MINISTRY OF EDUCATION
TE TĀHUHU O TE MĀTAURANGA

31 August 2020

[redacted]

Tēnā koe [redacted]

Official Information Act request

Thank you for your email of 21 July 2020 to the Ministry of Education requesting the following information:

- *The New Zealand Commerce and Economics Teachers Association (NZCETA) is seeking information and all supporting documentation that outlines the process the Ministry of Education followed for the development of the NCEA Level One provisional subject list. More specifically, NZCETA would like all information (e.g. survey responses, SEG feedback, Subject Association feedback, Big Ideas and Significant Learning documentation, wider sector feedback) pertaining to how the decision was made to collapse three key subjects within the Social Sciences Learning Area (Accounting, Business Studies, and Economics) into one subject called Commerce.*

Your request has been considered under the Official Information Act 1982 (the Act).

I am providing you with 22 documents within scope of your request, attached as **Appendix A** along with a document table outlining the decision to the release of these documents.

Where information has been withheld in these documents it has been withheld under section 9(2)(a) of the Act, to protect the privacy of natural persons.

The rationale for the formation of the Level 1 Provisional List, including provisional Commerce, is contained within the attached documents.

You may also be interested in two further documents on the NCEA Review publicly available on the Ministry's website. These documents are:

- Cabinet Paper: Implementation of the new, strengthened NCEA, and
- Education Report: NCEA Review: Provisional Subjects List for Level 1 and Cabinet Paper on the Change Package.

Please note, the Ministry now proactively publishes OIA responses on our website. As such, we may publish this response on our website after five working days. Your name and contact details will be removed.

National Office, Mātauranga House, 33 Bowen Street, Wellington 6011
PO Box 1666, Wellington 6140. Phone: +64 4 463 8000 Fax: +64 4 463 8001

Thank you again for your email. You have the right to ask an Ombudsman to review this decision. You can do this by writing to info@ombudsman.parliament.nz or Office of the Ombudsman, PO Box 10152, Wellington 6143.

Nāku noa, nā



Jackie Talbot
Group Manager – Secondary Tertiary
Early Learning and Student Achievement

Appendix A

Table 1: Ministry decision documents

Doc #	Date	Title	Decision on release
1.1	30 Nov 18	Curriculum doc - Social Sciences	**Release in full**
1.2	8 Oct 19	DRAFT Social Sciences Learning Big Ideas with narrative	**Release in full**
1.3	19 Dec 19	PowerPoint: BI criteria and Mātauranga Māori	**Release in full**
1.4	19 Dec 19	Criteria for Big Ideas, Significant Learning and Key Competencies	**Release in full**
1.5	19 Dec 19	Social Sciences model	**Release in full**
1.6	29 Jan 20	Report: Provisional Subject List for NCEA Level 1	**Release in part.** Information that does not relate to the request has been removed as out of scope.

Table 2: Feedback documents

Doc #	Date	Title	Decision on release
2.1	26 Feb 20	Email: Strong objection to proposed changes to NCEA by removing Latin, Classics, Economics and Physics, Chemistry and Biology - Ref: C012053	**Release in part.** Information has been withheld under section 9(2)(a) of the Act.
2.2	22 Mar 20	Email: Feedback on a provisional Level 1 subject list	**Release in full.**
2.3	2 Jun 20	Email: Proposed changes to Commerce – **s9(2)(a)**	**Release in part.** Information has been withheld under section 9(2)(a) of the Act.
2.4	2 Jun 20	Email: Proposed changes for Commerce - **s9(2)(a)**	**Release in part.** Information has been withheld under section 9(2)(a) of the Act.
2.5	5 Jun 20	Email: Changes to Level 1 commerce subjects - **s9(2)(a)**	**Release in part.** Information has been withheld under section 9(2)(a) of the Act.
2.6	5 Jun 20	Email: Commerce NCEA level 1 - **s9(2)(a)**	**Release in part.** Information has been withheld under section 9(2)(a) of the Act.
2.7	11 Jun 20	Email: NCEA Review - Level 1 Commerce - **s9(2)(a)**	**Release in part.** Information has been withheld under section 9(2)(a) of the Act.

Doc #	Date	Title	Decision on release
2.8	22 Jun 20	Email: Re: Invitation to meet via zoom – Economics	**Release in part.** Information has been withheld under section 9(2)(a) of the Act.
2.9	19 Jul 20	Email: Submission NCEA Level 1 provisional subject list	**Release in full.**
2.10	22 Jun 20	Wellington College Concerns over Changes to the National Certificate of Education Achievement (NCEA)	**Release in full**
2.11	3 Mar 20	Feedback from education.govt.nz	**Release in part.** Information has been withheld under section 9(2)(a) of the Act.
2.12		Commerce website comments raw data	**Release in full**
2.13		Summary of PSL Responses Related to Commerce	**Release in full**
2.14		Notes from Accounting SEG	**Release in full**
2.15		Notes from Business Studies SEG	**Release in full**
2.16		Notes from Economics SEG	**Release in full**

Document 1.1

NCEA grad profile

Capability statement: Ākonga can draw on and connect knowledge from different learning area disciplines to solve problems in increasingly complex contexts. They have a can do attitude, are willing to work hard towards goals, and are adaptable and flexible in new and changing situations. They are confident to actively participate in and contribute to diverse opportunities in the community.

Social Sciences

Accounting

Social Sciences capability statement
Threshold concepts / big ideas:

Integrity: being honest, responsible, and accountable and acting ethically with awareness of social and cultural differences.

Accountability: justifying and taking responsibility for actions and decisions; adhering to the law and keeping accurate records of property, documents, or funds.

Confidentiality: being trustworthy and having the ability to keep the financial affairs of others secure and not passing on private information other than to those with a legal right.

Reliability: being trusted and organised and having the ability to deliver on time.

Relevance: being able to connect current information and keep up to date on any changes that may affect financial decision-making.

Citizenship: understanding the importance of contributing to the community and being able to be fiscally responsible.

Sustainability: the need for an entity to operate profitably taking into consideration ecological issues.

Accounting Practices:

Processing: gather and sort financial information that can be used to prepare financial statements.

Reporting: prepare financial statements for a variety of users to provide information about their financial performance and position.

Interpreting and decision-making: interpret the financial statements for a variety of users to enable decisions to be made.

Developing digital literacy: embrace relevant technologies in all aspects of accounting to reflect modern business practices.

Business studies

Social Sciences capability statement
Threshold concepts / big ideas:

Central Theme:
- Enterprise

Three broad concepts:
- globalisation
- citizenship
- sustainability

Other concepts
- management; rangatiratanga; rights and responsibilities; hangarau; needs and wants; kawa; organisation; supply and demand; scarcity; manaakitanga; culture; whānau.

Senior social studies

Social Sciences capability statement
Threshold concepts / big ideas:

Society: An interdependent collection of communities or cultures.
Culture: The common characteristics and behaviours associated with a group.
Change: The cause or effect of human actions and interactions, which may be positive or negative, short term or long term.
Perspectives: A framework of ideas, beliefs, and values through which people interpret and interact with the world. Perspectives are bigger than one person or group.
Rights: Entitlements relating to fair treatment and equity for all.
Values: Deeply held beliefs about what is important or desirable.
Social justice: An outcome of social action taken to develop fair treatment and equity for all.

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

Classical studies

Social Sciences capability statement
Threshold concepts / big ideas:

Citizenship and society: The interaction of status, gender, family, rights, responsibilities, and freedom and their importance to wider society.

Culture and identity: Social conventions and values, role models, mythology, and belief systems in relation to cultural and social identities, ranging from political and religious to scientific and philosophical ideologies.

Empire and power: The rise and fall of individuals and groups; the reasons for cultural, economic, and political imperialism; the causes and consequences of social and political change; the importance of place and environment to individuals and societies.

Conflict: The contesting relationships between individuals, groups, and ideas, in both historical and literary contexts and the way that conflict can be a force for both continuity and change.

Art and aesthetics: The perception of beauty, ideals of harmony and balance, design, creativity, and invention; the influence of classical literature; how art, literature and aesthetics inform cultural values and traditions.

Heritage: How and why the ideas and values of the classical world have influenced other cultures.

Education for sustainability

Social Sciences capability statement
Threshold concepts / big ideas:

Sustainability: Sustainability is about individuals, groups, and societies adopting ways of thinking and behaving that allow them to meet their needs and aspirations without preventing future generations of all living things from meeting theirs.
Equity: Equity is about fairness. In considering the four aspects of sustainability, it incorporates respect for all life, social justice, intergenerational fairness, and the fair management of finite resources.
Interdependence: Interdependence is about the interconnectedness of people and environments. This interconnectedness can be understood through considering ecosystems, community, cultural diversity, democracy, and fair trade.
Responsibility for action: Personal and social actions are required to live sustainably. Actions for sustainability include: guardianship or kaitiakitanga, citizenship, having an action orientation, informed decision-making, resilience and regeneration, thoughtful consumerism, and enterprise and entrepreneurship.

Geography

Social Sciences capability statement
Threshold concepts / big ideas:
Environments: May be natural and/or cultural. They have particular characteristics and features which can be the result of natural and/or cultural processes. The particular characteristics of an environment may be similar to and/or different from another. A cultural environment includes people and/or the built environment.

Perspectives: Ways of seeing the world that help explain differences in decisions about, responses to, and interactions with environments. Perspectives are bodies of thought, theories or worldviews that shape people's values and have built up over time. They involve people's perceptions (how they view and interpret environments) and viewpoints (what they think) about geographic issues. Perceptions and viewpoints are influenced by people's values (deeply held beliefs about what is important or desirable).

Processes: A sequence of actions, natural and/or cultural, that shape and change environments, places and societies. Some examples of geographic processes include erosion, migration, desertification and globalisation.

Patterns: May be spatial: the arrangement of features on the earth's surface; or temporal: how characteristics differ over time in recognisable ways.

Interaction: Involves elements of an environment affecting each other and being linked together. Interaction incorporates movement, flows, connections, links and interrelationships which work together and may be one or two way interactions. Landscapes are the visible outcome of interactions. Interaction can bring about environmental change.

Change: Involves any alteration to the natural or cultural environment. Change can be spatial and/or temporal. Change is a normal process in both natural and cultural environments. It occurs at varying rates, at different times and in different places. Some changes are predictable, recurrent or cyclic, while others are unpredictable or erratic. Change can bring about further change.

Sustainability: Involves adopting ways of thinking and behaving that allow individuals, groups, and societies to meet their needs and aspirations without preventing future generations from meeting theirs. Sustainable interaction with the environment may be achieved by preventing, limiting, minimising or correcting environmental damage to water, air and soil, as well as considering ecosystems and problems related to waste, noise, and visual pollution.

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

History

Social Sciences capability statement
Threshold concepts / big ideas:

Significance: Historians weigh the importance, durability, and relevance of events, themes, and issues in the past and the appropriateness of using the past to provide contemporary lessons; historians debate what is historically significant and how and why the decisions about what is significant change.

Continuity and change: History examines change over time and continuity in times of change. Historians use chronology to place these developments in context. Historians debate what has changed, what has remained the same, and the impact of these changes.

Cause and effect: Historians investigate the reasons for and the results of events in history; they debate the causes of past events and how these events affect people's lives and communities. Historians study relationships between events to identify pervasive themes, ideas, and movements, such as terrorism, revolution, and migration.

Perspective: There are multiple perspectives on the past (both at the time and subsequently). Interpretations of the past are contested – historians base their arguments on historical evidence and draw from a variety of perspectives.

Media studies

Social Sciences capability statement
Threshold concepts / big ideas:
Mediation: Media texts portray individuals, groups, experiences, ideas, or events from particular ideological or value perspectives, constructing a mediated version of reality. Meanings are shaped by the interaction of media texts with audiences and social contexts.

Communication: Media forms have their own specialist languages and characteristic symbols and structures. Media products have distinctive ways of telling stories, particular narratives, and recognisable genres. The production and distribution technologies of different mediums influence the message and how it is interpreted, not just how we access it. Technological change has an impact on media products and institutions.

Creativity: Media creation incorporates vision, energy, critique, and reflection to produce artistic and aesthetic interpretations. The creative processes in media production draws on individual, group, and community relationships.

Legal studies

Social Sciences capability statement
Threshold concepts / big ideas:

Law: The role of law and its relationship to society, the ability of the legal system to provide just outcomes for all individuals and groups, how the legal system impacts on our lives and how we can influence and change it.

Democracy and government: The power to determine how you are governed, electing government, power sharing between parliament, executive and the judiciary.

Justice: The ability of the legal system to provide just outcomes for all individuals and groups, how the system impacts on our lives and how we can influence and change it.

Psychology

Social Sciences capability statement
Threshold concepts / big ideas:
Brain and behaviour: Psychology attempts to unpack the complexity in mental processes throughout the life span by investigating learning, perception, memory, cognitive development, and emotion. Psychologists interested in behaviour ask questions around the mental and physical processes within the brain that contribute to different behaviours.
Individual differences: The fundamental role of psychology is to explore how these aspects interact and how individuals develop their identity.

- **Personality:** The term 'personality' refers to a person's unique behavioural and cognitive patterns. Personality is closely linked to identity. Psychologists use broadly applicable conceptions of personality. They have developed a number of theories that help explain how and why different personality traits arise.
- **Motivation:** Motivation is largely about values and rewards. Motivation theories tend to assume that every learned response is the result of some motivation.
- **Intelligence:** While intelligence is one of the most widely discussed subjects in psychology, psychologists have very different views as to what it actually consists of. Some believe that intelligence is a single, general ability, while others believe it encompasses a range of aptitudes, skills, and talents.

Group behaviour: Psychologists may explore both pro-social and anti-social behaviours that may result from the influence of others. Social psychology can investigate how people might conform to social roles or obey a person in authority. Social psychology can also research how culture and gender roles can shape a person's behaviour or what may influence helping behaviour in emergency situations.

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

Philosophy

Social Sciences capability statement
Threshold concepts / big ideas:

Reality and illusion:

- What is, and what might be?
- What is the relationship between appearance and reality?
- Is there more to reality than what we experience?
- Can there be truth in myths and legends?
- Did Māui really pull Aotearoa out of the sea?

Truth, beauty, and justice:

- What is truth?
- Do beauty and justice have a universal aspect, or are they different for every community?
- What is justice in Aotearoa New Zealand?
- Is the legal system interested in the truth?

Freedom and responsibility:

- Am I free to live in whatever way I wish? If not, how should I live?
- Am I responsible for my actions?
- Do I have any responsibility for historical decisions that have impacted negatively on the freedom of others?
- What role does the Treaty of Waitangi have in defining our freedoms and responsibilities?

Value, goodness, and happiness:

- What makes something valuable?
- Does anything have intrinsic value?
- Should I aim to be good?
- Are there different goods?
- Is happiness the highest good?
- What is happiness?
- How do we know if we are happy?

Rationality and meaning:

- What is it to be rational?
- Why not be irrational?
- How do we know the meaning of words?
- How can I tell you what I really mean?
- Are rationality, thinking, and meaning equally relevant to all cultures? Why or why not?

Economics

Social Sciences capability statement
Threshold concepts / big ideas:

Scarcity results in choices with opportunity costs:

- Economic growth reduces scarcity
- Full employment reduces scarcity
- International trade reduces scarcity

Values influence economic choices: Values are the core beliefs that people hold. The different values or perspectives held by individuals and groups influence the economic choices they make.
Markets provide incentives and ration scarce resources: Markets are places or situations where producers and consumers exchange goods and services.
Perfectly competitive markets are efficient: Efficiency is an economic concept related to how well an economy allocates scarce resources to meets the needs and wants of consumers.
Market failure may require government intervention: Market failure occurs when free markets fail to allocate resources efficiently. For example, in the cigarette market, consumers' decisions can impact negatively on other people in a variety of ways.
The benefits of market activities may not be equitable: Equity is an economic objective relating to fairness or evenness. A market may be efficient, but society may be concerned that the benefits from market activity are unfairly shared out.
Government intervention may involve an equity–efficiency trade-off: Government interventions to improve equity may sometimes diminish efficiency.
Interdependence results in flow-on effects: The different sectors of an economy (households, producers, financial, government, overseas) rely on each other (are interdependent).
Marginal analysis will maximise results: Marginal analysis compares the additional benefit of an activity with its additional cost.
Economic indicators aid economic analysis: Economic indicators are usually economic statistics, such as the unemployment rate, real GDP, or the inflation rate.
Inflation can distort economic indicators: Nominal indicators have not accounted for the effects of inflation. Real indicators account for the effects of inflation.

Economic models aid economic analysis: Economic models are simplifications of the real world. They are developed to aid analysis and support predictions about economic behaviour and performance. Economists have developed a variety of models to aid analysis of both macroeconomic and microeconomic issues.

Micro and macro-economics: Micro-economics is the branch of economics that examines individual decision-making by firms and households and the way they interact in specific industries and markets.
Macro-economics is the branch of economics that examines the workings and problems of the economy as a whole.

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

Social Sciences Learning area –Big ideas

There are twelve big ideas for social studies that have been written to reflect key approaches, purpose and ideas that underpin the social science learning area. The first three ideas are procedural and describe *how* students learn in the social sciences – through social inquiry processes, which include examining social ideas and issues through multiple perspectives (both epistemological and of people/groups) with the aim of developing higher order understandings about society (models, frameworks, generalisations). The fourth big idea explains the *purpose* of learning in the social sciences, which is to create deeper understandings of society and how to participate as a citizen. The final eight big ideas relate to four strands identified in the NZC (2007) (Identity and Social Organisation; Place and Environment, Continuity and Change, and the Economic world) which capture substantive ideas that underpin learning in the senior social sciences. The 'Summary of strands in Social Studies' document illustrates how this process has been done using the strands in the NZC (attachment).

A further 30 Big ideas have been developed for the senior social sciences using a subject-specific approach that relies on the four named social sciences in the NZC (Social Studies, Geography, History and Economics including business studies and accounting) and one further subject – Religious Studies (at the request of the Ministry of Education). These were developed by subject specialists and include stated 'Significant learning' which includes the type of contexts and topics studies could explore in order to develop understandings in these big ideas, including concepts and understandings of Matauranga Māori that could be explored through these big ideas. Further work is needed to develop this and resource and support teachers, and especially in the area of New Zealand history.

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

SUMMARY: Big ideas for social studies

1. Social scientists explore human society through processes of social inquiry[1] and through appropriate social science conventions.
2. Social scientists examine social issues through a range of diverse theoretical perspectives in order to analyse and evaluate individuals' and groups' values, beliefs, decisions and actions and recognise the contested nature of these.
3. Social scientists emphasise frameworks and models that guide and critique argument, enabling students to evaluate evidence, make informed decisions towards preferred futures and express viewpoints.
4. Learning within the social sciences seeks to enable students to develop greater understandings about social issues and society in order to equip young people to participate as citizens with ethical, justice-oriented and inclusive responses.
5. Cultural identities (incl ethnic, religious, political etc) and practices are dynamic and shape people's perspectives and human society.
6. The ways in which people organise themselves socially (to make decisions, address challenges and social change) shapes society and the structure of groups, organisations and institutions, laws and government with implications for citizens, their rights roles and responsibilities and how they (can) participate.
7. People's interaction with places and environments impact on the sustainability of places, resources and groups.
8. People value, view and use places and resources differently.
9. Events and actions of people in the past shape society and today and how we understand them.
10. How we understand and interpret the past is contested.
11. The decisions people make about scarce resources impacts on people, communities and groups.
12. People seek and have sought economic growth through business, enterprise, and innovation.

[1] In Approaches to Social Inquiry (Ministry of Education, 2008, p. 2, a social inquiry is defined as 'an integrated process for examining social issues, ideas and themes' (pg 2) that provides 'an appropriate and distinctive process for studying human society' (Ministry of Education, 2008, p. 4).

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

Social sciences Big Ideas showing links to Y1-10 and Y11-13

Cross-cutting approaches, ideas and aims for Social Studies (Years 1-10-) which underpin learning within the Social Sciences learning area (Y11-13):

- Social scientists explore human society through processes of social inquiry[2] and through appropriate social science conventions. [key **process/methodology** of social studies/sciences]
- Social scientists examine social issues through a range of **diverse theoretical perspectives** in order to analyse and evaluate individuals' and groups' values, beliefs, decisions and actions and recognise the contested nature of these. [thinking through (theoretical) **perspectives** informs our learning]
- Social scientists emphasise frameworks and models that guide and critique argument, enabling students to evaluate evidence, make informed decisions towards preferred futures and express viewpoints. [a key **outcome** of social science learning].
- Learning within the social sciences seeks to enable students to develop greater understandings about social issues and society in order to equip young people to participate as citizens with ethical, justice-oriented and inclusive responses. [the **purpose/aim** of social science learning]

The strand of Identity, Culture and Social Organisation seeks to equip students to understand that:	*The strand of Place and Environment seeks to equip students to understand that:*	*The strand of Continuity and Change seeks to equip students to understand that:*	*The strand of the Economic world seeks to equip students to understand that:*
• Cultural identities (incl ethnic, religious, political etc) and practices are dynamic and shape people's perspectives and human society. • The ways in which people organise themselves socially (to make decisions, address challenges and social change) shapes society and the structure of groups, organisations and institutions, laws and government with implications for citizens, their rights roles and responsibilities and how they (can) participate.	• People's interaction with places and environments impact on the sustainability of places, resources and groups. • People value, view and use places and resources differently.	• Events and actions of people in the past shape society and today and how we understand them. • How we understand and interpret the past is contested.	• The decisions people make about scarce resources impacts on people, communities and groups. • People seek and have sought economic growth through business, enterprise, and innovation.

[2] In Approaches to Social Inquiry (Ministry of Education, 2008, p. 2, a social inquiry is defined as 'an integrated process for examining social issues, ideas and themes' (pg 2) that provides 'an appropriate and distinctive process for studying human society' (Ministry of Education, 2008, p. 4).

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

Social Studies Y11-13	Religious Studies Y11-13	Geography Y11-13	History Y11-13	Economics Y11-13
1. Identities and cultures are dynamic and change through the interaction of people (their beliefs, cultural and religious practices) and communities, with consequences for individuals, groups and societies. 2. Global flows of people and ideas and global, regional, cultural and environmental conflicts (past and present) shape our contemporary world and future identities. 3. The way societies organise themselves through systems of government and different institutions influences how decisions are made, how laws are implemented and how power is distributed. 4. People, groups and institutions work to shape human rights, social and environmental justice in different ways with different effects. 5. Aotearoa New Zealand's colonial past and te Tiriti o	1. Religion and beliefs systems are dynamic and change in response to interactions (past and present) with other groups (local and global). 2. Aotearoa New Zealand today is shaped by multiple religious beliefs that reflect migration of groups to our country. 3. Exploring religious beliefs helps to understand the perspectives and actions of different groups of people. 4. Understanding diverse religious beliefs helps to develop ethical responses to contemporary issues and can encourage greater understandings, fairness, empathy and	1. Environments and places are shaped by natural and cultural processes which interact at different spatial and temporal scales. 2. Cultural characteristics of environments are shaped over time and at different spatial scales by interactions between people, economic activities, cultural conventions, and the natural world. Resources are defined, used and managed through these interactions. 3. Geographical patterns are the product of natural and cultural processes, with environmental, economic, social and political consequences. 4. Global processes acting in local contexts produce spatial distributions of geographical phenomena across the Earth's surface. 5. Environmental sustainability depends on the maintenance or restoration of the environmental functions that sustain all life and human wellbeing (economic, cultural and social). 6. Sustainability means different things to different people which can have significant implications for decision-making.	1. History is about contested constructions of the past. 2. Significant historical events often centre on unequal power relationships and competing ideologies. 3. Te Tiriti o Waitangi is symbolic of the coming together of two peoples; different understandings of Te Tiriti and processes of colonisation have led to Māori marginalisation and, later, efforts at reconciliation. 4. The significance of historical events Is contested. 5. Continuity and/or change can describe related events, perspectives, actions and beliefs over time. 6. Causes and consequences of historical events are complex, involving both long-term and short-term aspects.	1. Resources are scarce when unlimited wants exceed the capability of the available resources to satisfy them, so that economic choices must be made. 2. Consumer and business choices are informed by people's differing values and perspectives. 3. Economic models help to explain and predict economic behaviour and performance and macroeconomic and microeconomic patterns. 4. There are differing types of economic markets where producers and consumers exchange goods and services and these are shaped by interactions with government and different sectors of an economy (households, producers, financial, government, overseas) to produce different levels of equity. 5. Successful business operations involve multiple inter-related components, including effective management of people,

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

Waitangi has shaped (and continues to shape) people's lives, cultural and economic institutions, laws and justice systems and social action. 6. Past and present discourses, social institutions and media play a role in shaping the knowledge and political choices of citizens.	acceptance of religious diversity.	7. Social and environmental change can occur over time, is spatially uneven, and affects places differently. 8. By understanding the contemporary processes changing the world we can interpret the past, understand the present and make predictions about possible future change.		resources and internal and external influences 6. Accounting systems are underpinned by principles of financial integrity which require a recognition of differing contexts and appropriate control measures in order to make informed financial decisions.

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

Social Sciences Learning area – combined Big ideas and significant learning

Big idea	Significant learning
1. Social scientists explore human society through processes of social inquiry[3] and through appropriate social science conventions.	*Significant matauranga Māori knowledge Yr 11-13* • Explore whanaungatanga (ā-whānau, ā-hapū, ā-iwi) *Significant learning across Yr 11-13* Students will be able to pose social inquiry questions to explore a social issue with growing levels of independence. They will be able to: • explore and compare primary and secondary sources, and consider their strengths, limitations and integrity; • process and communicate information using appropriate social science conventions and form generalisations about human society; • reflect on and analyse the contested values and perspectives which underpin human beliefs and actions; • communicate ideas to different audiences clearly. *Important contexts* • *Ideas about society (past and present)* • *Social issues of personal and social significance* • *Significant themes of social science (incl human rights, justice, equality, etc)*
2. Social scientists examine social issues through a range of **diverse theoretical perspectives** in order to analyse and evaluate individuals' and groups' values, beliefs, decisions and actions and recognise the contested nature of these.	*Significant matauranga Māori knowledge Yr 11-13* • Understandings of kaupapa Māori and Māori epistemologies is part of learning in the social sciences. *Significant learning across Yr 11-13* • Studies of human society require a clear knowledge of the beliefs, values, and perspectives that underpin human dispositions, action and decision-making. • Analysis of perspectives requires an engagement with theoretical perspectives that seek to explain at a worldview level the paradigms and ideologies which inform action and ideas. *Important contexts* • The study of most contexts in social sciences require understandings of perspectives.

[3] In Approaches to Social Inquiry (Ministry of Education, 2008, p. 2, a social inquiry is defined as 'an integrated process for examining social issues, ideas and themes' (pg 2) that provides 'an appropriate and distinctive process for studying human society' (Ministry of Education, 2008, p. 4).

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

3. Social scientists emphasise frameworks and models that guide and critique argument, enabling students to evaluate evidence, make informed decisions towards preferred futures and express viewpoints.	*Significant matauranga Māori knowledge Yr 11-13* • Understandings of kaupapa Māori and Māori epistemologies is part of learning in the social sciences. *Significant learning across Yr 11-13* • As a way to make sense of the world, social scientists employ a range of frameworks and models to explain patterns, characteristics and ways of studying human society (method). *Important contexts* • *Economic models to explain, e.g. supply and demand* • *Historical frameworks (such as historical thinking (method) and historical consciousness (outcome) to underpin learning and explain* • *Geographic models to explain inequalities of development, migration, urban sprawl or land patterns etc.*
4. Learning within the social sciences seeks to enable students to develop greater understandings about social issues and society in order to equip young people to participate as citizens with ethical, justice-oriented and inclusive responses.	*Significant matauranga Māori knowledge Yr 11-13* • Enhancing kaupapa Māori approaches and knowledge is a key outcome of social science learning. *Significant learning across Yr 11-13* • As a way to make sense of the world, social scientists employ a range of frameworks and models to explain patterns, characteristics and ways of studying human society (method). *Important contexts* • *Local community, national and international contexts* • *Participatory responses to learning* • *Engagement in community, civic and political spaces.*
5. Environments and places are shaped by natural and cultural processes which interact at different spatial and temporal scales.	*Significant matauranga Māori knowledge Yr 11-13* • Māori cosmology and worldview about humans' relationship with nature contrasts with prevailing liberal Western ideas. *Significant learning across Yr 11-13* • Environments as the product of natural processes such as: atmospheric, geological, glacial, aeolian, fluvial, biotic, soil processes. • Environments as the product of cultural processes such as: development of quality of life; migration; capitalism; tourism development. *Important contexts* • *Atmospheric and oceanic Circulation, (e.g. El Nino; La Nina)* • *Regional and local environments of geographic significance to NZ: (e.g. South Island High Country, Tongariro Volcanic Zone, Canterbury Plains)*

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

6. Cultural characteristics of environments are shaped over time and at different spatial scales by interactions between people, economic activities, cultural conventions, and the natural world. Resources are defined, used and managed through these interactions.	*Significant matauranga Māori knowledge Yr 11-13* • Past, Present and Future demographic trends of Māori in NZ. • Migration / hekenga occurs to meet the needs of Māori at any one time and in response to outside forces. • The right to use, manage and control land depends on the protection of mana whenua. Mana whenua is based on Ahikā (Iwi maintaining residence in a particular place) and is an important part of tino rangatiratanga (self-determination). *Significant learning across Yr 11-13* • Disparity in development, places developing at different rates and scales • Environmental processes transform places • Global and National demographic trends • Economic production and use of resources in NZ *Important contexts* • *Vulnerability to Extreme Natural Events* • *New Zealand national population trends and factors* • *Global Fertility rate decline* • *Ageing population* • *NZ Agriculture and Tourism Industry*
7. Geographical patterns are the product of natural and cultural processes, with environmental, economic, social and political consequences.	*Significant matauranga Māori knowledge Yr 11-13* • Understanding of concepts such as: Whakapapa, Whanaungatanga and Kaitiakitanga. *Significant learning across Yr 11-13* • (Cultural): The pattern of migration: understanding the reasons for and impacts on both people and place • (Cultural): Opportunities and challenges of urbanisation • (Natural): Global ecosystems/ Biomes and natural phenomena in local and regional settings. • The decision making associated with patterns and processes. *Important contexts* • *Tropical Rainforests; Tundra; Hot/Cold Desert etc* • *De-urbanisation* • *Global labour movements* • *Growth of megacities* • *Environmental refugees* • *Patterns of communicable and chronic disease*
8. Global processes acting in local contexts produce spatial	*Significant matauranga Māori knowledge Yr 11-13* • Concepts such as Kōrero püräkau *legend or story* that explains an event or activity and atua

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

distributions of geographical phenomena across the Earth's surface.	*Significant learning across Yr 11-13* • Geopolitics shapes access to resources at local, regional and national scales • The changing geographies of economic superpowers • The process of globalisation transforming the spatial distribution of production and consumption of commodities and services *Important contexts* • *China – economic growth and influence on Pacific* • *The impact of globalisation on NZ economy and towns*
9. Environmental sustainability depends on the maintenance or restoration of the environmental functions that sustain all life and human wellbeing (economic, cultural and social).	*Significant matauranga Māori knowledge Yr 11-13* • Approaches to custodial responsibility and environmental management by Tangata Whenua. • Understanding of concepts such as kaitiakitanga, rohe, tapu noa, and manaakitanga *Significant learning across Yr 11-13* • Natural and cultural environments supporting human well-being *e.g Tropical Rainforests, Oceans, Urban and Rural areas* • Sustainability is viewed as a balance between environmental, economic, social and cultural wellbeing • Exploring limits to unfettered economic growth, environmental tipping points and how humans are responding to these. • The pursuit of Free Trade agreements and the positive and negative impact these have on human wellbeing *Important contexts* • *NZ's commitment and progress towards international sustainability targets (eg Paris Accord; SDGs)* • *NZ economy and social policy: Agriculture and food security; Outsourcing;* • *Transition to cleaner energy sources* • *Local 'grassroot' restoration / management projects* • *NZ international trade policy (bilateral and multilateral)* • *Managing the global commons (e.g. Polar regions; Oceans)*
10. Sustainability means different things to different people which can have significant implications for decision-making.	*Significant matauranga Māori knowledge Yr 11-13* • Understanding of concepts such as kaitiakitanga, rohe, tapu noa, tino rangatiratanga, manaakitanga, consensus decision making • Treaty of Waitangi principles and social and environmental policy (eg RMA, 1991) *Significant learning across Yr 11-13* • Technological, legislative, social justice, and deep ecology approaches to sustainability • The role of international and national government, NGO and community initiatives in improving human wellbeing in NZ and other countries

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

	• Viewpoints and values shape decision making and are influenced by wider world-views and theoretical perspectives. • The politically, socially, and culturally contested nature of sustainability *Important contexts* • *The opportunities and challenges of Tourism to NZ* • *Sustainability in global chains of production* • *Changes in NZ immigration policy* • *Local development projects which address, for example, housing shortages, transportation, resource management, local environments* • *Developing green-economies*
11. Social and environmental change can occur over time, is spatially uneven, and affects places differently.	*Significant matauranga Māori knowledge Yr 11-13* • Understanding of concepts such as tino rangatiratanga, kaitiakitanga • Confiscation of economic base of Māori through (post) colonialism • Urbanisation and counter urbanisation of Māori. *Significant learning across Yr 11-13* • Increasing multiculturalism in NZ cities • The impact of climate change on people and places • The planetary modification of the earth's surface since the mid 20th Century • Inequity and inequality within and between places at a range of scales • Glacial and post-glacial environments • Desertification • Spatial representation skills (eg GIS) *Important contexts* • *Study of development at continental, national, and regional scales (eg Sub-Saharan or Auckland development indicators)* • *Sea level rise in the Pacific region* • *Loss of arctic sea ice* • *Changing weather patterns* • *Changes in agriculture (NZ)*
12. By understanding the contemporary processes changing the world we can	*Significant matauranga Māori knowledge Yr 11-13* • Kaitiakitanga to "*care for*" the environment; sustainable use, management and control of natural and physical resources that are carried out to the mutual benefit of people and resources. • Principles of the Treaty.

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

interpret the past, understand the present and make predictions about possible future change.	*Significant learning across Yr 11-13* • Significant contemporary geographic issues of global importance • Possible, probable and preferred futures of the Anthropocene • Research skills. *Important contexts* • *Anthropogenically induced climate change* • *Living in sustainable cities* • *Food and water security* • *Transition to low carbon societies* • *Shifting patterns of chronic disease* • *Increasing wealth inequalities* • *Challenges of the burgeoning middle classes in China and India.*
13. Religion and beliefs systems are dynamic and change in response to interactions (past and present) with other groups (local and global).	*Significant mātauranga Māori knowledge across Yr 11-13* • Understanding concepts of traditional Māori beliefs • How Christianity had an effect on Māori (past and present) *Significant learning across Yr 11-13* • how spiritual and religious ideas in history and religion have played a major role in some key events in history • how developments in technology, philosophy and science from both within and outside religious traditions have affected the roles of religion in society • other ideas and movements that have influenced and are influencing the roles of religion in society • the reasons, when considering prehistoric and ancient religious traditions, why ideas or the religious tradition in its entirety ceased to exist • the reasons why some ideas from one religious tradition become part of other religious traditions. *Important contexts* • *The Search for Meaning* • *Religious Systems*
14. Aotearoa New Zealand today is shaped by multiple religious beliefs that reflect migration of groups to our country.	*Significant matauranga Māori knowledge across Yr 11-13* • *Concepts of Taonga, ako and whanau* • Maori language and spirituality, Katorika Māori Spirituality *Significant learning across Yr 11-13* the distribution of and adherence to major religious traditions in Aotearoa, past and present • the influences of recent religious and non-religious trends on NZ religious composition • the influences of government policies on the religious composition of NZ society over time

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

	• the way collective identity is expressed by religious traditions in Aotearoa through relevant aspects of religion • the personal meaning and identity that is found and further developed through engagement with relevant aspects of religion and the spiritual experience • tensions that can occur between members of a religious tradition over issues of authority, freedom, interpretation of beliefs and teachings, and behaviour • interactions between different religious traditions and within the wider NZ society and reasons for these, in particular: – the role of religion in providing social infrastructure in NZ society – the role of interfaith and ecumenical interaction in Aotearoa *Important contexts* • Religion in Aotearoa • NZ is changing – migration is having an impact on religious/societal practice • Sects and cults
15. Exploring religious beliefs helps to understand the perspectives and actions of different groups of people.	*Significant matauranga Māori knowledge Yr 11-13* • Wairua, tapu, noa, mana Significant learning across Yr 11-13 • the authorities, principles, values, norms and ideas informing ethical perspectives of religious traditions in societies in which multiple worldviews coexist • the nature and purpose of religion, past and present, considering: – the questions and life experiences which shape religion and religious identity – other needs to which religion responds – the extent to which religion can satisfy these needs the role of religion generally in shaping and giving expression to spiritual experiences through the aspects of religion ○ the relationship of the aspects to each other ○ the varying importance of the aspects across different religious traditions Important Contexts • *church and faith history* • *Key reformers from faith traditions*
16. Understanding diverse religious beliefs helps to develop ethical responses to contemporary issues and can encourage greater	*Significant matauranga Māori knowledge Yr 11-13* • Principles of pono (faith), tika (integrity) and aroha (compassion) • Karakia and meditation *Significant learning across Yr 11-13* • understand issues that are regarded as ethical issues

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

understandings, fairness, empathy and acceptance of religious diversity.	• the ethical decision-making methods, including the philosophical traditions that have influenced the understanding of ethical perspectives of the religious traditions • how the ethical perspectives of religious traditions inform the moral judgments of their religious communities • the aspects of religion related to ethical decision-making processes in religious traditions. • the religious and non-religious individuals, groups and traditions that contribute to the debates about ethical issues in societies where multiple worldviews coexist • the ethical perspectives and moral judgments presented in the arguments by those participating in the debates, including the authorities, norms, values and ideas on which the various ethical perspectives and moral judgments rest • the ethical decision-making methods involved in the debate process and their strengths and weaknesses • the influence of the various participants' contributions to the debates. • Develop Understanding – so we know why they do what they do Important Contexts: • *Religion and Ethical Issues* • *Peacemaking in Aotearoa and the world* • *Interfaith practices.*
17. Identities and cultures are dynamic and change through the interaction of people (their beliefs, cultural and religious practices) and communities, with consequences for individuals, groups and societies.	*Significant matauranga Māori knowledge Yr 11-13* • understanding of concepts such as tūrangawaewae, pepeha, whanaungatanga. *Significant learning across Yr 11-13* • language is an important part of identity and culture • when people feel valued and their identities are recognised, they feel a sense of belonging • belonging is an important social construct and creates culture • exclusion of individuals and groups due to identities leads to human rights injustice and conflict • understanding the intersectional nature of identities - multiple and dynamic - helps to remove stereotypes and prejudice; promotes tolerance and inclusive practices • cultural change is influenced by different factors e.g. technological, political, social and environmental • there are consequences for individuals, groups and society as a result of cultural change *Important contexts* • *21st century Aotearoa New Zealand, particularly cities such as Auckland and Wellington* • *Cultural conflicts- Israel/Palestine, Ihumātao*

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

	• *Societies experiencing rapid change and where there is a clash between the traditional and modern such as China and India* • *Racism* • *Perceptions of beauty standards* • *Drinking culture in New Zealand* • *Communication and the impact of social media* • *Te Kōhangareo Reo movement* • *Pākehā /Tauiwi/NZ non-Māori as culture.*
18. Global flows of people and ideas and global, regional, cultural and environmental conflicts (past and present) shape our contemporary world and future identities.	Significant matauranga Māori knowledge Yr 11-13 • understanding of concepts such as tūrangawaewae, manaakitanga, tangata whenua, turangawaewae • principles of kaitiakitanga. Significant learning across Yr 11-13 • That there are complex social, cultural, economic, political and environmental factors that shape migration trends in the 21st Century. • Individuals, groups, societies and nations respond to migration differently. • Globalisation shapes the production of goods and the delivery of services • Societies and communities are becoming more diverse and there are different responses to this. • Social media has changed the nature of communication and shapes how people see themselves (identity). Important contexts • *Immigration debates in Western nations* • *Global citizenship* • *Westernization of beauty e.g. China, India* • *Social Media influencers* • *Human trafficking/modern day slavery* • *Rise of Artificial Intelligence* • *Climate Change refugees* • *Rise of nationalism and white supremacy* • *Global organisations for action e.g. Greenpeace*
19. The way societies organise themselves through systems of government and different institutions influences how	*Significant matauranga Māori knowledge Yr 11-13* • understanding of concepts such as tino rangatiratanga, kawanatanga, mana whakahaere • Marae as a site of decision-making *Significant learning across Yr 11-13*

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

decisions are made, how laws are implemented and how power is distributed.	• Similarities and differences between different systems of government, especially in the distribution of power between the state, citizens, NGOs and businesses. • Forms of government and governance offer people and groups different avenues for decision-making (e.g. parliamentary democracy, autocracy, republic, monarchy, indigenous forms of decision-making etc) with implications for freedom, justice and rights. • Participation in democratic processes such as making submissions, writing petitions and voting and the role of political parties. • Democratic practices and processes are created in particular contexts and with particular goals in mind - not all democracies are the same • Impact of settler colonial processes on current political practices. • Role of local and national government, the rights they give citizens and how to participate in these. • Values and ideologies which underpin political positions and parties. *Important contexts* • *New Zealand's government electoral and Parliamentary system, including MMP and purpose of Maori seats.* • *Policy reform through a democratic system such as Aotearoa/NZ such cannabis, euthanasia* • *Extradition law conflict and wider governance issues between Hong Kong and China* • *West Papua Independence movement* • *Te Tiriti o Waitangi, colonisation and the legacy of land confiscation* • *Indigenous representation, particularly Māori seats (local and national level government)* • *Significance of participation in decision-making and social action by individuals and groups in democratic processes.*
20. People, groups and institutions work to shape human rights, social and environmental justice in different ways with different effects.	Significant matauranga Māori knowledge across Yr 11-13 • understanding of concepts such as turangawaewae, ahi kaa, mana whenua • principles of kaitiakitanga. Significant learning across Yr 11-13 • aims and activities of global organisations such United Nations, Greenpeace • understanding of factors that give rise to injustice – colonisation, discrimination, uneven power relations • legislative and policy responses to address injustice • actions taken to protect, preserve and transform places, resources, and communities • Differing perspectives individuals and groups adopt to address injustice and enable sustainability, including indigenous ideas of kaitiakitanga. Important contexts • *Parihaka*

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

	• *Refugees* • *USA Gun debates* • *Anti-Death penalty movement* • *Black Lives Matter* • *Examples of successfully addressing injustice at local, national and global scales* • *Fight for citizenship – e.g. Māori Battalion*
21. Aotearoa New Zealand's colonial past and te Tiriti o Waitangi has shaped (and continues to shape) people's lives, cultural and economic institutions, laws and justice systems and social action today.	***Significant matauranga Māori knowledge across Yr 11-13*** • understanding of concepts such as turangawaewae, ahi kaa, mana whenua, tino rangatiratanga ***Significant learning across Yr 11-13*** • understanding of factors that give rise to injustice – colonisation, discrimination, uneven power relations • legislative attempts to address injustice • activism to address injustice • the differing positions that individuals and groups adopt to injustice • aims and activities of global organisations such United Nations, Greenpeace, Amnesty International • how ideologies influence the success or failures of attempts to address in justice. Important contexts • *Role and actions of Waitangi Tribunal* • *Sites of colonial conflict e.g. Parihaka* • *Sites of current conflict e.g. Ihumātao* • *Polynesian Panthers* • *Refugees and forced migration* • *Examples of groups/individuals successfully addressing injustice at local, national and global scale* • *Use of te Reo Māori in institutions (e.g. law courts, Parliaments).*
22. Past and present discourses, social institutions and media play a role in shaping the knowledge and political choices of citizens.	***Significant matauranga Māori knowledge Yr 11-13*** • *understanding of concepts such as rangatiratanga,* • *Development of dialogical skills including listening to each other.* ***Significant learning across Yr 11-13*** • *understanding of factors that give rise to injustice – colonisation, discrimination, uneven power relations.* • *Ideologies shape individuals and society* • *Development of critical media skills to evaluate sources, identify bias, inaccuracy and distortion of ideas and defend reasoned ideas about contemporary social issues* ***Important contexts*** • *Historical and contemporary genocide*

Released Under the Official Information Act 1982

	• *Colonial attitudes towards indigenous peoples (Māori, Aboriginal peoples, First Nations of Americas)* • *Suffrage Movement and subsequent feminist movements* • *Terrorism* • *Racism* • *Green movement* • *Student Climate Change Strikes* • *Immigration debates.*
23. History is about contested constructions of the past.	***Significant matauranga Māori knowledge Yr 11-13*** • Understanding of concepts of tangata whenua, mana whenua, pacifism, colonialism, tohunga, te ao Maori in regard to whenua, whanau, whakapapa, taonga, reo, kaitiaki, hikoi. Mana motuhake, mana, tino rangatiratanga, taonga • Understanding the oral nature of Māori history. • Māori have a unique conceptual understanding of the nature and purpose of the past: I nga ra o mua: the past that lies in front of us. ***Significant learning across Yr 11-13*** • "isms": Liberalism (classical)/capitalism, Marxism/communism, Nationalism, Imperialism, Conservatism, fascism, feminism, genderism, populism. • Understanding historiography; master narratives versus marginalised narratives • "The end justifies the means" • Alternative sources of knowledge and learning: marae, carvings, moko, whaikorero. • Commonality across Pasifika cultures? ***Important contexts*** • *Treaty of Waitangi/Empire/colonisation, (including Pacific colonisation)* • *Significant historical decisions: military, economic, political. Protest: Parihaka, Bastion Point, Land March, conscientious objectors (WWI), First/Second Wave feminism (suffrage), unionism* • *Holocaust and Israel/Palestine* • *Local history*
24. Significant historical events often centre on unequal power relationships and competing ideologies.	***Significant matauranga Māori knowledge Yr 11-13*** • Te Ao Maori, Whakapapa, Mana, Whenua, Kaitiaki, Kaitiakitanga, Tapu, Hikoi, Manaakitanga, mana whenua ***Significant learning across Yr 11-13*** • exploration of how power is perceived across time, how power is shown, who has it, how people/groups try to gain it – or resist the efforts of others to do so - the results for 'in' and 'out' groups when it is attained.

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

	• "isms": Liberalism (classical)/capitalism, Marxism/communism, Nationalism, Imperialism, Conservatism, fascism, feminism, genderism, populism. *Important contexts* • *Global conflict in the 20th century* • *Colonisation* • *Revolutions* • *Genocide* *Social/political movements (eg Black Civil Rights; Maori Treaty/land activism; anti-apartheid movement; Mau movement in Samoa/Polynesian Panthers; Second Wave feminism; LGBTQ struggle; counter-culture)*
25. Te Tiriti o Waitangi is symbolic of the coming together of two peoples; different understandings of Te Tiriti and processes of colonisation have led to Māori marginalisation and, later, efforts at reconciliation.	*Significant matauranga Māori knowledge Yr 11-13* • raupatu, mana motuhake, taonga, tino rangatiratanga, kawanatanga • local iwi/hapu efforts to retain/reassert rangatiratanga *Significant learning across Yr 11-13* • Background to the signing in the Contact Period: 'workable accord', 'competition for mana'. • Differences between the Māori and English versions te Tiriti and thus the contested understandings and expectations of the ongoing relationship. • Post-war marginalisation for Maori: numerically, politically, economically, (culturally?). • Maori efforts to retain rangatiratanga inside, alongside and outside the settler system *Important contexts* • *Contact Period* • *Treaty signing korero* • *From 'workable accord' to 'competing assertions of sovereignty', culminating in war* • *Land: confiscations, Native Land Court* • *Maori political and prophet movements* • *Urbanisation, the 'Maori Renaissance', activism* • *Waitangi Tribunal*
26. The extent to which historical events are perceived to be significant relates to perspectives of people and groups (past and present), the	*Significant matauranga Māori knowledge Yr 11-13* • Understanding the effects of raupatu, mana motuhake, kirirarautanga (Citizenship). • Understanding the importance of kotahitanga to affect change: Hīkoi, Land wars, Ngā Tama Toa, kotahitanga. *Significant learning across Yr 11-13* Individuals, groups, movements, forces can all shape history, and the contested significance of subsequent events and developments can be evaluated by considering:

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

impact of the event, the way it reveals something important about the past or informs our understanding of the present and how it provides validation for present-day claims. The significance of historical events is contested.	• the importance of the event, or place, to people alive at the time • how deeply people's lives were affected at the time • how many lives were affected • the length of time people's lives were affected • the extent to which the event, or place, continues to affect people, including by providing validation for present-day claims. • the way it reveals something important about the past or informs our understanding of the present ***Important contexts*** • *Treaty of Waitangi/Empire/colonisation, (including Pacific colonisation)* • *Global conflict in the 20th century* • *Colonisation* • *Revolutions* • *Genocide (for example, the Holocaust)* • *Social/political movements (eg Black Civil Rights; Maori Treaty/land activism; anti-apartheid movement; Mau movement in Samoa/Polynesian Panthers; Second Wave feminism; LGBTQ struggle; counter-culture)*
27. Continuity and/or change can describe related events, perspectives, actions and beliefs over time.	***Significant matauranga Māori knowledge Yr 11-13*** • Options to discuss and learn how Maori values have changed and continued over time ***Significant learning across Yr 11-13*** • Exploration of change, continuity, progression, regression, cyclical trends • Exploration over time of "isms": Liberalism (classical)/capitalism, Marxism/communism, Nationalism, Imperialism, Conservatism, fascism, feminism, genderism, populism. • Exploration over time of societal features: roles of men/women; medicine; work; leadership etc ***Important contexts*** • *Treaty of Waitangi/Empire/colonisation, (including Pacific colonisation)* • *Global conflict in the 20th century* • *Colonisation* • *Revolutions* • *Genocide (for example, the Holocaust)* *Social/political movements (eg Black Civil Rights; Maori Treaty/land activism; anti-apartheid movement; Mau movement in Samoa/Polynesian Panthers; Second Wave feminism; LGBTQ struggle; counter-culture)*
28. Causes and consequences of historical events are complex,	***Significant matauranga Māori knowledge Yr 11-13*** • I nga ra o mua: the past that lies in front of us

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

involving both long-term and short-term aspects.	*Significant learning across Yr 11-13* • Events have causes that can include long-term/underlying, short-term and trigger. • Consequences of events can include short-term and long-term, as well as those that may not become apparent for some time. • Events can have intended as well as unintended consequences. *Important contexts* • *Treaty of Waitangi/Empire/colonisation, (including Pacific colonisation)* • *Global conflict in the 20th century* • *Colonisation* • *Revolutions* • *Genocide (for example, the Holocaust)* • *Social/political movements (eg Black Civil Rights; Maori Treaty/land activism; anti-apartheid movement; Mau movement in Samoa/Polynesian Panthers; Second Wave feminism; LGBTQ struggle; counter-culture)*
29. Resources are scarce when unlimited wants exceed the capability of the available resources to satisfy them, so that economic choices must be made that reflect people's differing values and perspectives.	*Significant matauranga Māori knowledge Yr 11-13* • Understanding the concepts of kaitiakitanga *Significant learning across Yr 11-13* • Markets are places or situations where producers and consumers exchange goods and services. In free market economies, the prices set by the interaction of supply and demand allocates scarce resources. • Whenever resources are particularly scarce, demand exceeds supply, and prices are driven up which has the effect of discouraging demand and conserving resources. E.g. as oil slowly runs out and its price rises, demand will be discouraged, leading to more oil being conserved than at lower prices. • An incentive is something that motivates a producer or consumer to follow a particular course of action or to change it. • Higher prices resulting from increased consumer demand are an incentive for producers to supply more of a good or service because they may earn more profit. Important contexts • *For example, as world demand for dairy products rises, New Zealand farmers are switching to dairying.* • *Similarly, students are likelier to work hard to develop skills they recognise as required for the high paying job they aspire to.* • *International trade reduces scarcity.*
30. Economic models help to explain and predict economic	*Significant matauranga Māori knowledge Yr 11-13* •

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

behaviour and performance and macroeconomic and microeconomic patterns.	Significant learning across Yr 11-13 • Economic models are simplifications of the real world that aid analysis and support predictions about economic behaviour and performance and aid the analysis of macroeconomic and microeconomic issues. • Micro-economics is the branch of economics (Based on neoclassical economics) that examines individual decision-making by firms and households and the way they interact in specific industries and markets. • Macro-economics is the branch of economics that examines the workings and problems of the economy as a whole. It is concerned with aggregate supply (total national output of goods and services) and aggregate demand (the total spending of the whole economy) and issues such as economic growth, inflation, unemployment, and economic fluctuations. Important contexts • A supply and demand model Microeconomics uses a supply and demand model. This model combines producer supply and consumer demand to support analysis of the effects of choices on price and the flow-on effects of decisions on others. More sophisticated applications allow users to make predictions about economic efficiency. • An aggregate supply and aggregate demand (AS AD) model The macroeconomic AS AD model aids analysis of changes in the internal and external influences affecting an economy, in particular, their impact on inflation, economic growth, and employment.
31. There are differing types of economic markets where producers and consumers exchange goods and services and these are shaped by interactions with government and different sectors of an economy (households, producers, financial, government, overseas) to produce different levels of equity.	*Significant matauranga Māori knowledge Yr 11-13* • *Significant learning across Yr 11-13* • The benefits of market activities may not be equitable. Equity is an economic objective relating to fairness or evenness. • A market may be efficient, but society may be concerned that the benefits from market activity are unfairly shared out. *Important contexts* • *For example, free markets inevitably distribute incomes unevenly because the income earned depends on supply and demand for labour resources, which are different in different markets.* • *If a government believes the gap between rich and poor is too great, it will redistribute wealth by giving benefits to the poor, for example, unemployment benefits, and taxing the rich at higher rates.* *Government intervention may involve an equity–efficiency trade-off* • *Government interventions to improve equity may sometimes diminish efficiency. E.g. higher marginal tax rates may discourage high-income earners from working harder or longer (productivity falls)*

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

	• *Some governments seek to help low-income families by adopting policies to stimulate economic growth. They believe that the benefits of higher growth will trickle down to the low-income families.* • *Other governments recognise that reducing poverty will improve economic efficiency. E.g. reducing poverty tends to reduce levels of illness, which are linked to poor housing and nutrition, with fewer health costs as a result; and more money for other developments (e.g. developing infrastructure to improve productivity).* *Interdependence results in flow-on effects* • *The different sectors of an economy (households, producers, financial, government, overseas) are interdependent, and events impacting one sector will flow on to affect other sectors. E.g. when overseas countries that trade with New Zealand go into recession and reduce their spending, the flow-on effect for New Zealand is fewer export receipts and lower levels of economic growth.*
32. Successful business operations involve multiple inter-related components, including effective management of people, resources and internal and external influences	Significant mataruanga Maori knowledge across Yr 11-13 • Kaitiakitanga – guardianship of the natural resources for future generations • Putake – the reason the business exists • Turanga – an iwi based organisational structure • Rangatiratanga – leadership • Tikanga – values, rules, priorities • Manaakitanga – care and giving *Significant learning across Yr 11-13* Business Formation Students will develop an understanding of how and why business is established. Functions of Business Students will demonstrate an understanding of the components of operating a successful business. People in Business Students will understand the requirements for recruiting, developing and retaining people in a business. Business Management Students will identify why and how resources must be managed effectively to ensure continued business success. Business Environment Students will develop an understanding of the internal and external influences that impact on business. *Important contexts* • *Ngai Tahu Seafood* • *Kaitahi superfoods*

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

	• *Moka Fibre eco-eyelashes* • *Mana Kai honey* • *Ahu* • *Kahu Wines* • *Pakihi.co.nz resource*
33. Accounting systems are underpinned by principles of financial integrity which require a recognition of differing contexts and appropriate control measures in order to make informed financial decisions.	*Significant matauranga Māori knowledge Yr 11-13* • Rangatiratanga – leadership • Tikanga – values, rules, priorities • Manaakitanga – care and giving *Significant learning across Yr 11-13* • The Conceptual Basis of Accounting Students will develop an understanding of the foundations of accounting, the principles on which it is based and how they are applied in context. • Processing Students will be able to prepare accounting entries to process the impact of financial transactions appropriate to the context. • Accounting Systems Students will be able to describe and design an accounting sub-system, including objectives, input, process, output, features and appropriate control measures. • Accounting Reports Students will be able to present and report financial information to interested parties, in order for them to make financial decisions • Decision Making Students will be able to analyse, interpret and evaluate financial and non- financial information in order to make financial decisions *Important contexts* • *Household* • *Sole trader* • *Company* • *Community organisation*

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

Document 1.3

Ensuring mātuaranga Māori is explicit in NZC: guidance from Charles Royal about what this can mean

‘Mātauranga Māori’ is a distinctive body of knowledge held within New Zealand. P10 *(criteria 1)*

A focus on iwi based learning and ‘future proofing’ curriculum so that learners obtain pre-existent knowledge with an awareness and openness to new learning, to new experiences. P5 *(criteria 3)*

The world view lies at the very heart of the culture, touching, interacting with and strongly influencing every aspect of the culture. P38 *(criteria 5 & 6)*

CRITIERIA FOR BIG IDEAS WITHIN A NZC LEARING AREA

1. This idea directs attention to mātauranga Māori i.e. to a distinctive body of knowledge and awareness held by Māori (reo: language, ahurea: culture, tuakiritanga: identity).
2. This idea has lasting value i.e. it is important to remember beyond school long after details may have been forgotten.
3. This idea is central to the learning area i.e. it captures an understanding (declarative/‘knowing that’; procedural/‘knowing how’; epistemic/’knowing why’) that lies at the heart of the learning area.
4. This idea has depth i.e. it can be developed with increasing complexity from the earliest years at school.
5. This idea is of life significance i.e. of aesthetic, historic, scientific, social, physical, environmental, cultural or spiritual value that will be relevant to students in their lives during and after their school years
6. This idea informs ethical judgement, decision-making and/or action.
7. This idea allows for learning to be connected across the learning area – i.e. it is conceptually based and transferable to multiple contexts and circumstances.

Mātauranga Maori is about studying the universe from a Maori perspective. P25 *(criteria 2 & 4)*

Themes within mātauranga Māori connect with world themes in human society and culture. P14 *(criteria 5)*

With respect to mātauranga Māori, it is my view that we should be approaching this body of knowledge as a national opportunity – incentivising activities which explore its possible application to a range of activities and fields of endeavour. P25 *(criteria 7)*

Released Under the Official Information Act 1982

Criteria for Big Ideas

A Big Idea will usually be expressed as a full sentence or, at most, two sentences.

A Big Idea will not necessarily meet all of the criteria, but it should meet at least more than one of the following:

1. This idea directs attention to mātauranga Māori- i.e. to a distinctive body of knowledge and awareness held by Māori (reo: language, ahurea: culture, tuakiritanga: identity)

2. This idea has lasting value: i.e. it is important to remember beyond school long after details may have been forgotten. `

3. This idea is central to the learning area – i.e. it captures an understanding (declarative/'knowing that'; procedural/'knowing how'; epistemic/'knowing why') that lies at the heart of the learning area

4. This idea has depth – i.e. it can be developed with increasing complexity from the earliest years at school.

5. This idea is of life significance – i.e. of aesthetic, historic, scientific, social, physical, environmental, cultural or spiritual value that will be relevant to students in their lives during and after their school years

6. This idea informs ethical judgement, decision-making and/or action

7. This idea allows for learning to be connected across the learning area – i.e. it is conceptually based and transferable to multiple contexts and circumstances.

Key question for determining Significant learning for Years 11-13

Significant Learning across Years 11-13 (curriculum levels 6-8) is related to each Big Idea.

The key question to consider is:

> **What is critical for students to know, understand and do in relation to that Big Idea by the end of schooling?**

Being explicit about key competencies in significant learning

"The school curriculum should challenge students to use and develop the key competencies across the range of learning areas and in increasingly complex and unfamiliar situations" (NZC p38). The key competencies are "more complex than skills, (they) draw also on knowledge, attitudes and values in ways that lead to action. They are not separate or standalone. In practice, they are the key to learning in every learning area" (page 13). "The key competencies are most often used in combination" (page 38). The clarification of the essence of NZC learning areas models how this combining is done.

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

Each learning area[1] draws from one of more disciplines.[2] And each discipline has its own knowledges, languages, and practices that contribute to the community's particular ways of working to make meaning (of new knowledge and for using knowledge). Explicitly identifying key competencies with the significant learning provides opportunities to focus on what it means for students to develop disciplinary ways of working, i.e. to take action, which would be recognisable to members of the disciplinary communities concerned.

Significant learning statements weave the key competencies with the important learning area knowledge. The questions below are designed to use with the learning area big ideas and significant learning to bring clarity about how to weave the key competencies with the learning areas.

Key competencies	*From a discipline perspective this means....*	*To make meaning[3] in this significant learning...*
Thinking	Internal critical and creative thinking processes. Examples of types of thinking include: Cause and effect thinking, evidence-based thinking, embodied thinking, lateral thinking, systems thinking, values clarification, and epistemic thinking: (from http://nzcurriculum.tki.org.nz/Key-competencies/Key-competencies-and-effective-pedagogy/Insights-into-the-key-competencies)	What types of disciplinary thinking do students need to do?
Using language symbols and texts	Interpreting and producing texts for knowledge production (for personal sense making and for sense making that can be shared) using the language conventions of the discipline.	What disciplinary specific use of language symbols and texts do students need to engage in?
Managing self	Systematic and sequential agreed on processes; a set way of doing things that help progress understanding. These processes draw on students' ability to take risks; be resilient, patient and resourceful; and persevere. The sort of processes would include ways for not losing ideas, observations, drafts etc. For example, such things as prototypes, reference lists, labels on tables, measurements etc.	What systematic processes of the discipline do students need to be follow?
Relating to others	Perspective taking when making sense of things. This means seeing things from other perspectives, cultural, interdisciplinary, short term /long term, global/ local etc and being clear about whose shoes students need to stand in. This would involve competencies for being reflective, empathetic, listening and not talking past each other.	What different perspectives do students need to engage with?
Participating and contributing	Practices and social conventions for the knowledge production of the disciplinary community.	What discipline-specific social practices and conventions do students need to follow as they participate and contribute in ways consistent with the discipline?

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

[1] It is important to remember that, while the learning areas are associated with different disciplines, what appears in curriculum documents and is enacted in classrooms is not just a less complicated version of disciplinary knowledge and practices. Rather, the written and enacted curriculum is an adapted version of disciplinary knowledge and practices designed to educate students for social and economic purposes.

[2] Some disciplines within a learning area are more closely aligned than others (e.g. while physics and biology communities are part of the wider science community that has many shared ways of working they also have their difference e.g. different types of ways to investigate natural phenomena).

[3] To know, take action and understand

NZC Significant learning

Document 1.5

at years 11 - 13 is based on **Knowledge BIG IDEAS** that are developed by applying **Discipline and subject level-appropriate COMPETENCIES and WAYS OF WORKING** that incorporate **Relevant MĀTAURANGA MĀORI knowledge-generating processes and knowledge** to **Level-appropriate CONTEXTS**

Year 11 – 13 students develop knowledge of the discipline and subject big ideas (that draw from the learning areas). The Review of Achievement Standards will include a taxonomy of NCEA NZC derived senior secondary subjects. The BIG IDEAS will then be developed for each subject.

Years 11 – 13 students' competency and ways of working are intuitive and disciplined-focused. They use discipline-specific ways of **thinking** such as critical and creative thinking, cause and effect thinking, abstract thinking, evidence-based thinking, embodied thinking, lateral thinking, systems thinking, values clarification, epistemic thinking, and evaluative thinking. They can evaluate the quality of their thinking. They interpret and produce **language, symbols and texts** using the conventions of the discipline. They understand the disciplinary-specific ways of being and processes they need to follow and can **manage themselves** accordingly. For example they can identity as scientist, social scientist, artist, mathematician etc. Students understand and use the discipline/s set way of doing things that help progress understanding in the subject. They develop strategies to synthesise information; take risks; be resilient, patient and resourceful; suspend judgement; persevere; and be reflective.

Years 11 – 13 students use and reflect on the disciplinary-specific ways of **relating to others** and to others' perspectives. They can see from different perspectives; notice power relationships and positioning; interact with theoretical models and frameworks that frame perspectives; and negotiate and resolve different perspectives and theoretical positions. Students **participate and contribute** to their community by following discipline-specific practices and conventions. They understand the rules of engagement. For example, they provide evidence to support viewpoints, and they communicate both methodology and results.

By Years 11 – 13 students are use the **learning area** processes independently and in a sustained way. The description of the learning area processes year 11 – 13 students engage in are found on the following page in the hatched box.

Year 11 – 13 students engage with contexts that are typically broad, deep and large in scale, and extend beyond personal experience. The contexts involve multiple interacting elements; contested ideas; provocative or nuanced interpretations; and require sustained engagement to understand. Theoretical models and frameworks are needed to make sense of the context/s.

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

From The New Zealand Curriculum page 30

The social sciences learning area is about how societies work and how people can participate and take action as critical, active, informed, and responsible citizens.

Why study the social sciences?
Students develop the knowledge and skills to enable them to:

- better understand, participate in, and contribute to the local, national, and global communities in which they live and work
- engage critically with societal issues
- evaluate the sustainability of alternative social, economic, political, and environmental practices.

NZ context:

- Students explore the unique bicultural nature of New Zealand society that derives from the Treaty of Waitangi.
- They learn about people, places, cultures, histories, and the economic world, within and beyond New Zealand.
- They develop understandings about how societies are organised and function and how the ways in which people and communities respond are shaped by different perspectives, values, and viewpoints.
- As they explore how others see themselves, students clarify their own identities in relation to their particular heritages and contexts.

Knowledge big ideas organised in cross cutting themes that can be integrated through particular learning contexts (strands)

- Identity culture and organisation
- Place and environment
- Continuity and change
- The economic world

Competencies and ways of working
Social inquiry approach to explore human society and citizenship

- Ask questions, gather information and ideas, examine current issues
- Reflect and evaluative understanding and responses
- Explore and analyse peoples values & perspectives
- Consider ways people make decisions & participate in social actions

In the social sciences year 11 – 13 students pose questions; explore and compare primary and secondary sources, and consider their strengths, limitations and integrity; process and communicate information using appropriate disciplinary conventions; form generalisations about human society; reflect on and analyse the contested values and perspectives; and communicate ideas to different audiences clearly.
They analyse and evaluate the beliefs, values, and perspectives that underpin human dispositions, action and decision-making; recognise the contested nature of these; and engage with diverse theoretical perspectives that seek to explain at a worldview level the paradigms and ideologies which inform action and ideas.
Year 11 – 13 students apply a range of frameworks and models to evaluate evidence, make informed decisions towards preferred futures and express viewpoints. They participate as citizens with ethical, justice-oriented and inclusive responses.

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

Information that is not within scope of your request has been removed from the document.

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION
TE TĀHUHU O TE MĀTAURANGA

Report: Provisional Subject List for NCEA Level 1

To: Programme Board (NCEA Review)

From: Simon Laube, Senior Manager NCEA Product Delivery, Secondary Tertiary

Author: Bill Dieckermann, Senior Advisor, Secondary Tertiary

Date: 29 January 2020

Introduction

1. An in-principle decision of the NCEA Change Package was to **retain NCEA Level 1 as an optional level for schools who wish to continue to use this qualification**. The NCEA Review found that NCEA Level 1:

    i. is the highest exit qualification for around 10% of students

    ii. is a key motivator for many students in year 11

    iii. provides many students with structured and credentialed opportunities to develop the disciplinary knowledge to prepare for advanced learning in Level 2 and beyond.

2. Further agreement (in principle) was to refocus NCEA on fewer, larger standards within more coherent courses. It was emphasised that the fewer number of standards should "encourage students to focus on breadth as they work towards NCEA Level 1." In this vision of a broader, more foundational NCEA Level 1 students would balance a focus on "exploration within a broad range of Learning Areas or Wāhanga Ako, while retaining some specialised standards per subject to credential foundational disciplinary learning" with increasing specialisation at Levels 2 and 3 [SWC-19-MIN-0045]. The Ministry's mechanism for enacting such change is through its Review of Achievement Standards.

3. Each subject matrix developed will have 4 standards. These will be larger, with a focus on the important learning and of a more consistent size. We expect these standards to be significantly broader than many of the existing standards. These changes to the design of standards and matrices will work alongside the refined subject list for NCEA Level 1 to support meaningful learning for secondary students. There will be decreased ability to build courses from miscellaneous standards and the standards will be deliberately written to reflect the curriculum entitlement of important learning in each subject within each *New Zealand Curriculum* Learning Area. While it is not compulsory for learners to engage across the curriculum from year 11, we believe it is valuable to support them to have opportunities to, and to ensure that the learning within each subject covers the important aspects of the Learning Area.

4. A previous paper "The Process for Progressing New Subjects within the RAS" outlined a process for progressing new subjects through the Review of Achievement Standards. This paper adapts that framework for the current offering of subjects in NCEA to support a provisional subject list for NCEA Level 1 for subjects derived from the *New Zealand Curriculum* and a vision for NCEA Level 2 and 3. The Ministry will also be developing subjects derived from *Te Marautanga o Aotearoa* from 2020; however, the process for the development of these subjects will be distinct, to ensure we support Māori to shape Māori-medium pathways through NCEA. While the criteria and analysis used may be applicable for TMoA derived learning, this paper specifically deals with NZC subjects, recognising that they play an important role within both schools and wharekura.

5. Alongside the development of subjects derived from The *New Zealand Curriculum*, we are working with experts in the Wāhanga Ako of *Te Marautanga o Aotearoa* to develop subjects at Level 1 in 2020.

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

6. For the purposes of the provisional subject list, we will outline that planned subjects will be under development for Level 1 in 2020, but that a final subject list for *Te Marautanga o Aotearoa* is unlikely to be confirmed until the end of 2020, following Cabinet decisions on the refresh of *Te Marautanga o Aotearoa*.

7. For the purposes of this paper, the term 'subject' is used to refer to bodies of learning credentialed through NCEA with their own assessment matrix either currently or within a revised subject list. Courses are how bodies of learning are delivered by schools and usually align with a subject or a group of subjects. This paper uses the term 'discipline' where it is necessary to make as distinction between a subject in NCEA and the broader body of learning it belongs to, for example when discussing the basis for a subject in the *New Zealand Curriculum*.

    - Part 1 of this report will outline the policy context for the provisional subject list at NCEA Level 1 and establish the criteria for selecting a subject at NCEA Level 1.

    - Part 2 will outline the application of the criteria for selecting a subject at NCEA Level 1: this is the process the Ministry follows when applying the criteria to determine subjects for NCEA Level 1 and beyond, and a process for including additional subjects in NCEA if required outside of the standard review points (every five years).

    - Part 3 will apply the process to each learning area to make a recommendation of what the provisional subject list for NCEA Level 1 and the Review of Achievement Standards should look like.

8. The analysis in this paper predominantly draws upon the following sources:

    - Usage data on subjects provided by the New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA)

    - Self-reported subject enrolment data collected from schools by the Ministry of Education

    - The report 'NCEA Review: Findings from the public engagement on the future of NCEA' prepared by the New Zealand Council for Education Research in December 2018

Part 1: Policy context for the provisional subject list and establishing the criteria for selecting a subject at NCEA Level 1

9. The starting point for determining the Level 1 provisional subject list is the two key questions posed in the "The Process for Progressing New Subjects within the RAS" adapted for the existing subject list:

    i. Should the subject continue to receive support as part of NCEA?

    ii. If so, what degree of support should the Ministry commit to the subject, and at what NCEA level(s) should it be supported?

10. Should the subject continue to receive support as part of NCEA?

    - Subjects currently part of NCEA will continue to receive support from the Ministry unless there is evidence that the subject is no longer fit for purpose. In that instance, we should consider whether the subject would meet the standard for a new subject today and whether there are ways outside NCEA to teach and credential the subject.

    - If a subject is determined to be no longer fit for purpose, then it would not receive support as part of NCEA

11. What degree of support should the Ministry commit to the subject, and at what NCEA level(s) should it be supported?

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

- There are four degrees of support that the Ministry can provide. This ranges from full support as a credentialed subject through to being a context within another subject e.g. with support provided to develop resources for that learning from a discontinued subject within a separate subject (that is aligned to learning topics or areas of interest) so that learning can continue to be supported through school courses.

12.

Degree of Support	Descriptions	Reasons in favour
1	Full support for the subject credentialed at Level 1	Most appropriate for subjects with • high usage • unique curriculum ties and disciplinary knowledge at Level 1 i.e. subject does not overlap significantly with other subjects • specific knowledge development is critical for success at Level 2 and beyond • clear pathways
2	Merge or reorganise subject with another related subject or subjects at Level 1 with full support from Level 2 onwards	Most appropriate for subjects with • overlaps in disciplinary knowledge, big ideas and/or synergies at Level 1 • where the use of (previous) subjects by students indicates that the learning pathway may be overlapping at Level 1 • support clearer pathways at Level 2 and/or 3 • strong curriculum ties • evidence of a need to increase course coherence
3	Support subject as a context within another subject or subjects at Level 1 with greater support at Level 2 and/or 3	Most appropriate for subjects with • lower usage • little unique disciplinary knowledge at Level 1 • weaker curriculum base at Level 1 • major overlap with another subject or subjects • potential for a course to exist at Level 1 as a cross-curriculum course or a highly-contextualised course, or as a topic within another course
4	Discontinue the subject at Level 1 and possibly at Level 2 or 3 if appropriate	Most appropriate for subjects with • very low usage

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

		• little to no unique disciplinary knowledge at Level 1 • more limited pathways

13. To support decision making over which option should be taken for a subject or group of subjects, the following criteria is proposed that would be applied as a holistic assessment:

    i. How the subject fits with the policy vision of a broader, foundational NCEA Level 1 with increasing specialisation from Level 2 and with fewer, larger standards within more coherent courses.

    ii. All foundational learning, disciplinary knowledge, big ideas and essence of each Learning Area or Wāhanga Ako derived from the *New Zealand Curriculum* and Te Marautanga ō Aotearoa are available through a subject at NCEA Level 1, without unnecessary repetition to ensure a broad foundational Level 1.

    iii. How best to structure that body of knowledge to support pathways to further specialist learning at NCEA Level 2 and 3.

    iv. The Crown's commitments to Te Tiriti o Waitangi are upheld and the subject supports opportunities for Māori learners to succeed as Māori.

    v. The extent to which subjects interact with each other to create coherent courses in NCEA settings and support a breadth of learning for individual students.

    vi. The extent to which there is demand for a subject from the sector and students, and the capability of the sector to support the subject.

    vii. The provisional subject list upholds NCEA's credibility as a qualification.

14. In some subjects or learning areas there may be other policy concerns which are relevant to how a subject is offered. This will be highlighted where relevant in the commentary provided in Part 3. The remainder of this paper focuses on the development of achievement standard-based subjects in coherent matrices, to determine the provisional list which the Ministry proposes to develop during the next stage of the Achievement Standards Review. Where learning will not be supported in this way, or may continue to be best credentialed through unit standards, the other methods of support may be appropriate. We will work with NZQA and WDCs, alongside the RoVE changes, to ensure that the use of unit standards to gain an NCEA also supports the policy objectives of the NCEA Review.

15. As some subjects may need to be merged or reorganised, analysis is done by Learning Area to capture whether reorganisation is desirable, with commentary on individual subjects where appropriate (a summary of our analysis is provided in Annex 2). Some subjects have connections to a number of Learning Areas in practice or have overlaps in disciplinary knowledge with subjects from other Learning Areas. Where this is the case, these subjects can be considered together as a group as well as within the context of their Learning Area.

16. Once the provisional subject list is finalised in early 2020, the Ministry will lead the development of the required products so that the NCEA Level 1 subjects can be trialled in schools in 2021. Further subjects could be added at later points, but timelines to develop products dictate that they would not be ready for trial in 2021. Level 2 and 3 subjects are not being set at this point.

Part 2: Application of the criteria for selecting subjects at NCEA Level 1

17. It is proposed that the Ministry's criteria for including an achievement standard-based subject in NCEA should be applied in a holistic assessment (refer below). Some criteria will be more important for some subjects or

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

Learning Areas or Wāhanga Ako than others based on the current state of the subject, Learning Area or Wāhanga Ako and the needs which have been identified through sector engagement and the NCEA Review.

Criterion 1: How the subject fits with the policy vision of a broader, foundational NCEA Level 1 with increasing specialisation from Level 2.

18. This work focuses on Changes 4 *Have fewer larger standards*, 6 *Show clearer pathways to further education and employment* and 7 *Keep NCEA Level 1 as an optional level*. Change 6 includes the intention to refocus NCEA so that Level 1 supports a broad, foundational education, while Levels 2 and 3 promote more specialisation.

19. These changes were intended to respond to feedback through the NCEA Review about the negative effects of early specialisation and streaming of young people, particularly on Māori and Pacific learners, and how early specialisation can restrict students' education pathways. In the current structure of NCEA common examples include schools taking advantage of large subject matrices to create courses which use more internal assessment for students streamed into "lower band" classes that lack curriculum coherency and do not properly prepare those students for the next step of learning.

20. Recent school leavers and university submitters to the NCEA Review also noted that early specialisation at NCEA Level 1 had implications for the pathways of young people as it reduced their exposure to the breadth of the curriculum. This can reduce the options for young people at NCEA Level 2 and 3 and consequently post-school pathways. The trade-off of a broader qualification is that some deeper disciplinary knowledge in some subjects may be lost if they are merged with other subjects or delayed until later, making it more difficult for students to succeed later. To respond to this situation, the Ministry's decisions on subject choices available at Level 1 should consider the impact on student pathways through later levels.

21. The changes were also intended to encourage more students to have external assessment opportunities. Since 2012 there has been a steady decline in the percentage of external assessed credits attained by students. Feedback through the NCEA Review indicated that there were concerns that this trend was reducing the credibility of the qualification. The subject list itself will not directly influence the balance between external and internal assessment, so this issue will be addressed separately.

22. Note that this vision of a broader NCEA intersects with the Change Package's focus on equity, in particular for the most vulnerable learners. For example, for students with learning support needs or disabilities a broader more foundational NCEA Level 1 should support those students to access a greater range of the curriculum at Levels 5 and 6. It is, however, important that matters of equity are considered when determining the provisional subject list, particularly where there may be few subjects in a learning area. Where there are possible pitfalls from an equity perspective further work will be required to ensure that the outcome has a balance of subjects that actually work for vulnerable learners and accessible to all, with further changes to be considered where necessary.

23. Applying Criterion 1 necessarily means reducing the number of subjects within each Learning Area where possible to encourage programmes of learning for individual students which cover as much of the *New Zealand Curriculum* as possible. However, this will have to be balanced against ensuring that every subject offered within NCEA as a whole has a coherent pathway and that important foundational learning at Level 1 is available.

Criterion 2: All foundational learning derived from the *New Zealand Curriculum* and *Te Marautanga o Aotearoa* at Level 6 is available

24. All subjects offered as part of NCEA via achievement standards must be derived from the *New Zealand Curriculum* or *Te Marautanga o Aotearoa*. Most subjects will be a subset of a Learning Area at a given curriculum level, while a few will cover an entire Learning Area (such as English and Te Reo Pākehā) or draw from multiple Learning Areas explicitly or implicitly (such as Media Studies or Agribusiness).

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

25. The *New Zealand Curriculum* and *Te Marautanga o Aotearoa* makes all Learning Areas compulsory up to Level 5. At Level 6, which is where most learners engage with a full NCEA Level 1 programme, there are no compulsory Learning Areas which in practice can create a sharp change in the programmes of learning for many students at Year 11. This is particularly important for students whose understanding is not yet at Level 5 of the Curriculum in some Learning Areas; oftentimes these students do not have many more opportunities to gain the foundational learning at Level 5 as their NCEA Level 1 courses do not give those opportunities. In making NCEA Level 1 a broader, more foundational qualification we essentially consider Levels 5 and 6 of the *New Zealand Curriculum* and *Te Marautanga o Aotearoa* holistically to smooth this transition and increase the opportunities for students to gain the foundational knowledge at Levels 5 and 6.

26. The alignment process during the 2012 review of NCEA aimed to align the then achievement standards with the Achievement Objectives of the *New Zealand Curriculum*. The alignment process also converted a large number of unit standards to achievement standards. Although this process means that we know that the current offering of subjects have some alignment to the *New Zealand Curriculum*, it also led to the current structure of NCEA with too many standards within some subject matrices which as a consequence led to the creation of courses which did not cover all the foundational learning within a subject. This is a particularly noticeable problem in subjects where there were many unit standards converted into achievement standards. Furthermore, in some Learning Areas, particularly Science, the large number of achievement standards and subjects mean that schools often mix and match standards to create courses which do not necessarily ensure that students have learnt the most significant foundational knowledge in the Learning Area.

27. The Curriculum, Progress and Achievement (CPA) work programme is working towards creating a framework for ensuring that the education sector's understanding of the *New Zealand Curriculum* is up-to-date. Recent work in the CPA work programme has led to the clarification of Learning Area Essence Statements which outline the essential learning at curriculum levels 6-8. The essence statements are broad-stroked statements which describe the competencies and big ideas which students in senior secondary education should be engaging with. The starting point for determining the provisional subject list is to ensure that the offering of subjects for each Learning Area align to and cover the learning in the essence statements.

28. For some subjects currently available there is an overlap in the curriculum-derived learning credentialed through that subject with other subjects. In some instances the overlap at the curriculum level may be very different in the practice of each subject, in which case it is more appropriate to support subjects separately. However, where the overlap is significant there may be a case for merging or reorganising the subjects. At the extreme, the overlap between a narrow subject and a broad subject may mean that the narrower subject is more appropriately catered for at NCEA Level 1 as a supported context.

29. Applying this criterion can have a range of impacts. In some Learning Areas, this will mean little in terms of the available subjects. In others, this may mean a comprehensive reorganisation of how the Learning Area is organised to refocus the available subjects on the most important foundational learning.

Criterion 3: Supporting pathways

30. As part of enacting Change 6, each subject offered in NCEA will need to show a clear pathway to further education and training, and the labour market. Subjects also need to align to progress against the curriculum and internal pathways through NCEA to give students opportunities to develop necessary disciplinary knowledge, skills and capabilities to progress to the next level.

31. Disciplinary knowledge or skills required for a pathway can be determined by working backwards from formal or informal pre-requisites for tertiary education, further training or the world of work. This can be seen most clearly in the pre-requisites for some professional degree programmes such as medicine and engineering where there is an expectation of prior learning at secondary of particular aspects of science and mathematics.

32. Conversely, where a subject does not prepare students for the next step of the pathway, or is not necessary for success in the next stage, then questions need to be asked as to whether that subject is necessary at that level. This concern is more important at NCEA Level 1 where a broader foundational qualification is desired; if

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

important disciplinary knowledge can easily be and often is picked up at NCEA Level 2 then our assessment is that offering that subject at Level 1 is a lower priority.

33. However, there still needs to be a clear pathway for students who may want to pick up a subject at Level 2. Some Level 2 subjects build on Level 1 conceptual understandings of content and contexts which need to be present at Level 1 in some form. This can be done by incorporating contexts from Level 2 or 3 subjects into exemplars for Level 1 subjects which prepare students for those subjects if deemed essential. For example, currently Agribusiness only exists at Level 2 and 3; students can be prepared for Level 2 Agribusiness through the use of agricultural contexts in Business Studies or commercial contexts in Agricultural and Horticultural Science.

34. Usage data on current NCEA subjects can show patterns which reveal the relative importance of different levels of NCEA in a subject's pathway. For example, if a subject has lower usage at Level 1 compared to Level 2 or Level 3, or has a significant number of new students at Level 2 and 3 then that may be evidence that schools currently do not see the Level 1 matrix as necessary for success in the subject. NZQA has produced usage data which shows the relationship between two or more subjects which can reveal which subjects have significant overlap in students.

35. Some level of specialisation is still required to support students' transition to further education and training. This is most appropriate at Level 2 and 3 where pathways for students become more concrete and clear and students are making more deliberate and informed choices about their future. By Level 3, a student is likely making a conscious decision to remain at school to follow a particular pathway; increased specialisation is not only appropriate but likely desirable for students with a particular pathway in mind. However, broad generalist subjects should still exist for students wishing to pursue broad pathways such as a generalist university degree.

36. Supporting pathways also means ensuring that subjects can lead to University study where relevant. This means that University Entrance is also a policy concern at Levels 2 and 3. University Entrance is set by NZQA in consultation with each university and Universities New Zealand and is outside the scope of the NCEA Review. Under the current model of University Entrance students need to obtain credits from discrete NCEA Level 3 subjects which means schools are more likely to offer courses built upon standard subject matrices. However, changes to University Entrance can have an impact on school practices around course building so it is important that we work alongside Universities New Zealand to understand the possibilities of change to University Entrance how they follow on from school pathways. This is a concern for the provisional Level 1 subject list as considerations over the Level 2 and 3 subject list are salient to decision making at Level 1.

37. Although provisional subject lists for Levels 2 and 3 do not need to be decided yet, they are still broadly relevant when considering the next steps from the provisional Level 1 subject list. This is most important when looking at subjects which will see the most change at Level 1 as this will give some certainty for the sector on our vision for NCEA.

38. There has also been significant work progressing new subjects particularly in the vocational space and new mātauranga Māori subjects aligned to the *New Zealand Curriculum*. Although decisions over what subjects may be introduced have not been made yet, possible new subjects should be considered when looking at pathways from Level 1 and the overall structure of the provisional subject list at Level 1.

39. Applying this criterion to the provisional subject list will mean that when considering the status of a subject at NCEA Level 1, we will need to consider what Level 2 and 3 subjects it may lead to and how to ensure that students are well supported along that pathway. We also need to consider how changes to Level 1 may require changes to be made at Levels 2 and 3 in both their subject lists and the content included in those subjects. This will look like considering questions such as:

    - How does this change impact how Level 2 or 3 may be offered in this subject?
    - What subjects at Levels 2 or 3 could this lead to?

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

- What pathways out of school need to be supported and what subjects should exist at Levels 2 and 3, and consequently Level 1?

Criterion 4: Ensuring coherence and pathways in local curricula

40. To support schools to deliver coherent NCEA Level 1 courses and programmes, the structure of the new standards and the provisional subject list need to encourage coherent course design. One of the big messages that we heard during the NCEA Review was that many felt that there was a need to increase the level of coherence in NCEA. Reasons given included concerns that some schools constructed courses which maximised internal assessment and pass rates at the expense of coherent disciplinary teaching and learning, or picking and choosing standards to create courses with little thought as to how the course supported students overall. These courses disproportionately impacted upon Māori and Pacific learners. Although the new standardised matrices makes this less likely, where schools create bespoke courses across subject matrices to meet a local curriculum need low quality course design can still occur.

41. To understand the probability that an additional subject may increase the risk of incoherent courses we can examine current practices in NCEA by looking at a representative sample of school and wharekura course structures. In particular we can examine where schools and wharekura offer courses which are variations of the same subject in order to stream students or courses which draw from multiple subject matrices. This can identify how schools and wharekura are likely to react to any changes to NCEA subject offerings and if there are any likely unintended consequences.

42. The provisional subject list proposed for the *New Zealand Curriculum* contains fewer subjects than is currently available at NCEA Level 1. Some schools may wish to continue to offer learning drawn from subjects which are currently available through creating new cross-curricular courses at Level 1. If done poorly, these may lack coherence. This creates a potential trade-off between retaining a subject to ensure it has a coherent matrix at the expense of the goal of a broad, foundational NCEA Level 1, especially if the subject is narrow in scope with regards to its curriculum base. In this case it may be appropriate to consider how schools can be supported to create coherent cross-curricular courses through supporting resources which use similar contexts across multiple subjects.

43. Course offerings at years 9 and 10 and how they relate to NCEA subjects can indicate how schools and wharekura implement the curriculum entitlement through course and programme design. While some of these subjects may not be included in the proposed subject list at Level 1, schools may wish to continue offering the precursor courses at a junior level. Where this is an issue, to ensure coherent pathways into NCEA Level 1, we should consider how these subjects can be supported as contexts at Level 1 so that schools are still supporting students to engage with important curriculum learning from years 9 to 13.

44. We also know that many schools and wharekura offer NCEA achievement standards or full subjects to students in years 9 and 10. It is important that this exposure to NCEA supports learners engaging with the full extent of the curriculum and does not contribute to their learning being unnecessarily narrowed.

45. Although current school and wharekura practices should be considered when determining subjects for NCEA, they should not be seen as overall justifications, particularly where the aims of the NCEA Review are to encourage changing those practices.

Criterion 5: Demand and Sector Capability

46. For subjects to be properly taught, there needs to be a workforce that can deliver them and can create, mark and moderate assessments both internally and externally. This is most pertinent for learning areas where there is significant change to how subjects are structured. If two subjects are proposed to be merged or reorganised at Level 1 it is important to ensure that the current workforce can deliver the new subject, particularly where subjects draw from multiple learning areas. Concerns with the workforce's capability to deliver a proposed subject can be mitigated through ensuring sufficient support to the workforce such as resources and PLD, and

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

working with Initial Teacher Educators (ITEs) to ensure that initial and returning teacher training supports new teachers to use the new standards and subjects.

47. It may also be a relevant concern that merging or reorganising subjects may lead to subjects which some schools believe they will not be able to deliver. For example, if specialist equipment is often used in one subject schools which do not offer that subject currently may not believe they will be able to continue to offer the merged subject. Feeding in these concerns into the analysis behind the provisional subject list will reduce the probability that issues arise.

48. Subject demand and usage is also an important factor to consider. NZQA usage data shows the demand for subjects relative to other subjects. Subjects with high usage, particularly compared to usage of other subjects within the same Learning Area, are better off supported than not as it is clear that schools want to teach that subject and there is student demand. Removing an in demand subject can create unintended consequences including schools finding other ways to offer the subject. Subject demand also shows us trends in usage which can be indicative of the overall health of the subject. Usage trends can inform us whether a subject can realistically stand on its own or whether it is better to treat the subject as a context within another subject.

Criterion 6: Te Tiriti o Waitangi and Mana ōrite mō te mātauranga Māori

49. This work also aligns with Change 2 - Mana ōrite mō te mātauranga Māori as the implementation of this change will involve the creation of new mātauranga Māori subjects in *New Zealand Curriculum* settings, meeting the Crown's commitments to Te Tiriti o Waitangi. This paper includes the addition of one more of these subjects, Māori Performing Arts, which is likely to be created as part of the review.

50. The Crown and Ministry's obligations under Te Tiriti o Waitangi are of paramount importance when considering inclusion of subjects within NCEA.

51. While the Ministry's obligations under Te Tiriti should be considered holistically, relevant considerations will include:

    - The perspectives of Māori, including iwi and relevant kaitiaki, on whether the Ministry should support a subject
    - That the Ministry should wherever possible enable and support Māori to preserve and revitalise mātauranga Māori and te reo Māori
    - That kaitiakitanga may apply to certain bodies of mātauranga Māori, and that subjects or standards which are developed will need to appropriately respect that, balancing access against cultural protection
    - That subjects grounded in te ao Māori ought have equal mana with subjects which reflect non-indigenous paradigms or knowledge bases.

52. When considering other criteria, meeting our obligations under Te Tiriti o Waitangi means specifically considering Māori perspectives on the relevant criteria – particularly where subjects are grounded in mātauranga Māori, or have high uptake by ākonga Māori. For example, where overall uptake of a subject is low but a high proportion of those students are ākonga Māori, this should be considered in determining whether a subject continues to receive support.

53. This commitment to Te Tiriti in determining the provisional subject list means ensuring that subjects which are particularly important to Māori as Māori are available through NCEA. This is not just in terms of cultural value, but also in terms of the practical outcomes for ākonga Māori in English-medium settings. For example, Māori uptake of a subject should be considered particularly in a subject with high uptake by Māori. Local school practices relating to subjects which disproportionately impact Māori should also be considered. This includes subjects which are particularly important to many ākonga Māori as well as those subjects which ākonga are disproportionately channelled into at the expense of relevant education, employment, or cultural pathways.

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

54. Questions to consider under this criterion include whether a particular change to the NCEA subject list might reduce a subject's ability to be used successfully within Māori settings or whether a change may unintentionally affect a prospective mātauranga Māori subject.

Criterion 7: Credibility

55. The credibility of a subject and the qualification as a whole should be considered in determining the Level 1 subject list. A credible subject list and qualification requires various interests to be carefully balanced. This includes the interests of direct stakeholders in the NCEA such as schools, wharekura, teachers and students, but also indirect stakeholders such as hapū, iwi, employers and universities, and the general public.

56. We can consider how overseas jurisdictions structure subjects as a sense check as to whether certain configurations of subjects may be credible in New Zealand. However, there are a number of caveats given the overall differences between jurisdictions. For example, education systems in more densely populated countries benefit from economies of scale in schools which do not exist in New Zealand allowing for a wider variety of specialist subjects. NCEA's flexibility and modular nature also creates challenges which are not present in other jurisdictions. This is compounded in the Māori medium sector by size and level of resourcing.

Part 3: Provisional Subject List and Commentary on Learning Areas

Out of scope

[redacted]

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

[redacted]

Commerce

101. A single Commerce subject that encompasses Economics, Accounting and Business Studies will support stronger foundational knowledge in commerce type subjects as well as support the vision for a broader NCEA Level 1, drawing on the essence statements in the *New Zealand Curriculum*. All three existing subjects are unique in terms of the focus of their disciplines but at Level 1 may be on the narrow side. Combined Commerce courses which draw from both Business Studies and Economics exist currently at year 11 in a handful of schools, and as elective subjects in year 9 and 10 in others.

102. A single Commerce subject would likely draw from the foundational ideas of microeconomics such as supply and demand, and the parts of all three subjects which relate to the running of companies and small businesses. This would be able to contextualise all three disciplines within the subject. It is unlikely that content and contexts from Accounting will be present in Level 1 Commerce other than general principles which relate to all commerce subjects, in effect meaning no support for Level 1 Accounting. However, many schools currently

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

allow students with grounding in Mathematics and no prior Accounting to enrol in Accounting which indicates that the pathway into Accounting is still possible.

103. The loss of more specialist content at Level 1 can easily be made up at Level 2 and beyond as most Commerce pathways at tertiary assume no prior study of Commerce. Furthermore, it is not uncommon for students to successfully first engage with Economics and to a lesser extent Business Studies at Levels 2 or 3 without any focussed prior learning.

[redacted]

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

Recommendations

Note that the Ministry of Education intends to consult the Minister of Education (the Minister) on the provisional subject list for NCEA Level 1 and that following public engagement on the provisional subject list, we intend to confirm a finalised subject list with the Minister's approval.

Noted

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

Annex 1: Current vs Target state map by Learning Area

Table

1. Table 1 shows the relationships between the subjects in the current state and the subjects in the target state sorted by Learning Area.

Learning Area	Current subject list	Target subject list
Out of scope		
Social Sciences	Economics	Commerce[2]
	Business Studies	
	Accounting	
Out of scope		

Released under the 1982

Out of scope

[2] 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.

Out of scope

Annex 2: Analytical table of subjects judged against criteria

Analysis of the subjects in tabular form

1. The following table applies the criteria to each subject considered in this paper, including subjects which are not included. Where there may be significant change between the current and target states this has been noted.

2. Scores between Learning Areas are not necessarily comparable due to the structure of the Curriculum.

3. Italicised subjects are target subjects.

4. Full explanations can be found in the body of the report.

Key		
-	Contributes somewhat negatively	Weighted score = 1
+	Contributes somewhat positively	Weighted score = 2
++	Contributes moderately positively	Weighted score = 3
+++	Contributes significantly positively	Weighted score = 4
N	Not possible to assess (high degree of uncertainty)	Weighted score = 1

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

Learning Area	Subject	Fit with policy vision	Curriculum connect	Supporting Pathways	Course design coherency	Demand and sector capability	Te Tiriti ō Waitangi	NCEA's Credibility
Out of scope								

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

Out of scope

Social Science							
	Economics	+	++	++	+++	++	+	+++
	Business Studies	+	++	++	+++	++	+	++
	Accounting	+	+	-	++	+	+	++
	Commerce	++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+	+++
	Out of scope							

Out of scope

Release... 1982

From: 9(2)(a)
Sent: Wednesday, 26 February 2020 1:27 PM
To: Hon Chris Hipkins <Chris.Hipkins@parliament.govt.nz>; info@act.org.nz; Hon Paul Goldsmith <Paul.Goldsmith@parliament.govt.nz>
Cc: office@eggs.school.nz; admin@mteden.school.nz; admin@ags.school.nz
Subject: Strong objection to proposed changes to NCEA by removing Latin, Classics, Economics and Physics, Chemistry and Biology - Ref: C012053

Dear Sirs,

I am a mother of five schoolchildren, and on behalf of my family I register our strong objection to the proposed dropping of the above subjects at Level 1 NCEA. Latin, Classics and Economics especially are strongly valued subjects that are integral to New Zealand – and all Western Democratic - culture.

Many, many people are discussing these proposals with absolute disbelief and also anger –

Thank you for doing whatever you can to entirely safeguard these subjects – and more – to promote and enhance their teaching - so that this precious body of knowledge continues to be passed on to future generations –

Kind regards,

9(2)(a)

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

Andy Smith

From: NZCETA Wellington <cetawellington@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, 22 March 2020 9:12 p.m.
To: RAS Review
Subject: Feedback on a provisional Level 1 subject list
Attachments: Opposition to NCEA L1 subject change.pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

[PSL0049]

The Wellington Branch of the NZ Commerce & Economics Teachers Association (NZCETA) OPPOSES the possible subject change from Accounting, Business Studies and Economics, as three separate and distinct subjects, to one subject called Commerce at NCEA Level 1

In line with the criteria applied holistically by the Ministry of Education in developing the provisional subject list, the reasons for our opposition are as follows:

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.

- 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 Science course?
- Could 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?
- Why have commerce based subjects been singled out in this process?

2 - Accounting, Business Studies and Economics, as three separate and distinct subjects, support the inclusion of important and rich learning from the National Curriculum, with as little overlap as possible.

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

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.

Additionally, a taster of Accounting, Business Studies and Economics in one course is already offered at year 10 by a number of schools. Mandating that schools do this again at year 11 would actually create more overlap, and reduce the ability for schools to design and offer a range of junior programmes.

3 - Accounting, Business Studies and Economics, as three separate and distinct subjects, each support coherent and robust pathways into NCEA Level 2 and further study or training.

We are concerned that 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.

Authentic learning is at the heart of all three subjects; this instructional approach allows students to explore, discuss, and meaningfully construct concepts and relationships in contexts that involve real-world problems and projects that are relevant to the learner. Few other senior secondary subjects can provide such coherent learning with such a clear pathway to Level 2 and beyond.

4 - Accounting, Business Studies and Economics, as three separate and distinct subjects, all contribute to creating well designed and coherent local curricula, which support pathways for individual learners.

If the review aims to enable schools to develop a strong, localised curriculum, we wish to point out that mandating schools must combine Accounting, Business Studies and Economics actually removes potential for a localized curriculum

Schools are currently able to do this if they wish within the current NCEA framework, if this better suits their school community.

However the changes would remove the ability for schools to offer the three subjects separately, if that is what better suits their school community.

The changes would significantly reduce student agency, when evidence has shown that student agency has significantly positive outcomes for student learning. We are therefore concerned that this change would have significant, negative impacts on students and their individual learning pathways.

5 - There is high demand for Accounting, Business Studies and Economics, as three separate and distinct subjects, the sector has the capability to deliver all three subjects.

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. We cannot understand why Economics, Accounting and Business Studies would be combined while these others are not.

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

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.

Many students currently choose only one of the three subjects without choosing the other two; 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. A combined course would mean students miss out on finding these passions.

Schools currently have the agency to design and offer their own senior courses that are in line with their students' demand and teachers' ability. Not many, if any, schools offer every single subject that is available at NCEA Levels 1-3, and that is the beauty of having such a diverse number of subjects available.

It could also be argued that the sector does not have the capability to competently deliver many senior secondary subjects; notably in the Sciences, Technology and Mathematics.

6 - Accounting, Business Studies and Economics, as three separate and distinct subjects, support the Crown's obligations under Te Tiriti o Waitangi

All three subjects, more so than many other senior secondary subjects, are able to explicitly incorporate into their courses, the following obligations the Crown has:

- Protect Māori interests.
- The needs of both Māori and the wider community must be met, which will require compromise.
- The treaty can be adapted to meet new circumstances.
- Māori retain rangatiratanga over their resources and taonga and have all the rights and privileges of citizenship.

- Tino rangatiratanga includes management of resources and other taonga according to Māori culture.
- Taonga include all valued resources and intangible cultural assets

7 - Accounting, Business Studies and Economics, as three separate and distinct subjects, support the credibility of NCEA as a qualification overall among stakeholders.

A watered down course called Commerce means very little to the majority of stakeholders. However, with subjects called Accounting, Business Studies and Economics it can be reasonably expected that stakeholders know what these different subjects are and can comprehend what an NCEA qualification in these might involve.

If there is a desire to reduce assessment through these changes, we wish to also point out this is an ineffective means of doing so. Many courses already only offer 4 standards to students in a year, so combining Accounting, Economics and Business Studies at Level 1 would not reduce the assessment load for students.

- More effective would be to reduce the number of standards available in each subject across all of NCEA Level 1

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

Student usage data for **Accounting, Business Studies and Economics, as three separate and distinct subjects**, clearly illustrates they are currently among the most popular external and in the top 50% of internally assessed subjects at NCEA Level 1.

Rank	Subject	Level	Ext or Int	Year	Total Number of Standard Entries
6	ECONOMICS	1	External	2019	16,129
9	ACCOUNTING	1	External	2019	10,116
12	BUSINESS STUDIES	1	External	2019	5,755
16	ACCOUNTING	1	Internal	2019	15,052
19	BUSINESS STUDIES	1	Internal	2019	14,059
21	ECONOMICS	1	Internal	2019	11,988

NZQA
Data as at: 02/03/2020

In 2019 **37** Subjects were assessed Externally and **50** were assessed Internally

For all of the reasons detailed above the Wellington Branch of NZCETA thoroughly opposes the possible changes proposed by the Ministry of Education. We are struggling to see where any rationale for this proposed amalgamation has come from, perhaps you could enlighten us?

Thank you for taking the time to consider our response, and we look forward to hearing back from you with regards to our specific questions.

I have also attached a PDF copy of our response and have completed the online survey.

Regards

Lucy Chave

Chairperson and Executive Member

Wellington NZCETA Branch

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

The Wellington Branch of the NZ Commerce & Economics Teachers Association (NZCETA) <u>OPPOSES</u> the possible subject change from Accounting, Business Studies and Economics, as three separate and distinct subjects, to one subject called Commerce at NCEA Level 1

In line with the criteria applied holistically by the Ministry of Education in developing the provisional subject list, the reasons for our opposition are as follows:

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.

- 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?
- Could 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?
- Why have commerce based subjects been singled out?

2 - Accounting, Business Studies and Economics, as three separate and distinct subjects, support the inclusion of important and rich learning from the National Curriculum, with as little overlap as possible.

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.

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

- Again, this is akin to combining Dance, Drama and Music into Performing Arts.

Additionally, a taster of Accounting, Business Studies and Economics in one course is already offered at year 10 by a number of schools. Mandating that schools do this again at year 11 would actually create more overlap, and reduce the ability for schools to design and offer a range of junior programmes.

3 - Accounting, Business Studies and Economics, as three separate and distinct subjects, each support coherent and robust pathways into NCEA Level 2 and further study or training.

We are concerned that 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.

Authentic learning is at the heart of all three subjects; this instructional approach allows students to explore, discuss, and meaningfully construct concepts and relationships in contexts that involve real-world problems and projects that are relevant to the learner. Few other senior secondary subjects can provide such coherent learning with such a clear pathway to Level 2 and beyond.

4 - Accounting, Business Studies and Economics, as three separate and distinct subjects, all contribute to creating well designed and coherent local curricula, which support pathways for individual learners.

If the review aims to enable schools to develop a strong, localised curriculum, we wish to point out that mandating schools must combine Accounting, Business Studies and Economics actually removes potential for a localized curriculum

Schools are currently able to do this if they wish within the current NCEA framework, if this better suits their school community.

However the changes would remove the ability for schools to offer the three subjects separately, if that is what better suits their school community.

The changes would significantly reduce student agency, when evidence has shown that student agency has significantly positive outcomes for student learning. We are therefore concerned that this change would have significant, negative impacts on students and their individual learning pathways.

5 - There is high demand for Accounting, Business Studies and Economics, as three separate and distinct subjects, the sector has the capability to deliver all three subjects.

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

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. We cannot understand why Economics, Accounting and Business Studies would be combined while these others are not.

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.

Many students currently choose only one of the three subjects without choosing the other two; 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. A combined course would mean students miss out on finding these passions.

Schools currently have the agency to design and offer their own senior courses that are in line with their students' demand and teachers' ability. Not many, if any, schools offer every single subject that is available at NCEA Levels 1-3, and that is the beauty of having such a diverse number of subjects available.

It could also be argued that the sector does not have the capability to competently deliver many senior secondary subjects; notably in the Sciences, Technology and Mathematics.

6 - Accounting, Business Studies and Economics, as three separate and distinct subjects, support the Crown's obligations under Te Tiriti o Waitangi

All three subjects, more so than many other senior secondary subjects, are able to explicitly incorporate into their courses, the following obligations the Crown has:

- Protect Māori interests.
- The needs of both Māori and the wider community must be met, which will require compromise.
- The treaty can be adapted to meet new circumstances.
- Māori retain rangatiratanga over their resources and taonga and have all the rights and privileges of citizenship.
    - Tino rangatiratanga includes management of resources and other taonga according to Māori culture.
    - Taonga include all valued resources and intangible cultural assets

7 - Accounting, Business Studies and Economics, as three separate and distinct subjects, support the credibility of NCEA as a qualification overall among stakeholders.

A watered down course called Commerce means very little to the majority of stakeholders. However, with subjects called Accounting, Business Studies and Economics it can be

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

reasonably expected that stakeholders know what these different subjects are and can comprehend what an NCEA qualification in these might involve.

If there is a desire to reduce assessment through these changes, we wish to also point out this is an ineffective means of doing so. Many courses already only offer 4 standards to students in a year, so combining Accounting, Economics and Business Studies at Level 1 would not reduce the assessment load for students.

- More effective would be to reduce the number of standards available in each subject across all of NCEA Level 1

Student usage data for **Accounting, Business Studies and Economics, as three separate and distinct subjects**, clearly illustrates they are currently among the most popular external and in the top 50% of internally assessed subjects at NCEA Level 1.

Rank	Subject	Level	Ext or Int	Year	Total Number of Standards
6	ECONOMICS	1	External	2019	16,129
9	ACCOUNTING	1	External	2019	10,116
12	BUSINESS STUDIES	1	External	2019	5,755
16	ACCOUNTING	1	Internal	2019	15,052
19	BUSINESS STUDIES	1	Internal	2019	14,059
21	ECONOMICS	1	Internal	2019	11,988

NZQA
Data as at: 02/03/2020

In 2019 **37** Subjects were assessed Externally and **50** were assessed Internally

For all of the reasons detailed above the Wellington Branch of NZCETA thoroughly opposes the possible changes proposed by the Ministry of Education. We are struggling to see where any rationale for this proposed amalgamation has come from, perhaps you could enlighten us?

Thank you for taking the time to consider our response, and we look forward to hearing back from you with regards to our specific questions.

Regards

Lucy Chave

Chairperson and Executive Member

Wellington NZCETA Branch

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

Andy Smith

From: NCEA Review
Sent: Wednesday, 8 July 2020 2:24 p.m.
To: RAS Review
Subject: FW: Proposed changes to Commerce - 9(2)(a)

[PSL0067]

Kia ora,

I'm doing an audit of the NCEA Review Mailbox to ensure everything that is currently in there is either underway or complete.

Can you confirm whether 9(2)(a) has received a response and it can be closed off?

Ngā mihi,
Natasha

Natasha De Jong | Personal Assistant | ELSA Secondary Tertiary
DDI +6444638064 | Mobile 9(2)(a)

From: 9(2)(a)
Sent: Tuesday, 2 June 2020 5:17 PM
To: NCEA Review <NCEA.Review@education.govt.nz>
Subject: Proposed changes to Commerce - 9(2)(a)

Kia ora,

As a group of highly interested and engaged professionals who represent our subject area, we were 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.
As stated:'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: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 of Commerce teachers. There are parental expectations about these being taught at Secondary School, they are subjects that are genuinely supported by parents. These subjects are very relevant to the real world, with real authentic learning opportunities.

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

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.

We request additional information on the rationale behind this proposal, and where the initial idea was founded. 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 we note, that many subject areas that have less students engaging with them nationwide have been able to maintain their status as individual subjects.We believe the status quo for Accounting, Economics and Business as individual subjects, should remain.

Ngā mihi,
9(2)(a)

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

Andy Smith

From: NCEA Review
Sent: Wednesday, 8 July 2020 2:23 p.m.
To: RAS Review
Subject: [Response require] Proposed changes for Commerce - 9(2)(a)

[PSL0066]

Kia ora,

I'm doing an audit of the NCEA Review Mailbox to ensure everything that is currently in there is either underway or complete.

Can you confirm whether 9(2)(a) has received a response and it can be closed off?

Ngā mihi,
Natasha

Natasha De Jong | Personal Assistant | ELSA Secondary Tertiary
DDI +6444638064 | Mobile 9(2)(a)

From: 9(2)(a)
Sent: Tuesday, 2 June 2020 4:34 PM
To: NCEA Review <NCEA.Review@education.govt.nz>
Subject: Proposed changes for Commerce - 9(2)(a)

Hello,

As a group of highly interested and engaged professionals who represent our subject area, we were 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.As stated:'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: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 of Commerce teachers.There are parental expectations about these being taught at Secondary School, they are subjects that are genuinely supported by parents.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

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

limit access to students and compromise authentic learning.We request additional information on the rationale behind this proposal, and where the initial idea was founded.. 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 we note, that many subject areas that have less students engaging with them nationwide have been able to maintain their status as individual subjects.We believe the status quo for Accounting, Economics and Business as individual subjects, should remain.

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

Andy Smith

From: NCEA Review
Sent: Wednesday, 8 July 2020 2:25 p.m.
To: RAS Review
Subject: [Response Required] Changes to Level 1 commerce subjects - 9(2)(a)

[PSL0069]

Kia ora,

I'm doing an audit of the NCEA Review Mailbox to ensure everything that is currently in there is either underway or complete.

Can you confirm whether 9(2)(a) has received a response and it can be closed off?

Ngā mihi,
Natasha

Natasha De Jong | Personal Assistant | ELSA Secondary Tertiary
DDI +6444638064 | Mobile 9(2)(a)

From: 9(2)(a)
Sent: Friday, 5 June 2020 10:20 AM
To: NCEA Review <NCEA.Review@education.govt.nz>
Subject: Changes to Level 1 commerce subjects - 9(2)(a)

Hello,
Yesterday I was informed by my accounting teacher that the Ministry of Education has proposed combining accounting, economics and business into one subject al Level 1. As a level 1 student taking both accounting and economics this was highly concerning to me especially as my teacher informed me that this decision seemed to come completely out of the blue, with no consultation with commerce teachers prior to it being made. I sincerely hope that I have been wrongly informed because the concept of the government making proposals without consultation or debate does not seem to fit with the policy of having a transparent government. As I said before I am taking both economics and accounting and the subjects are vastly different. In accounting, we are learning how to do peoples accounts, in economics we are learning about government choices. Surely as a government, you should be able to recognise that filling out a cash receipts journal and putting the seven steps of government decisions to use do not combine well into one subject. I plan to have a future in business and feel that getting 3 years of tutoring for both economics and accounting, as separate subjects key to my success.

But of course, these subjects both come under the subject of commerce. Let's just combine them. Oh and commerce and history and geography all come under the subject of social sciences. But wait social science and science all come under the subject of science. Let's just make one big happy family. Oh, I almost forgot calculus is basically the same as physics and calculus is mathematics so let's just throw maths into the bundle because let's be real they are all basically the same, no one needs to take them as individual subjects. This is were a feel like you are heading as a government. But please prove me wrong. Provide me with a perfectly logical explanation as to why 3 completely different subjects should be crammed into one. Or even better, don't do it at all.

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

Andy Smith

From: NCEA Review
Sent: Wednesday, 8 July 2020 2:24 p.m.
To: RAS Review
Subject: [Response Required] Commerce NCEA level 1 - 9(2)(a)

[PSL0068]

Kia ora,

I'm doing an audit of the NCEA Review Mailbox to ensure everything that is currently in there is either underway or complete.

Can you confirm whether 9(2)(a) has received a response and it can be closed off?

Ngā mihi,
Natasha

Natasha De Jong | Personal Assistant | ELSA Secondary Tertiary
DDI +6444638064 | Mobile 9(2)(a)

From: 9(2)(a)
Sent: Friday, 5 June 2020 10:06 AM
To: NCEA Review <NCEA.Review@education.govt.nz>
Subject: Commerce NCEA level 1 - 9(2)(a)

As a group of highly interested and engaged professionals who represent our subject area, we were 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. As stated:'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: 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 of Commerce teachers. There are parental expectations about these being taught at Secondary School, they are subjects that are genuinely supported by parents. 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 that 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. We request additional information on the rationale behind this proposal, and where the initial idea was founded. The data of student numbers taking these

Released Under the Official Information Act 1982

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 fewer students engaging with them nationwide have been able to maintain their status as individual subjects. We believe the status quo for Accounting, Economics, and Business as individual subjects, should remain.

A final point. Whoever decided that these three, very individual, subjects could possibly be taught in a year as a single subject, has clearly no experience teaching any of them at all. They are also delusional about how similar these subjects are. Yes, they are all commerce but they all have a very different focus which does not easily transpose to the other subjects. As a commerce teacher with a background in Accounting and Finance, I find it absurd that they can be so easily lumped together as one subject without any consultation.

Ngā mihi

9(2)(a)
[redacted]

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

Andy Smith

From: NCEA Review
Sent: Wednesday, 8 July 2020 2:25 p.m.
To: RAS Review
Subject: [Response Required] NCEA Review - Level 1 Commerce - 9(2)(a)

[PSL0070]

Kia ora,

I'm doing an audit of the NCEA Review Mailbox to ensure everything that is currently in there is either underway or complete.

Can you confirm whether 9(2)(a) has received a response and it can be closed off?

Ngā mihi,
Natasha

Natasha De Jong | Personal Assistant | ELSA Secondary Tertiary
DDI +6444638064 | Mobile 9(2)(a)

From: 9(2)(a)
Sent: Thursday, 11 June 2020 10:43 AM
To: NCEA Review <NCEA.Review@education.govt.nz>
Subject: NCEA Review - Level 1 Commerce - 9(2)(a)

Hi,
I am writing to express my disappointment that Accounting, Economics and Business Studies are to be combined at Level 1 under the proposed changes to NCEA. These are very individual and differing subjects with the skills taught at Level 1 underpinning the success at Level 2 and Level 3. It seems odd that the Ministry of Education demands success in Level 3 and Scholarship Accounting and Economics, yet takes away the knowledge that students would gain at Level 1 by combining these subjects.

Financial literacy is a concern nationwide, and this proposal limits students access to improve their financial literacy. Accounting in particular, is a hard subject to "pick up" at Levels 2 and 3.

I have real concern that this move to combine Accounting, Economics and Business Studies at Level 1 will have a negative impact on student numbers and therefore teaching numbers. Student numbers taking these subjects is increasing and would support keeping them separate at Level 1.

I believe the status quo for Accounting, Economics and Business as individual subjects at Level 1, should remain.

Yours sincerely
9(2)(a)

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

Andy Smith

From: 9(2)(a)
Sent: Monday, 22 June 2020 6:14 p.m.
To: RAS Review
Subject: Re: Invitation to meet via zoom - Economics

[RAS0007]

Hi Rob.

It turns out I am double booked at that time. I have my son's parent teacher conference at 4pm at his school. Sorry for this but I need to be there for that.

The main points I wanted to make were that under the proposal there seems to be a one size fits all, central approach that does not recognise the diverse school communities that we have across NZ. The ability to create a course of learning.that suits each local community exists currently within the three separate subjects, Economics, Accounting and Business Studies. Many school communities already have courses that select achievement standards from within these three subjects to create a body of learning that suits their communities. Others offer them separately as that is what their community wants/values. To remove this choice removes our ability to co-construct learning within our communities, and may not go against the spirit of Te Tiriti o Waitangi in terms of rangatiratanga.

An analysis of the data from the insight report shows students getting a broad and foundational education by choosing some of these subjects in year 11, before moving on to specialise in other subject areas in year 12, eg Sciences. By taking these subjects away we are reducing students' exposure to this learning, as many will likely never take them, instead choosing to specialise in non Commerce subjects in year 12. The data shows few students picking up Economics as a new subject in years 12 and 13.
This is further evidenced by the 2461 students who studied Economics in year 11 and did not take the subject again, page 11. I don't believe this reflects badly on Economics as a subject but rather that these students have taken a broad variety of subjects in year 11 but have no space for them in year 12 as they increasingly specialise.
This pattern is repeated in Accounting with 2250 not continuing beyond year 11, page 5. The same cannot be said for Business Studies where there is increased participation/specialisation at higher levels, page 7.
If the decision is made to combine I would therefore conclude the data suggests that the mix in year 11 should be of Economics and Accounting, and not Business Studies as students are more likely to pick this up and to be exposed to this in later years.

Kind regards
9(2)(a)

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

Andy Smith

From: Charlotte Evett <Charlotte.Evett@charteredaccountantsanz.com>
Sent: Sunday, 19 July 2020 11:36 p.m.
To: RAS Review
Cc: Rob Mill
Subject: Submission NCEA Level 1 provisional subject list
Attachments: Chartered Accountants ANZ Submission NCEA 1 provisional subject list -18 July 2020.pdf

[PSL0077]

Dear RAS review team,
Attached is Chartered Accountants Australia and New Zealand's submission to the Ministry of Education on the NCEA level 1 Provisional Subject List.
Apologies for the lateness of our submission, which was due to be sent on Friday 18 July.
Regards,

Charlotte Evett CA
New Zealand Government and Pacific Relations Leader

CHARTERED ACCOUNTANTS
AUSTRALIA + NEW ZEALAND

DDI +64 4 910 1130 **MOB** +64 21 733 945
charlotte.evett@charteredaccountantsanz.com
Chartered Accountants Australia and New Zealand
50 Customhouse Quay, Wellington 6142
PO Box 11342, Wellington 6142 New Zealand
T 0800 469 422 **F** +64 4 473 6303

This email, including any attachments, is intended solely for the named addressee(s). Its contents may be confidential or legally privileged. Any unauthorised use, reproduction, on-forwarding to others or storage of the contents and any attachments is expressly proh bited without the written consent of Chartered Accountants Australia and New Zealand ABN 50 084 642 571 (**CA ANZ**). If you have received this transmission in error, please delete it and any attachments immediately and advise the sender by return email. No representation or warranty is made by CA ANZ that this email or any attachment is free from viruses or other defect or error. Unless otherwise stated, this communication does not represent the views of CA ANZ. For information about how we handle your personal information, please see our Privacy Policy at www.charteredaccountantsanz.com/privacy.

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

CHARTERED ACCOUNTANTS™
AUSTRALIA + NEW ZEALAND

18 July 2020

Ministry of Education
PO Box 1666
Wellington 6140

Via email: Ras.Review@education.govt.nz

Dear Sir or Madam,

Feedback on the NCEA Level 1 Provisional Subject List

Chartered Accountants Australia and New Zealand (CA ANZ) welcomes the opportunity to provide feedback to the Ministry of Education on the NCEA level 1 provisional subject list. Appendix A provides our detailed submission and Appendix B provides more information about CA ANZ.

Key points

- We support the idea of a broad-based foundational curriculum for NCEA level 1.
- We believe that the merger of Accounting, Economics and Business Studies into a single NCEA level 1 subject presents opportunities for students to obtain an integrated and multifaceted view of business.
- The Ministry has signalled that the combined subject is likely to have very little accounting content. We disagree with this approach and find the Ministry's rationale unclear and unconvincing.
- Accounting remains a popular subject choice for NCEA level 1 students. The gradual decline of enrolments over time does not signal the need to remove all Accounting content from NCEA level 1, rather an opportunity to refresh the syllabus.
- Accounting education provides students with fundamental life skills including financial literacy.
- CA ANZ is a TEQSA[1] accredited body, with expertise in accounting, business and education. We are happy to provide support to the relevant subject expert group as they embark upon the review of the level 1 Commerce achievement standards.

Should you have queries concerning the matters discussed above, please contact Charlotte Evett via email at charlotte.evett@charteredaccountantsanz.com or phone on +64 4 910 1130.

Yours sincerely

Peter Vial FCA
Group Executive New Zealand & the Pacific
Chartered Accountants Australia and New Zealand

Charlotte Evett CA
New Zealand Government Relations Leader
Chartered Accountants Australia and New Zealand

[1] The Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (**TEQSA**) is Australia's independent national quality assurance and regulatory agency for higher education

© Chartered Accountants Australia and New Zealand ABN 50 084 642 571 (CA ANZ). Formed in Australia. Members of CA ANZ are not liable for the debts and liabilities of CA ANZ.

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

Appendix A

Detailed submission

Our comments relate solely to the the Ministry's proposed subjects for NCEA Level 1, specifically the proposal to merge current subjects Accounting, Economics and Business Studies into a single subject provisionally named Commerce.

We agree that a broad-based foundational curriculum for NCEA level 1 is desirable. It is logical and reasonable to consolidate closely related NCEA level 1 subjects, thus ensuring that students are exposed to a relatively broader range of subjects prior to greater specialisation at NCEA levels 2 and 3.

In particular, the combination of Accounting, Economics and Business Studies as a single NCEA level 1 subject presents opportunities for students to obtain an integrated and multifaceted view of business. This will enable them to determine whether they are interested in pursuing further study in any or all of the subject areas in NCEA level 2 and beyond. We encourage the Ministry to take this opportunity to further engage students by refreshing the content of the merged subject via the combined use of authentic business data and technology to bring basic accounting, economic and business concepts to life.

But for students to benefit from the combination of multiple subjects into a single broader subject, the merged subject should incorporate key ideas from *each* of the contributing subjects. We would therefore expect Commerce to expose students to basic accounting principles and concepts, basic financial statements, and basic analysis and interpretation of financial information i*n addition to* similar key concepts from the current NCEA level 1 Economics and Business Studies syllabus. However, a footnote to the provisional subject list states that "*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*".

We question how students will benefit from a broad-based foundational curriculum when the curriculum base is narrowed by deleting subjects as opposed to broadened by combining them. It is also unclear what the practical constraints of accounting are that prevent it from being included in the merged Commerce syllabus.

Further, there is a very low likelihood that students not engaged in a subject at NCEA level 1 will go on to engage in that subject during NCEA level 2. This calls into question the justification provided for the absence of accounting content in NCEA level 1, being that it is included as a subject in NCEA level 2.

We suggest that starting accounting education at NCEA level 1 not only builds a base for further study in accounting in NCEA 2 and 3, but more importantly exposes students to concepts central to basic financial literacy. Being able to read, navigate and analyse a set of basic financial statements, familiarity with accounting concepts such as profit, loss, capital, cashflow, PAYE, GST, and the definition of an asset and a liability form the building blocks of an education in accounting, but more importantly are the building blocks of basic financial literacy which are vital to students as members of society and consumers of financial services.

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

© Chartered Accountants Australia and New Zealand ABN 50 084 642 571 (CA ANZ). Formed in Australia. Members of CA ANZ are not liable for the debts and liabilities of CA ANZ.

Appendix A

Whilst we acknowledge a gradual decline in NCEA level 1 Accounting enrolments over the past five years, a high level of demand for NCEA level 1 Accounting remains with almost 10% of NCEA level 1 students (4,757 students) enrolled in 14 or more Accounting credits in 2018. Also, the gradual decline in enrolments over time is not unique to accounting. In fact, a similar decline has been experienced in French, History, and Economics. As opposed to a lack of interest in these subjects (which has been used as justification for the removal of Accounting as a NCEA level 1 subject), we suggest the gradual decline in NCEA level 1 enrolments most likely results from a limit on the number of courses students can select (usually 3 optional courses for NCEA level 1) combined with the introduction of a range of 'modern' subjects such as digital technologies, psychology and media studies.

We see a true merger of the current subjects, Accounting, Business Studies and Economics into a single offering as an exciting opportunity to removed outdated material and to refresh the syllabus. The new subject, Commerce, should be both relevant and engaging and informative to students.

CA ANZ has extensive experience in Tertiary level accounting and business education. We are accredited by TEQSA[2] to award the Graduate Diploma of Chartered Accounting (GradDipCA) postgraduate qualification level 8 under the Australian Qualification Framework (AQF). We are happy to provide support to the Ministry as the new subject, Commerce, is developed and are very interested in engaging with the relevant subject expert group as they embark upon the review of the level 1 Commerce achievement standards.

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

[2] The Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (**TEQSA**) is Australia's independent national quality assurance and regulatory agency for higher education

© Chartered Accountants Australia and New Zealand ABN 50 084 642 571 (CA ANZ). Formed in Australia. Members of CA ANZ are not liable for the debts and liabilities of CA ANZ.

Appendix B

About Chartered Accountants Australia and New Zealand

Chartered Accountants Australia and New Zealand is a professional body comprised of over 125,000 diverse, talented and financially astute members who utilise their skills every day to make a difference for businesses the world over.

Members are known for their professional integrity, principled judgment, financial discipline and a forward-looking approach to business which contributes to the prosperity of our nations.

We focus on the education and lifelong learning of our members and engage in advocacy and thought leadership in areas of public interest that impact the economy and domestic and international markets.

We are a member of the International Federation of Accountants and are connected globally through the 800,000-strong Global Accounting Alliance and Chartered Accountants Worldwide which brings together leading Institutes in Australia, England and Wales, Ireland, New Zealand, Scotland and South Africa to support and promote over 320,000 Chartered Accountants in more than 180 countries.

We also have a strategic alliance with the Association of Chartered Certified Accountants. The alliance represents 788,000 current and next generation professional accountants across 181 countries and is one of the largest accounting alliances in the world providing the full range of accounting qualifications to students and business.

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

© Chartered Accountants Australia and New Zealand ABN 50 084 642 571 (CA ANZ). Formed in Australia. Members of CA ANZ are not liable for the debts and liabilities of CA ANZ.

Document 2.10

Wellington College Founded 1867

PO Box 16-073 · Dufferin Street
Wellington · New Zealand
Tel: +64 4 802 2520 · *Fax:* +64 4 802 2542
Website: www.wellington-college.school.nz

22 June 2020

The Hon Chris Hipkins
Minister of Education
Parliament Buildings
WELLINGTON

Tena koe Minister

Concerns over Changes to the National Certificate of Education Achievement (NCEA)

The Board of Trustees of Wellington College wishes to express its concern to you as Minister of Education over the proposals by your officials to alter the NCEA. Our College sees itself as a progressive, modern college focused on the success, in the broadest possible sense, of all of its students.

We are not opposed to change, but we are opposed to reducing the flexibility that we have used at our school to promote the educational success of students of all abilities, and cultures. In particular, we are concerned with the following elements of the current proposal:

- The reduction in flexibility as to how students obtain the credits needed at various Levels. This will effectively require all students to achieve a much higher proportion of marks in external examinations. The Board believes that this will disproportionally affect Māori and Pasifika students, and students with learning disabilities.

- The removal of Latin as an NCEA subject and its effective removal from the curriculum in New Zealand schools. Officials do not appear to have provided any justification for this proposal. If this is purely a concern about the costs associated with external assessment, surely Latin could be offered as a fully internally assessed subject.

- Reducing the number of standards for Year 11 Science will leave Wellington College with the undesirable decision to either abandon what has been a very successful and diverse Year 11 Science programme or to decide not to pursue Level 1 Science at NCEA Level. Neither is in the best interests of our students, or our incredibly successful science programme that promotes science to all our students, in line with current government policy.

- The merging of Accounting with Economics and Business Studies unnecessarily removes Accounting as a separate option for our students. These are quite different subjects and this will be to the detriment of the teaching of both subjects and of students who want to study them.

We would like to meet with you and your officials to discuss our concerns, and to offer suggestions for an improved NCEA framework.

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

Increased requirement for external assessment

Wellington College has a proud tradition of success in external examinations. This year one of our students, for instance, was awarded the Prime Minister's Prize as the best scholarship student in New Zealand. For many of our students, external examinations are an appropriate challenge, and a realistic way of assessing their abilities in a particular subject. But the reality is that external assessments are not for all students and do not necessarily reveal those students' true talent and indeed may act as a significant disincentive to enrol in subjects which are perceived as being "academic".

At Wellington College we are committed to the success of all of our students, not just those who will achieve in the context of external examinations. Our teachers have been able to use the flexibility of the NCEA system to assist all students and to keep them engaged. We fear that many of those students would become disengaged if we return to a more heavily weighted external examination system.

While we have high expectations for our Māori and Pasifika students, we are also aware that this group of students is more likely to be disadvantaged by the shift to a more heavy focus on external examinations. One of our Board's key goals is to make sure these students achieve at the same Levels as all other students. We have not achieved that yet but together with our senior leadership team, we are deeply committed to that goal. Our teachers have developed innovative programmes to keep Māori and Pasifika students at College and engaged in academic subjects leading to tertiary study. We fear that this will be unjustifiably frustrated by the proposed changes.

Similarly, we know that students with learning disabilities perform less well in external examinations. We are as ambitious for those students as we are for all our students. We do not see why their real abilities should be hidden by a system that focuses on forms of assessment which obscure those abilities and discourage their participation.

We oppose the proposal and our preference is to retain flexibility to ensure that student assessment properly reflects their abilities and does not discourage them from the subjects that will lead to their future success as learners and as New Zealanders.

Removing Latin from NCEA

Latin has been taught at Wellington College for over 150 Years. We have a thriving Latin programme of enthusiastic students and committed and talented teachers. We do not see Latin as standing in the way of other subjects which are also important as part of a curriculum of a progressive and modern New Zealand college. For instance Wellington College has recently introduced Te Reo Māori as a subject studied by all Year Nine students. This did stretch our resources, but we decided to still continue teaching Latin for those boys who wish to do it by teaching Latin before the normal school day started. Two Year 9 classes are so committed that they start their college day before the usual school start time to learn Latin.

You will have received a large number of submissions about educational benefits of studying Latin, the Board does not wish to repeat those other than to say that it believes that it should be up to the College to decide whether or not we continue to offer the subject.

Latin is the only subject that is being completely abolished and the consultation materials do not give any justification for this. The abolition does not fit within the stated desire to simplify NCEA. We suspect, as a Board, that there are concerns within the Ministry over the expense of examining Latin.

Released Under the Official Information Act 1982

If indeed this were the underlying rationale, the Board believes that a better solution would be to allow schools that offer Latin to resource the assessment structure to ensure that there is appropriate assessment and appropriate standard levels for students to achieve NCEA credit. This already happens and Latin teachers who are passionate about the subject have coordinated assessment which is appropriate for the students. We also believe that concerns over students having "too much internal assessment" are unlikely to apply to Latin which by large is taken, at least at Wellington College, by some of our more able students who are likely to achieve at a very high standard regardless of assessment format.

We support the retention of Latin as an NCEA subject.

Reducing science credits at Year 11

Wellington College is extremely proud of its science programme, our students' results, and the inclusive way in which our science teachers have been able to structure courses in an area which is a national priority. The current system of multiple standards at Year 11 challenges our most able students and puts them on a path to high levels of success in Year 12 and 13 Biology, Chemistry and Physics. It also enables us to keep less academically oriented Year 11 students engaged who then benefit from a wider range of science options, and leave College "science literate". The experience of our science teachers does not support the assumptions made by your officials that all that is needed at Year 11 are general introductory credits over a broad science curriculum. We believe that being able to offer more specialised standards at Year 11 is an essential part of getting our students ready for more challenging science at Years 12 and 13. One example of keeping physics and chemistry students engaged has been our Space and Rocket Science course at Level 1, which packages more specific Chemistry and Physics standards in a format that excites our students. Just as we think we, as a college, should be able to decide to offer Latin, we think that we should be able to decide to offer more specialist science standards in Year 11.

We acknowledge that our size and our resources afford us opportunities that some smaller secondary schools may not have. For us, that is not a reason to stop us from using the resources that we have to construct a programme that we believe most suits our students. Removing flexibility from those schools that are able to use it doesn't help students in smaller schools.

We support the retention of separate science subjects at Level 1.

Merging Accounting with Economics and Business Studies

To be blunt, the Board does not understand the justification for this particular proposal. There is some synchronicity between Economics and Business studies and indeed we teach that combination at Wellington College in Year 11. Business Studies is practical example of some of the economic theory that students are taught. Accounting is a completely different subject. It is true that some students choose to do both, but they are fundamentally different subjects. The effective removal of Accounting at Level 1 will be to the detriment of students who only study Accounting and who may be discouraged from studying a subject that they might have benefited from at school, and also in their future careers, because they didn't want to study economics.

We support the retention of Accounting, Economics and Business studies as individual subjects at Level 1.

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

Conclusion

While this letter has expressed disagreement with some of the proposals that your officials have made, our Board and the senior leadership team want to end by re-emphasising that we are committed to engaging in a constructive conversation about how to build the best possible National Qualifications Framework for our students and our communities. We would like to meet with you and your officials to discuss how we can work together on this.

Yours sincerely



Paul Retimanu
Chair
Board of Trustees

cc Hon Grant Robertson, MP
Nicola Willis, MP
Paul Eagle, MP
Rino Tirikatene, MP

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

From: Web Channel
Sent: Tuesday, 3 March 2020 7:55 AM
To: Web Channel <Web.Channel@education.govt.nz>
Subject: Feedback from education.govt.nz

Describe the page or copy and paste the link (URL) to the page
This will help us identify the page you were on:

School leavers tool kit

Your feedback
Please provide your feedback:

HI. This tool kit is a good idea, however one that has been implemented in many schools for several years (I brought it in in 2008). Where is the correlation between this being a priority here BUT the lastest NCEA review getting rid of Accounting at level 1. So ignorant and naive. If this happens there will be no-one of knowledge in our schools to teach and implement the essential financial literacy skills our school leavers need. Help up fight this injustice and narrow-mindedness! We need voice to save an essential subject for our young people.

If you would like to be contacted about your feedback please provide a name and email address:
Your email address (if you would like a reply):

9(2)(a) [redacted]

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

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? (refer to Table 1 above)	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?
		Agree			*political and government education how our NZ system works, councils, voting and worldwide differences *life after school. Career pathways. Financial studies including- budgeting, financial responsibilities such as tax system, rates, medical costs, insurance, household management to prepare for leaving home and further education
		Strongly agree			Financial literacy
	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.
		Agree			Financial literacy Agribusiness
		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.
		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.
		Agree			Yes, Financial Literacy
		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 there 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.
		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.
	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
		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
		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 akonga from Yr. 11 onwards.	History of Aotearoa (Mandated), Te Reo Maori (Mandated), Civics (Citizenship responsibilities), and Financial Literacy.
		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
	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.
		Strongly disagree	Classics and Latin need to be offered		Civics education and financial literacy
	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.
		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.
		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
		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.
		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.
		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 ourself and others) - navigating cultural/generational differences - empathy (asking a student to lead the class instead of teacher. Chaos? Have faith) - preparing students for university (ask them to lead their own project) - interacting with social media
	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 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.	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.
		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...
	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 lesson 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 come from and how to deal with them or even talk about them. If the parents don't know, and can't teach children this, then this is a massive deficit in our educational system. Emotional Literacy would support a healthier, saner, more peaceful society. ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION understanding the macrocosm and microcosm of the planet and all of the creatures on it. The effects that we all have in our consumer decisions is massive. Thing Global - Act Local. 7 billion Dreams - One planet. https://youtu.be/JyL58vlbvgw	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 lesson 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 come from and how to deal with them or even talk about them. If the parents don't know, and can't teach children this, then this is a massive deficit in our educational system. Emotional Literacy would support a healthier, saner, more peaceful society. ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION understanding the macrocosm and microcosm of the planet and all of the creatures on it. The effects that we all have in our consumer decisions is massive. Thing Global - Act Local. 7 billion Dreams - One planet. https://youtu.be/JyL58vlbvgw
	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?
	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 combine 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.	Undecided	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. 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 qualifications and programmes, WDCs will also be responsible for developing the post-school education pathways for which NCEA programmes - including those primarily involving Achievement Standards - are intended to prepare learners. This requirement is clearest for subjects in the 'Technology' Learning Area (especially Materials Technology, which covers subjects where more than one ITO/WDC has coverage and expertise), but it is not limited to this area. For example, the future Creative, Cultural and Recreation WDC will have expertise in Health and Physical Education subjects, as well as subjects within 'The Arts' Learning Area. We would also note that the industries for which WDCs are responsible will also often have an interest in effective competencies across non-specialist areas (such as mathematics, sciences etc.) and we would encourage the Ministry to consider how their statutory leadership role can be reflected through input into the development processes of these broader SEGs.	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.	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. 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 structure learning around discrete and siloed subject areas (e.g. four classes a week for 'maths', four classes a week for 'physics'). Similarly, we note that initiatives such as Vocational Pathways which are intended to encourage a more integrated approach to learning are largely still treated as interventions for low achieving learners - and in particular are not seen as desirable options for 'high achievers'. Trying to increase the granularity of Achievement Standard/ Curriculum-based subjects will likely exacerbate this situation. Developing programmes of study that combine both types of assessment standards will be particularly relevant for learners intending to proceed directly into the workforce (including work-based apprenticeships) after school. For example, in addition to industry-specific skills, roles in construction also require or can benefit from competency in mathematics, english, general science (and some specialist sciences such as physics and chemistry), accounting, and other areas. A programme that combines BCATS standards with Achievement Standards in those areas can therefore prepare a learner well for success in the industry. However, such programmes are also relevant to most education and career pathways – notwithstanding the barrier to good education pathways created by the University Entrance award. For example, programmes based around the Creative Arts could easily combine relevant Unit and Achievement Standards as precursors for qualifications in music, fine arts, or film, that in turn prepare people for careers in those sectors. Similarly, the inclusion of industry-specific Unit Standards alongside relevant Achievement Standards could provide valuable context for students intending to pursue Engineering qualifications.
		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.

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

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? (refer to Table 1 above)	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?
		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: •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 of Commerce teachers. •There are parental expectations about these being taught at Secondary School, they are subjects that are genuinely supported by parents. •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. We request additional information on the rationale behind this proposal, and where the initial idea was founded. 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 we note, that many subject areas that have less students engaging with them nationwide have been able to maintain their status as individual subjects. We believe the status quo for Accounting, Economics and Business as individual subjects, should remain	
		Strongly disagree		A 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).	
		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.	
		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.	
		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.	
		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 fulfil 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.	
		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.	
		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). 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 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.We request additional information on the rationale behind this proposal, and where the initial idea was founded.. We believe the status quo for Accounting, Economics and Business as individual subjects, should remain.	
		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.	
		Strongly disagree		Accounting/Business/Economic are all specialists subject in there own write. I moved to a new school last year and they didn't offer level1 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
		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.	
		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.	
		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.	
		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. There is truly nothing comparable- do NOT strip future students of the opportunity to immerse themselves in ancient history.	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.
		Strongly disagree		Commerce - keep accounting separate	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?	
		Strongly disagree		Commerce should stay divided into accounting, economics and buisness.	
		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.	
		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.	
		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.	
		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.	
		Disagree		Economics, accounting and business need to be separate at level 1	
	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.
		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.	
		Agree		Good to combine commerce subjects under one roof and also science	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.	
	-	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. Personaly 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 :)
		Undecided		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.	No
	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 differated 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.	
		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.	
		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.	
		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.	
		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.	
		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

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

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? (refer to Table 1 above)	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?
		Strongly disagree		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: 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 of Commerce teachers. There are parental expectations about these being taught at Secondary School, they are subjects that are genuinely supported by parents. 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.	
		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
		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. Last but not least, the teachers teaching Latin, Art History and Classics tend to be high quality teachers with higher qualifications and a real calling for their job (few people would consider making a subject considered 'arcane' their profession if it wasn't their real passion!). People like this make school a place you want to run to in the morning. And while there always was a small number of people in my ancient language classes, most of them were there for the long run and considered it a stimulus that ignited an in depth study and success in other areas - modern languages, science, business. I am incredibly grateful to my ancient languages teachers. The world they opened to me is priceless and one I still refer to in my everyday personal and professional life. I think this proposed change is not a well informed one and that it will contribute to disadvantaging capable and ambitious students and amazing teachers.	No. But glad that NZSL, Korean and Maori Performing Arts made it on the list!
		Disagree		I disagree with the ministry proposed changes to NCEA level 1 subjects. This is because the rational of there being an overlap between subjects (ie Media Studies, Social Studies, psychology or Economics, Bussiness 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 subjects that they don't actually know much about, eg an Economics teacher teaching accounting. With this said, I propose that Economics and Accounting should remain separate level 1 courses, and Media Studies and Social Studies should also remain separate in level 1 NCEA and not be combined.	
		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.	
		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	
		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.	
		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.	
		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 the 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.	
		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
	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.	
		Strongly disagree		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. 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. 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.	
		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 2018, only five had students in 2019). I also note that in the 2018 and 2019 academic years one school (Auckland International College) accounted for roughly 80% of the students at Year 12. Moreover, Westlake Boys—the other school accounting for a significant proportion of students taking Korean—had no students at the Year 12 level in 2018, but then 19 students at Year 13 the following year. A spike in the nationwide 2019 Year 13 numbers is accounted for by a one-time enrolment at Hagley Community College, again with no corresponding student numbers from 2018 at Year 12. These details suggest (though they cannot prove without detailed demographic data) that at the upper levels Korean is not being taken by students who have started in Years 9 or 10, but by native speakers taking the subject as an "easy" option (potentially exchange students during their one or two years in New Zealand). A similar issue might be raised about the Pasifika languages: though their numbers are higher than Latin, in the absence of demographic data about these students, the allegation is open that these subjects are there cynically for the benefit of Pasifika students, particularly given the locations and general demography of those schools where the Pasifika languages are taught. I do want to be very clear, however. The Pasifika languages SHOULD have a place in the New Zealand curriculum: they are a vital part of New Zealand's cultural mix, and I applaud their continued inclusion. At the same time, the place of Latin in the traditional part of the New Zealand curriculum should not be overlooked—nor should it be dismissed as a holdover from New Zealand's colonial history. While student numbers in Latin may not be as high as other languages, the fact there is a consistent core of schools which continue to offer Latin is proof of its continued value. That value is in fact very specific to Latin. Unlike the modern languages which emphasise a communicative approach, students of Latin develop a more analytical understanding of how language works as a system and how it can be manipulated. Students of Latin emerge with a keen ability to parse words and phrases, to understand not just what is being said, but how and why it is being said that way. In today's world, that is an invaluable skill, and the Ministry should think very carefully before eliminating from the national qualification scheme the only subject that truly fosters it. The proposed elimination of Classical Studies from NCEA Level 1 seems ill considered from a numerical perspective: Classical Studies shows robust student numbers. It also flies counter to the Ministry's proposed refocusing of the qualification to provide a broad, foundational education in two respects. First, the material covered in Classical Studies is at the bedrock of so many traditions (literary, artistic, political, philosophical) in which New Zealand shares. The works of Shakespeare, for example, would be inconceivable without the works of the Roman poets Virgil and Ovid or the Greek biographer Plutarch. Closer to home and to our own period, the poems in James K. Baxter's Words to Lay a Strong Ghost engage directly with the Roman poet Catullus, as does C. K. Stead's Geographies and Anna Jackson's Catullus for Children. The very idea of "democracy" derives from ancient Athens, while modern theories of rhetoric and persuasion develop out of the work of Plato, Aristotle, and Cicero. Modern art is so often a reaction to (even a rejection of) the "classical" forms and styles developed in and after the Renaissance, yet the Renaissance itself was literally the "rebirth" of forms and styles practiced by the ancient Greeks and Romans. And the empire-building of European nations (not least of Britain) was modelled on the Roman Empire. As a nation whose history and culture is inextricably (though not exclusively) linked to Britain and the European tradition, it is vital to provide students with the opportunity to encounter and engage with the roots of that tradition. Classical Studies provides that opportunity, and students should be allowed to take that opportunity and receive recognition as early as possible. Second, Classical Studies is the only truly interdisciplinary subject offered in New Zealand secondary schools, and as such it is the only subject that offers a truly broad educational experience. As an academic discipline, Classical Studies is defined not by a particular methodological approach nor by the study of specific objects, but by time and place (namely, the peoples and cultures of Ancient Greece and Rome and their interactions with each other and other peoples in Europe, Africa, and Asia). Within that scope, students learn and practice literary analysis, historical analysis, the interpretation of art and visual culture, cultural anthropology (including religious studies), and philosophy (as the Ministry's own website acknowledges: http://senionecondary.tki.org.nz/Social-sciences/Classical-studies). Students develop a "toolbox" of critical thinking skills that they can apply not only to other subjects, but also more generally to their everyday lives and their engagement with the world around them. These skills are valuable and transferable, benefitting students beyond secondary school (and I would add anecdotally and from personal experience that students with a background in Classical Studies not only do well in BA programs at University, but also at Law School). Students should be given the chance to develop these skills and to have those skilled recognized through a national qualification at the earliest possible opportunity. Finally, I am also concerned about the potential impact on Classical Studies and particularly Latin teachers of the proposed eliminations.	
		Agree		I support the idea of combining the commerce subjects at level 1.	
		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.
		Undecided		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. 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 speakers learning a foreign language is discriminatory and unjust, and misses a great opportunity for this learning to gain credits for their qualification. It also signals that learning English as an additional language is supported by the Ministry, and thereby schools, thereby given the respect, value and kudos that it as a subject, and the students learning it of necessity, deserve. EAP should be an approved subject as for university entrance.	
		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 reason. 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
		Undecided		I think that accounting should be separate from economics and business studies as they are actually quite different subjects	
		Strongly agree		I think that it is good to combine similar subjects, like PE and Health and Commerce subjects art Level 1.	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!	
		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. 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. The media can also be a powerful tool for students to make social change in the 21st century. The student-led climate strikes showed how using social media can empower students. Media Studies enables students to not only understand the issues around them but also gives them a platform and the confidence to take action. Increasingly, there are clear pathways for students to study Media Studies beyond school. This includes communication courses; film production; and journalism, as well as applying media skills to other disciplines. Media Studies prepares students for an ever-changing environment where many future career paths are still evolving. This is what Media Studies offers to our students and is fundamental for a modern learner. Removing Level 1 Media Studies undermines the need to prepare learners to be confident, 21st Century citizens.	
		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

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

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? (refer to Table 1 above)	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?
		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.	
		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.	
		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.
		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.
		Disagree		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. 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? 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. 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. 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.	
		Disagree		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.	
		Strongly disagree		keep the commerce subjects separated. the reason for this is because it is extremely hard to pick up accounting at level 2.	
		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?	
		Agree		Like the idea of the combination to form Commerce.	
		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 .
		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 student, not only to prepare them for online/media related jobs, but so that they are able to navigate media content safely and for their best interests	
		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
		Disagree		MOE is punishing commerce ...	no
	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 be 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 and many students study them both. They are completely different subjects. Fewer took business studies - just under 6,000 students. •bot offering L1 accounting could see the demise of accounting in some schools altogether •accounting specialists love teaching their subject - our jobs could be in jeopardy over this.	
		Strongly disagree		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 servery impact on accounting numbers at level 2 and 3.	
		Strongly disagree		Need to keep Economics, Accounting and Business Studies!	No
		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	
		Agree		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. 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.	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).
		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.
	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.	
		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.	
		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.	
		Disagree		The Commerce subjects should be stand alone. There are a niche of students who thrive on the individual subjects.	
		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.
		Disagree		The proposed sweeping changes to science and commerce are of concern.	
		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 to the Ako and to deliver what they can teach to the highest standard.	
		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.	
		Disagree		The sweeping changes proposed to science and commerce are of concern.	
		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
		Disagree		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. 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. 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. The proposed absence of accounting for the Level 1 Commerce curriculum [note 2 on the provisional subject list] is particularly concerning. For students interested in accounting, it will reduce choice and curricular content for those wanting to study at Level 2 and above. It will also limit choice and opportunities for those wanting only a foundational accounting knowledge to support, for example, a student going into trades or a scientist understanding project finances. We support the retention of accounting, economics and business studies as individual subjects at Level 1.	
		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
		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 have in their response to the sector. It is unclear how a summative assessment approach that tests knowledge of scientific content and ideas can be conducted without some kind of specified syllabus. The old standards in Science were able to do this with external papers that specified content areas in Biology (genetic variation), Chemistry (acids and bases) and Physics (mechanics). We should be looking at other related assessment materials at similar curriculum levels such as the Coordinated Sciences syllabus for IGCSE, and how we could teach an 'NCEA-ified' version of such a syllabus that suits our national context. The Social Studies mergers are also inappropriate. Media studies and psychology should stand alone as their own subjects and 'social studies' should become something more concrete like sociology. The actual subject of 'social studies' is a junior not a senior subject area. In year 9 and 10, social studies starts to branch out into its respective disciplines anyway (particularly geography, history and economics but also the behavioural sciences) and it makes no sense for 'Social Studies' as a separate subject to sit alongside them at Level 1. The reason why NCEA Social Studies persists as a subject is largely because of the ministry's (in my view, poorly justified) belief & touting of computer-driven inquiry learning. Much of the old assessment programme was set up to encourage programmes of inquiry learning, the rather reductive study of 'social problems' without any disciplinary or scholarly basis.	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.
		Disagree		Too generalised- science should be split, as should accounting and economics	
		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.	
		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
		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.
		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.	
		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 cooment further until it is clearer what the ACH STANDARDS within Commerce look like. Thanks	
		Strongly disagree		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.	
		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 that some of the subjects it would take away resources from, however, it would be good to implement in some way	Engineering

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

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? (refer to Table 1 above)	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?
		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 rely on internet apps like "Grammarly". •Learning a language is a doorway to understanding another culture, and by extension, to understanding the value of other cultures. Language learning develops a global perspective in students. •Language learning develops good academic habits including self-discipline, time management, and the ability to memorize when this skill is required. Conclusion: language learning "supports coherent and robust pathways into NCEA level two and further study or training "for the simple reason that these students are better prepared academically as a result of learning a language.	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 in other academic subjects. •Learning Latin can lead to employment and a successful career. Students of Latin work in the following areas in New Zealand: government ministries, telecommunications, insurance, law, journalism, human resources, local government bodies, libraries and archives, museums, and education. Some students of Latin are prominent authors: JK Rowling and Ella Catton. Conclusion: Given the enormous benefits of learning a foreign language and learning Latin in particular, the Ministry would be well advised to promote learning Latin in order to meet the goals it sets out in the Review of Achievement Standards—NCEA Level 1 Subject List. Classical Studies should also remain--the MoE does not fully understand what this subject is: Classical Studies is not merely "history" (as the RAS proposes). Rather, it is a transdisciplinary field that encompasses literature, art, drama, philosophy, science, architecture, engineering, law and commerce, to name just a few. In this way it "fits with the policy vision of a broader, foundational NCEA level 1" and "supports the credibility of NCEA as a qualification among stakeholders." Because it is transdisciplinary, Classical studies supports learning across a range of other foundational NCEA level 1 subjects. In this way it allows schools to "create well-designed and coherent local curricula that support pathways for individual learners." The transdisciplinary nature of Classical Studies also supports the literacy goals (both reading and writing) embedded in NCEA level 1. In this way it "supports the inclusion of important and rich learning from the National Curriculum." Most imporantly, Classical Studies supports the Crown's obligations under Te Tiriti o Waitangi: •Māori concepts and values such as mana, mana whenua, rangatira, manaakitanga, tikanga, and whānua (to name just e few) are a useful way of understanding ancient Greek and Roman society. Studying the ancient world through the lens of Māori values and concepts supports New Zealand as a bi-cultural and multi-cultural society. •The strong oral tradition of Greek and Roman societies resonates with Māori and Pasifika students and engages them. Ancient literature reaches across the divide of time and culture because it deals with the emotions and concerns of the human condition: pride, respect, renown, family, familial piety, love, war, marriage, authority, the nature of divine beings, justice (to name just a few). •The path to understanding complex foreign cultures prompts important bi-cultural goals, such as the process of self-reflection on the nature of knowledge and norms, indigenous models of development knowledge and behaviours, and the process of colonisation and globalisation. Conclusion: Classical Studies and Latin should remain on the NCEA Level 1 list because it meets most of the criteria, most importantly obligations under Te Tiriti o Waitangi.	
		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 Classics into History implies that 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.	
		Agree	Agree with general direction. Good to include Maori Performing Arts.	In general I agree with the direction. 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). 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.	
	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 lessoning 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
		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.
	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 of 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 difference skill set to a general commerce - this wil definitely but off future entrepreneurs.	
		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?	
		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.
		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.	
		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	
	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
	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	
		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.	
		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.
		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.	
		Undecided	I agree with many of the changes as they seem well aligned and natural but some are reducing learning areas substantially where the percieved links are going to have reduced outcomes at higher levels of study.	Economics, Accounting and Business Studies are three very different disciplines and there would be no way to accomodate the learning required to be able to pick these up again individually at Level 2/3 if all pushed into a 'commerce' subject. 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. 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. 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 through financial literacy/social studies/money management learning and know which one (or more) they want to pursue in more depth.	No
	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". •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.
		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 pretexts for war and even the ways we human creatures experience drama and purpose itself are not inevitabilities of life, but, instead, are aspects of the universe that are open to inquiry, that centuries of gifted thinkers before us have helped map, that the best and worst things that afflict us as a species are still things that human minds can be brought to bear on. Latin teaches us -in a way no modern language can- that language itself is a construction, that this style of metre and that couplet were first instruments of a person, engaged in bitter rivalry or personal tragedy or political defiance or dismissal of social norms, and that astoundingly we can still glimpse the personalities and events behind these and feel ourselves in a world where bedrock things like these were -and can be- invented. We need these subjects, and it is not enough for them to be available to some tiny subgroup of our young; we need them to be understood widely. Our society will not be saved by a future Martin Luther King Jr, Te Whiti, Kate Sheppard, James Barry, Jefferson, Marx, Leonardo, Voltaire, Aristotle, Averroes. We will not see them if we are blinded by greed and choose to value only commerce and "STEM" subjects. We will not see them by training people in a way that sees my list of names above and doesn't understand -or even think to ask about- the forces that have led to that list biasing toward the white and male.	Critical thinking
	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 seperate, 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
		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
	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 nuture 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
		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.	
		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 at 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 years during a break from teaching. I was astonished at how helpful my own study of Latin and Classics was to me as a barrister and solicitor. In terms of preparing oral argument, written submissions, other court documents and opinion work, I consider that my classical background gave me a clear edge over other solicitors, certainly over those from a background not so rich in language - for example, those who had studied business - related subjects as part of their law degree or those who had not studied any language-rich subjects at school or university. Now as a teacher again, I find without exception that my first -time senior Classics students, who have studied Latin are far superior in all aspects of oral and written literacy. They also seem to have a wider view or perspective on life, and are not so constrained in their thinking or utilitarian or mercenary in their aspirations for the future. They are prepared to be open-minded and give things a go - and like the Romans they have studied and read, they have learned to be patient, resilient, careful - because Latin is not easy - it takes time and dedication, grit and determination to master - and it also take a huge dollop of courage to take Latin at senior levels, when everyone is telling you it is a waste of time, and leads nowhere! Fortunately, some students do value the wonderful tangible and intangible gifts the subject has offered for over 2000 years, and continues to offer to that small band of souls brave enough to continue studying it. We - in New Zealand - the home of so many outstanding international Classical scholars cannot afford to let Latin die in our schools or Classics be subsumed into History when it is a totally different, multi-disciplinary subject, and already a foundation subject on its own. A Chinese-NZ boy I taught Classics to in Form 6 and 7 (2017/8), returned to NZ for the lock-down from his first year at University College London where is studying Classics - including ancient Greek for the first time. He will begin Latin next year. He was fizzing! He talked non-stop about all he is doing there for an hour and a half - he could not wait, he said, to visit me to tell me how much he valued what he had learned in AS and A Level Classics here - as he was far in advance of the British students in his classes. He also told me he regretted deeply that he had not also studied Latin at school but that he was determined to study it at university when he returns to London in August. This young man's comments were a ringing endorsement of how well we in NZ are prepare our students for overseas study. The Ministry must save Latin in schools and must let Classics stand as a separate subject at Level 1. These subjects are the foundation stones of Western Civilisation!	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 down of the curriculum at all levels to compensate for these changes. By removing or merging subjects you are taking away the opportunity for students to study subjects that appeal to them. These subjects can be utilised in a number of professional areas including law, business, medicine, etc. I argue this on behalf of students who will be missing out due to the changes you are proposing. Lastly, in terms of the creation of Maori performing arts I can see why some may feel it is important but I do not believe it should be limited to one culture as there are several cultural groups that exist in NZ and they should all have an opportunity to gain credits for celebrating their culture. Either all cultures are able to be represented in this new subject OR it should stay as an extra-curricular activity which pretty much every school in the country offers.	
		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.	
		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	

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

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? (refer to Table 1 above)	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?
	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 'Commerce' 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.
		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.	
		Disagree	I support some and disagree strongly with others.	Extremely good to see Māori Performing Arts, I think that speaks to the value of te ao Māori. Also in favour of the merging of science and business subjects. 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.	
	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.	
	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 project5 based learning would allow for students to specialise.
	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. It should be kept as an important component in Level 1, so that it can continue to thrive at higher levels.	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.
		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
	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 jump 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).	
		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.	
	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
	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
	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 phycology. It is nothing like them, it is analysing into media genres and making media. That has nothing too 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
		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.	
	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.	
		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 Lvl2/Lvl3 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.	
	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 called rich and important. Moreover it balances an awareness of our unique Maori heritage, as the other half of the taonga that the treaty requires us to protect. Thirdly, Latin at levels 1, 2 and 3 leads directly to University study of Latin, classical literature, Greek, ancient philosophy and ancient art, and the whole classical tradition without which medieval culture and early modern history too cannot be understood properly. High school Latin gives university students the confidence to aim high in the study of this whole heritage, without which we do not understand our own place in history, culture and other civilisations. There are many jobs that come from this background: Latinists, and others with a knowledge of Latin have gone on to careers in academia, teaching, libraries, private contracted research, literary writing, film, television, public service, and business, including tourism and publishing. The intellectual discipline of learning a foreign language, particularly one with such a great literature, leads directly to greater achievements in all such careers. Fourth, while school students need to learn about their local cultures and environment, this should not be at the expense of a wider perspective on life, nature and cultural and historical variety. All the latter is very relevant to making sense of the local in a larger context, without which we will produce myopic impractical people who are unadaptable, naive, confused, and unable to deal with what is new and different. Not all students are suited to the same pathway of study; each will do better in one or another area, and closing off students from a deep resource, such as Latin is, for understanding the western heritage, which is a central component of New Zealand's history and culture, by stopping them from learning Latin, will particularly harm those students whose particular capacities tend in this general direction, and along this pathway. Fifth, there is no shortage of teachers of Latin in New Zealand, and no shortage of teachers and university staff willing and able to examine NCEA Latin. There are Latin graduates being produced in all the main universities who will enroll for graduate teacher training if the subject is still taught. These are likely to be some of the best teachers, and most useful and inspiring both in the classroom and in other school activities, because they are typically driven by a general love of other people and cultures, literary and dramatic self-expression, and are often the most intelligent and able students at university, with the prospect of becoming senior figures with serious responsibilities in high schools. In short, there is no problem with New Zealand's ability to resource and deliver Latin as an NCEA subject. Sixth, the Treaty of Waitangi involves two partner peoples, and both have responsibilities for the mutual protection and support of all the treasures each brings to the table. Maori who signed the treaty knew this, and embraced Latin in missionary schools deliberately and enthusiastically in the nineteenth century as a means to enjoying the benefits of both cultures, just as missionaries learned Maori. Today there is still a treaty obligation to support the heritages and languages of both cultures, not one at the expense of the other. We all benefit together by understanding the deep sources of both cutures, and this is what the Treaty is meant to protect, including the teaching of Latin. Seventh, if Latin is dropped from NCEA, the cultural failure involved will go round the world as a signal of the fact that New Zealand is aiming at cultural isolation and a rejection of everything we share with the UK, Europe, other Commonwealth countries, and the US. Students from New Zealand with high school Latin who apply to prestigious overseas universities are currently likely to be accepted and go as ambassadors of our nation's public education system, and its commitment to deep learning and serious understanding. NCEA is already under stress as a result of the falling levels of measured New Zealand student achievement in international tests that has come about since its inception. Overseas there is doubt that we are on the right path, and several other prominent countries have turned their backs on the educational methods employed in NCEA. The fact that we still teach Latin is an indication in the international context that NCEA is still a credible system. Moreover Latin scholars have not infrequently done exceptionally well in NZ Scholarship examinations across many subjects, demonstrating how Latin learning counteracts the problems that have come to light with the NCEA educational approach. Overseas people who have studied Latin at school are very commonly found at the top of their professions, in the UK, Europe and the US among other countries, as leaders in the public service, in business, in politics, in the law, in diplomacy, and even in the military and in science and technology. It is generally recognised in such countries that having learnt Latin at school is a sign of extremely high potential for leadership, an indication of diligence, intelligence, adaptability, of the ability to speak clearly and persuasively, to analyse difficult problems, summarise	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: - NEG 1 :"The highest standards of achievement, through programmes which enable all students to realise their full potential as individuals, and to develop the values needed to become full members of New Zealand's society." Latin provides the root words for all of the modern sciences and therefore an understanding is invaluable for development of an individual's full potential. - NEG 5: "Priority should be given to the development of high levels of competence (knowledge and skills) in literacy and numeracy, science and technology." A basis of Latin understanding is invaluable for learning in Law, Medicine and Business as well as Political Studies, Theology and Logic. - NEG 8: "Access for students to a nationally and internationally recognised qualifications system to encourage a high level of participation in post-school education in New Zealand." As mentioned above, an understanding in Latin provides a sound basis of learning for numerous areas of tertiary education.	Latin should be retained for NCEA Levels 2 and 3
	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 seperate 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! 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.	
		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
	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.	
	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.	
	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.
	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. Accounting 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 why? The earlier we start the kids to be challenged, the better.	
		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
	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.	

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

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? (refer to Table 1 above)	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?
		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, 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 disemboweled. Classical Studies is a very broad and multi-disciplinary subject. The plan to put Classical Studies into History is therefore extremely harmful, and it will also have serious consequences for numerous other fields. The study, for instance, of significant parts of modern literature requires a knowledge of Classical literature. It is not uncommon for Classical Studies students to go on to study English literature at University. Since Philosophy is not offered at all, it is by taking Classical Studies that many students first encounter this important subject. And again, it is not uncommon for Classical Studies students to go on to study Philosophy at University. But Philosophy, like Classical literature, cannot be included at all in the History curriculum. The proposed plans will be harmful therefore not simply to Classical Studies but also to a range of further fields, for which Classical Studies is fundamental and/or which it is a (and, in some cases, currently the only) gateway. As for the plan to abolish Latin, several decades' worth of studies have shown that the learning of Latin can significantly improve students' grasp of English grammar, syntax and vocabulary, and consequently English reading and writing skills. Given that English skills are absolutely essential for students' future success in almost every possible career path, and given that English language, literature, and culture embody one half of the bicultural, bilingual identity of New Zealand enshrined in the Treaty of Waitangi, Latin thus has the potential to contribute substantially to the goals for secondary education set by the Ministry of Education. We do not think it is necessary to remind the Ministry that barely a year has passed since the terrorist attacks in Christchurch. Crimes of religious and racial hatred of this nature, which have been increasing in number around the world, are no doubt at least in part an inevitable result of the long neglect and indeed active undermining of education in the Humanities. For too long there has been a growing and ever narrowing focus on the strictly vocational, and this has come at the expense of both humanity and the Humanities. We submit that this is not the time to cut further in this area but, on the contrary, to support, invest and expand. If we do not teach our youth about the diversity of humanity and culture, then intolerance and racism are bound only to increase. The study of ancient cultures is especially important in this context, precisely because they are different in so many respects from contemporary, and because they provide neutral territory in which all manner of issues can be discussed. Similarly, we submit that the so-called 'soft' skills that the Humanities develop are in greater need than ever, in our era of post-truth politics and 'fake news', and when politics are becoming ever more polarised. The ability to respect others' opinions and to discuss our views in a civil manner is vital, and this is also something for which teaching in the Humanities is absolutely essential. Similarly, in our era of job insecurity and automation, the 'soft' skills are vitally important for the flexibility that they offer. As for any reduction in the range of subjects on offer, we should like to point out to the Ministry that anyone who works in education for any length of time quickly finds that the difference between a student who does well and one of seemingly limited abilities so often is little more than a matter of interest and engagement. Reducing the range of subjects on offer is therefore absolutely a move in the wrong direction. The education system of New Zealand needs to be encouraging and catering to its students, not alienating them with a narrow curriculum which caters only to the interests and skills of some and which also presupposes that their purpose in life is only to serve the needs of business and the economy.	
	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 singled out? 2 - Accounting, Business Studies and Economics, as three separate and distinct subjects, support the inclusion of important and rich learning from the National Curriculum, with as little overlap as possible. 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. oAgain, this is akin to combining Dance, Drama and Music into Performing Arts. Additionally, a taster of Accounting, Business Studies and Economics in one course is already offered at year 10 by a number of schools. Mandating that schools do this again at year 11 would actually create more overlap, and reduce the ability for schools to design and offer a range of junior programmes. 3 - Accounting, Business Studies and Economics, as three separate and distinct subjects, each support coherent and robust pathways into NCEA Level 2 and further study or training. We are concerned that 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. Authentic learning is at the heart of all three subjects; this instructional approach allows students to explore, discuss, and meaningfully construct concepts and relationships in contexts that involve real-world problems and projects that are relevant to the learner. Few other senior secondary subjects can provide such coherent learning with such a clear pathway to Level 2 and beyond. 4 - Accounting, Business Studies and Economics, as three separate and distinct subjects, all contribute to creating well designed and coherent local curricula, which support pathways for individual learners. If the review aims to enable schools to develop a strong, localised curriculum, we wish to point out that mandating schools must combine Accounting, Business Studies and Economics actually removes potential for a localized curriculum Schools are currently able to do this if they wish within the current NCEA framework, if this better suits their school community. However the changes would remove the ability for schools to offer the three subjects separately, if that is what better suits their school community. The changes would significantly reduce student agency, when evidence has shown that student agency has significantly positive outcomes for student learning. We are therefore concerned that this change would have significant, negative impacts on students and their individual learning pathways. 5 - There is high demand for Accounting, Business Studies and Economics, as three separate and distinct subjects, the sector has the capability to deliver all three subjects. 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. We cannot understand why Economics, Accounting and Business Studies would be combined while these others are not. 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. Many students currently choose only one of the three subjects without choosing the other two; 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. A combined course would mean students miss out on finding these passions. Schools currently have the agency to design and offer their own senior courses that are in line with their students' demand and teachers' ability. Not many, if any, schools offer every single subject that is available at NCEA Levels 1-3, and that is the beauty of having such a diverse number of subjects	No, as it seems students will be unprepared for a large number of Level 2 subjects as it is.
	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, aobounting, 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 economic terminology when they have no idea that they have no idea what the terms we use. I turn to Latin and Greek in the classroom on a regular basis to help explain complex topics to students. I explain 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.
	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 now for everyone, Level 1 accounting gives a broader curriculum choice for those who choose to specialize elsewhere at higher levels.	
		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 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 * 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	
		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.	
		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 combinmed with Social Studies. Agree with Technology changes and History changes. Maori Performing Arts inclusion is great.	Maori Performing Arts all the way through
		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 .	
		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 Science 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
		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 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 suppnted 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
		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 commuication, 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.
	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 Y7-10, where are the PLD courses? So far, there is little available and we are supposed to be implementing the new curriculum this year.	
		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 the 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, 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 retained as they are some of the few subjects which offer rich, deep learning in humanities at Year 11.	No
		Disagree	The proposed changes will narrow down the way the curriculum can be delivered. It makes it difficult for schools deliver cross curricular and intergrated 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.	
		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 elected to take commerce, giving them a valuable base of knowledge to take into their future studies.	
		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 what I came up with: marrying it with Business studies and the art market, considering its value in medical humanities, art history's ability to enhance critical and creative thinking, its links to optics spectroscopy in the conservation of cultural heritage, the ways engineers apply art principles of line, balance and form in designing bridges and architecture. The fact that CERN has an art programme allowing the arts to collide alongside scienc Darwin drew his beloved species There are more! What about our visual arts themselves- knowing the past is important - take for example Lisa Reihana's Transit of Venus[Infected] that examines postcolonial NZ by critically evaluating Cook's expeditions to the South Pacific! or other artists using past works/traditions to speak of the past in relation to today! I cannot see how we allow students to paint, sculpt or photograph without promoting the importance of the works of the past and now to inform their journey. If you begin by removing art history at level 1, without considering its potential in integrated learning, it's a short slippery slope before you remove it at successive year levels. Stop and think of a broader plane, with ways AH can enhance future learning, project-based, inquiry learning etc. Yes art history has traditionally been teaching the western canon BUT we can do more, far more by continuing its tradition whilst building on its potential in 21st Century learning - We want our students to have opportunities to problem solve, think past the obvious and come up with new ways of seeing things - so why are you so quick to remove art history before considering how it could better enhance what we already do. take your blinkers off and consider how to support	
		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?	
	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 offered by schools. A Social Science hub can select various Achievement Standards from different learning areas, but by taking away these Achievement Standards this reduces selection for students and teachers implementing these courses that put student agency first. Don't take Achievement Standards and subject areas away! Just don't!	
	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 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.

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

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? (refer to Table 1 above)	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?
	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 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 remiss. 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.
	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 I , 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
		Strongly disagree	Unfortunately, you haven't provided a 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 offered at level 1. It requires a reasonable amount of statistical knowledge they have not been taught yet. Merging economics etc to make commerce. Support as these subject can easily be picked up at level 2. Home economics and processing technology to food science. Yes but why not just call it cooking? Or cooking and hospitality?	Ensure you retain Latin at level 2 and 3
	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.	
		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/Y10 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 year and get no credits or endorsements out of it, leading to more people dropping it and making it even more obsolete. Motivation when learning a language is tough, so taking away credits, one of the best ways for teenagers to mark their progress is simply illogical.	I would support seperate 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.
	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.	
	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.
	My understanding is that the standards offered does not fully represent the scope of the curriculum. Students are limited in their 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 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
		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
		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
		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
		Agree		Many schools have junior Business studies for years 9 and 10. Within these courses, they cover, Accounting Business and Economics. Financial literacy is an area that is lacking right across the board. Students having a lack of of basic financial literacy. 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. 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.	Financial literacy at Level 2 so that there is a Pathway for students.
		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.
	But not happy that it is taking subjucets 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
	I think there needs to be a significant focus on numeracy, literacy, digital literacy and finanical 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 disppear. 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
	These changes should be publicised more and I suggest making all students who have studied NCEA before aware of the changes to recieve 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 system!	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.
		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 MULITPLE 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 NZs key societal issues arise from lack of financial understanding and ability to manage money. These are key skills learnt under the Accounting umbrella. The background and fundamental key accounting learning L1 provides is the basis for Level 2 Accounting and beyond. Whole classes of students coming into a specialised Level 2 without the key basics introduced in Level 1 will result in Level 2 having heightened levels of complexity and difficulty for students and the course will be appropriate only for the more academically able. I question as to what this means for our priority learners? Currently Accounting in the schools that are doing it successfully, is a subject for all, not just the top end, but is inclusive and caters for all of our learners. There seems to be a lot of emphasis on transitioning into specialities and not on equality of opportunities for all into level 2 and 3. AS a Maori teacher having subjects that help our priority learners outside of school is extremely important to me and Financial literacy is so important in helping our priority learners for life after school. By omitting Level 1 you are making Level 2 significantly more difficult and effectively ruling out large numbers of priority learners currently benefiting from having it as a subject option. How is this equitable under the treaty? I believe that there is an obligation in the treaty to help our Maori people be financially literate. I find the words "specialising at level 2" not broad but very narrow and not encompassing of all opportunities for all learners to achieve. Not all of our learners are looking to specialise and go to university.	Yes Accounting/ Financial Literacy as above
		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.
		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
	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
		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.	
		Strongly 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 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 of Commerce teachers. •There are parental expectations about these being taught at Secondary School, they are subjects that are genuinely supported by parents. •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.		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	
		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.		
	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

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

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? (refer to Table 1 above)	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?
		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.		
		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.	
		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 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 of Commerce teachers. · There are parental expectations about these being taught at Secondary School, they are subjects that are genuinely supported by parents. · 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.		
		Disagree	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.		
		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.
		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
		Undecided	Concerns that combining science and commerce will lead to more schools dropping level one entirely		Upgrading the maths and statistics standards at level 2 to eliminate/combine all the small 2 credit standards
	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		
		Strongly disagree	Economics and Accounting are significantly different, like Geography and History are. 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. Accounting and Economics are popular subject choices at our college. 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. To merge Accounting and Economics "waters down" what is currently on offer at level 1. 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.		No
		Strongly disagree	Economics and Accounting should not be combined. Its like Latin and Japanese teaching together	no	No
		Strongly disagree	Economics, Business Studies and Accounting are all stand alone areas of learning which form the foundation at Level 1 to allow students to pursue each subject at Level2/3 and eventually at University.	Specialist subjects require specialist teaching to provide students with the opportunity to pursue a specialist career pathway.	
	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.
	I'm glad that broad is bicultural	Disagree	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. - 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. - 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. - 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. All arts and science courses can investigate this and we can continue to be inspired by our histories. - 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' languages; it is a great resource for improving one's understanding of English. - 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 (post-) 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 gives students a keen lens through which to view the modern world and any culture past or present - or future. I'm also concerned that the science combo is too dumbed down for those who are passionate about eg Physics and Biology and know early on they want to understand humans this way. I understand a	See above	
	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.		
	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.
		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.
		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 loose 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.		
		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	
		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.		
	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.		
		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.	
		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.	
		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.		
		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
		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.		
	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.
		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).	/	/
		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?		
	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 compulsary 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 foudnation for pathways at Levels 2 and 3. If the intention is for food science to cover the development of new food products and bio-technology 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.
		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,		
		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		

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

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? (refer to Table 1 above)	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?
		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)	
	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
		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.		
		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 aswell. 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.	
		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 combing the subjects is best for levels 2 and 3 as it gives students the ability to prepare for university better.
		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.
	NCEA at Level 1 should be broader and at Level 2 and 2, 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.there 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 AS91383 - Analyse a Human Resource Issue. I am confident that if more teachers, students and parents understood the value that tourism provides to the NZ economy and the range of career paths available, that more students might choose to be an accountant/marketer/auditor/engineer/IP solicitor etc. in the tourism industry. Tourism 'the industry' is not just about giving people a good time on holiday, serving them flat whites, greeting them at reception or throwing them off a bridge. In the wake of Covid-19, its becoming increasingly clear how valuable the tourism industry is to New Zealand. Education needs to have a paradigm shift and it is an opportune time now to look at how we can encourage more
		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
	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
	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.	
		Disagree	It would seem a difficult jumpvto level 2 in specialist science subject and also such things as accounting and economics, as they will now inky get tou hed on generally with no real depth of understanding. This concerns me in regards to my child achieving highly in level 2 subjects		
		Strongly disagree	It's hard to teach economics, accounting AND business studies with one student	Leave the classes as is	No
		Strongly disagree	Keep the commerce subjects separate, for NCEA level 1		
		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, 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
	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
		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.	
		Agree	Not sure about the watering down of accounting. The rest look fine. Adjustment of level 2&3 content is expected in some areas.	PE should stop being compulsory at year 10. 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
		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 time. To add business studies to the equation is highly unreasonable - unfair to students and teachers.		
	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.
		Strongly disagree	Re commerce. Combining Accounting, Economics and Business studies I do not agree with. Accounting and Economics are subjects that continue through to level 3 and is 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. 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. 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.	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. 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. Agree to have science for L1	We do not know what will be available at L2/L3. What decisions will be made in the future. I will need further information.
		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.	
	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 oportunities 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
	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.	
		Strongly disagree	Science - Level 1 Physical Science & Level 1 Biological Science. General science paper doe s 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 nots 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 .
		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		
		Strongly disagree	Science, Social Science and Commerce will find it hard to prepare students for their respective specialities in Y112 & Y13	No	No
		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.
		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.	
		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.	

Released Under the Official Information Act 1982

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? (refer to Table 1 above)	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?
	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 throughout secondary school, I was easily able to understand both English and French linguistic skills (including grammar) which non-Latin students struggled with, my essays and working memory improved and, importantly, it was fascinating and fun! - New Zealand has many amazing academics who are keen to foster the interest of secondary school Latin and classics students to expand on their ability at a tertiary level. To start from scratch at a tertiary level would be a complete waste of opportunity, as well as New Zealand's amazing secondary teachers' talents - In addition to Latin, my one year of classics alone broadened my thinking in many diverse subjects related to my university degrees, including discussions of modern history, philosophy, poetry, architecture, politics and art. In seven years, although they are important subjects for many other New Zealanders, I have not used Level 2 maths or chemistry skills in my career pathway once.	As a University of Melbourne student studying a Bachelor of Arts, I felt very behind my fellow students in politics and international studies subjects. Politics and international studies are offered at a secondary level in Australia, which I think should be replicated in New Zealand. Many students in the Politics & International Studies major had plenty of experience in the discipline before their first year of university, while I had to start from scratch. The subject offers historical, philosophical and sociological lessons which fall outside the realm of history and geography - this is something I wish I could have studied earlier so that I would not feel inferior to my classmates at university. Politics is also fundamental to understanding one's place in New Zealand, as well as New Zealand's place as a global actor in the political sphere.
		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!"	
		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).		
		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.	Sidelining 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.	
		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
		Strongly disagree	The desire to combine Business Studies, Economics and Accounting into one course will in my opinon disavantage 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 disavantage 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/entrpereneurial 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 relient on entrpereneurship to drive the economy forward and generate increased wealth.	N/A	No
	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.	
		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.		
	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.
	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.		
		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.
		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 to 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.
	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
		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		
		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.	
		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.		
	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 it is that makes us all human through study of the past. This seems exactly what New Zealand needs right now, and NZACT teachers around the country are working on the front lines on our behalf in this area. Seems a shame to tell thousands (or tens of thousands?) of students around the country that something they're really interested in, and something from which they benefit greatly, isn't really worthwhile. I don't think any of us is hoping to produce a generation of drones fit only for mindless, repetitive tasks. Let's continue to encourage passionate learning.	
		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.		
		Disagree	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. 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 breading of their subjects will likely reduce their success. 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. (Also the renaming of home economics seems to reflect a lack of interest in teaching students life skills, a field which many desperately need)		
		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)	Technology will include Textiles? Further development of Food Science with both theoretical and practical applications as in PE.
	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.	
		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 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 of Commerce teachers. There are parental expectations about these being taught at Secondary School, they are subjects that are genuinely supported by parents. 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.		

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

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? (refer to Table 1 above)	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?
	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. 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.	Disagree	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. 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.	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. 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?	
		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.
	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 seperate 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.
		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 aucnoeds trade courses and pre-employment opportunities.
		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
		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	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	More commerce subjects, classics and media studies.
		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. Al going to become less relevant as time passes	Keep Economics Accounting and Business Studies seperate. Seems very anti business this change
		Strongly disagree	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. 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 engage and recognise top level students. The fundamentals of economics are being diluted by these proposals.		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.
	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 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 Studies, Art History and Latin are not. Is this simply because religious schools have pressured those making decisions to keep Religious Studies, while the other subjects do not have as much clout? I also hope that saving some money was not a consideration when removing subjects from the list or merging subjects with others. The proposed list also unnecessarily makes some subjects into winners and others into losers. Those subjects that are retained on the Level 1 list will find it easier to survive and recruit students for Levels 2 and 3 - those that are not will find it harder. It is very disappointing to me that subjects like Classical Studies, Art History, and Latin are not on the proposed subject list. These are all option subjects which a lot of students really enjoy. It is the option subjects that really engage a lot students - rather than the "core" subjects like English, Maths and Science. We should be looking at ways to increase student engagement - not doing things that are going to make it more difficult to keep students engaged. I believe that Classical Studies and Art History should be retained at Level 1 - as they provide an opportunity for the students to learn useful skills in a context that they hopefully find interesting and engaging. I also believe that it is a bad move to scrap Latin as a subject at Level 1. It would be very sad if New Zealand's education system became insular in its focus and did not offer students the same opportunities to learn about other civilizations and cultures.	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.
		Disagree	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.	Refer to previous answer about Financial Capabilities	Financial Capabilities as Achievement Standards.
	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 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.
	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)
	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.
	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 asubject 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 deoend 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.
	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 intensive 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 intensive 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.
	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
		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!
	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).
	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 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 Social Sciences, so Art History is its own area within History	
	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	•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. 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.	I have the following concerns and recommend that the Accounting, Economics and Business Studies remain as separate subjects at L1: •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 of Commerce teachers. •There are parental expectations about these being taught at Secondary School, they are subjects that are genuinely supported by parents. •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. •Both Accounting and Economics are Table B subjects for university entrance to some courses.	No
	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 consdiered? 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	

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

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? (refer to Table 1 above)	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?
		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 and many of which did it for only one year. In short, I support the idea of limiting specialisation at year 11, but we have already done that further down the system and we are suffering for it, so it is a fine balance we have to strike.	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 timetabler 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 find. Here's hoping this isn't the real reason for these proposed changes.	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 relaionships and phenomena that make up our societies.
		Disagree	A stated criterium 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.	
		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.	
	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. Accounting is a practical subject where students learn resilience, problem solving and logical thinking skills. These skills can be applied to a wide variety of pathways. It is a discipline in its own right providing students with meaningful learning and foundations for further study. The notion that Accounting can be picked up in Year 12 dismisses the fact that it requires students to learn foundations and requires practice. We often say learning accounting is similar to learning a language. Would we have French just as a two year course? Would we combine French and Spanish as a single course? International students and those who speak English as a second language make up a big percentage of our cohort. (15% of our Level 1 Accounting classes) These students need the time and space to develop their practice. These students will be at a disadvantage. Students taking Year 11 Accounting even for just one year, learn authentic life skills in financial literacy such as making financial decisions, bank reconciliations, reading financial statements. These lay foundations for citizenship and potential employment. If there is an assumption the proposal will improve educational outcomes, this current proposal will likely widen the gap as Accounting, Economics and Business studies students will not have the necessary foundations for higher levels at school, tertiary study or employment. I strongly disagree with the changes and support the status quo which is to keep Accounting, Economics and Business studies as separate disciplines.	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 overall among stakeholders"	
		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 Financial Literacy in part is taught through accounting - it is not reflected in any of the changes yet it is essential	
		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. Consequentially 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.	
		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 1are 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 subjects being taught at Secondary School. They are relevant subjects that are genuinely supported by parents and students. These subjects are very relevant to the 'real' world with real authentic learning opportunities. Given our current economic situation within New Zealand due to Covid-19 many people taking opportunities to be creative and instigate new business ideas need a broad knowledge of Accounting, Business Studies and Economics to assist them on their new pathway. These three 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. This may limit access to students and compromise authentic learning. The individual subjects play to different learner strengths. I am adamant that the status quo for Accounting, Business Studies and Economics as three individual subjects should remain.	
		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).	
		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.
	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 appropriate because it would allow schools that may not off psychology a chance to offer it briefly and present it as an option to students but adding media studies to the mix complicates the whole subject and would not allow enough depth for level 2 and 3 studies.	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.	
		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.	This an Accounting Business combine course and a separate Business Economics course would work perfectly well to prepare for Level 2 and 3 expectations	No
	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.
		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
	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.	
		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.	Please continue to keep accounting, economics and business separate. I do not see the need to merge them and could not see a cohesive way of doing so. As stated above, the need for specific knowledge has been shown in this area. It would minimise the likelihood of students taking accounting further and would decrease the skill set needed for our students.	No
	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 very odd	Strongly disagree	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 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. 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. In my own life (I am 50) Latin has allowed me to : 1 - develop a huge passion for Italy, Italian history and language 2 - be a basis for my speaking of (some) French and (semi-fluent) Italian language 3 - be able to help my children with English Grammar 4 - assist in my business and accounting career given the study or Law as part of that etc The positive impact of Latin cannot be understated	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 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. 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. In my own life (I am 50) Latin has allowed me to : 1 - develop a huge passion for Italy, Italian history and language 2 - be a basis for my speaking of (some) French and (semi-fluent) Italian language 3 - be able to help my children with English Grammar 4 - assist in my business and accounting career given the study or Law as part of that etc The positive impact of Latin cannot be understated	None at this time that I can think of
		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.
	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
		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	
		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.	
		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 indepth 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 commerce in order to become productive citizens. Learners need an opportunity to get the skills needed to go straight out into the workforce, Accounting is an important part of this.	We haven't seen the list at Levels 2 and 3 yet.
		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 seperate. Certainly review the content, there is ample opportunity to refresh and redesign the content for 21st century learners.	
		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
		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.	
		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

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

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? (refer to Table 1 above)	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?
	...but the rational 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.
		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.	
		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 has, 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
		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
		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 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.	
	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 be disrespectful to the hours of work teachers have invested into local curriculum design in the areas that are cut.	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 generic standards that could include Classical Studies or History. This will not be achieved with a history SEG alone who will look to focus directly on the history curriculum and pathways to Level 3, which, of course, is the exact opposite of broadening the curriculum (the current history standard are not usable for classics). It would likely need experts across multiple subjects to collaborate and develop 1-2 standards for each subject area. The same type of negotiated scenario could apply within the Commerce domain where perhaps each of the three areas develops one standard and a generic standard that is flexible is developed. Similarly, the connection between Social Studies and Media Studies could equally have a 50/50 split. Overall, I believe it is very important that the new matrices for Social Science enable schools to at the very least build coherent and meaningful pathways to L2 and L3. This might take the form of generic standards or the ability to create and assesses Social Science courses that include multiple subject areas. There may be other good ideas to approach this but I believe that the status quo as it stands is not feasible. We are currently reviewing curriculum and as a result of the current science, English, & Visual Arts SEG drafts we will now be seriously looking at abandoning the qualification. This is sad as many priority Maori school leavers only get this but as a Social Science Head of Faculty I could not continue to support NCEA Level 1 for building coherent pathways in our Faculty based on these subject lists.	Philosophy
		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?	
		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 belief 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	
		Agree	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.	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. I am a Deputy Principal who has subjects in their room so I am concerned for future Commerce students!	
	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 linguistic and 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 schools. Is that really seen as a suitable end goal of these NCEA changes? Personally, I think it would be a very great shame. It would ultimately result in a generation of students leaving school without the financial literacy they need for success in tertiary Commerce studies (not to mention independent living). I therefore propose that all three Commerce subjects be retained in their own right. This allows students with an interest in this field to develop their specific area/s of interest, just as those with an interest in the Arts or Languages are able to.	
		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 basing 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
	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 be 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 media studies with social studies. Your telling me that because i care about and enjoy learning about media and producing films and potentially getting into the film industry, that is around the same topic as discussing social issues like racism, criminology, and social injustice? In sorry if i just don't see the similarities between them, I'm only 17 anyway and yet have a much better understanding then you clearly do. Also, having less subjects would mean teachers who specialise in these subjects may potentially lose their job or have to reeducation and pay more money because of this. Now I know that for you government this may be what you want as its more money into your pocket, but what about those who can't afford to restudy, you already dont pay teachers enough and do you really want more adults having to go onto the unemployment benefit. The country is already struggling and trying to get back to normal and I don;t think we really need another change/thing to worry about.	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.	
	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.	
		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 Accounting and Business Studies are VERY different subjects from Economics. There is no way I have the skills to teach Accounting for example.	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 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.	
		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.	
		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.	
		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 employement opportunities in finance which utilise these skills.	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.	
		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.	
		Strongly disagree	I dislike that there are less life skill 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	
		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.	
		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
		Strongly disagree	I don't this 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 s 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.	
	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.
		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.	

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

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? (refer to Table 1 above)	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?
		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, students with greater learning needs will find it hard to pick the concepts in a hurry without year 11.	
		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.	
		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.	
	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,,	
	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.
		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.	
		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, phycology, 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, phycology, 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 benifits 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 arogant 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 person who proposed this idea did not take latin because if they did, they would not have had this idea in the first place. So why should people who are not educated in the subject be the ones to decide its fate. Classics and Art history should also not be shunted aside. They are their own subjects and are loved by the students who take them. If we have students have a passion for something we should have the right to study it. By taking these subjects away you are closing doors that we want to walk through, locking them, and throwing away the keys. Although the latin community is not as large as the other languages we still deserve a place! Accounting should be its own subject. Media studies and phycology should be there own subjects and not just buried at the very bottom of the sociology class.	Latin should be kept.
	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.
	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.	I think psychology would be really good, as would marketing (I know some is covered in business studies).
	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.
		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.
		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 🕶☐
		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 Bussiness 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 Bussiness 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
		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.	
	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 NCEA completely, and seek other assessment models instead.	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.
	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 than 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.	
		Strongly disagree	In regard to the combination of Accounting, Economics and Business into one subject Commerce.	•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
	I was aware and I 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 some 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	
		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.
		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?	
	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 off 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.
		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 models and vice-versa disadvantaging the students taking the proposed changes. this proposal is terrible and would just turn students away from the 'subject'. At level 2 students will be disadvantaged and stressed resulting in students mental health suffering as a result as many nights will be spent studying and students will become more anxious about getting good grades and understanding content. there is NO reason for the proposed change. It makes ZERO sense and would only damage the well-being of students and add to the stress of both students and teachers. this 'change' should NEVER happen as it is AWFUL and ASHAMEFULL to economics, business studies and accounting	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
	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.
		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 is fundamental to understanding). Therefore these subjects should not be merged at level one.	Philosophy Politics & Civics

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

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? (refer to Table 1 above)	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?
		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 related to household financial issues and the new curriculum is looking to take this support away. The 3 subjects are very different. This would be similar to combining Music, Visual Art and Drama and calling it "Art" and I can imagine the outcry over that. If the philosophy is to delay specialisation then why is it only "Commerce" subjects being combined? Arguably Science is as well but Level 1 Science courses already teach standards from Biology, Physics and Chemistry.	
		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
	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.	
		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.	
		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 contstraints.	
		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 ritore "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.	-
		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 specializing 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 year at Year 11. Many of my students have been of average academic ability or International students with little English. Taking them through the foundations of Accounting and seeing them specialize at level 2 and 3 has given many a much better chance to succeed. Like a language Accounting takes time for many students to fully understand and practice. My own son completed L1 Accounting last year and it is has become his passion. A hybrid commerce course would have been less engaging for him as he already had this experience of this in Year 10. The current NCEA structure in Accounting allows us to capture our students interest as we lay the foundations in Level 1. This includes key financial literacy skills. Their confidence grows in L2 Accounting as they specialise and by L3 they are able to extend their learning to a wider context. The skills learnt in L1 Accounting include the key competencies of the NZC. Not every school chooses to offer L1 Accounting, however for those who can and for those whose students demand it, why would we deny our students the opportunity to learn about such a vital discipline in our society?	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.	
		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
		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.
		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.	
	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
		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
	SUBMISION From: Tourism Export Council of New Zealand By:Lynda Keene, Chief Executive Email:lynda@tourismexportcouncil.org.nz •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. •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. •TECNZ has always been a strong proponent of educating students (and parents) on the benefit of tourism as a valuable and credible career path and have been concerned about perception issues of tourism at schools that tourism is not valued profession or career industry. Yes, and we appreciate the review is happening. TECNZ supports NCEA at Level 2 and 3 provides greater specialisation and that Achievement Standards are incorporated as a recognized qualification/achievement.	Strongly agree	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. 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.	Yes. 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.	Yes. 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. 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 Human Resource Issue. I am happy to discuss any of these issues further. We fully support and endorse MoE to place a higher weighting on tourism as a serious career path and that Achieve Standards be incorporated back into the curriculum.
		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	
		Strongly disagree	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. 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. We appreciate this change may be suitable for smaller schools who struggle to gain the numbers and interest for Health and PE, however we feel the choice to either combine or remain separate subjects would cater for the needs of all schools and serve as the best solution. Rangitoto College Physical Education and Health Department	Physical Education and Health> combining as one Subject area. 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. 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. Rangitoto College Physical Education and Health Department	
		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).
		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	
		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.	
		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
		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.	
		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.	
		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 are 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.	
	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.
	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	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 loose 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	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.	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
		Strongly disagree	There are some good combinations of subject areas such as Sciences , PE and Health History and Classics which has been proven to work. However, Commerce and Social Studies do not! 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.	Removing Accounting does not make sense. 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. There are rich and relevant contexts with very little overlaps with other subjects. Basic Numeracy skills are reinforced in authentic, meaningful contexts. The subject supports very coherent and robust pathways into NCEA Level 2 and further study or training. Over 10,000 students enrolled in an External Examination for Level 1 Accounting in 2019 yet Koreen had only 81 and yet that is continuing as a very specialised subject. This would indicate that the demand for Accounting has not been respected.	

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

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? (refer to Table 1 above)	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?
		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 subjectsat Level 1 to help cover this basic need for all young adults to be financially literate	
	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.	
	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.	
		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
	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.
	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 students 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 taken the course the previous year). Yet, we continue to have very high pass rates in both these subjects. This strongly suggests that the knowledge required for History and Geography at Level 1 is no more foundational than other Social Science subjects. Instead, this is a reflection of a conservative and traditional prioritization of student knowledge by the panel selecting the subjects (criteria 1).	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 knowledge that better reflects high school curriculum choice from the 1970s. Instead, we suggest that the Ministry focus on developing high-quality standards across all Social Science subjects which focus on key skills and concepts that uphold the New Zealand Curriculum Social Science statement of intent, while allowing students to build subject-specific knowledge which is of interest and relevance to them and their community.	
		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
		Disagree	Very concerned about the loss of Accounting and EConomics at level1	Would like to see Accounting and Economics retained individually at level1	fine
		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.	
		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.	
	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.
		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
	Really unsure what the Ministry of Education is hoping to achieve by the changes they are suggesting.	Strongly disagree	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.	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. 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. 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. 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 everyone back a whole year in their learning?	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 drafter by someone who is not concerned about the future at all.	please do not change any thing 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
		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.	
	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!	
	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 yetplan 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 combines 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 representives met with you and this was never mentioned. So no!
		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 todays 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 aAchievement 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 decisios that will impact on their future eg. use of Kiwisaver, raising of mortgages and loans and hire purchase and rental situations.
		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
		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).
	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
		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
		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 interanl 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. I believe the status quo for Accounting, Economics and Business as individual subjects, should remain.	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. •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 of Commerce teachers. •There are parental expectations about these being taught at Secondary School, they are subjects that are genuinely supported by parents. •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.	Can we even assume Accounting Economics and Business studies will be included in this list. They should be.
		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 the course.	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 advise 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.
	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.
	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 & 3. My rationale for this is that the method of questioning and the content / knowledge taught in Business Studies in NCEA is at a very low level compared with other international examination systems (IB & Cambridge). I've had students sit Business Papers at level 2 and pass them without being taught the content in class or preparing for the standard at all - they sat it accidentally when we entered them in standards and then did not teach it in class due to numerous reasons. They were NOT my top students in any way, shape or form and that they could pass (some with merit) without any teaching or learning on the standard has concerned me deeply with regards the nature of the assessment and content for the Business Studies course. 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. Financial Literacy needs to be compulsory at some level in high school. If not level 1, then where and when?	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.
		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

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

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? (refer to Table 1 above)	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?
	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 Business Studies.
		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 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 separate Accounting, Economics and Business Studies course as this best suits their ākonga. Externally assessed examinations must be retained as a choice of assessment option at Level 1. There is nothing wrong with the current NCEA set-up which provides sufficient flexibility to meet the learning needs of all ākonga in New Zealand provided schools implement in the correct spirit that the NZ curriculum was intended. Rather than proposing a complete change of the curriculum and standards (by abandoning some subject specific standards at Level 1), we suggest some fine tuning of the current assessment matrix, which should be supported by significant teacher resources and professional development. The new standards could be offered in addition to subject-specific content-based standards, but schools need to have more agency in terms of what standards they offer their ākonga, and how they are to be assessed. We believe retaining genuine external examinations is an important part of a valid assessment mix. Key findings in the Best Evidence Synthesis Iteration (BES) - Effective pedagogy in Social Sciences - make it clear that there are four mechanisms which support Social Sciences pedagogy. The four mechanisms, connection, alignment, community and interest are vital to good teaching and learning. What seems to be glaringly missing from the new opportunities provided for Level 1 is Alignment. Alignment is important in teaching as students need to be able to relate experiences to important outcomes. The outcome opportunities significantly decrease when the Social Sciences collapses from 10 subjects to 5. Teachers currently work hard to provide a range of opportunities for students across a broad set of curriculum areas within the Social Sciences. This means there are engaged, active students who are provided with rich learning opportunities to develop into full participants of the New Zealand economy. This is a key outcome of the New Zealand curriculum. It is disappointing that particularly the combination of Commerce has occured when so much research and rhetoric has suggested that Financial competencies/ capabilities is a much needed addition to students' toolbox of life. Furthermore, these changes assume that teachers have the skills and knowledge to create multi-discipline, interconnect curriculums at Level 1. While there is acknowledgement that many of the teachers in the profession are capable - some collapsed subjects require specific skills which do not lend themselves to others. For example, there are some shared understandings within Media and Social Studies but some specific knowledge particularly around media production is foreign to most Senior Social Studies teachers.	The comprehensive submission above details our strong opposition to the proposed changes to creating one commerce subject at Level 1	Financial capability
		Strongly disagree	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. 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 "preforming arts" subject. 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.	I strongly disagree with combining accounting, business studies and economics at level 1 for the following reasons: 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 preforming 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. 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. 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.	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.
	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 students unprepared for level 2. Consequentially this could then weaken the learning at Level 2 and Level 3. 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. We cannot understand why Economics, Accounting and Business Studies would be combined while these others are not. 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. Many students currently choose one of the three subjects without choosing the others, 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. Meaning students miss out on finding these passions. 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, not make it broader, as teachers would have to teach less content from each subject in order to fit them all into a year. If there is a desire to reduce assessment through these changes, we wish to also point out this is an ineffective means of doing so. Many courses already only offer 4 standards in a year, so combining Accounting, Economics and Business Studies at level 1 would not reduce the assessment load for students. More effective would be to reduce the number of standards available in each subject - across all of level 1 NCEA.	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 students unprepared for level 2. Consequentially this could then weaken the learning at Level 2 and Level 3. 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. We cannot understand why Economics, Accounting and Business Studies would be combined while these others are not. 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. Many students currently choose one of the three subjects without choosing the others, 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. Meaning students miss out on finding these passions. 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, not make it broader, as teachers would have to teach less content from each subject in order to fit them all into a year. If there is a desire to reduce assessment through these changes, we wish to also point out this is an ineffective means of doing so. Many courses already only offer 4 standards in a year, so combining Accounting, Economics and Business Studies at level 1 would not reduce the assessment load for students. More effective would be to reduce the number of standards available in each subject - across all of level 1 NCEA. If the review aims to enable schools to develop a strong, localized curriculum, we wish to point out that mandating schools must combine Accounting, Business Studies and Economics actually removes potential for a localized curriculum. Schools are currently able to do this if they wish within the current NCEA framework, if this better suits their school community. However the changes would remove the ability for schools to offer the three subjects separately, if that is what better suits their school community.	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?
	Not happy about it though. I'm particularly concerned that it is the intention to move it up to Level 2 in time. Until we end up with a curriculum that has no specialized knowledge and is all general "skills". My reading of the educational research is that to learn high level skills you need a high level context, and that isn't given by generalized units. Just as you don't get to be a good plumber by learning about carpentry, you don't get to be good at economics by having a mish-mash of accounting and business thrown at you. You instead get low level thinking about economics, accounting and business. Despite what many people believe, the world is "increasingly" specialized. "General skills" won't get you most jobs -- you need specific skills. Government is staff full of people with general degrees, so they tend to exaggerate how useful that is, but that is misleading. If NZ is to lead the world in STEM and business and the rest, then generalizing education is the wrong way to be heading. A person who does Chemistry at Level 1 is always going to have a head start over one who does mixed Science. A person who starts accounting early will be advantaged over one who starts late. Note, that this isn't to suggest students need to specialize early. One advantage of NCEA over the rest of the world is that it is possible to do Chemistry and French and Sports Studies up to the end of school. It is good that students aren't locked in to science or arts or technology at 15. But what they do inside their chosen subjects should be high level thinking, which is not gained by mixing topics from too broad an area.	Undecided			
	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 unalike 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			
	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		-	-
	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 and 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.
	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
	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, Accounting and Economics in Social Studies. At Level 1 akonga must take English, Maths and Science which makes up a full programme. The individual student's learning is focused in a narrow disciplinary range. With more subject options available to a limited number of students, some subjects have small student numbers. With the proposed reduction in number of subjects in a student's NCEA programme, the proposed subject list seems likely to have the effect of retaining a similar kind of balance between disciplines and subjects as exists currently. I understand the rationale around making Level 1 NCEA more broad. I believe the push for students to choose a career is happening too early (year 10-11) and this shapes subject choices throughout NCEA. We must remember that subjects have benefits beyond preparing students for a career in the field. For example, in Dance students learn to think creatively, work co-operatively, develop emotional intelligence and empathy, use self-discipline and many other "soft skills" that are applicable across all occupations and industries. Science is compulsory for all Level 1 students, however not all L1 students will go on to become scientists. Broadening Level 1 NCEA will support students to develop a wider range of skills and experience beyond that required	Agree	As above.	As above.	It is of utmost importance that curriculum subjects are all retained all NCEA levels.
	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		
	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?		
	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?
	But I did not realize this would meant 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.		

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

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? (refer to Table 1 above)	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?
	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
	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.		
	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.	
	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?
	There are equity issues here - some subjects have become a lot more broad that 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 that 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
	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.	
	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 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.	
	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
	I think the changes are good I feel it gets rid of some subjects that require students to specialize too early eg accounting And also bring some subject that need to be brought in to be at Level 1 Great that subjects like Latin that drain staffing and are under subscribed are going - makes it easier for schools to make decisions around this	Strongly agree		Good that Latin and accounting are going ... very future focused	Environmental studies
	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 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.We request additional information on the rationale behind this proposal, and where the initial idea was founded.	Strongly disagree		I believe the status quo for Accounting, Economics and Business as individual subjects, should remain.	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..	
	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		We would like to express our concern about the proposal to combine Level 1 Economics, Accounting and Business Studies into one subject Commerce. 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. 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. We believe the status quo for Accounting, Economics and Business Studies as individual subjects, should remain. Our other concerns are: • 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. • Lack of consideration of the number of students choosing this as a pathway • A concern over where will students get their foundational Accounting knowledge (currently taught in L1) • The skills and knowledge across these three subjects is very different. • We have increased numbers in all three subjects and levels • A combined Level 1 course has the potential to become surface level teaching in order to attain breadth of content across three subjects • This proposal is in contrast to the nationwide concern about the lack of student financial capabilities. This does not align with the vision of the NZ Curriculum document: "who, in their school years, will continue to develop the values, knowledge, and competencies that will enable them to live full and satisfying lives".	
	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 combing 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 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	
	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
	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
	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.	
	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
	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.
	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.
	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. I cannot see history teachers being able to do the subject justice, especially when they have a background in NZ history and know nothing of Greek or Roman culture. How can a history teacher with no understanding of the ancient world suddenly discuss the socio-political and cultural impact, the significance of the ancient world on modern society? History already has a plethora of topics to cover in class. After all, they have a wider perspective in focusing on events in world history. They do not need to use ancient events analyse, interpret or evaluate in isolation. Classics is a subject that requires a certain level of subject knowledge and pedagogy that history teachers simply do not have.	No.
	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
	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.	

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

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? (refer to Table 1 above)	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?
	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) This will have a negative impact on student's numbers and therefore teaching numbers. There is concern around maintaining our profession of Commerce teachers. There are parental expectations about these being taught at Secondary School, they are subjects that are genuinely supported by parents. 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.	See previous comments. I believe Accounting, Economics and Business should be kept separate.
	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.
	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 seperate.	No
	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.
	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
	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 to create broad, foundational, disciplinary-focused course that will ensure NZ's young people receive the rich, coherent education to which they are entitled, instead of a set of genericised courses, devoid of coherent knowledge, and ignorant of the *cognitive* science evidence about how people learn.	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.
	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.	
	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 combination of a general Social Science subject where standards assess skills and understanding from a variety of subject areas could be established.	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.
	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.		
	Accounting, Economics and Business Studies (Entreprenuership) are separate subjects and should be kept as such.	Disagree	Accounting and Economics and Business Studies should be keep 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 ENTREPRENUERSHIP (BUSINESS STUDIES) - we are a global economy where knowidge and skills in the 3 separat areas are tecognized - NCEA NZQA should do this to.	
	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
	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 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.
	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.	
	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 equished 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.
	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	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.	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. 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). 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 students are unable to rise to the status of experts in these specialised subjects, the future impact on New Zealand's economic strength will be huge.	As stated below if you want to improve the validity of NCEA (and the fall in our international rankings both relatively and absolutely. 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.
	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.	Strongly disagree	I strongly oppose the combination of Accounting, Economics and Business Studies at Level 1 becoming Commerce because: 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 learning outcomes, knowledge and skills which would not be covered in a combined subject. There are currently 19 Level 1 achievement standards across the 3 courses; with a combined course there is no opportunity to formally assess or permit specific knowledge 5.The proposal will result in a surface learning approach rather than a rich, deep and meaningful learning experience that students currently have and enjoy and will result in the transition to higher learning levels being more challenging for many students. 6.This proposal will not improve educational outcomes but rather widen the gap which impacts academic rigor at level 1. More schools will make up their own courses or move to Cambridge or IB.	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. 2. Science - this is taking away choices students want to have at Level 1 and has similar reasons as the 3 Commerce courses. 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? 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?	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.	
	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.	
	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 in flexible the whole thing smacks of cost cutting and penny pinching with no thought to the actual logisitics 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	
	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.	
	*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 practise is very unfair. It also leaves very little time for planning. *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? * 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. * 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?	Disagree	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, language study is not always vocational. In other words, the rationale and the approach do not match.	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.	

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

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? (refer to Table 1 above)	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?
	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 along-side 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 MEDIOCRATY. 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.
	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.	
	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 made informed decision later on regarding running businesses and understanding economic policy. A vastly pared back 'Commerce' will not allow students to gain the base 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 - downgrading Accounting at school will lead to less following this career path. All three Commerce subjects provide clear career paths linked to tertiary education, and well paid jobs and ownership of businesses that employ others - why downgrade these subjects at school and weaken these links?	
	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 specialization is a stupid argument to justify lower standards being reached at the end of Year 13. Dumbing down - NOT IN THE MISTRY'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 already pose barriers to success.	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 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 serach for alternative one year courses at Year 13 or worse - LEAVE.
	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. FI 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
	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. The notion that Accounting can be picked up by "Most" is false. Teachers of NCEA Level 1 Accounting, (and with Economics and Business) teach "foundations" to a range of abilities. This includes less engaged students, refugees, International students, ESOL, SAC students etc.... and these students need time to develop the practical skills and lay the foundations for further study. (Akin to learning a language). L1 Accounting includes students who do accounting at just level 1 and use it to complement their other studies or for employment or as a life skill. 4. What we have now already supports school to create a well designed and coherent local curricula. A one size fits all approach to a single course at NCEA L1, restricts the ability of schools to design courses which supports individual learners. School that can offer courses in Economics, Accounting and/or Business should be allowed to do so. Some school offer hybrid courses to suit their cohort/community. The suite of subjects that we currently have, allows flexibility, which is one of the pillars of NCEA. The current system provides flexibility and opportunities for our students to thrive. 5. There is a demand for each of Economics, Accounting and Business studies at level 1. The numbers of external entries in L1 sees Economics 6th highest ranked subject, Accounting at 9th and Business at 13th. Internal entries are: Eco 19th, Bus, 18th and Accounting 15th.(Provided by CETA) When there are 36 subjects, these are pretty solid numbers. As option choices widen at L2, these numbers will naturally fall, but should not restrict choice at Level 1. If schools do not have sufficient numbers or sufficient staff to teach the 3 separate disciplines, then they can already create their own courses. (See point 4), however this should not be at the detriment to those schools who have staff and the demand from students to do L1 Economics, Accounting and/or Business. 6. How the change supports Te Tiriti O Waitangi The current subjects as they are already support values and teachings connected to the Treaty. Business for example teaches many Maori concepts as does Economics with resource use. I have taught a number of Maori students who have done Accounting at level 1 and have needed the foundations at level 1 and the time to practice. Without level 1 Accounting, we are cutting off a potential and lucrative pathway for our Maori students. Some of whom will go on to use these skills at Whanau, Iwi and national level. 7. The current subjects as they stand already supports the credibility of NCEA as a qualification. Teaching Accounting, Economics and Business at level 1 gives a deep rich understanding of these disciplines. A watered down level 1 course will put our students on the back foot when moving to L2, L3 and subsequently to tertiary education. (Compared to History or Geography, Dance or Drama). Many of my students have told me that they go back to the foundations in Economics and Accounting learnt at level 1 after leaving school and even in work. Furthermore, Economics, Accounting and/or Business courses at Level1 are sought by International pupils. In our school, due to the language barrier, these students need time to learn Accounting and/or Economics. By year 13 most of our students flourish. Our international market may be jeopardised if these students cannot get a hold of the basics at level 1 and have options cut off.	
	Waikato CETA Branch Submission 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. Waikato CETA have a number of specific concerns which are addressed below. 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. 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 how, why and what of these changes we cannot support them in any form. Regards. Waikato CETA	Strongly disagree	Waikato CETA Branch Submission 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. Waikato CETA have a number of specific concerns which are addressed below.	Increased Specialisation 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? Lack of detail and delivery of Level Two and Three courses 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 from the proposed Level One changes can be evaluated effectively without understanding what Level Two and Three will look like. The construct of these courses and what they will contain will significantly influence what standards are being taught, in what order and in what context. With a focus on report writing and internal standards the jump to Level Two and Three and therefore the flow on effect for Universities in NZ is unknown. This feels like the cart is being put before the horse, and these changes are being done in isolation to Level Two and Three. Is the best choice for our akonga and their further studies? Academic Subject and Teacher Retention Economics, Accounting and Business Studies are academic subjects for academic students. Students often choose these subjects as it allows them the opportunity to challenge themselves academically but in a real world context. This allows them to develop real world skills for their chosen career paths. By narrowing the exposure to these subjects by focussing on breadth rather than depth of knowledge, it is denying them the opportunity to specialise early and we feel that this in turn will force these students into other academic subjects and reduce student numbers entering our subjects, which in turn will have significant flow on effects at Level Two and Three. This ultimately is a major cause of concern for teacher retention in these subjects, as the staffing requirements for the proposed combined course may result in teachers leaving the profession due to an unwillingness to teach across multiple subjects (IE: teachers may not have the breadth of knowledge across all three subjects to be able to teach at the standard required). This again will add to teacher workload, not decrease it, as teachers will be required to rewrite resources and course outlines and retrain in other subject areas. There needs to be a consideration of the professional learning required with regards to both content and assessment literacy. This upskilling doesn't happen overnight, and shouldn't happen while students are being guinea pigs with new assessment standards and methods. Building Blocks of Business There is an overwhelming sense that the design of this new "Commerce" course is a push towards a business studies focused course. Waikato CETA feel that economics and accounting are the building blocks upon which business is founded. Therefore a move away from a specific course is removing these foundations blocks and the required detail to fully appreciate business ideas/concepts as a whole. You cannot explain productivity without understanding the concept of supply and linking this to accounting processes. Lifelong Learners Financial capabilities and the understanding of business concepts promotes lifelong learners with respect to financial capabilities and the fundamentals of business. This watering down of Level One does not support these basic concepts, that are already lacking amongst a number of youth today.	NA
	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?	
	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 numbers and therefore teaching numbers. There is concern around maintaining our profession of Commerce teachers. There are parental expectations about these being taught at Secondary School, they are subjects that are genuinely supported by parents. 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.	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 numbers and therefore teaching numbers. There is concern around maintaining our profession of Commerce teachers. There are parental expectations about these being taught at Secondary School, they are subjects that are genuinely supported by parents. 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.	
	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.
	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
	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 Agribusiness fit in. At the moment Agribusiness 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.
	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.
	this was a shock to me - who has decided that Acounting, Economics and Business Studies aren't important enough to amalagmate 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 excternally in 2019. How can you justify the reason for reducing these subjects.	I would like to see you bring all three business/comemerce 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.
	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.

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

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? (refer to Table 1 above)	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?
	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.

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

Commerce

Do not cluster commerce subjects

- Clustering the commerce and science subjects together can cause some trouble; not cluster science together (III
- The new Commerce curriculum becomes a stand-alone curriculum area rather than as adjunct to Social Sciences;
- Business Studies, Economics and Accounting should not be combined into Commerce; (IIIII-II
    - Not being able to go in depth in the subject and just dabbing at the surface just makes it a waste of time for the students;

- Abolishing three subjects – Economics, Accounting and Business and forcing them into Commerce. Students in L1 will learn only a third of what they are learning.
- Commerce – the proposal will not provide students with the foundations on knowledge to pursue diversity and the understanding to cope up with L2 and L3.
    - 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;
- 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'

Insufficient information provided

- There is not enough information provided to assess the changes and effect on the commerce subjects;

Agrees with the combination

- Likes the combination to form Commerce; (I
- Support the combination of accounting into commerce – include personal budgeting and financial literacy;
- Agree with the streamlining of Commerce;
    - There is not enough information provided to assess the changes and effect on commerce subjects;
- Another approach for broader foundational knowledge is to have commerce course in junior years that is set as a compulsory option;
- Agree with broadening - 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).

Student Demand

- Greater demand for Accounting and Commerce;

- 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.

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

- 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?
- 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.
-

Foundational Learning

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.

Teacher Expertise

- The change in commerce will be difficult for smaller schools, no specialist teachers;

Cambridge and IB

- 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.

Lack of Consistency

- 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.
- 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.
- Commerce subjects have been unfairly targeted, combining them while other subjects (the Arts for example) remain stand alone subjects.

Pathways

- 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 year at Year 11.

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

Many of my students have been of average academic ability or International students with little English. Taking them through the foundations of Accounting and seeing them specialize at level 2 and 3 has given many a much better chance to succeed. Like a language Accounting takes time for many students to fully understand and practice. My own son completed L1 Accounting last year and it is has become his passion. A hybrid commerce course would have been less engaging for him as he already had this experience of this in Year 10. The current NCEA structure in Accounting allows us to capture our students interest as we lay the foundations in Level 1. This includes key financial literacy skills. Their confidence grows in L2 Accounting as they specialise and by L3 they are able to extend their learning to a wider context. The skills learnt in L1 Accounting include the key competencies of the NZC. Not every school chooses to offer L1 Accounting, however for those who can and for those whose students demand it, why would we deny our students the opportunity to learn about such a vital discipline in our society?"

- 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.
-

Subjects are Different

- 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.
- 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).

Student Choice

- 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."
- - 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)
- "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

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

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 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. Accounting is a practical subject where students learn resilience, problem solving and logical thinking skills. These skills can be applied to a wide variety of pathways. It is a discipline in its own right providing students with meaningful learning and foundations for further study. The notion that Accounting can be picked up in Year 12 dismisses the fact that it requires students to learn foundations and requires practice. We often say learning accounting is similar to learning a language. Would we have French just as a two year course? Would we combine French and Spanish as a single course? International students and those who speak English as a second language make up a big percentage of our cohort. (15% of our Level 1 Accounting classes) These students need the time and space to develop their practice. These students will be at a disadvantage. Students taking Year 11 Accounting even for just one year, learn authentic life skills in financial literacy such as making financial decisions, bank reconciliations, reading financial statements. These lay foundations for citizenship and potential employment. If there is an assumption the proposal will improve educational outcomes, this current proposal will likely widen the gap as Accounting, Economics and Business studies students will not have the necessary foundations for higher levels at school, tertiary study or employment. I strongly disagree with the changes and support the status quo which is to keep Accounting, Economics and Business studies as separate disciplines."
- 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.
- 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

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

one subject is a good idea because later on down the track, students can still choose to pick up specific sciences if they desire.

- 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.

- 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.

Transition to L2 and L3

- 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.

- 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.

- "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."

- We are concerned that 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.

Students getting disengaged

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

- 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.

- 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 models and vice-versa disadvantaging the students taking the proposed changes. this proposal is terrible and would just turn students away from the 'subject'.

Different content

- Each course has very different and distinct learning outcomes, knowledge and skills which would not be covered in a combined subject. There are currently 19 Level 1 achievement standards across the 3 courses; with a combined course there is no opportunity to formally assess or permit specific knowledge.

The proposal will result in a surface learning approach rather than a rich, deep and meaningful learning experience that students currently have and enjoy and will result in the transition to higher learning levels being more challenging for many students.

- 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. 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 engage and recognise top level students. The fundamentals of economics are being diluted by these proposals."

- 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.

- "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. For example combining accounting, business studies and economics into a 'commerce' subject at level 1, makes about as much sense as combining dance,

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

drama and music into one ""preforming arts"" subject. 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."

- 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.

Cambridge and IB

This proposal will not improve educational outcomes but rather widen the gap which impacts academic rigor at level 1. More schools will make up their own courses or move to Cambridge or IB."

Financial Literacy

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 excternally in 2019. How can you justify the reason for reducing these subjects."

. 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 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.

NCEA Credibility

- Accounting, Business Studies and Economics, as three separate and distinct subjects, support the credibility of NCEA as a qualification overall among stakeholders.
  A watered down course called Commerce means very little to the majority of stakeholders.
- 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.
-

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

Accounting SEG meeting notes

Comments

- Accounting is useful for every student, especially Level 1 Accounting
    - People going into admin roles gain some understanding
    - It is useful for the Brethren community (who often don't go to university)
- The more commerce students can do the better
- Accounting contains a lot of real life skills – budgeting, spreadsheets, etc – financial literacy and understanding
- The proposed merger would likely turn accounting into a subject for purely academic learners
- There is an obligation to Māori to support growth of financial literacy under the Treaty
- COVID-19 showed why the flexibility in subject choices is important for students
- The merger would probably increase equity issues between schools
- There is concern from Accounting point of view – the Business Studies financial statements are very basic and the combined subject would probably not cover statements to the extent needed
- Not every "Commerce" teacher is confident teaching accounting
- The merger would probably result in the number of students who take it at a higher level dropping
- The note about Accounting's place in Commerce was unclear but suggested it would not really be in the combined subject, but without providing a clear reason

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

Notes taken at SEG meeting

Question

Will Business Studies have to be broader at level 2 to support transitions for students?

Comments

- There are different learners in each of the subject – don't just rely on student numbers data. These even apply within combined courses now
- Need to see good information about learners – at curriculum levels 7 and 8
- With a combined subject, students may miss some learning
- The combined subject would likely miss out on some leaners – those who don't like business studies, econ, or accounting may not take the subject
- If the subject is combined – it needs to make sure there is enough learning for students to experience enough of subjects to make valid choices for future learning
- It would dilute a lot of the theory in econ if the subjects were merged
- Some schools have Enterprise subject at year 10
- Teachers are trying to provide more diverse pathways from level 1, this could limit that
- Some teachers are excited by this opportunity, and believe it could offer all learners a chance to explore the full range of subjects at Level 1

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

Economics SEG notes

- Some people's jobs are on the line with this proposed change
- NCEA already has flexibility in commerce where schools can create a range of courses, including combined courses if appropriate
- NCEA is about flexibility to suit local curricula – this change would undermine that
- Most schools do not offer all three, and instead focus on providing the subjects which best support their students.
- Many schools and students value the specific subjects at Level 1
- There are fundamental differences between the subjects
- Teachers who have tried combining them have struggled, students have not learned what they need to, and many have gone back to individual subjects
- International and "average" students need the foundation of Accounting particularly, which would likely specifically suffer from a combined subject

Released under the Official Information Act 1982