

## ISTANZ Survey results – NCEA (girls, boys, co-ed = order of data)

|   |                                      |   |                                     |                           |   |
|---|--------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|---|
| 1. How have you found the work load for level one?  | Greatly Increased<br>22,11, 3<br>51% | Moderately Increased<br>13, 12,4<br>40% | No change<br>3, 0, 2<br>7%          | Less<br>1, 0, 0<br>1%     | Rewriting/writing tasks and assessments, meetings, marking and recording, formative and summative assessments, training time, reassessments, reworking programmes, training students to write appropriate answers, especially TIC of subjects     |
| 2. How have you found the quality of standards provided on the website?   | Excellent<br>0, 1, 0<br>1%           | Reasonable<br>8, 5, 4<br>40%            | Average<br>15, 9, 2<br>35%          | Poor<br>14, 8, 3<br>35%   | Mistakes, errors, inconsistencies, tasks and assessment schedules not rigorously proofed, versions differ, out of date, non-existent, not enough, vague, too loosely worded, differences between exemplars and exam, criteria not tightly defined |
| 3. How have you found the process for enrolling students?<br>(many stated they had little to do with this activity)   | Excellent<br>1, 1, 3<br>7%           | Reasonable<br>6, 2, 6<br>18%            | Average<br>11, 5, 3<br>27%          | Complex<br>5, 1, 1<br>10% | Used Classroom Manager, used Musac, HOD did it, very time consuming esp checking each entry, lack of communication with NZQA once data exported- too late when problems found, better to wait til mid year, school well set up for this admin     |
| 4. Are you aware of your school having any difficulties with the admin of the external exams at the end of last year?<br>(many replied that they were not involved) | No problems<br>6, 6, 7<br>25%        | One or two problems<br>15, 10, 5<br>43% | A lot of problems<br>3, 0, 1<br>10% |                           | A few minor problems, rooming issues, entries still messed up by term 4, time consuming matching every student with standards they sit  |
|   |                                      |   |                                     |                           |   |

|  |  |                                |                             |                         |   |
|--|--|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|---|
| 5. How have you found the training for NCEA to date?                                       | Excellent<br>2, 0, 2<br>6%   | Quite good<br>11, 6, 5<br>21%  | Average<br>14, 12, 5<br>44% | Poor<br>9, 7, 4<br>28%  | Good opportunity to discuss problems, unfocussed, argumentative, too much talking and retalking issues, negative discussion, poorly resourced, weak facilitators who didn't know what they were doing, insufficient info prior to day, many teachers not focussed and come ill prepared, utterly useless, variable, too late for this year, level 3 too late in year, excellent, especially level 2 chemistry, gained a lot, one day is not training! Not last day of term. Need more practical hands on activities. Lot of wasted time. Several mentions of excellent work done by Cheryl Harvey as dedicated and hardworking advisor. |
| 6 Do you feel level 2 resources are ready and at a reasonable standard?                    | Excellent<br>1, 0, 0<br>1%   | Quite good<br>5, 1, 4<br>14%   | Average<br>10, 11, 6<br>24% | Poor<br>18, 5, 8<br>43% | Not available to acceptable standard, external ok, nothing for externals, some exemplars not available, insufficient, severely restricts teacher organisation, useless, good chemistry, not ready when wanted, internals being rewritten- still waiting, out of date already, still being modified, excellent, so far so good.  |
| 7. Does your school have a good policy and admin structure for the implementation of NCEA? | Excellent<br>19, 7, 8<br>47%   | Quite good<br>13, 3, 11<br>38% | Average<br>3, 0, 2<br>7%    | Poor<br>0<br>0%         | Excellent, good, takes a lot of time to develop and maintain skills required to access and understand policy, good intra net system   |
| 8 What are your views on the appointing of Excellent, Merit and                            | Discrepancies between subjects-some under/over represented in excellence, huge range included in merit-no distinction between nearly top and just made it, lumping lots of students in merit, unfair results for individuals, getting excellence too difficult, questions should indicate whether they are for |                                |                             |                         |   |

|  |   |                               |                                |   |   |
|--|---|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|---|---|
| Achieved passes?   | Ex, M or A, weird, vague, too broad, markers reasoning in externals a mystery, waffly marking schedules, too pedantic marking, poor tasks, a negative system, poor moderation of internals- very variable quality, concept good, no ranking. Infinitely better than S.Cert – not predetermined, indifferent, OK. External schedules not available yet. Weaker students disheartened with lots of NA. Able students denied excellence for nit picking reasons. |                               |                                |   |   |
| 9 Has your school experienced difficulties with the clash of school trips and activities and timetabling of assessments? | A lot<br>9, 1, 7<br>24%   | Some<br>18, 6, 16<br>56%      | Very little<br>4, 2, 0<br>8%   | Hard to plan for vast range of student activities and assessments, will kill field trips, could get worse, has always been the case, especially with such fragmented learning, especially end of year level 2-may lead to loss of camps, no change, not that I am aware of, will be worse next year |   |
| 10 How did you find the quality of the level one external standards in your subject area?                                | Very fair<br>5, 2, 3<br>10%   | Reasonable<br>12, 4, 5<br>21% | Inconsistent<br>9, 3, 7<br>19% | Poor<br>4, 0, 2<br>6%   | Unclear standards, expectations need to be clearly defined, open to interpretation, very variable, judgements not qualified, testing writing skills not science, different questions had varying level of difficulty for same grade, some try to be too clever, maths probability standard shocking- poorly worded question affects results as exams so short, will work with what's given, a bit broad |
| 11 How did you find the quality of marking of the external Level One standards in your subject area?                     | Very fair<br>5, 1, 1<br>7%  | Reasonable<br>9, 3, 9<br>21%  | Inconsistent<br>7, 3, 4<br>14% | Poor<br>0, 0, 0<br>0%   | No marking rationale provided on papers, a mystery, marking schedules came out too late, cant comment-no marking schedules, German- external higher standard required than internals. Bio 1.3 too hard-puts students off the subject  |
| 12/13 Is your school involved in alternative assessment programmes eg Cambridge, IB?                                     | Cambridge offered in some subjects, but few at level 2. Cambridge is a more positive system-students get marked for what they can do. Reverted to Unit standards for practical subjects much better resourced and fairer and easier to assess. More applicable to the workplace.  |                               |                                |   |   |

|          |   |
|----------|---|
| Feedback | <p>Too many NCEA surveys to fill in!!!!</p> <p>Am making it work because it has to, dump NCEA!, huge discrepancies in professional judgement of markers, waffly marking schedules, too many changes to tasks and marking through the year, need to keep on top of admin esp writing tasks and assessments, modifying units well before time due, Technology poorly resourced, late, no direction from chief moderator, more detail needed for Bio Level 2, Economics teacher seriously considering leaving teaching because of NCEA frustrations, information arrives too late in the year, post pone Level 3- same set of students are guinea pigs again- not fair, needs more resourcing, not enough time to teach, picky admin, NZQA need to streamline systems-web site too many 'out' times, insufficient time for writing standards, no scholarship incentive for brighter students, not achieved' a very damning result-same for 49% and 0%., more trialing tasks needed, state schools get one hour a week for NCEA stuff, assessment is driving everything-less real education and creative teaching, System pits students against teachers in high stakes assessment, rather than encouraging co-operation and talking more- hands off assessments required. Too rushed. Plead to stop Level 3. Continued resourcing level 1 and 2 needed with marked exemplars to give clear guidelines for boundary judgements.</p> <p>Idea of teachers marking own external assessments is appalling!!!! (said by many)</p> <p>Facilitator felt they were left on own too much</p> <p>Heading towards an all pass society. Schools not submitting 'not achieved' results, selecting standards. Not honest assessment</p> <p>Bring back accrediting at level 2.</p> |
|----------|---|