in the Ministry with big ideas are by definition not teachers on the ground. In at least 2 subjects (Sciences and Commerce) teachers on the panel were "consulted" but were only informed of the proposed combining of the subjects when it was released to the Media - never having heard of the idea prior. I have no trust in the Ministry's "consultation" process - and no trust that the Ministry is actually interested in doing what is best for our students. Sounds like someone has a pet project to me.	Combining Commerce subjects sounds like someone has decided that they overlap and are all the same (someone who perhaps hasn't actually taught those subjects much) - that would be like teaching cooking and digital technologies at the same time. What this means is that students will be at a huge disadvantage in both Accounting and Economics at Level 2. The skills required for understanding both Economics and Accounting take a while to develop. Our Commerce classes (split into Accounting, Economics, Business studies and Enterprise) are full with students often choosing more than one Commerce subject - we already do a broad commercial course at Y10. Year 11 students are well capable of managing the higher level skills - why are we "dumbing down". It also allows students agency in choosing subjects of interest to them - we should be offering more choice rather than fewer choices. Why are we reducing classes that are well supported by students?	Philosophy. This is a subject proven to have positive academic benefits for students at all levels (not only academically strong students).	Yes				2020-07-01 09:11:29	ANON-YFPW-RCT7-6	2020-07-01 09:11:29	2020-07-01 09:11:38
Yes		Strongly disagree	Generic commerce subject are already offered at year 10. needs to be a step up into more specialised/favoured subject areas at year 11 to retain interest.	Subjects being 'merged' into a broader foundation course are the more popular and varied courses. Do not understand why Science and Commerce are being combined, while languages are kept separate? Surely one language 'taster' course would also apply. Same for Technology. We allow more academic students to enter commerce subjects at level 2 or 3 and they still find it difficult to Have student numbers and popularity in these subjects been considered?		No				2020-07-01 09:17:35	ANON-YFPW-RCTF-N	2020-07-01 09:17:35	2020-07-01 09:17:48
No	Each area of accounting, economics and business studies requires special knowledge and expertise to teach. Combining these is not giving value to the subject and acknowledging the expertise of teachers. Certain skills are required in each of the 3 subjects and by combining them, is not giving justice to the 3 specialised subjects.	Strongly disagree				No				2020-07-01 09:36:34	ANON-YFPW-RCT1-Z	2020-07-01 09:36:34	2020-07-01 09:36:57
Yes		Strongly disagree	The current structure of the level 1 course is achievable for students. Mixing it into one subject will put undue pressure on teachers to teach outside their subject specialty area. This in turn will spill over to students getting taught parts of a subject where the teacher is not trained, therefore delivery of material will to the learners will be compromised.	No. I have given feedback in question 3.	No.	No				2020-07-01 09:37:45	ANON-YFPW-RCTZ-9	2020-07-01 09:37:45	2020-07-01 09:38:00
Yes		Strongly disagree	The amalgamation of Economics, Business Studies, and Accounting into one subject is short-sighted, particularly as almost no Accounting content. This is quite a popular subject at Level 1 - many students study it at this level and then specialise in other subjects, particularly Sciences, at Level 2. Level 1 Accounting is their only chance to study it. Accounting is also a more popular subject than many that are left as stand-alone such as Dance, and Drama.	I have never studied Latin but it's exclusion from the list smacks of reverse snobbery or anti-elitism. I see a place for a subject like Latin which is an academic pursuit in its own right. I teach in a Decile 6 Co-ed state school so have no elite 'axe to grind'!		No				2020-07-01 09:46:23	ANON-YFPW-RCTH-Q	2020-07-01 09:46:23	2020-07-01 09:46:34
Yes		Strongly disagree	I strongly disagree with the proposed changes to creating a Level 1 Commerce programme. The current subjects of Economics, Accounting and Business Studies all fulfill different needs to students, especially in a large city school such as mine. Economics and Accounting develop foundations in elementary theory that is totally accessible to Year 11 students. Academic disciplines are needed at this level. There are many young New Zealanders with a working brain who thrive on new content and who should be increasing their knowledge at a steady rate.	As above - as the Head of a Social Science faculty, to see the watering-down and blending of Economics, Accounting and Business Studies while Social Studies, History and Geography remain full-year courses seems to be inequitable and poorly-advised.		No				2020-07-01 10:10:10	ANON-YFPW-RCTB-H	2020-07-01 10:10:10	2020-07-01 10:10:20

Yes		Strongly disagree	Accounting, Business Studies and Economics are very individual and differing subjects.	The skills and knowledge in each of Accounting, Business Studies and Economics are very different. The skills taught at Level 1 underpin the foundation of success at Level 2 and 3. As a pathway into future success in Level 3 and Scholarship for Accounting and Economics, students require knowledge that is embedded during teaching Level 1. Students need robust grounding in these subjects at Secondary school level as not all students continue on to University. Students financial capabilities are a concern nationwide. This proposal limits students access to varied pathways where this is a predominant idea. Accounting knowledge, including Financial Capability is essential for everyone. These skills are used, no matter what pathway our students take. Nationally, student numbers in Accounting and Business at Level 1 are increasing. Trying to cover the key foundation ideas of three subjects in one is not feasible. Commerce subjects, Accounting in particular, will be a step behind with respect to learning as it is not able to be accessed at Level 1, or will be condensed significantly to fit in the other subjects' ideas and content. There are parental expectations about these three	No			2020-07-01 10:14:45	ANON-YFPW-RCTM-V	2020-07-01 10:14:45	2020-07-01 10:15:46	
No		Undecided			No			2020-07-01 13:52:13	ANON-YFPW-RCTX-7	2020-07-01 13:52:13	2020-07-01 13:52:30	
Yes		Disagree	Narrowing down the Social Science courses seems to counter the intention of a 'broad curriculum'. History/Geography/Social Studies are no broader than the other subjects that are being removed, as they traditionally only feed into their own subject area - as the review has identified. Offering a broad range of Social Science courses enables students to learn key Social Science concepts in a context that appeals to them.	It appeals that the decision on what Social Science subjects to offer has been done on a numbers game and less popular subjects have been wiped. Not on what would actually appeal to students and teachers when they have the opportunity to refocus their Social Science curriculum.	No			2020-07-01 13:57:25	ANON-YFPW-RCTA-G	2020-07-01 13:57:25	2020-07-01 13:57:36	
Yes		Strongly disagree	Limiting entire programs to 4 possible standards is not a BROAD program... THE BEST ASPECT OF NCEA IS HAVING CHOICE SO THAT INDIVIDUAL LEARNERS CAN HAVE MULTIPLE OPPORTUNITIES OF SUCCESS. My fear is that limiting each course to 4 standards is widening the gap between priority learners even further. Having a large number of standards that teachers can draw from gives flexibility to teachers to customise and create meaningful courses for their students.as shown in lockdown being able to tailor courses given different circumstances means we as teachers can adapt our programs..With limited standards available under one area, it does not cater for all students and all situations.	Yes Accounting Accounting as an NCEA subject is intrinsically different from the historical perception of "accounting" that people remember from when they were at school. There is possibly not another subject out there that has more contextual application to the "real world" than Accounting Accounting offers students the opportunity to learn key skills that will help them in everyday life; -Use of spreadsheets & budgeting; -Understanding financial documents and household financial management; for managing cash whether it be from a benefit or investment income. -Making informed real-life decisions that best meet the needs of a household or individual; -Understanding of current issues in our economic climate and ways in which both individuals and businesses can best address these to move forward; cash jobs, student loans, sustainability are just to name a few. -Understanding debt management and the importance of cash flow both in personal and business contexts. These are not skills for "Accountants" but skills that all NZers can benefit from and to be honest should be able to leave school able to do. We talk about competencies in education. Most of	Yes Accounting/ Financial Literacy as above	No			2020-07-01 14:17:00	ANON-YFPW-RCTN-W	2020-07-01 14:17:00	2020-07-01 14:17:21
Yes		Disagree	I think the Ministry have to rethink about the L1 Commerce, joined together with Accounting, Economics and Business Studies. These three subjects are the core subject at L1, because they cover the prerequisite for L2 Accounting, Economics and Business Studies. I don't think it is a good idea to combine the three core subject into one, because the key foundation for higher level learning will not be covered and some students will surely lose interest in these academic subjects as they will lack the real foundation. It may also lead towards dyeing of subjects like Economics and Accounting where the numbers are dropping at senior schools.	My advice to the Ministry is to keep the Accounting/ Economics/ Business Studies separately at L1.	No				2020-07-01 15:27:00	ANON-YFPW-RCTK-T	2020-07-01 15:27:00	2020-07-01 15:27:12
No	What happens with commerce? At levels 2 & 3 do we still have Economics cs and accounting	Strongly disagree	At level 1 Economics and Accounting should be separate subjects	Definitely. All commerce subjects should be taught separately	No	No			2020-07-01 16:37:46	ANON-YFPW-RCT6-5	2020-07-01 16:37:46	2020-07-01 16:38:06

Yes		Strongly disagree	<p>Re commerce. Combining Accounting, Economics and Business studies I do not agree with.</p> <p>Accounting and Economics are subjects that continue through to level 3 and re scaffolding from L1. Students starting Accounting at L2 will be at a disadvantage to handle the work at L3. As stated there is no content intended for Accounting in level 1 Commerce.</p> <p>Accounting and Economics have significant numbers of students at L1. I believe it undervalues the subjects by combining them with business studies. One consider eg to combine History/ Geo and Social studies - and call them Humanities studies. I believe none of the social Science subjects should be combined.</p> <p>Not taking any of the subjects Acc / Eco and Business Studies as stand alone will have an impact on the numbers of students taking these subjects at L2.</p>	<p>Like the Maori performing Arts as this fits in the huge amount of input that goes into Kapa Haka competitions and performance in the school community.</p> <p>Science to specialise at L1 into individual science disciplines was too limiting for student options to take other subjects. Specialising at L1 was too intense for science students.</p> <p>Agree to have science for L1</p>	We do not know what will be available at L2/L3. What decisions will be made in the future. I will need further information.	No			2020-07-01 18:08:37	ANON-YFPW-RCTR-1	2020-07-01 18:08:37	2020-07-01 18:08:55
No	I thought level one was going to become optional.	Agree	It provides direction for students and teachers.		Philosophy Political studies Alternative economic systems and leading transformative change Deeply explore concept of equity and humanity's place on planet earth	No			2020-07-01 20:04:42	ANON-YFPW-RCTW-6	2020-07-01 20:04:41	2020-07-01 20:04:54
No		Strongly disagree		Commerce should stay divided into accounting, economics and business.		No			2020-07-02 08:36:05	ANON-YFPW-RCT4-3	2020-07-02 08:36:05	2020-07-02 08:36:20
Yes		Strongly disagree	<p>Economics and Accounting are significantly different, like Geography and History are.</p> <p>Teaching these both separately at level 1 is the beginning of the in-depth understanding required of both subjects. This level 1 understanding allows for a deeper appreciation and understanding of the subjects as study progresses to level 2.</p> <p>Accounting and Economics are popular subject choices at our college.</p> <p>Business studies is less academic and can be a good introduction to commerce for less academic students and it can be more easily taught by non-specialist teachers.</p> <p>To merge Accounting and Economics "waters down" what is currently on offer at level 1.</p> <p>If they are merged, the course should have an equal weighting of Economics and Accounting. Building up the knowledge at level 1 is so important to getting a "depth" of understanding at level 2.</p>		No	No			2020-07-02 09:09:48	ANON-YFPW-RCTT-3	2020-07-02 09:03:37	2020-07-02 09:10:17
Yes	Really unsure what the Ministry of Education is hoping to achieve by the changes they are suggesting.	Strongly disagree	<p>What is the rational behind taking Economics and Accounting out of the curriculum at Level 1 and combining them as Commerce? How is this improving outcomes? At Level 1, Accounting and Economics are life skill subjects where students are introduced to real life situations/scenarios that enable them to start a journey towards becoming financially literate.</p>	<p>Accounting is a strongly supported subject in our school curriculum - we have always had two classes, if not three at Level 1 as it is not a subject you choose to take because you want to become an Accountant. Everyone should have a basic understanding of how to manage their finances, what interest and income expenses are all about, how to budget and what it means to have a loan, a mortgage etc. Fundamental Accounting knowledge is essential in life - particularly if you have a dream to run your own business in the future.</p> <p>Not all students learn at the same rate - and neither should teaching and learning always be focused on the assessment at the end. Students need time to step their way through important concepts and skills and it should not be pushed together into a smaller time period.</p> <p>Economics and Accounting are completely different subjects covering their own concepts, ideas and skills. Not all teachers are able to teach competently in all subject areas.</p> <p>Going forward students won't have the basic, solid foundation necessary for the next level of learning. Level 2 builds on the knowledge of level 1 and students will have basically lost a whole year of learning. Does this mean Level 2 Accounting is now going to become Level 1? Are we dumbing down the Commerce subjects and setting</p>	No.	No			2020-07-02 09:29:10	ANON-YFPW-RCT3-2	2020-07-02 09:29:10	2020-07-02 09:29:27
No		Strongly disagree	Merging Accounting, Economics and Business Studies into Level 1 Commerce will do the students an enormous disservice. The subjects are vastly different in terms of their content and will make specialization at Levels 2 and 3 more difficult for some students.			No			2020-07-02 09:45:53	ANON-YFPW-RCT2-1	2020-07-02 09:45:53	2020-07-02 09:46:00

Yes	the idea sounds good initially but is actually terrible in reality (just like socialism.) combining 3 business subjects into one will not lead to increased specialisation at level 2, the students will not have enough background to be able to specialise in any, especially in accounting. BAD IDEA BAD IDEA BAD IDEA	Strongly disagree	there is no rationalisation to combine 3 business subjects into one. subject numbers are strong in all 3 of these subjects so why combine them. aren't you trying to increase financial literacy???? If you are trying to get people to be financially dependant on the government go ahead, if you want people to be financially independent and promote independent thinking then leave these subjects alone is this just a socialist agenda to get rid of business??? wake up! small business is the backbone of any economy accounting is the language of business and finance , and last time i looked most people need to know about getting a loan or a mortgage	Economic issues are some of the biggest challenges facing the world today, do you want people who are unaware of this? do you want to dumb things down? accounting is the language of business, do we want to have no knowledge of business or basic accounting and budgeting there is no logical reason to combine 3 business subjects into one and then expect people to be able to specialise at level 2. it wont work and you don't have the staff who could make this work none of the subjects will be done well at level one under this proposal. "if a man chases 3 rabbits he will catch none." this is just a cynical cost cutting exercise dressed up as "educational improvement"	I would like the ministry to justify the following 1) how combining 3 subjects into 1 is justified based on subject numbers 2) how eliminating 2/3 of the content from each of the subjects will somehow enable you to specialise at year 12 3) how you will staff this fiasco given that not all teachers of one of the subjects could teach the others WELL, and we are all about quality teaching right? RIGHT? 4) what is the real agenda behind this proposal, because it is definitely not about quality education and financial literacy, and it is certainly not about financial independence and freedom.	No				2020-07-02 09:50:37	ANON-YFPW-RCTU-4	2020-07-02 09:50:37	2020-07-02 09:50:50
Yes	Reducing the number of subject choices is limiting not broadening especially when each subject develops different skills	Disagree	some combinations are reducing skills and curriculum development not covered elsewhere	Indications that Commerce will have very little accounting is removing a skill set not covered elsewhere. The 'practical constraints' would indicate it should remain a subject in its own right. Does the data back up that students access accounting at higher levels and are successful. (level 2 numbers drop off not increase) Will level 2 accounting be 'dumbed down' if it is new for everyone. Level 1 accounting gives a broader curriculum choice for those who choose to specialize elsewhere at higher levels.		No				2020-07-02 10:32:15	ANON-YFPW-RC9Y-D	2020-07-02 10:32:15	2020-07-02 10:33:16
Yes		Disagree	This comment concerns Economics, Accounting and Business Studies being grouped as 'Commerce'. I have no real concern with the happening but do strongly oppose the removal of Level 1 Accounting Standards. These standards provide the foundation for a strong understanding of accounting processes which are useful not only in any future study of accounting and business studies but for general use in everyday life. Standards such as 'Make a financial decision' include skills that all New Zealanders should possess and be able to use.			No				2020-07-02 10:52:12	ANON-YFPW-RC9Y-A	2020-07-02 10:52:12	2020-07-02 10:52:21
Yes		Disagree		Where is English Language? ELL standards are essential for migrants, refugees, and international students.	English Language, including English for Academic Purposes	No				2020-07-02 12:02:16	ANON-YFPW-RC9C-Q	2020-07-02 12:02:16	2020-07-02 12:02:27
Yes		Undecided		Concerned about the combined Health and Physical Education proposal - I believe this will be a detriment to the subject		No				2020-07-02 12:03:27	ANON-YFPW-RC9S-7	2020-07-02 12:03:27	2020-07-02 12:03:37
Yes	This approach is already available at Year 10, where Commerce is an Option Subject, and the Science, Mathematics, English and Social Studies are compulsory. If the intention is to make Commerce compulsory at Year 10, then this would meet the needs of ensuring that all New Zealanders have some understanding. However, to collapse specialist subjects at Year 11 simply builds the leap from Year 11 to Year 12. Without the foundation knowledge at Year 11, many students would struggle with the workload to meet current levels of achievement at Year 12. To dumb down Year 12 to accommodate a dumbing down of Year 11, smacks of dumbing down.	Strongly disagree	The Ministry knows all the specialist subjects align with the NZ Curriculum, so this is a stupid question. However if the question is aimed at students missing out on financial literacy then make Commerce compulsory at Year 10. A superficial understanding of Accounting, Economics and Business Studies is possible in Year 10. This is not a foundation course for Year 11. It just lets students know what are good and bad choices for subjects at Year 11. Shifting the requirement of understanding from Year 10 to Year 11 is insulting to Year 10, where a combined course would help students make good choices at Year 11. Early specialisation is a stupid argument to justify lower standards being reached at the end of Year 13. Dumbing down - NOT IN THE MIISTRY'S NZ CURRICULUM	You are trying to fix a wheel that is not broken. You would not combine NZ Sign Language with French to get LANGUAGES. Why would you combine Economics and Accounting to get COMMERCE and think the outcome would be different. At some point students need to choose and that is Year 10. Nothing is set in stone for students to change options if the choice at Year 11 is misguided. At the moment a bad choice is not monished as some subjects will accept students who did not do Year 11, into a Year 12 course. If the decision is delayed a year, the specialist courses in Year 12 and Year 13 will not allow this solution. Students who drop out will face very restricted choices in Year 13. Why would leaving school having dropped out of a Year 12 course be a good idea? Surely students who choose a subject because it sounds like them, can make a mistake that does not result in repeating Year 12 (the good old days) or taking a one year course in Art History which has no benefit vocationally. Dropping out of school would see long term unemployment become the Ministry driven career path for many struggling students where language and culture	If the Ministry is determined to push this through because of their agenda (this was never asked for by teachers) then the Ministry should think of equipping schools to offer one year introductory courses to Poly Tech and Apprenticeships so that students do not get disconnected from the qualification stream. In addition, schools need to be equipped to offer these courses. A considerable expense to the Government. In addition schools must face that many of their senior student leaders will have weak academic programmes as students who can't pass Year 12 in a subject search for alternative one year courses at Year 13 or worse - LEAVE.	Yes	This is not a relevant requirement in my submission.	This is a matter for Iwi to decide and feed back, not Ministry to impose.		2020-07-02 12:14:46	ANON-YFPW-RC98-C	2020-07-02 12:14:46	2020-07-02 12:15:02
Yes	However a base grounding of specialist subjects still has a place at Level 1, Business, Economics and Accounting are very different in their content, context and delivery so suit very different students.	Disagree	Does not allow students the opportunity to choose specific subjects if they have an aptitude in those areas. Why are certain learning areas given subject specialism and others not?			Yes				2020-07-02 12:21:45	ANON-YFPW-RC99-D	2020-07-02 12:21:45	2020-07-02 12:21:52

Yes		Disagree	I like the idea of making materials technology more broad and possibly mixing hard and soft materials as a single subject, but I am concerned that the opportunity for soft material/textiles design is getting pushed out all together, which would be unfortunate with the strong fashion designers that have come out of our country.	I like the idea of making materials technology more broad and possibly mixing hard and soft materials as a single subject, but I am concerned that the opportunity for soft material/textiles design is getting pushed out all together, which would be unfortunate with the strong fashion designers that have come out of our country.	Creative technologies	Yes			2020-07-02 12:25:27	ANON-YFPW-RC9G-U	2020-07-02 12:25:27	2020-07-02 12:25:39
Yes		Strongly agree		Science with two specialities only. Keep its simple and a good coverage of general science for a strong base knowledge.		No			2020-07-02 12:32:22	ANON-YFPW-RC9J-X	2020-07-02 12:32:22	2020-07-02 12:32:36
Yes		Agree				Yes			2020-07-02 13:51:27	ANON-YFPW-RC9E-5	2020-07-02 13:51:27	2020-07-02 13:51:35
No	Yes, I was aware of the principle of the changes.	Strongly disagree	These changes make a subjective claim to the value of a subject. Commerce is a field of study and is belittled by condensing it down to an area of social science. By the same logic, you should also place English as a sub topic within the Learning Languages.	As a commerce teacher, it is tremendously inconsiderate to combine the three disciplines (Economics, Accounting, Business Studies) into a single subject. There is no way that within the time frame of one year can you hope to deliver a true and accurate picture of any of the three disciplines. Also, the note states that very little accounting will be taught due to "practical constraints". As a past registered accountant, I am disappointed that the practicality of financial literacy within a business is seen to have lesser value. This does not align with the curriculum as the study of business financials is a essential to any commerce major.	None.	No			2020-07-02 14:12:15	ANON-YFPW-RC9S-9	2020-07-02 14:12:15	2020-07-02 14:12:23
Yes		Strongly disagree	The "clumping" of all commerce subjects together shows no understanding of the different aspects involved in all areas.	The commerce subjects should all be kept separate - each has its strengths as a standalone subject and to put them in 1 clump dilutes the essence of the subject matter and importance to financial literacy and 21st century NZ		Yes			2020-07-02 14:26:56	ANON-YFPW-RC9P-4	2020-07-02 14:26:56	2020-07-02 14:27:07
Yes	I have grave concerns about the "combination" of Economics, Accounting & Business Studies into one domain. I do not believe that CETA was given a chance to be involved in the final decision making - apparently it was a DONE DEAL! Especially, when DRAMA and DANCE have been kept separate! Surely, these are more suited to being combined.	Strongly disagree	Completely off the mark with the Commerce combination. Level One Science is being "dumbed" down - students need the basics of science! It has become too theoretical. Keep it fact based no airy-fairy. Not all students who are great at science are also excellent at English. Keep science as science. Do not blur the edges.	Keep Economics as a separate academic subject - theory at this level is essential to build the fundamental economic concepts and graphs. Level Two Economics is a huge step up into the macro environment and students need to have a thorough understanding of the market equilibrium. Consider combining Accounting and Business Studies into one subject. LEAVE ECONOMICS ON ITS OWN.		Yes			2020-07-02 14:34:19	ANON-YFPW-RC97-B	2020-07-02 14:34:19	2020-07-02 14:34:30
Yes		Undecided				No			2020-07-02 14:51:43	ANON-YFPW-RC9F-T	2020-07-02 14:51:43	2020-07-02 14:51:51
Yes	It is logical.	Strongly agree		It looks like a good balance that will produce greater specialization later in the students' school lives.	No	Yes	It looks logical.		2020-07-02 14:55:05	ANON-YFPW-RC91-5	2020-07-02 14:55:05	2020-07-02 14:55:24
Yes		Agree			No	No			2020-07-02 14:55:31	ANON-YFPW-RC9Z-E	2020-07-02 14:55:31	2020-07-02 14:55:39
Yes		Agree		Science. Needs to cater broadly to students with widely divergent needs: - those heading towards a more basic trades career ; - those heading towards an academic or professional science qualification; - those needing a generally broad education. The General course should be simple and broad, and should also continue into level 2 for students following Trades courses. Specific strands (Chemistry, Physics, Biology, Earth Science) should be more rigorous and provide a good foundation for a thorough treatment of the specialised courses in Levels 2 & 3.		No			2020-07-02 17:03:52	ANON-YFPW-RC9H-V	2020-07-02 17:03:52	2020-07-02 17:04:04
Yes		Undecided			Specific Climate Change subject that incorporates an interdisciplinary approach and also a Te Ao Māori Science course.	No			2020-07-02 18:33:24	ANON-YFPW-RC9B-P	2020-07-02 18:33:24	2020-07-02 18:33:34
Yes		Agree				No			2020-07-02 19:37:04	ANON-YFPW-RC9M-1	2020-07-02 19:37:04	2020-07-02 19:37:13

Yes		Strongly disagree	I don't have an issue with offering more options for schools and students to choose from. However, I find it inappropriate to decide all sciences and commerce should all just get lumped into their respective categories. It should be up to the school and demand from students to decide what is the best option for them. This selection sounds very political as if it was the National government then science and commerce might have more weight in the selection process.	Subjects such as science and commerce/ business have been sidelined in a time when NZ needs to promote science innovation and to further develop the economy. While it is possible to pick up accounting and economics at level two, it requires a far stronger academic ability to skip year 11 courses. Students from disadvantage background will have a greater barrier in achieving in science and commerce with limited year 11 prior knowledge and stepping stone. In accounting, year 11 students who have learned about journal and ledgers are much better prepared for year 12-13 standards where they need to process ledgers for stock control, accounts receivable, partnership accounts...etc. Unless AS1.2 in accounting is moved up to level 2, it is as important as the timetable for junior maths to access senior maths. Other units such as accounting concepts AS1.1 and AS2.1 in accounting provide step stones for students. A number of students will find it more difficult to skip AS1.1 to move to AS2.1. In economics, year 11 AS1.1, AS1.3, AS1.4 is a must for economic modelling in year 12. While it is possible to pick the concepts up in year 12, 13,		No			2020-07-02 21:07:57	ANON-YFPW-RC9D-R	2020-07-02 21:07:57	2020-07-02 21:08:22
Yes		Agree		I wish to see separate Accounting, Economics and Business Studies rather than some general mish mash of all three. I think three offers greater flexibility eg at present in Level 1 we offer Accounting and Economics standards, no Business Studies. We used to offer all three but students found it too much to cover standards from all three .	No	No		2020-07-03 07:49:32	ANON-YFPW-RC9X-C	2020-07-03 07:49:32	2020-07-03 07:49:54	
Yes		Undecided		With the governments focus on moving the New Zealand economy into a knowledge/ technology based space and with the ministry reporting metrics on STEM in schools being seen as so important it seems something of a contradiction to be distilling (dumbing down) all science into a single subject while on the other hand retaining 3 performing arts subject, Music, Drama and Dance. Perhaps they should be distilled down to "performing arts" and "Science" left in its distinct subject areas.		No		2020-07-03 08:39:28	ANON-YFPW-RC9A-N	2020-07-03 08:39:28	2020-07-03 08:39:43	
Yes	Compression of subjects into core areas: * Provides better opportunity for establishing a broad foundational understanding of a general area of work * Avoids unnecessary early specialisation (forcing students into pathways that they did not actively choose, do not have sufficient awareness of, are unable to effectively engage in) * Allows for better management of staff and resources in creating courses for the school But: * Potentially degrades the perception of topics merely for being uncommonly known	Agree	* Dance, Drama, Maori Performing Arts should be compressed into a single Performing Arts subject - there is no reason to not integrate all traditions and backgrounds of performance art together - the same as grouping together Maths/Stats, Health/PhysEd, all Sciences * "Social Studies" is an outdated term originally used to group the extra bits that no other subject really covered explicitly. It is now a mature subject and leads into fields known generally as Social Sciences - this should be the preferred name for the subject - it is even the name used for actual degrees covering this subject area * Generally speaking, the idea of "possible contexts within.." MUST be discarded completely. They are NOT just "possible contexts" but legitimately distinct areas of knowledge that could/should be taught within the subject: Chemistry is its own area within Science, Economics is its own area within Commerce, so Media is its own area within Social Sciences, so Art History is its own area within History	* Dance, Drama, Maori Performing Arts should be compressed into a single Performing Arts subject - there is no reason to not integrate all traditions and backgrounds of performance art together - the same as grouping together Maths/Stats, Health/PhysEd, all Sciences * "Social Studies" is an outdated term originally used to group the extra bits that no other subject really covered explicitly. It is now a mature subject and leads into fields known generally as Social Sciences - this should be the preferred name for the subject - it is even the name used for actual degrees covering this subject area * Generally speaking, the idea of "possible contexts within.." MUST be discarded completely. They are NOT just "possible contexts" but legitimately distinct areas of knowledge that could/should be taught within the subject: Chemistry is its own area within Science, Economics is its own area within Commerce, so Media is its own area within Social Sciences, so Art History is its own area within History		No		2020-07-03 09:54:38	ANON-YFPW-RC9N-2	2020-07-03 09:54:38	2020-07-03 09:54:44	
Yes		Strongly disagree	Putting all the sciences into one general science subject is short-sighted.			No		2020-07-03 10:04:36	ANON-YFPW-RC9K-Y	2020-07-03 10:04:36	2020-07-03 10:04:46	
No		Strongly disagree		I would be very disappointed if Latin was not included in NCAEA level 1 and 2 as it is a very important language and so many words in our English language derive from Latin. Also slot if medical and scientific words are latin. My son loves his latin. Please keep it in the curriculum.	Latin	No		2020-07-03 19:49:59	ANON-YFPW-RC9R-6	2020-07-03 19:49:59	2020-07-03 19:50:10	

Yes		Disagree		As a parent I am appalled to see ThatNutrition and the practical skills required to produce nutritious food are missing from the subject list. During the pandemic it became obvious that many NZers can't cook and rely heavily on convenience foods and takeaways. This inevitably has a huge and unnecessary impact on our health system. Governments especially the current government uses the word Well-being but they fail to recognise that Nutrition and the physical skills and knowledge associated with Nutrition has a huge impact on all 4 dimensions of Hauora. Basic food and Nutrition knowledge has been lost and the younger generation are oblivious to the negative impacts that poor food choice is having on their well-being. The question really is, can the ministry of education provide substantial evidence today and in the future to all NZers that food and Nutrition does not impact on individuals Hauora? Food Science is NOT Nutrition regardless of what companies involved in the food industry say. Their main objectives are predominately to make profit and have no interest in the impacts their products have on the well-being of consumers. History has proven this. Does The M.O.E want to act responsibly and protect the health and well-being of the younger generation or not? If the M.O.E does not continue to fully		No			2020-07-03 20:01:25	ANON-YFPW-RC9W-8	2020-07-03 20:00:15	2020-07-03 20:01:33
Yes		Agree		I believe Technology subjects should be broader and promote cross curriculum...It shouldn't be a "subject" as such but a "specialised" field instead e.g Product Design - DVC and Materials (could be textile or hard tech etc.). Spatial Design - DVC focus solely on architecture, spatial and landscape etc., Food Technology - food science. Home Economics (hospitality). Digital Media design (media and animation) - Computer Science - coding, programming etc.	Same as my previous comment above. We need to really identify what they are doing in tertiary studies to close the gaps (if there's any etc.)	Yes	Incorporate community more. Make it a community focus.	2020-07-03 20:11:18	ANON-YFPW-RC94-8	2020-07-03 20:11:18	2020-07-03 20:11:38	
No		Undecided		Latin should be included as it is a language from which many of our words come from and our medical and scientific names derive, and so it's important not to lose the language		No		2020-07-03 20:52:38	ANON-YFPW-RC9T-8	2020-07-03 20:52:38	2020-07-03 20:52:55	
Yes		Agree			Mindfulness	No		2020-07-05 00:38:39	ANON-YFPW-RC93-7	2020-07-05 00:38:39	2020-07-05 00:38:56	
Yes		Undecided	Changing Home Economics to Food Science does not take into consideration the aspects of the HPE curriculum particularly the area of well being that are currently delivered as part of a Home Economics programme. There is more to the subject than food science. Further down the track will we become part of the science curriculum? The same applies to food (process) technology. Is it now a science? How do Science feel about the use of the word science in the name? Confusing for everyone but especially students and parents. Consider another name - Food and Life Studies is the one we use at our school.	See above		No		2020-07-05 12:42:43	ANON-YFPW-RC92-6	2020-07-05 12:42:43	2020-07-05 12:43:02	
Yes		Disagree		Food Science needs to revert back to Food and Nutrition. Food Science doesn't cover enough of the basic nutrient knowledge that students need in order to improve their physical well being.		No		2020-07-06 10:20:06	ANON-YFPW-RC9U-9	2020-07-06 10:20:06	2020-07-06 10:20:20	
No		Strongly disagree	With regards to the Commerce area, placing three areas of Accounting, Economics and Business Studies into one course would seriously impact students exposure to Commerce. Furthermore, the important financial literacy skills that are developed in the accounting paper would disappear.	Research indicates the lack of financial literacy skills in our community, not just for individuals but also for our small businesses that make up 98% of our commercial world. The Accounting subject area with some revisions to its curriculum will deliver the financial literacy skills to our teenagers but the subject needs the dedicated space in NCEA Level 1 to enable this to happen.		No		2020-07-06 11:59:54	ANON-YFPW-RCUY-9	2020-07-06 11:59:54	2020-07-06 12:00:32	
Yes	Yes aware and fully in support of this	Agree	Only one area of concern is that te reo Māori has been identified (woohoo) but I'm wondering if at level 1 a broader inclusion of te reo me ngā tikanga would then therefore also encompass some of the filed Māoir offerings which could and should be developed into achievement standards as well.	Te Reo Māori me ngā tikanga - it is widely known teaching language in isolation does not sustain the culture of the target language. I also think we need to consider this for the Pacific languages as well.	Field Māori needs redevelopment to encompass achievement standards as there is some great mahi in this space	Yes	There is a good cross-section of the learning areas of the marau. This will be an interesting space to see being developed. I am hopeful that this will be presented in similar fashion as foundational knowledge and then specialisation at L2 & 3. Has there been consideration to a combination of Ngā Toi or is the splitting on purpose?	2020-07-06 21:41:32	ANON-YFPW-RCUV-6	2020-07-06 21:41:32	2020-07-06 21:41:49	

Yes		Strongly agree	The proposed subjects meet the criteria of providing a broad, foundational NCEA.	With reference to commerce, I support combining accounting, economics and business studies into one subject. From a business perspective, it is essential to have knowledge of accounting and economics when pursuing business studies. From an economics perspective combining the 3 subjects allows students the space to engage with other subject areas as well. As NZ moves towards a circular economy it is important that economists and business people have an understanding of where resources are coming from, who is making products and what happens at the end of the product's life. For this, knowledge of subjects outside of commerce is essential - allowing students to take other subjects like science, history, geography and social studies will give them the base knowledge to be able to put their commerce learnings into perspective. Combining economics, business studies and accounting will also increase the likelihood that students whose main interests lie in other areas will elect to take commerce, giving them a valuable base of knowledge to take into their future studies.		No				2020-07-07 07:18:14	ANON-YFPW-RCUC-K	2020-07-07 07:18:14	2020-07-07 07:18:23
Yes		Agree				No				2020-07-07 12:04:20	ANON-YFPW-RCUS-3	2020-07-07 12:04:20	2020-07-07 12:04:29
Yes	I have concerns that some schools may not offer Level 1 and this would greatly disadvantage those students that Level 1 is the only academic accomplishment that they are capable of achieving.	Agree	students are still young at Level 1 and giving a broad education will be beneficial for everyone.			No	not familiar with all aspects that is on offer but am aware of its inclusion in areas that I am involved with.			2020-07-07 16:48:31	ANON-YFPW-RCU8-8	2020-07-07 16:48:31	2020-07-07 16:48:57
Yes		Undecided				No				2020-07-08 11:22:38	ANON-YFPW-RCU9-9	2020-07-08 11:22:38	2020-07-08 11:22:59
Yes		Agree	In principle, most of the ideas are good. There is still a lot of work needed about how the different elements of curriculum areas get brought together under one course in areas where they have been so distinct previously. We need to make sure there is no watering down of the essential parts.	There is a particular amount of uncertainty and uneasiness about the way Science will be delivered. It needs to keep some of the content focus in what is a very content-rich subject. I am in support of Commerce becoming a more general course that can allow branching out into Economics, Accounting and Business later on. I am also in favour of Media Studies being part of a wider Social Studies course - I think it has the scope to do more than it currently does as a highly specialised individual course.	No	No				2020-07-09 12:37:11	ANON-YFPW-RCUG-Q	2020-07-09 12:37:11	2020-07-09 12:37:22
Yes		Disagree		I am concerned about what a general Commerce Course at Level 1 will do to students ability to gain the knowledge and understanding to be successful at Levels 2 and 3. It would be helpful to see the plan for all levels before being able to make a final decision.		No				2020-07-09 13:42:39	ANON-YFPW-RCUJ-T	2020-07-09 13:42:39	2020-07-09 13:42:47
Yes		Disagree	I am especially concerned about the Technology provision. Food Science is not Home Economics and vice versa. Food Technology is distinct from Food Science, Nutrition or Home Economics. Processing technologies are not confined to Food - they include a wide range of materials including textiles and, for example, harakeke. Construction and Mechanical Technologies included both hard materials and textiles. Materials technologies gives no indication about what this might or might not include.	It is unclear whether these subjects would be concerned with the processes or the outcomes. Food Science is not Home Economics and vice versa. Food Technology is distinct from Food Science, Nutrition or Home Economics. Processing technologies are not confined to Food - they include a wide range of materials including textiles and, for example, harakeke. Construction and Mechanical Technologies included both hard materials and textiles. Materials technologies gives no indication about what this might or might not include. Without examples of contexts, it is difficult to offer any feedback, but as a start, in the past construction and mechanical technology in textiles has been concerned with garment construction. This is only one area of textiles.		No				2020-07-09 16:11:14	ANON-YFPW-RCUQ-1	2020-07-09 16:11:14	2020-07-09 16:11:36
Yes		Strongly disagree	I have been apart of the commerce lineup during level 1 and there is a pronounced and distinct difference between the 3 subjects to the point that they should not be separated, regardless the level of NCEA. In particular, the L1 accounting programme is filled with the general accounting functions and tools used as a foundation and this only fits in one whole year programme, whereas economics and business studies also have their own major parts (ie. macro and micro economics) which also take up a large period for a solid foundation towards an economics degree or accounting focuses BComm degree.	/	/	No				2020-07-09 21:14:26	ANON-YFPW-RCU5-5	2020-07-09 21:14:26	2020-07-09 21:14:45

Yes		Agree	I have commented separately on the Science subject questionnaire (which I teach). I support Option B on that survey.	I think Science should have some contextual strand standards. The other changes seem logical and support a broader qualification.	No				2020-07-13 12:41:57	ANON-YFPW-RCUP-Z	2020-07-13 12:41:57	2020-07-13 12:42:07	
Yes	It has been well publicised in the various education/teaching networks I belong to and at my school	Strongly agree	If the vision of NCEA Level 1 is to be achieved then there needs to be a review of the subjects on offer. I definitely support the integration of subjects and in particular I support the integration of Sciences and Commerce.	As a commerce teacher, I believe that integrating Economics, Business Studies and Accounting (to a lesser extent) will mean there is less duplication of learning, greater depth of learning and a better introduction into the overall purpose of commerce subjects (in terms of skills, knowledge and dispositions). There is NO need to specialise in these subjects at Level 1 - they should be integrated.	No				2020-07-14 10:59:57	ANON-YFPW-RCU7-7	2020-07-14 10:59:57	2020-07-14 11:00:15	
Yes		Agree	pleased to see a range of languages sorry to see latin not included	Latin is an ideal introduction to language learning- especially for bright nerdy Boys, who may not respond to the communicative Approach, but rather to a more mathematical/linguistic one	Translation studies (Translation into English from a chosen language or languages) is a specialised skill that should earn credits in English (definitely) and possibly also the chosen language. This fits with the skills based aspects of the NZ Curriculum. (Translation is often falsely considered to be a way to test comprehension in the "new" language, whereas it is really a specialised skill that has more to do with the first language into which the translator generally translates.	Yes			2020-07-14 13:21:02	ANON-YFPW-RCU1-1	2020-07-14 13:21:02	2020-07-14 13:21:27	
Yes		Strongly agree				Yes		No	2020-07-14 14:05:19	ANON-YFPW-RCUZ-A	2020-07-14 14:05:19	2020-07-14 14:05:28	
Yes		Agree		I would like to see Biology, Chemistry, Physics and Earth & Space Science retained as separate subjects as this allows for a more diverse range of standards to choose from when constructing a Level 1 Science course which meets the needs of individual learners.		No			2020-07-14 14:08:45	ANON-YFPW-RCUH-R	2020-07-14 14:08:45	2020-07-14 14:09:13	
Yes		Agree		I would like to see Biology, Chemistry, Physics and Earth & Space Science retained as separate subjects as this allows for a more diverse range of standards to choose from when constructing a Level 1 Science course which meets the needs of individual learners.		No			2020-07-14 14:09:41	ANON-YFPW-RCUB-J	2020-07-14 14:09:41	2020-07-14 14:09:57	
No		Strongly disagree	My name is Jason Thorpe. I am a Latin teacher. I completed my training in 2018 to become a teacher specialising in Latin and Classical Studies. I currently work at Fintona Girls' School in Melbourne as a Latin teacher. In my training with the University of Auckland Education Campus, we were taught of an emerging priority regarding the importance of teaching academic English to enhance student outcomes. Latin enables students to understand academic English owing to the innumerable derivatives from Latin language. Latin students statistically achieve higher scores in language based subjects such as English, History, and Classics. Latin also addresses a second emerging priority to counter monolingualism bias through the experience of learning another language. Latin also involves much historical and literary analysis, already achieving the current aims to compact	My name is Jason Thorpe, I am a Latin teacher. I completed my training in 2018 to become a teacher specialising in Latin and Classical Studies. I currently work at Fintona Girls' School in Melbourne as a Latin teacher. I suggest that Latin be kept and invested in. In my training with the University of Auckland Education Campus, we were taught of an emerging priority regarding the importance of teaching academic English to enhance student outcomes. Latin enables students to understand academic English owing to the innumerable derivatives from Latin language. Latin students statistically achieve higher scores in language based subjects such as English, History, and Classics. Latin also addresses a second emerging priority to counter monolingualism bias through the experience of learning another language. My students love the subject, I have a lot of passion and energy in my teaching and I get my students excited and valuing everything Latin has to offer. I have goals to return to NZ and introduce Latin into new schools, and through my success develop modern and engaging methods for teaching Latin. Latin must remain an option for students to learn, as it is an extremely rigorous academic subject that challenges and enriches the lives of those who are willing and able to take up the challenge.	Yes				2020-07-14 16:17:38	ANON-YFPW-RCUM-W	2020-07-14 16:17:38	2020-07-14 16:17:55	
Yes		Strongly agree				No			2020-07-14 20:50:14	ANON-YFPW-RCUX-8	2020-07-14 20:50:14	2020-07-14 20:50:24	
Yes	I support this direction	Strongly agree	Students need a board educational base for a strong pathway. There is plenty of time to specialise			No			2020-07-15 10:43:38	ANON-YFPW-RCUA-H	2020-07-15 10:43:38	2020-07-15 10:43:48	
Yes		Strongly disagree		The removal of the separate sciences is a tragedy. It will stop us from being able to create diverse year 11 science courses built which directly relate to student interests. It will reduce the amount of students we have feeding into senior courses as it is the science content that students find interesting not the nature of science so much.	Human Biology	No				2020-07-15 13:34:39	ANON-YFPW-RCUN-X	2020-07-15 13:34:39	2020-07-15 13:34:43

Yes		Agree		I think that Latin should be included among the languages that are offered. I think that language learning needs to be strengthened and the connection between our three official languages (English, Te Reo, NZ sign language) and *other* languages needs to be better understood and supported. Studying Latin, in particular, not only allows for a better understanding of other languages (in particular romance languages such as French or Spanish, but also English and German), but also of the language of science (in which Latin terminology dominates). Further more, while I am in strong support of the emphasis on local histories, the elimination of Classics can be balanced by the retention of Latin - as the study of this language of course also allows for an understanding of the societies in which this language was used.	I think that a required component in language learning (including Te Reo and other "foreign" languages, including Latin) should be seen as part of our students' core literacy skills. In learning the structure of another language, students develop important linguistic and cultural understanding of how communication works - which is a key skill in an increasingly multicultural and multilingual Aotearoa. They also become more aware of their the language(s) they are more familiar (in most cases, English). We include - and in fact we make it compulsory - Maths (even if they are not going to take it all the way to NCEAL level 3) because we believe that numeracy is important in what ever education or career pathway the students may choose. Similarly, we should make learning a language (other than one's own) an important component of our Year 11 studies.	No			2020-07-15 13:43:48	ANON-YFPW-RCUK-U	2020-07-15 13:43:09	2020-07-15 13:43:55
Yes		Strongly disagree	As a teacher of commerce for 40 years I do not agree with the huge assumption that accounting will be taken at level 2. Level 1 accounting is our third most popular option with three classes. At level 2 when students "specialise" it drops to one class. The level one provides financial literacy not offered at higher levels and an important base of knowledge for those who become self employed, middle managers, club officers,. Less than one third of our year '11 accounting students show any desire to do economics or business studies so that will be a significant disincentive to take a subject that offers so much to financial independence.	see comments above	Legal Studies is one of our most popular level 2 and 3 options. If you push introductory accounting into level two then some students will be forced to drop one. I support a strong call for a unit standards style course for financial literacy that targets non university students, yr12 leavers and potential supports trade courses and pre-employment programmes.	No		As an observation we are 10 times more likely to attract Maori students into accounting at level one than in level 2. The current curriculum suits many Maori students and we have strong pass rates that can encourage students to follow promising career pathways.	2020-07-15 18:44:49	ANON-YFPW-RCUR-2	2020-07-15 18:37:24	2020-07-15 18:45:15
Yes	I Teach Science, so I am commenting on the science sections only	Undecided	While I think the NCEA level 1 Science Matrix is adequate and allows a lot of choice, especially in terms of internal assessments, I believe that some changes are needed.	I have read the document and my choice would be Option C that has 20 NCEA level 1 standards. I think these give a wider choice and can easily be implemented.	no	No			2020-07-16 14:33:54	ANON-YFPW-RCU4-4	2020-07-16 14:26:32	2020-07-16 14:34:12
Yes		Disagree	I'd like to see a Life Skills subject in place of Home Economics. I'd also like to see the individual science retained to strengthen the base for students who want to go on with STEM courses.	Please see above	Please see above	Yes			2020-07-16 19:49:18	ANON-YFPW-RCUT-4	2020-07-16 19:49:18	2020-07-16 19:49:29
Yes		Undecided	Re Level 1 Commerce. I teach Business Studies at a low decile Boys' high and have taught Economics in the past. We have discontinued Economics in favour of Business Studies. We have had much more student interest and success, in Business Studies than we had previously Economics and Accounting. We feel that this is because it is more relevant, hands on, experience-driven, and entrepreneurial than the more theoretical Economics. I am worried that level 1 Commerce (new course) may be more slanted toward Economics than to Business Studies which will not suit our students. I am well aware that Economics teachers will well argue the opposite (but the same) case- ie don't slant it too heavily toward Business Studies with less Economics. Please keep the 'Carry Out a Business- Market Day' internal in level 1 Commerce.	Are you keeping the L1,2,3 Personal Financial Management US from Core Generic? Please keep them.		No			2020-07-17 13:21:36	ANON-YFPW-RCU3-3	2020-07-17 13:21:36	2020-07-17 13:22:07

Yes		Disagree	I would like to see a proposed "Food Science" curriculum paper before I commit to the proposed changes. Home economics should be about nutritional knowledge and practical skills for the future generations of parents. Enable them to make informed decision when caring and providing food for their children.		No	I am not informed sufficiently about this. Being Pakeha and married to a Maori I acknowledge the differences we are presented with within an educational context. We must be cautious though not to plant a seed that might lead to educational advantages/disadvantages for any cultural group in this nation.		2020-07-17 14:14:21	ANON-YFPW-RCUU-5	2020-07-17 14:14:21	2020-07-17 14:14:40
Yes		Agree	We don't agree with the proposed changes for Science and Commerce.	The effective removal of Accounting at Level 1 potentially negatively affects the subject's viability at Years 12 and 13 and it must remain as a stand-alone subject at this level. The subject is sufficiently specialist to require students to, where at all possible, study it prior to Year 12. Economics is a full-year subject in its own right and it is very hard to see Accounting being studied as part of a Year 11 Economics programme. Similarly, in Science, the removal of specialist Sciences subjects at this level would not be advisable - we do support, however, the changes that are being considered in this area since the publication of the proposed list in February 2020.		No		2020-07-17 14:15:38	ANON-YFPW-RCSV-7	2020-07-17 14:15:38	2020-07-17 14:15:59
No	I am a member of the Economics SEG. I was aware of change, but not that this would involve removing or merging core foundational subjects.	Strongly disagree	This proposal does meet the 7 criteria. In fact the status quo meets the criteria as it is. The Level 1 subjects as they stand with Economics, Accounting and Business studies as separate disciplines align very well with the NZC.	1. This notion of Foundational education at NCEA level 1 is not clear and not consistently applied across the L1 subjects. NCEA level 1 is already "foundational", but that is not the same as combining subjects and watering them down resulting in a lack of foundation. Economics, Accounting and Business studies are disciplines with their own distinct foundations, just have History and Geography have. 2. As separate subjects Economics, Accounting and Business studies support the inclusion of important rich learning from the national curriculum. Each support the key competencies, in different ways. There is little to no overlap in these subjects as the content, knowledge and skills required are distinct. Students know that Accounting is an information science and Economics is a social science and choose these accordingly. The way students of each discipline present their skills is also different, in the same way that Drama and Dance, both performing Arts, are considered to be presented differently. 3. Each of Economics, Business and Accounting have a clear pathway to NCEA level 2 and further study.		No		2020-07-17 15:35:09	ANON-YFPW-RCSV-4	2020-07-17 15:35:09	2020-07-17 15:35:24
Yes		Undecided	the broadening of subjects obviously will mean that some topics/ contexts are lost and this is an area of concern. many BOTs set rules that certain subjects are compulsory for yr 11s to sit, if these rules stay in place this broadening might mean some whole learning areas are overlooked by schools where as with the current format e.g. having a health and pe and home economics class might mean you atleast capture more students across the learning area. if this is condensed to one subject this might not continue to happen.	with level 1 health in particular NZQA need to consider updating the standards, some are very outdated and don't engage students in current issues, topics are not relevant in their lives. hopefully, standards will be updated as well as these other changes happening.	I don't think health and pe should be put together in level 2 and 3, they should remain separated.	No		2020-07-17 16:54:30	ANON-YFPW-RCSC-H	2020-07-17 16:54:30	2020-07-17 16:54:35
Yes		Agree				No		2020-07-17 17:07:23	ANON-YFPW-RCSS-1	2020-07-17 17:07:23	2020-07-17 17:07:39

Yes		Disagree	Media Studies is the obvious issue with this proposal. It would make sense for students to be able to study this through another domain (potentially English). This would ensure students are adequately prepared for Level two Media Studies and/or Psychology. The Level two standards for this subject are not follow on from the Level One Social Studies standards so unless this is addressed then issues may occur.	As above	It would be helpful to receive confirmation of the continuation of available Level 2 subjects.	Yes		No	2020-07-17 18:18:31	ANON-YFPW-RCS8-6	2020-07-17 18:18:31	2020-07-17 18:18:38
Yes		Disagree	I believe health and Physical Education should be kept separate to provide opportunities to have more practical PE assessments. Students who study NCEA L1 Health are usually quite different students who take Level 1 Physical Education.	I believe health and Physical Education should be kept separate to provide opportunities to have more practical PE assessments. Students who study NCEA L1 Health are usually quite different students who take Level 1 Physical Education.		No			2020-07-17 19:39:10	ANON-YFPW-RCS9-7	2020-07-17 19:39:10	2020-07-17 19:39:19
No		Agree				No			2020-07-17 20:43:03	ANON-YFPW-RCSJ-R	2020-07-17 20:43:03	2020-07-17 20:43:14
Yes		Undecided		In our school we offer Arabic Language, will there be a chance this will be included?		No			2020-07-18 08:06:05	ANON-YFPW-RCSQ-Y	2020-07-18 08:06:05	2020-07-18 08:06:46
Yes	Good to have a broad base at level 1 with more specialisation at level 2 & 3	Agree		Digital Technologies covers a broad range of skills and techniques both in digital design and in programming. There needs to be space to do both as well as other Technology and STEM subjects for our Technology inclined students. The future is digital!	Programming & Computer Science Digital Design Technology Robotics - hybrid of science and maths	No			2020-07-18 11:29:59	ANON-YFPW-RCSK-K	2020-07-18 11:29:59	2020-07-18 11:30:22
Yes		Agree				Yes			2020-07-18 12:33:43	ANON-YFPW-RCSX-X	2020-07-18 12:33:43	2020-07-18 12:33:52
Yes		Undecided		Whilst Art History can be included as part of a practical Art course or within a History class, this is unlikely to be done by an Art History specialist in most schools limiting a students options moving forward. Broadening what is assessed within practical art to include the option of a thorough research evidenced through written forms or oral presentation could be a possible solution.		Yes			2020-07-18 13:25:43	ANON-YFPW-RCS7-5	2020-07-18 13:25:43	2020-07-18 13:26:16
No		Disagree	I think Latin should be available.	I think Latin should be available. Although this is not a widely spoken language, there are benefits of learning it as knowledge of it helps when learning other languages and it has connections to terms used in some other learning areas, the sciences for example. I also wonder whether community languages such Hindi, Gujarati, Arabic could be included.	no, not aside from the languages mentioned in the previous question (Hindi, Gujarati, Arabic)	No			2020-07-18 14:02:11	ANON-YFPW-RCSF-M	2020-07-18 14:02:11	2020-07-18 14:02:33
No		Undecided		Will there be changes to teaching criteria?		No			2020-07-18 17:44:54	ANON-YFPW-RCS1-Y	2020-07-18 17:44:54	2020-07-18 17:45:25
Yes		Undecided				No			2020-07-19 09:47:59	ANON-YFPW-RCS8-G	2020-07-19 09:47:20	2020-07-19 09:48:02
Yes	There is nothing "broader" or more "foundational" to Western Civilisation than Classical Studies and Latin.	Strongly disagree	Level 1 Classical Studies provides an important pathway into the subject at Levels 2 and 3. Latin must be included if it is to form a part of Levels 2 and 3 - which it unquestionably should be.	Level 1 Classical Studies allows a foundational year to the highly specialised areas studied at Levels 2 and 3. After all, we are talking about western civilisation - an enormous and very important area of study. Latin must be allowed to continue at all levels. It is the basis of all Romance languages and Latin vocabulary forms a very large part of the English language too. It teaches students not just the vocabulary but the grammatical structures (which are the grammatical structures of English) and a disciplined way of thinking and analysing. It is unthinkable that a western, English-speaking country would not promote and encourage the teaching of Latin.	Yes, as above, Latin.	Yes			2020-07-19 12:54:24	ANON-YFPW-RCSM-U	2020-07-19 12:54:24	2020-07-19 12:54:50

Yes	Seems a good idea	Strongly agree	I'm a Food Technology and also a Hospitality teacher and I also have a Science degree. I think it makes sense to combine Food Tech and Home Economics at level 1, though I don't understand how further specialization at level 2 and 3 would modify this. I think that both Food tech and Home Ec teachers could learn from their different curriculum. Both have strength and weakness. Priority needs to be given to developing standards that are straight forward to teach, engaging and relevant. my experience with Food tech standards is that although they allow for some great student led work there can be annoying and irrelevant boxes that need ticking which lead to disengagement and frustration for both students and teachers. Food Science sounds great, but what does this mean?? Is it an exploration of scientific concepts via food? Or is it about exploring cooking with a focus on understanding food related processes, ingredients, nutrition ?	Food Tech and Home Ec = Food Science I think that Food Science should not be taught as an off shoot of Science (although I think the idea of teaching level 1 science via cooking is a great one for student engagement). Food Tech's strength is in student led product development (design process) and understanding production process / cooking techniques/ chemical change. Without having taught Home Ec. I'm guessing it's strengths are in teaching Nutrition/ diet and its personal and social consequences. I think that the strengths of both these subjects are complimentary and could be combined. Nutrition - understand the basic science of this (it's complicated so keep it relatively simple) and the effects of deficiencies / poor/ good nutrition. An understanding of nutrition (probably taught in Health/ PE) is important in navigating life/parenthood etc Cooking Processes/ Chemical / Physical change / bio active ingredients ... all great stuff which allow for a wide range of exploration via food production	I definitely think that sustainability based standards should be added to, it is and only become more so an important focus for the future. These should be practical / actions based as much as possible. Maybe Science concepts taught via Foods standards. Many level 1 science standards could be taught via a practical food focus	No	I imagine it is the same as in English, or should be. It would only be relevant to me or students/parents if we were fluent in te reo	I did not answer yes to the above question and was not aware that it was different. If it differed why is it called described as "the New Zealand Curriculum in te reo Māori" surely it should be called "the New Zealand Māori Curriculum in te reo Māori"	2020-07-19 15:11:08	ANON-YFPW-RCSJ-J	2020-07-19 15:11:08	2020-07-19 15:11:27
Yes		Undecided		Accounting Level One. Over the past two years I have run a broad business programme for Level One Business and included the blend of three components, Accounting, Economics and Business. The vision was to provide a broad understanding of business and then specialise in each subject in Level Two. One main reason that we blended and broadened was in response to our enrolment numbers. After two years of implementing this, we have found this unsustainable. Unfortunately this has resulted in key Accounting and Economics learning missed. A blend of three key specialist areas/major learning areas is not beneficial for the subject because each subject has its own. We started planning for 2021 at the beginning of the year, and decided to blend only two subjects. Our ideas are to blend Econ/Bus and Acc/Bus. We need our Econ/Bus to meet the needs for Level 2 Econ and Level Two Agri-bus. We choose Acc/Bus as it can still fulfill the needs for Accounting skills and also be supplemented by crucial business learnings. I think blending Acc/Econ/Bus is too broad. I suggest only blending two subjects, perhaps Bus/Econ and leaving Accounting to stand alone.		No			2020-07-19 20:40:44	ANON-YFPW-RCSX-6	2020-07-19 20:35:45	2020-07-19 20:40:49
No	The Commerce subjects cater for very different ability students with Economics requiring much greater understanding of key concepts and application to theory to explain changes whilst the Business standards cater for students interested in the practical application of business principles in the making and selling of a product. Why would you deny students the opportunity to take a subject that best fits their abilities by removing these options.	Strongly disagree	As above	Offer both Business Studies and Economics as they are very different. To combine them will see Economics at Level 1 gone and deny students the opportunity to learn the basic concepts required for Level 2-3 . Change for change sake is never good - what would be achieved by removing the choice. Nothing.	If you make the change to Commerce at Level 1 you will need to redo Level 2 and 3 Economics to include the basic concepts that they have missed in Level 1. You will kill the subject.	Yes	No		2020-07-19 21:23:50	ANON-YFPW-RCSA-F	2020-07-19 21:23:50	2020-07-19 21:24:04
Yes		Agree	Yes but with a willingness to take on board the recommendations of students, parents and teachers. In particular teachers, who are aware of what motivates our students at different ages and as such, what content is appropriate	As it stands 'Science' by itself is too broad. Students need to be given the option to take for example, more than one option line of science if that is their passion. Or, if a teacher / department has a particular specialism in one particular area of science, that should also be allowed for. Option C for science looks good.	In the science area the options are good, but possibly with a better range of astronomy standards.	No			2020-07-19 21:43:23	ANON-YFPW-RCSN-V	2020-07-19 21:42:02	2020-07-19 21:43:37

No		Strongly disagree		I am alarmed by the proposal to replace the separate subjects of Biology, Chemistry, and Physics with the apparently over-arching subject Science. I fear this will serve only to provide students with an all too generalized (if not dumbed-down) introduction to science when in fact the opposite (i.e. early specialization in the afore-mentioned separate subjects) might be more useful. The two greatest challenges facing humanity at this time – climate change and the COVID-19 pandemic – both require a scientifically informed response, and it is therefore essential that young New Zealanders should be scientifically equipped to properly comprehend and confront these challenges.	Perhaps consider introducing some kind of Environmental Studies option (i.e. environmental history), where this could not otherwise be incorporated within Geography?	No				2020-07-20 02:31:44	ANON-YFPW-RCSK-5	2020-07-20 02:31:43	2020-07-20 02:33:11
Yes		Undecided	What follows is a series of anonymous replies gathered by TENZ over this last weekend from three members.	What positive changes do you see in this proposal? It is hard to see positives in this. Any positives may be found in the detail at a later stage. The inclusion of Food Science as a subject. As a Food Technology teacher I have been much concerned about the linking of the Food technology that we teach in schools with the Food Technology/Food Science Tertiary training, and eventual career. I do think that there is space for food technology to be taught as technology and design but feel that we have for too long neglected the food science training that makes our subject relevant in the real world. Better broad spectrum alignment of subjects. Good to keep student options open at level 1 and only specialise from level 2. Gives students more choice. Many have no idea what they want to do in level 1 -second response- What concerning changes do you see in this proposal? Why are they concerning?3 responses I am concerned that the "generic" standards which cross Technology areas are being removed/intergrated. I am concerned that this will diminish opportunities for flexibility within and across technology disciplines. It will continue to	Do you have any further thoughts you would like TENZ to communicate to the Ministry of Education?2 responses Reducing the number of credits to 4 per assessment would enable flexibility for our learners. Why not focus more on generic achievement standards which enable assessment that is flexible and authentic for our learners. DT is made up of 5 strands, yet we are being squashed into 2 again. Being part of Tech (a good thing) comes at a price as there are a number of other tech subjects also worthy of an airing. Altogether it makes for a lot of sub-subjects, far more than in art or science, who still manage to have separate subjects for all the variants. Also Tech is still perceived by many to be a non-essential subject. This has to change. Core subjects no longer exist, yet they persist in the schooling system. Tech is a valuable subject because of the methods of practical problem solving and fit for purpose skills it teaches. It must have an equal platform alongside other older subjects. Its not just to play around and enjoy.	Yes	In a minor way and in technology education area only	-no-		2020-07-20 08:50:26	ANON-YFPW-RCS6-4	2020-07-20 08:50:26	2020-07-20 08:50:35
Yes	ART HISTORY Due to its focus on visual literacy Art History can be considered to be a broad subject which is highly relevant for the 21st century. The skills and understandings which are developed through the study of Art History can be used to interpret imagery relevant to many disciplines. In this age of digital technologies we are increasingly reliant on interpreting visual cues and are continually exposed to visual messages which require the skills of interpretation. The New Zealand Art History Teachers Association gained considerable feedback on the proposal from members. One of the findings was that the value of Art History was recognised by teachers across a range secondary school subjects. Teachers use the Art History standards in Media Studies, the Visual Arts, English, Religious Studies, History, and in creating interdisciplinary or integrated programmes. This suggests that the subject is viewed as having broad applications. It also explains why numbers are strong despite the fact that there are few full year Level 1 Art History programmes. There are significant numbers of students who engage with one or two Level 1 Art History standards during their courses.	Strongly disagree	This submission relates to Art History.	Art History Submission from the New Zealand Art History Teachers Association on the proposal to remove Level 1 Art History The New Zealand Art History Teachers Association (NZAHTA) opposes the suggestion to remove Art History from the subjects available at Level 1 NCEA. We argue that Art History is currently being used in innovative ways and has particular benefits for interdisciplinary learning. The arguments we present are given in relation to the seven criteria the Ministry used to holistically assess subjects for the provisional subject list. 1.How the subject fits with the policy vision of a broader, foundational NCEA Level 1 with increasing specialisation at Levels 2 and 3. (Note: just this section is repeated here form the first survey question as this submission is organised according to the Ministry's seven criteria) Due to its focus on visual literacy Art History can be considered to be a broad subject which is highly relevant for the 21st century. The skills and understandings which are developed through the study of Art History can be used to interpret	No	Yes				2020-07-20 09:29:37	ANON-YFPW-RCSR-Z	2020-07-20 09:27:30	2020-07-20 09:29:56
Yes		Strongly disagree	Technology should NOT be separated into subjects. As a foundational subject it should only offer generic. This does not mean the skills and knowledge specific to each of the new technological areas is not important. It will be evidenced in quality technological outcomes. Surely a generic programme is what is required for a more generic qualification at level 1. Those with a good understanding of the philosophy of technology underpinning our curriculum will know that.	Technology should be singular and taught through a variety of contexts as it is about designing and developing technological outcomes.	Specialism into the technological areas but with some sub areas such as textiles, foods and biotechnology more explicit	Yes		Keep Hangarau holistic and not separated into subjects at L 1 but taught through a variety of contexts.		2020-07-20 09:38:07	ANON-YFPW-RCSW-5	2020-07-20 09:38:07	2020-07-20 09:38:21

Yes	<p>Latin</p> <p>Latin is a foundational subject for understanding European culture. Many of the political, philosophical, social and cultural features of contemporary society stem from Ancient Rome and from its language - Latin.</p> <p>Latin is a foundational subject for understanding other European languages, which students may study either at school or at University, or they may go overseas and learn a related language. Latin makes this easier.</p> <p>Latin is not a specialisation. Students of Latin are likely to begin their learning of Latin in Year 9 and therefore the absence of Year 11 will be an interruption in their learning.</p>	Strongly disagree	<p>Latin is an essential subject. While Latin may have small numbers the students are commonly high achievers who go on to be scholars, lawyers, doctors etc, and Latin is useful in these pathways. Many of the words used in medicine and law stem from Latin.</p>	<p>Latin</p> <p>If students are lost to the subject at Year 11 then they may not return to it at Year 12 and 13 and the subject will be lost.</p> <p>The subject is very useful for students studying Classical Studies and for the future teachers of Classical Studies. I am concerned that this knowledge will be lost and future generations will have no knowledge of a language that still has relevance to society today.</p>	No	Yes			2020-07-20 10:08:13	ANON-YFPW-RCS4-2	2020-07-20 10:05:20	2020-07-20 10:08:20
Yes		Disagree	<p>I have concerns that there appears to be specific place for Financial Capabilities Education. Perhaps if the Level 1 subjects of Accounting, Business Studies and Economics became Accounting and Finance as 1 subject and Business and Economics as a second subject . That would make more sense.</p>	<p>Refer to previous answer about Financial Capabilities.</p>	Financial Capabilities as Achievement Standards.	Yes			2020-07-20 10:24:51	ANON-YFPW-RCS2-2	2020-07-20 10:24:51	2020-07-20 10:25:22
Yes		Strongly disagree	<p>See comments below</p>	<p>As a Home Economics teacher, I am disappointed that Home Ec. would transform into Food Science. We have some significant health issues linked to obesity and the title Food Science simply doesn't do it justice. I would have preferred Home Ec connect more closely with Health and PE. In which case, I think Food and Health Science would make a more sensible title. I have so many students who are interested in Nutrition at university and then are unable to take Home Ec because all the science and maths 'recommendations' for UE fills their timetables. And I cannot then combine Home Ec with bio or health at Level 3 because of UE requirements (14 credits in 1 subject). It doesn't make sense to broaden choices at Level 1 if this flexibility gets lost at Levels 2 and 3.</p>	<p>As above. I'd like to see more flexibility in combining standards, particularly at Level 3. In my case, I teach a combination of Health and Home Ec. standards in a Food, Nutrition and Health course but these can cause problems at Level 3 for some students to get 14 credits in ONE subject.</p>	No		I think you meant Question 5.	2020-07-20 11:37:12	ANON-YFPW-RCS2-Z	2020-07-20 11:37:12	2020-07-20 11:37:19
Yes	<p>Yes, but we don't particularly support combining PE and Health together as alot of students that currently take these courses take them for very different reasons. It will prevent a large number of students from taking the course as they either will be choosing to do this for PE or Health.</p> <p>Whilst there is a cross over for some students who take both subjects, there is also a distinctly one or the other. For example, there are a large number of Health students who would not take Physical Education and therefore not take the subject if it were to be combined.</p> <p>We think that combining Health and physical education will prevent a large number of students taking the course. We feel as though there is a large difference between the students that take Health Education and Physical Education as they are very different subjects.</p>	Strongly disagree	<p>It's hard to support it when you don't know the exact details of what it will look like. More detail on what the internal standards will look like (e.g will it be a mix of PE and Health standards as they currently are in the course, how will the external work and will it be a combo of PE/Health standards as we currently know them? It's hard to make professional judgements/ support what we don't know.</p> <p>We strongly oppose the idea of joining Physical Education and Health. We think that the idea of simplifying NCEA is good and standardising the number of credits is positive. We do not feel as though you have given us enough detail to give specific comments on the changes because we do not actually know the extent of the changes as you have not provided the standards and what flexibility that will allow.</p> <p>We support the idea of change but are confused about how in some subjects there will be an increase in credits offered, whereas the conversation has been previously about reducing credit/workload. It's hard to comment on the change when we have not been given further information about the standards that are involved with this.</p> <p>In some ways we like the idea around a broader</p>	<p>We are in strong disagreement with the combining of Health and Physical Education as per the reasons stated in question 2. We feel it might put a lot of students off taking the subject as Health and PE students can be very different and have different reasons for taking each of PE and Health. Some Health students detest physical activity and can't wait till it is no longer compulsory at school, whereas some students who take PE enjoy the content of the PE course such as 1.2 Anatomy/physiology/biomechanics which is very different to the content in Health. Likewise if it is combined is the expectation of 2 in class theory lessons and 2 practical lessons a recommendation for a course such as this? This could put the students off a combined course too. The PE students main reason for taking PE is they love to be active, which is often in contrast to the reasons a student may take Health.</p> <p>We strongly oppose the combination of Health and Physical Education at Level 1 and wonder whether this will continue through in Level 2 and 3. These should be two separate offered subjects as there are a very different demographic of students that these subjects typically attract. Knowledge bases for the two are different and late specialisation will put students at a disadvantage.</p>	<p>We think that PE and Health should be kept separate.</p> <p>Question - Where does Outdoor Education fit into this? A specific Outdoor Education matrix?</p>	No		Is it the same content but it te reo Māori? Where is this document available? We do not understand if this is an alternative curriculum document or if it is NCEA standards. We need more information.	2020-07-20 12:25:34	ANON-YFPW-RCSU-3	2020-07-20 12:25:34	2020-07-20 12:26:16
Yes	<p>We were aware of the intentions, however we feel that eliminating Art History level 1 will not achieve these goals, as the visual analysis and interpretation skills integral to many of the standards are not being taught or covered in the recommended target subjects.</p>	Strongly disagree	<p>Associate Professor Ngarino Ellis and Dr. Caroline Vercoe from Art History at the University of Auckland strongly disagree with this proposal. There has been very little consultation in relation to a change that we think has significant impact for level 1 students. The proposal either to accept or eliminate the standards is too binary, and we would like to see some other options explored by the Ministry. We would like to retain some level of Art History at level 1 - in particular the skill sets relating to visual analysis, cultural diversity in particular indigenous and Te Tiriti Ō Waitangi. Today more than ever a strong understanding of visual literacy is crucial for students as they move into their more specialised subject choices into levels 2 and 3.</p>	<p>We would like to suggest a Visual Literacy standard with a particular focus on Art History at level 1. This could be used by a range of subjects including History, Classics, Visual Arts, Drama, English, Design and (if it survives) Media Studies. Our discussions with Art History alumni who are now successful high school teachers highlights the importance and value of this idea. It would provide crucial and relevant transferable skills as students then move to specialise in their senior year subjects.</p>	No	No			2020-07-20 13:40:21	ANON-YFPW-RCSV-C	2020-07-20 13:40:21	2020-07-20 13:40:41

Yes		Strongly disagree	Year 11 is part of the senior school, when students can start to think about how they want to specialise. To take away their options to do so, and only offer more generic/broader options I think limits opportunities.	The exclusion of art history and classics from the curriculum takes away options that serve a sector of students who are not served by other subjects. At high school it wasn't until I found these options that I really started to perform academically. I have gone on to get an MA in Art History, work as a curator and am now doing a PhD in Art History. As the footnote in relation to history records, they are not covered by any other subject and teach important histories, stories and skills. Visual analysis in particular is something that is invaluable today, and is a skill applicable to much more than art history. They give you understanding of other cultures and ways of thinking. A decolonised curriculum would add to this further - giving an understanding of Maori art and indigenous perspectives. Further, I think removing Latin from the curriculum is short-sighted. It is a subject that underpins many others and I know many people who have found it very useful in their later study of medicine, law and other languages. It is a subject that many people only take to level 1, so removing it basically kills it in New Zealand and for New Zealanders.		No			2020-07-20 15:07:26	ANON-YFPW-RC8V-9	2020-07-20 15:07:26	2020-07-20 15:07:38
No		Disagree		I took Art History in Level 1 in 2016 and find that it was very informative to my current life. I think it is essential to be included.		No			2020-07-20 16:08:33	ANON-YFPW-RC8C-P	2020-07-20 16:08:33	2020-07-20 16:09:18
Yes	We would argue that whilst the intended changes are meant to support a broad, more foundational education, ironically the number of subjects available to students is being reduced.	Strongly disagree		The removal of Latin across NCEA is disturbing: it is the only subject being abolished completely. Such a move betrays lack of knowledge and understanding of the benefits of learning Latin, its legacy as the language of scholarship and its well-deserved place in the international curriculum for past and current generations. Even the National Australian Curriculum has reaffirmed the value of Latin, assigning Classical Languages a special place through the drafting of their very own framework. The cognitive benefits of learning Latin are many, and they derive from the complex nature of Latin syntax and the fact that it is an inflected language: development of analytical skills, critical and creative thinking skills, problem solving, precision of thought, just to name a few. For decades quantifiable assessment data has affirmed the positive impact of Latin on literacy. More recently, the establishment of Latin primary school programs in various countries has only added more evidence. In fact, rather than dying out, internationally Latin has seen a resurgence. For students who continue to study the original authors, the benefits only increase as they develop critical literature analysis skills which are transferable to the study of English texts. Latin gives access to the great literatures and philosophies of the past: new pedagogies stop	Cannot comment.	No			2020-07-20 16:37:34	ANON-YFPW-RC8S-6	2020-07-20 16:35:17	2020-07-20 16:37:44
No		Disagree		Retain Art History, this subject strongly supports the teaching of visual arts through providing understanding of principles and theory as applied to historical and more recent art, it enables understanding of the visual as a means of communication and encourages critical thinking and writing.		No			2020-07-20 16:52:35	ANON-YFPW-RC88-B	2020-07-20 16:52:35	2020-07-20 16:52:43
No		Disagree	Curriculum is limited and restrained. More focus on global knowledge needed.	Latin - not spoken, but read and translated. Basis of English and study of grammar, logic, rhetoric, ancient history, legal studies, cultural roots of the Western world, essential for understanding modern concepts, philosophy and ways of life. Not elitist and globally recognised, IB, etc.		No			2020-07-20 16:52:40	ANON-YFPW-RC89-C	2020-07-20 16:52:40	2020-07-20 16:53:35
Yes		Agree		Within 'Science' - there needs to be at least two each of Chem/Bio/Phys/ESS achievement Standards at Year 11 so that students still know about individual science areas, not all mixed together (as in junior science taught in the school). Each school can then chose appropriately for the needs of their students. Students are getting to the age and intellectual curiosity to start introducing some of the more technical knowledge of the different areas of Science.		No			2020-07-20 16:59:45	ANON-YFPW-RC8G-T	2020-07-20 16:55:03	2020-07-20 16:59:53

No	As I am Australian, this was brought to my attention by those I have professional contact with, namely colleagues and friends in New Zealand's Education system (both tertiary and secondary levels).	Agree	The attempt to streamline subjects for foundational learning in students is admirable, however the glaring and considered omission of Latin specifically while retaining all other languages is both disappointing and unnecessary.	The exclusion of Latin is a gross weakness in the curriculum. Several reasons include: 1) the study of Latin promotes literacy skills, which constitute one of the key areas of focus for curricular change. The benefits of Latin for literacy have been clear for a long time. 2) Latin promotes intercultural competence, a key skill for today's global professional and educational landscape. By exploring and mediating identity in a past context, discussions about law, land, language and culture can be held which promote student understanding of modern developments regarding globalisation, the post-colonial era, and treatment of indigenous peoples in countries such as Canada, New Zealand, and Australia. 3) Students are interested in Latin. There is a continuing demand for the subject which, while relatively small, is nonetheless worthy. Other languages have smaller candidatures and are being retained, so the argument of deletion by size or supply and demand is invalid. 4) Studying Latin provides opportunities for students to connect with others around the world. Increasingly, Classics communities at both secondary and tertiary levels are in regular contact and helping each other develop positively. This is evident from recent joint efforts during COVID-19,	No			2020-07-20 17:18:26	ANON-YFPW-RC8J-W	2020-07-20 17:18:26	2020-07-20 17:18:34
Yes		Strongly disagree			Yes			2020-07-20 18:08:53	ANON-YFPW-RC8Q-4	2020-07-20 18:08:53	2020-07-20 18:09:05
Yes	This feedback is on behalf of the Kāpiti College Social Science Dept. We take umbrage at what appears to be the Ministry of Education's belief that more 'traditional' subjects, such as History and Geography better prepare students to be successful in other Social Sciences at NCEA Level 2 and 3. While we readily acknowledge that taking a subject in the previous year increases a student's chance of success (and generally makes the teacher's job a bit easier), an analysis of student data in 2020 shows that 30.7% of students in a Level 2 Social Science course are deemed to have a high likelihood of success in their selected course, having taken a different Level 1 Social Science course. Perhaps more interestingly, there is no evidence whatsoever that History or Geography provides a foundation which ensures students will be more likely to succeed at another Level 2 Social Science course as there is no pattern that indicates these Level 2 students have come disproportionately from History or Geography. Furthermore, our 2020 data reflects that History and Geography are actually the two Social Science courses where students were most likely to select the subject at Level 2, without having done the subject at Level 1 (64% and 54% respectively had	Disagree	This feedback is on behalf of the Kāpiti College Social Science Dept. We take great pride in being able to currently offer a diverse range of progressive Social Science courses that are responsive to the priorities, preferences, and issues of our community and young people. We firmly believe that access to a Social Science education throughout Year 9 - 13 of secondary school is pivotal to developing critical, active, informed, and responsible citizens. In 2020, Kāpiti College offered the following Level 1 courses: Economics, History, Geography, Media Studies and Psychology. This diversity acknowledges that not every learner will want to access a Social Science education through traditional disciplines like History and Geography. As such, we provide alternatives that are exceptionally popular (Psychology is our second largest social science subject at Level 1 in 2020 and was the largest in 2019). Through narrowing the available subjects at Level 1, the Kāpiti College Social Science department believes the Ministry of Education will be reducing our ability to offer a local curriculum that is responsive to student preferences (criteria 4).	This feedback is on behalf of the Kāpiti College Social Science Dept. We would like to draw the Ministry of Education's attention to our concern around the shift from Economics to Commerce. This new Level 1 subject integrates two subjects we do not currently offer at any level of NCEA - Accounting and Business Studies. This is namely due to a significant decline in students selecting Accounting over recent years. As a department, we do not believe we should have to change a very popular and successful Level 1 course to include subject areas in which there is simply no pathway for students to continue on with at Level 2 and Level 3 (criteria 3). students to continue on with at Level 2 and Level 3 (criteria 3). Overall, the Kāpiti College Social Science department maintains that the proposed Social Science NCEA Level 1 subject list ultimately reduces opportunities for students at Level 1. The proposed changes go against the intention of the NCEA Change Package, by narrowing down student selection, restricting the development of local curricula and instead follow a traditional, and conservative prioritization of student subject	No			2020-07-20 19:05:39	ANON-YFPW-RC8E-R	2020-07-20 19:04:21	2020-07-20 19:05:45
Yes		Strongly disagree	Art history must continue in L1 to strengthen all arts and broader thinking. It is very limiting to remove this from L1 as it aides in creative thinking historical understanding/context and literacy across the curriculum.	Game development/animation	No			2020-07-20 20:29:31	ANON-YFPW-RC85-8	2020-07-20 20:29:31	2020-07-20 20:29:45
Yes		Disagree	I am sorry to loose some of the excellent standards available in Art History, Media Studies and Classical Studies. I believe these could be incorporated into another subject - History, Art or a combined social arts cultural subject	Cultural studies	No			2020-07-20 20:29:55	ANON-YFPW-RC8P-3	2020-07-20 20:29:55	2020-07-20 20:30:30
Yes		Agree		Art History and Classics are important subjects as not all students are comfortable/ intend to follow the latter pathways as they don't fit or choose to.	Art History	No		2020-07-20 20:57:42	ANON-YFPW-RC8F-5	2020-07-20 20:52:19	2020-07-20 20:57:55
Yes		Strongly disagree	Classics and art history are arguably the subjects that most helped me in high school. It would be a blow to our young people to remove the chance for them to experience what I did.	Ancient or world history, not just in New Zealand (for three years in a row for god's sake)	No		I'm not involved in learning Maori as of yet.	2020-07-20 21:39:36	ANON-YFPW-RC81-4	2020-07-20 21:39:36	2020-07-20 21:39:45
Yes		Strongly disagree		By removing subjects like art history and other arts related subjects students who gravitate towards these subjects will be greatly let down. These subjects are highly regarded in European countries and NZ is going down the path of focusing on "money making" subjects and a one size fits all.		No		2020-07-20 21:40:56	ANON-YFPW-RC82-D	2020-07-20 21:40:56	2020-07-20 21:41:07
No		Strongly disagree			Yes			2020-07-20 22:28:09	ANON-YFPW-RC8H-U	2020-07-20 22:28:09	2020-07-20 22:28:26

No		Strongly disagree		<p>0 I strongly disagree with the removal of Art History and Classics from the NCEA Level 1 curriculum.</p> <p>These humanities subjects help develop a deeper understanding of cultural and philosophical change in the context of societal constructs. They encourage critical reasoning, thematic analysis and the importance of multiple perspectives. They also provide the inspiration and foundation for a wide variety of careers including architecture, psychology, interior design, art curating, art restoration, advertising/media.</p>		No				2020-07-20 22:40:28	ANON-YFPW-RC88-N	2020-07-20 22:40:28	2020-07-20 22:41:00
----	--	-------------------	--	--	--	----	--	--	--	---------------------	------------------	---------------------	---------------------