



The cost of change

PPTA Survey on

NCEA Workload

2010

Table of Contents

	<i>Page</i>
List of tables	3
1. Introduction	4
2. Methodology	5
3. Results	6
3.1 Causes of increased workload - total sample	6
3.2. Causes of increased workload – subjects experiencing the greatest pressure	10
3.2.1 Technology	10
3.2.2 Computing/Digital Technologies/Information Technology	11
3.2.3 Graphics/Design & Visual Communication	13
3.2.4 Home Economics	14
3.2.5 Mathematics	15
3.2.6 English	16
3.2.7 Accounting & Business Studies	18
3.2.8 Media Studies	20
3.3 Causes of increased workload – impact of role in school	22
3.4 Causes of increased workload – impact of school decile	26
3.5 Access to professional development	28
3.6 Time to collaborate about the changes	31
4. Conclusions	33
<i>Appendix – Sample characteristics</i>	<i>34</i>
<i>End Notes</i>	<i>37</i>

List of tables

		Page
Table 1	Workload pressures for total sample	6
Table 2	Workload pressures for Technology teachers	10
Table 3	Workload pressures for Computing teachers	11
Table 4	Workload pressures for Design & Visual Communication teachers	13
Table 5	Workload pressures for Home Economics teachers	14
Table 6	Workload pressures for Mathematics teachers	15
Table 7	Workload pressures for English teachers	17
Table 8	Workload pressures for Business Studies & Accounting teachers	19
Table 9	Workload pressures for Media Studies teachers	21
Table 10	Workload pressures for middle managers & Principal's Nominees	23
Table 11	Workload pressures for teachers in low decile schools	26
Table 12	Respondents answering Yes on sufficiency of access to subject-specific PLD about the changes	28
Table 13	Respondents answering Yes on sufficiency of time to Collaborate with colleagues about the changes	31
 <i>Appendix – sample characteristics</i>		
Table 14	<i>Subject taught most in Years 11-13</i>	34
Table 15	<i>Decile level of respondents' schools</i>	35
Table 16	<i>Type of school respondents taught in</i>	35
Table 17	<i>Roll size of respondents' schools</i>	35
Table 18	<i>Main role in school of respondents</i>	35
Table 19	<i>Applicable collective agreements for respondents</i>	36
Table 20	<i>PPTA region of respondents' schools</i>	36

1. Introduction

In the first three weeks of Term 4 2010, PPTA conducted a membership survey that sought to establish a detailed picture of the workload pressures being engendered by the current phase of change to the National Certificate of Educational Achievement (NCEA), New Zealand's standards-based school qualification system. This phase of change in the qualification is commonly called "the alignment project" or "the standards review".

These changes have been caused by the need to revise achievement standards to match them to the new curriculum, but also by a government decision to use the opportunity to address other issues with NCEA. These included:

- Duplication of standards, especially between achievement and unit standards, which was resolved by making all curriculum-referenced standards achievement standards,¹
- Application of a firm policy that all Level 1 standards must assess the achievement objectives of Level 6 of the NZ Curriculum,²
- A lack of credit parity between standards,³
- Exams in some subjects that offered assessment for as many as five separate standards in one three hour exam,
- The introduction of course endorsement, originally called 'subject endorsement'.⁴

Addressing all of these issues in one project, while probably sensible, has led to a huge scale of change. This survey has made a significant contribution to knowledge about how these changes are impacting on secondary teachers.

Some PPTA members are teachers of Year 7 and 8, and will be experiencing significant impacts on their assessment workload as a result, not of the NCEA changes, but of the introduction of National Standards in Reading, Writing and Mathematics. Consequently, some questions about National Standards work were included in the questionnaire. 519 respondents either taught in Year 7 and 8 in 2010 or expected to in 2011, but only 370 respondents were involved with implementing National Standards. A separate report on this aspect of the research has been published by PPTA, titled *PPTA members and National Standards: Report on assessment workload survey 2010*, and can be downloaded from www.ppta.org.nz.

2. Methodology

PPTA has often surveyed its members, or subgroups of its members, in the past, however this was the first time that an online survey has been conducted using the email addresses in the membership database. The number of members for whom current email addresses were available was 10,063, and responses were received from 3,259 members, a response rate of 31% of those sampled. Of the total membership, i.e. including those for whom no current email address is held, the response rate was approximately 18%. Either figure would be considered by statisticians to be an excellent response rate from an online survey.

The online survey tool used was Survey Monkey, and respondents appeared to find it straightforward to use, with very few technical hitches encountered. These were mostly caused by school IT systems blocking access, or by respondents being interrupted in the course of completing the survey and then being locked out. The survey was open for a two week period, from 11 October to 25 October. The response rate suggests that this was an adequate timeframe.

In conducting the survey, PPTA was keen to identify which sub-groups of teachers were feeling the workload pressures most, so a number of demographic questions were asked, e.g. main subject taught in Year 11-13, position in school, school decile, type and size, applicable collective agreement, and geographical area. The variables that appeared to most influence workload were subject, position in school, and school decile.

The sample appears to be representative of the PPTA membership in terms of most variables. (Data on the sample is provided in an appendix.)

3. Results

3.1 Causes of increased workload – total sample

The survey asked two questions about what tasks associated with preparing for or implementing the NCEA changes were causing increased workload. One asked about workload in 2010 at the time of the survey, and the other asked for a prediction about increased workload in 2011, as follows:

- “To what extent is each of these causing increased workload for you now in 2010?”
- “To what extent do you believe that the following are likely to cause you increased workload in 2011?”

These stem questions were then followed by a list of nine tasks that were likely to be required of teachers in implementing the NCEA changes, and teachers were asked to rate each task. (See Table 1.)

It was clear from responses that on all of the tasks rated, (a) teachers were experiencing a significant increase in their assessment workload as a result of preparing for the changes, and (b) teachers perceived that their workload would be even higher in 2011 than at the time of responding.

The questions required a choice on a 4-point rating scale, from “A lot”, “Quite a bit”, “To some extent” and “Not at all”. When the first two of these are combined, i.e. “A lot” and “Quite a bit”, the results for 2010 and 2011, in descending order of the 2010 responses, were as follows:

Table 1 – Workload pressures for total sample

Task	2010 actual increased workload – Total sample	2011 predicted increased workload – Total sample
	% rating as ‘A lot’ or ‘Quite a bit’	% rating as ‘A lot’ or ‘Quite a bit’
Developing new assessment tasks and resources	78	87
Adapting content to revised assessment resources	74	84
Demands of internal moderation	73	84
Quantity and assembling of material for external moderation	62	74
Redesigning courses because of loss of unit standards below Curriculum Level 6	55	63
Redesigning courses because of reduction in number of external standards	52	64
Increased internal assessment because of reduction in number of external standards	51	69
Redesigning courses because of new literacy/numeracy requirements	40	53
Redesigning courses because of introduction of course endorsement	37	51

It is interesting that only one of the tasks, 'Increased internal assessment because of reduction in number of external standards', changed its position in the rank order for 2011 compared with 2010.

A box was provided for additional comments, and this was used by many respondents. Comments ranged across further amplification of the tasks listed in the questions, other tasks generated by the changes, the impacts on teachers of MOE's and NZQA's change management processes, and job circumstances that exacerbate the workload pressures. Some typical examples of these comments are listed below.

Amplification of tasks listed

- *Constant research and reading for material and stress over the removal of the core skills and work and study skills learning areas.*
- *Redesigning all resources due to change of topics in each achievement standard.*
- *Also any increase in internal assessment to meet the needs of students increases workload and puts greater pressure on me to be accurate in my assessments. Giving students feedback is less stressful than allocating internal assessment marks.*
- *The workload related to the reduction in the number of external standards relates to preparation for next year. It's not going very well, as there is no time, little guidance, and I have a full time job.*
- *Redesigning my course each year is quite stressful as I have to search around, see what is different and rewrite planning etc. I think it is good that courses can be fluid and can't be allowed to get stale old and irrelevant but the fluidity in NCEA to date is a cascading waterfall.*
- *I have developed some resources this year - not enough for one year level, never mind three. I don't expect them to be perfect. So as well as continuing to develop new resources, after using them I will need to evaluate and improve them.*
- *As year 11 dean the new literacy and numeracy requirements and the new structure will mean I have to do a lot of extra work.*

Other tasks related to changes

- *Rewriting scheme to align with the new NZ curriculum; incorporate the key competencies and also taking into account the Secondary Numeracy Project.*
- *Implementing inquiry learning and teaching as inquiry.*
- *Measurement of key competencies and tracking key competencies.*
- *New curriculum extra work load and inclusion of key competencies into schemes. Also school management want all schemes re formatted to fit a school-wide template which is different from what exists for subject scheme.*
- *Providing resubmissions and reassessments for more internal assessments.*
- *Major pressure is trying to find appropriate courses for lower ability students.*

- *Trying to keep students motivated who are operating at level 3 or 4 in the curriculum and getting a constant string of 'Not Achieved'.*
- *Huge technical issues from having to have portfolios of students' oral work.*
- *Looking into IT techniques that will be needed to store student work for new assessment tasks in 2011 - a lot.*
- *Translating assessments to Tongan Language.*
- *We have a whole new standard in Geography on GIS systems which is very exciting but I have no idea how I can get the pd to learn about it, or find assessments for it (they are promised of course) and although I would like to teach it I can't in a professional vacuum.*
- *Introduction of Achievement Standards in Religious Studies in 2010, with absolutely NO training in implementing them, writing the tasks, marking the tasks and moderating the tasks, then being told we did it all wrong in 2009 is a MASSIVE workload increase. It has taken over my LIFE.*
- *Have multilevel groups with different standards running at the same time. I am able to do this as I have built up the resources over the last 7 years. It is very hard work but the best path for my students. Now I will have start all over and the increased workload is very daunting.*
- *Preparing budget to usher in aligned standards; locating suitable texts/resources; concern over funding linked to roll four times per year.*
- *Redesigning courses in years 9 and 10 to be ready for new form of NCEA assessment.*
- *Rewriting year 10 programmes and assessments in preparation for NCEA.*
- *Especially with the pressure of virtually no term 4 for senior students for both portfolio work and revision due to the World Cup!*

Impacts on teachers of MOE/NZQA management of change

- *Understanding the contradictory and unclear demands of the assessment standards. Can we have them written clearly, simply and unambiguously please?*
- *Concern about Min Ed process and quality assurance, for example no assessment activities or exemplars (just the standards themselves so far).*
- *The standards haven't been registered, there are few examples of new assessment tasks, no one has given any examples of what the new exams will look like - all these things add to uncertainty and stress, and they add a time pressure - you can't advance.*
- *Hours and hours chasing my tail to locate the most update and relevant information from NCEA, NZQA, TKI and Techlink websites - so many changes - so little time.*
- *Re-inventing the wheel all by ourselves again...*
- *The biggest workload issue right now is caused by the assessment specs for next year's level 1 still not being finalised. These are still being changed and this makes it virtually impossible to plan next year's courses. And of course creates a huge amount of stress.*

Job circumstances that exacerbate the pressures

- *I also work in a second subject area as the sole teacher in the school. This has a marked impact.*

- *Sole teacher of a subject in the school means arranging times to meet with teachers from other schools.*
- *As I am a 'one person department' I will buy in resources as I will not have the physical time to develop new tasks and resources.*
- *As subject association key secondary person - there is a lot of work there, most of it voluntary. I also am seconded as an advisor for some days and used by MoE/NZQA although that is recompensed.*
- *I am a PRT so am creating everything anyway.*
- *This will be very new to me as I am primary trained and will therefore be teaching te reo Maori to a new level.*
- *Huge increase in workload because full pathway (6 option lines) now to cover for other qualifications for students unable to reach level 6 ever.*

3.2 Causes of increased workload - subjects experiencing the greatest pressure

The subjects which appear to be affected more than most by a number of the tasks required by the revision were Technology, Computing (including the new Digital Technologies area), Graphics/Design and Visual Communication, Home Economics, Mathematics, English, Media Studies, Accounting and Business Studies. The sample sizes for some of these subjects was rather small, e.g. 14 for Business Studies and 31 for Media Studies, but these numbers probably reflect the proportion of teachers teaching those subjects.

3.2.1 Technology

The 133 Technology respondents rated their 2010 workload and their predicted 2011 workload as significantly increased. Table 2 (see next page) compares them with the total sample for both years:

Table 2 – Workload pressures for Technology teachers

Task	2010 actual increased workload - Technology	2010 actual increased workload – Total sample	2011 predicted increased workload - Technology	2011 predicted increased workload – Total sample
	% rating as 'A lot' or 'Quite a bit'	% rating as 'A lot' or 'Quite a bit'	% rating as 'A lot' or 'Quite a bit'	% rating as 'A lot' or 'Quite a bit'
Developing new assessment tasks and resources	89	78	91	87
Adapting content to revised assessment resources	84	74	89	84
Demands of internal moderation	83	73	87	84
Quantity and assembling of material for external moderation	77	62	84	74
Redesigning courses because of loss of unit standards below Curriculum Level 6	80	55	78	63
Redesigning courses because of reduction in number of external standards	59	52	64	64
Increased internal assessment because of reduction in number of external standards	64	51	75	69
Redesigning courses because of new literacy/numeracy requirements	45	40	58	53
Redesigning courses because of introduction of course endorsement	59	37	67	51

For most of the tasks, these teachers did not differ greatly from the total sample except that overall they tended to rate the increased workload a little higher than for the total sample. However, the area that appears to be

causing most significant pressure is 'Redesigning courses because of loss of unit standards below Curriculum Level 6'. Why this is affecting Technology teachers so much is not clear to the writer, but merits further investigation.

Respondents wrote about the never-ending task of redesigning courses:

- *Redesigning courses to maintain a student centred learning focus which changes annually depending on the external interests of the students in relation to their project.*
- *I haven't taught the same course or units one year after the other. Courses and curriculum always changing. New curriculum needs, we require more PD to integrate.*

3.2.2 Computing/Digital Technologies/Information Management

The range of titles required to describe this group of teachers reflects the level of change being faced in this area. 'Information Management' is disappearing in favour of a new subject titled 'Digital Technologies'. Many of these teachers call themselves Computing teachers, though, because they have been using Computing unit standards in preference to the Information Management standards. Some may well continue to use a mix of standards in their courses in future. For brevity, the name 'Computing' is used here.

Table 3 – Workload pressures for Computing teachers

Task	2010 actual increased workload - Computing	2010 actual increased workload – Total sample	2011 predicted increased workload - Computing	2011 predicted increased workload – Total sample
	% rating as 'A lot' or 'Quite a bit'	% rating as 'A lot' or 'Quite a bit'	% rating as 'A lot' or 'Quite a bit'	% rating as 'A lot' or 'Quite a bit'
Developing new assessment tasks and resources	89	78	95	87
Adapting content to revised assessment resources	90	74	94	84
Demands of internal moderation	77	73	88	84
Quantity and assembling of material for external moderation	74	62	82	74
Redesigning courses because of loss of unit standards below Curriculum Level 6	75	55	79	63
Redesigning courses because of reduction in number of external standards	56	52	65	64
Increased internal assessment because of reduction in number of external standards	51	51	61	69
Redesigning courses because of new literacy/numeracy requirements	38	40	50	53
Redesigning courses because of introduction of course endorsement	61	37	73	51

It is not surprising that 'Developing new assessment tasks and resources' and 'Adapting content to revised assessment resources' scored so highly for this group, given that they are facing a completing new set of standards rather than their current standards revised. 'Redesigning courses because of introduction of course endorsement' would be more significant for these teachers because those who have been using the Computing unit standards will largely be shifting to the Digital Technologies achievement standards because, unlike the unit standards, they offer students the possibility of course endorsement.

This group of teachers had a lot to say about the major changes they face, and their comments reflected a high level of uncertainty, to a great extent caused by significant delays in delivery of final registered standards and sample assessment resources:

- *Lack of assessment exemplars (none) on which to design a new course for Digital Technologies based on vague and new ASs is very frustrating. We need to know where we are going so we can decide how to get there!*
- *Working in a very short timeframe because in digital technologies - a new subject area of technology - the achievement standards for 2011 are still not finalised and I have already "made up" info for subject course booklets for 2011. Trying to plan a new Y11 course with limited info available in final form is very difficult and time consuming.*
- *The entire digital technology curriculum structure and content has changed. This year I have had to deliver and assess an already heavy workload in Achievement Standards Technology, which was never suitable for Computing/Digital Technology, and prepare for a new course next year, including organising professional development, developing skills in my own time, evaluation of resources offered by other teachers in the same boat, and development of new resources.*
- *Creating a whole new program of work for Year 11 Digital Technology with the introduction of the new Technology curriculum and standards*
- *Changing standards and new AS at Yr11, 12, 13 for ICT has made a huge workload in our area*
- *Changing assessment requirements has put a huge extra workload on my staff and me in our subject area.*
- *New Digital Technology course requires COMPLETE rework, new material, upskilling. All with ZERO support from MOE et al.*
- *Concern because have not seen any assessment exemplars therefore feel I am still in the dark about what the 'new' requirements will be.*
- *Planning for a course for 2011 in Digital Technologies, using Achievement Standards that have just been written, and that there are no resources currently for.*
- *We have lost an entire Yr 11 subject 'Info. Management' which will be replaced with Digital Technology achievement standards - a lot of extra work is involved here.*
- *In addition to an ever-increasing number of software programs to learn, plan and deliver. This year I learnt five new packages - next year at least the same. Each package has taken between 20 and 80 hours of additional work.*

3.2.3 Graphics/Design and Visual Communication

The change for this subject goes so far as even changing its name, from 'Graphics' to 'Design and Visual Communication'. For brevity, 'Design' will be used here. Developing new assessment tasks and resources, and adapting content to these, appear to be big pressure points for Design teachers this year particularly. There also appears to be a perception that assembling of material for external moderation will greatly increase. The introduction of course endorsement is also particularly affecting Design, presumably because it imposes a pressure to use achievement standards where possible rather than unit standards in order to allow students to access Merit or Excellence endorsement.

Table 4 – Workload pressures for Design and Visual Communication teachers

Task	2010 actual - Design	2010 actual - Total sample	2011 predicted - Design	2011 predicted - Total sample
	% rating as 'A lot' or 'Quite a bit'	% rating as 'A lot' or 'Quite a bit'	% rating as 'A lot' or 'Quite a bit'	% rating as 'A lot' or 'Quite a bit'
Developing new assessment tasks and resources	86	78	86	87
Adapting content to revised assessment resources	80	74	90	84
Demands of internal moderation	73	73	90	84
Quantity and assembling of material for external moderation	75	62	79	74
Redesigning courses because of loss of unit standards below Curriculum Level 6	50	55	53	63
Redesigning courses because of reduction in number of external standards	53	52	66	64
Increased internal assessment because of reduction in number of external standards	47	51	63	69
Redesigning courses because of new literacy/numeracy requirements	34	40	53	53
Redesigning courses because of introduction of course endorsement	44	37	58	51

There were almost no comments from Graphics teachers.

3.2.4 Home Economics

Some Home Economics teachers may be facing a “double whammy” of change because they are offering Food Technology courses as well as Home Economics, meaning that the changes in Technology (see above) affect them too. The 47 respondents reported here named Home Economics as their main senior subject, however. Developing new assessment tasks and resources appears to be a big pressure for Home Economics teachers, presumably because of major changes in the standards. They are also concerned about how to adapt to the loss of unit standards below Level 6 of the curriculum, which suggests that they have significant numbers of students who will struggle to succeed.

Table 5 – Workload pressures for Home Economics teachers

Task	2010 actual increased workload - Home Economics	2010 actual increased workload – Total sample	2011 predicted increased workload – Home Economics	2011 predicted increased workload – Total sample
	% rating as ‘A lot’ or ‘Quite a bit’	% rating as ‘A lot’ or ‘Quite a bit’	% rating as ‘A lot’ or ‘Quite a bit’	% rating as ‘A lot’ or ‘Quite a bit’
Developing new assessment tasks and resources	86	78	93	87
Adapting content to revised assessment resources	76	74	90	84
Demands of internal moderation	79	73	93	84
Quantity and assembling of material for external moderation	69	62	76	74
Redesigning courses because of loss of unit standards below Curriculum Level 6	83	55	85	63
Redesigning courses because of reduction in number of external standards	46	52	54	64
Increased internal assessment because of reduction in number of external standards	55	51	50	69
Redesigning courses because of new literacy/numeracy requirements	43	40	49	53
Redesigning courses because of introduction of course endorsement	45	37	61	51

Home Economics teachers, like those in many other subjects, are feeling uncertain because the resources they need are not yet available:

- *The lack of information available, the new interpretation of the standards ie the teaching guidelines are not yet available for 2011.*

There was also a comment by one teacher who felt they were being poorly led at school level, leaving uncertainty about the future:

- *Total upheaval, unsure if doing technology or home ec and yr 13 hosp or technology or home economics, lack of leadership in dept.*

One teacher, who appears to be also offering ITO unit standards for Hospitality or something similar, talked about having to cope with two different moderation systems:

- *Meeting ITO external moderation and NZQA External Moderation.*

3.2.5 Mathematics

Mathematics teachers appear to be feeling somewhat different pressures from the total sample. Redesign of courses because of the loss of lower-level unit standards, the reduction in external standards and the new numeracy requirements are the pressure points for them, along with an increase in internal assessment. (It should be noted that Mathematics, prior to 2011, had up to five standards assessed in one exam and this has been reduced to three, but with the addition of a Common Assessment Task which is in practice semi-external, i.e. set by NZQA but administered and marked by teachers.)

Table 6 – Workload pressures for Mathematics teachers

Task	2010 actual increased workload - Maths	2010 actual increased workload – Total sample	2011 predicted increased workload - Maths	2011 predicted increased workload – Total sample
	% rating as 'A lot' or 'Quite a bit'	% rating as 'A lot' or 'Quite a bit'	% rating as 'A lot' or 'Quite a bit'	% rating as 'A lot' or 'Quite a bit'
Developing new assessment tasks and resources	70	78	88	87
Adapting content to revised assessment resources	68	74	85	84
Demands of internal moderation	72	73	85	84
Quantity and assembling of material for external moderation	52	62	77	74
Redesigning courses because of loss of unit standards below Curriculum Level 6	67	55	80	63
Redesigning courses because of reduction in number of external standards	65	52	80	64
Increased internal assessment because of reduction in number of external standards	62	51	86	69
Redesigning courses because of new literacy/numeracy requirements	61	40	73	53
Redesigning courses because of introduction of course endorsement	39	37	56	51

Comments largely reflect perceptions that resourcing to support the changes was coming far too late for school planning purposes:

- *Lack of appropriate time to develop material is causing an increase in workload. As an example the maths exemplars for 2011 came late and the date for the algebra CAT paper is still not set. No maths course can be planned for next year until this is known.*
- *Extreme concern and worry about lack of direction given by Ministry of Education regarding new maths standards for 2011, and attempted preparation of resources for these standards which may all be a waste of time because we don't know what the new standards will look like.*
- *I am still in the dark about assessments. We as a department have looked at one but there is no time allowed for us to get our heads around this until 2011.*
- *You need a category here that says "No idea" because especially for external moderation, no one knows what will be required for moderation next year especially for new numeracy standards.*

Some Maths departments were delaying introduction of the new standards until 2012, but this imposes its own pressures:

- *Because we will keep it the same for the last time next year, 2012 will be a huge step-up/learning curve/increased workload.*
- *We have decided to keep the current unit standards in alternative year 11 courses in 2011 to make the workload involved in implementing the new achievement standards manageable. For the same reason we are not looking at the new Numeracy standards at least until 2012.*

Other pressures were funding, how to cater for the lower achieving students, and the sheer time taken to instigate changes:

- *Reassessing text books with every change of curriculum!! Stress of funding this from departments limited and dwindling budgets!!*
- *Trying to keep students motivated who are operating at level 3 or 4 in the curriculum and getting a constant string of 'Not Achieved'.*
- *Time taken for consultation processes prior to and during all of this is hugely significant.*

3.2.6 English

English teachers constituted the largest group of respondents, with 470 naming English as the subject they taught most in Years 11-13. The loss of low level unit standards, the reduction in the number of externally assessed standards, and the introduction of new literacy requirements would appear to be the issues for English teachers that are more demanding than for the total sample. (See Table 7 on next page.)

Table 7- Workload pressures for English teachers

Task	2010 actual increased workload - English	2010 actual increased workload - Total sample	2011 predicted increased workload - English	2011 predicted increased workload – Total sample
	% rating as 'A lot' or 'Quite a bit'	% rating as 'A lot' or 'Quite a bit'	% rating as 'A lot' or 'Quite a bit'	% rating as 'A lot' or 'Quite a bit'
Developing new assessment tasks and resources	77	78	87	87
Adapting content to revised assessment resources	73	74	87	84
Demands of internal moderation	77	73	86	84
Quantity and assembling of material for external moderation	57	62	75	74
Redesigning courses because of loss of unit standards below Curriculum Level 6	64	55	75	63
Redesigning courses because of reduction in number of external standards	57	52	73	64
Increased internal assessment because of reduction in number of external standards	56	51	77	69
Redesigning courses because of new literacy/numeracy requirements	56	40	72	53
Redesigning courses because of introduction of course endorsement	34	37	56	51

English teachers showed relatively little concern about MOE/NZQA timelines, with only a few respondents expressing anxiety that the assessment resources were not yet available:

- *Concern about Min Ed process and quality assurance, for example no assessment activities or exemplars (just the standards themselves so far).*
- *Letting students and parents know what is going on when I am not sure myself.*

One respondent actually commented that while there was increased workload it was for a worthwhile purpose:

- *Workload has increased to redesign courses, but all very positive changes, so no CONCERNS about this work, as long term benefit.*

What the comments reflected more was a general perception that the assessment workload in English has always been very high:

- *NCEA has been the bane of my life and I don't feel I teach better than before. I actually assess more and teach less.*
- *The internal marking load for English teachers is horrendous. Most nights my planning, marking, administration and pastoral care duties can take up to 8:30 pm, 3 out of 5 nights a week. Every second weekend I work at least one day marking internal standards submissions or resubmissions,*

often to the detriment of Junior marking. I have no idea how Team Leaders and Middle Managers have a life at all outside teaching!

- *The HUGE requirement for marking in English is almost an impossible task to keep up with and complete, now. The demand upon us to be undergoing activities and processes to keep up our professional development is adding to this. Teachers Council's new requirements for registration are ABSOLUTELY RIDICULOUS and should be opposed vigorously by the PPTA.*

Some English teachers also took this opportunity to write very passionately about the workload in general:

- *The workload part that serves the God of bureaucracy has become so tremendously huge in comparison to maybe even only 12-13 years ago that I hardly have time to teach the kids. And don't ask me to come up with "fun activities" for the kids anymore! I now need to sit in front of the computer screen all day long! They'd better start learning to teach themselves quickly because I have to satisfy the demands of the paper God! But maybe the Ministry should establish another working party to come up with even more regulations that we also need to adhere to and create meetings in which meetings are being planned or the last meetings are being discussed! That way NO ONE will want to go into teaching any more when student teachers are shown the reality of our job these days, where actually teaching the kids makes up a quarter if that much of the job! Just send the rest of us teachers to mental health clinics because that's where we're heading! This job has now become unmanageable. I cannot possibly comply with all the demands laid on me now. I used to be such an enthusiastic teacher, taking kids overseas, being active in drama and all, and I can't believe myself saying these things now. The Ministry is completely failing us AND the kids!*
- *The prospect of this increased workload, among other things, actually drove me to have a small breakdown. I was on stress leave for the last three weeks of Term Three. This term I will be teaching junior classes only, and am looking for a change of career.*

3.2.7 Accounting and Business Studies

It is useful to look at Accounting and Business Studies together, as there is probably considerable crossover of teachers between the two subjects, but as respondents were asked to nominate the subject they “currently teach most in Years 11-13”, the data below represents two separate groups of respondents, 14 for Business Studies and 48 for Accounting.

The reduction in external standards is the main area of stress for Accounting teachers. For Business Studies teachers, however, there is a completely new set of achievement standards to implement, so that tasks such as developing new assessment tasks and resources and adapting content are major challenges. The arrival of the long awaited achievement standards presents both an opportunity and a challenge for Business Studies teachers, in that this makes Business Studies, previously assessed using unit standards, now able

to count for both course and certificate endorsement, but this means that there will be pressure to make the changes from unit standards-assessed courses immediately.

Table 8 – Workload pressures for Business Studies and Accounting teachers

Task	2010 actual increased workload - Business Studies	2010 actual increased workload - Accounting	2010 actual increased workload – Total sample	2011 predicted increased workload – Business Studies	2011 predicted increased workload – Accounting	2011 predicted increased workload – Total sample
	% rating as 'A lot' or 'Quite a bit'	% rating as 'A lot' or 'Quite a bit'	% rating as 'A lot' or 'Quite a bit'	% rating as 'A lot' or 'Quite a bit'	% rating as 'A lot' or 'Quite a bit'	% rating as 'A lot' or 'Quite a bit'
Developing new assessment tasks and resources	93	74	78	92	89	87
Adapting content to revised assessment resources	83	71	74	100	89	84
Demands of internal moderation	92	76	73	92	71	84
Quantity and assembling of material for external moderation	92	63	62	92	80	74
Redesigning courses because of loss of unit standards below Curriculum Level 6	67	38	55	73	40	63
Redesigning courses because of reduction in number of external standards	83	68	52	73	78	64
Increased internal assessment because of reduction in number of external standards	75	60	51	91	89	69
Redesigning courses because of new literacy/numeracy requirements	42	29	40	64	42	53
Redesigning courses because of introduction of course endorsement	58	37	37	64	40	51

Business Studies teachers made few comments about their workload. Accounting teachers, on the other hand, had rather more to say, much of it around being the sole teacher of Accounting in the school and the extra workload that this generates:

- *Sole teacher of a subject in the school means arranging times to meet with teachers from other schools.*

- *Being only teacher of the subject in school and therefore having to get everything moderated by someone at a school half way across town - all in my own time and at own travel expense.*

The significant revisions of the achievement standards also provoked comment:

- *Having to adjust all my resources to fit in with the new Achievement Standards will greatly increase workload.*

One Accounting teacher was concerned about the need to contribute to the collection of evidence for the new Numeracy unit standards:

- *Assembling "naturally occurring evidence" very time consuming and vague. Resources for numeracy very poorly thought out. 3-4 weeks allowed for each resource that covers so many topics that it would normally take months to teach.*

3.2.8 Media Studies

There were 31 responses from Media Studies teachers. The biggest issues for them appear to be the need to develop new assessment tasks and resources because of changes to the standards, and the demands of internal and external moderation. A slightly puzzling result is the above average concern about having to redesign courses because of the loss of unit standards below Level 6; this may reflect an English teacher issue rather than a Media Studies issue, given that many Media Studies specialists are also senior English teachers. (See Table 9 on next page.)

Table 9 – Workload pressures for Media Studies teachers

Task	2010 actual increased workload - Media Studies	2010 actual increased workload – Total sample	2011 predicted increased workload – Media Studies	2011 predicted increased workload – Total sample
	% rating as 'A lot' or 'Quite a bit'	% rating as 'A lot' or 'Quite a bit'	% rating as 'A lot' or 'Quite a bit'	% rating as 'A lot' or 'Quite a bit'
Developing new assessment tasks and resources	90	78	93	87
Adapting content to revised assessment resources	72	74	90	84
Demands of internal moderation	80	73	90	84
Quantity and assembling of material for external moderation	79	62	83	74
Redesigning courses because of loss of unit standards below Curriculum Level 6	69	55	72	63
Redesigning courses because of reduction in number of external standards	41	52	69	64
Increased internal assessment because of reduction in number of external standards	38	51	83	69
Redesigning courses because of new literacy/numeracy requirements	41	40	76	53
Redesigning courses because of introduction of course endorsement	24	37	59	51

There were few comments from Media Studies teachers. For one teacher, the Standards Review appears to have created an opportunity to begin to offer a Year 11 Media studies course:

- *Designing new courses (Media Studies) at Year 11.*

Another teacher took the opportunity to comment generally about their workload:

- *I am constantly working. I am at school every single school day at 7.15 and leave most days at 17.00 or after and work every single weekend at least six hours.*

3.3 Causes of increased workload - impact of role in school

Of the 3,259 respondents, 1,072 (35%) respondents said that their main role in the school was as a middle manager and 19 were Principal's Nominees. Although the sample size for Principal's Nominees is very small, it is worth looking at the two groups together because they are the two school roles groups which appear to be facing exceptionally high workload pressures.

Middle managers appear to be greatly affected by the need to develop new assessment tasks and resources and adapt content to them, by the demands of both internal and external moderation, and by the need to redesign courses because of the reduction in external standards and the loss of unit standards below curriculum level 6.

Principal's Nominees, as one might expect, are affected no more than average by the need to develop new assessment tasks, but are feeling the pressure of overseeing school-wide processes such as internal and external moderation and the redesign of courses. (See Table 10 on next page.)

Table 10 – Workload pressures for Middle Managers and Principal's Nominees

Task	2010 actual increased workload - Middle Managers	2010 actual increased workload - Principal's Nominees	2010 actual increased workload – Total sample	2011 predicted increased workload – Middle Managers	2011 predicted increased workload – Principal's Nominees	2011 predicted increased workload – Total sample
	% rating as 'A lot' or 'Quite a bit'	% rating as 'A lot' or 'Quite a bit'	% rating as 'A lot' or 'Quite a bit'	% rating as 'A lot' or 'Quite a bit'	% rating as 'A lot' or 'Quite a bit'	% rating as 'A lot' or 'Quite a bit'
Developing new assessment tasks and resources	84	68	78	91	79	87
Adapting content to revised assessment resources	81	74	74	88	74	84
Demands of internal moderation	79	79	73	88	79	84
Quantity and assembling of material for external moderation	73	74	62	83	68	74
Redesigning courses because of loss of unit standards below Curriculum Level 6	60	63	55	64	63	63
Redesigning courses because of reduction in number of external standards	56	56	52	65	61	64
Increased internal assessment because of reduction in number of external standards	52	59	51	70	67	69
Redesigning courses because of new literacy/numeracy requirements	39	37	40	51	37	53
Redesigning courses because of introduction of course endorsement	38	39	37	52	39	51

MOE/NZQA timelines that did not work for middle managers were a constant theme:

- *Lack of consistent, timely information with regards to standards realignment has created the need to second guess and rework planning already put in place for implementation. This double and triple handling of information and planning stages is an unnecessary increase of workload.*
- *Frequent changes in specs and the necessity to rewrite tasks for standards on a regular basis.*
- *Designing course tasks with no exemplars to work from.*

- *The lack of information available, the new interpretation of the standards ie the teaching guidelines, are not yet available for 2011.*
- *Waiting for NZQA to supply exemplars for realigned external standards - very stressful because they have only just produced them and they will still need to be commented on. Who knows what they will do to them after that? Meanwhile we are supposed to be preparing for next year.*
- *What makes it worse is that the aligned standards have not yet settled down so that work done in preparation for 2011 is having to be redone -- told in Staff Briefing this morning from a colleague who is a National Moderator that the changes may well be still happening in February.*
- *Concern because have not seen any assessment exemplars therefore feel I am still in the dark about what the 'new' requirements will be.*
- *They say they will have things organised at the end of each year but it is always AFTER we need to have course booklets and courses designed for the following year for course selection.*

Coordinating their team in light of the changes was also an issue for middle managers:

- *Upskilling other staff/extra PD required.*
- *Encouraging staff in department to change their practice and approach.*
- *Finding time to work with others in the department over planning for the above.*
- *Meetings to discuss and prepare for the changes.*

Other tasks for middle managers were noted:

- *Redesigning timetable because of new Year 11 courses. Implementing inquiry learning and teaching as inquiry.*
- *Managing digital storage of students' evidence.*
- *New texts needed plus new teaching resources = huge outlay of time.*
- *Dealing with material that is stored moderation material from past years.*
- *As an HOD, internal moderation has increased the workload significantly.*
- *Increase in documentation for EOTC safety standards. Increased class size has caused huge time and management constraints in such a practical assessment focused subject.*
- *We also now do computer rolls (takes extra time). More time spent inputting student info and checking entries for internal assessments (the amount of time we spend sitting on our asses at a computer) - secretaries did this once upon a time.*
- *As HOD: Coordinating NZQA and ITO moderation requirements with 4 specialist subjects. Collecting & storing of student evidence for moderation purposes. Implementing new Teachers Council criteria with 7 staff (ie leading effective pedagogy, accountability, arranging PD etc). Managing maintenance of workshop equipment and meeting OSH requirements. Overseeing budgeting, purchasing & costing of student projects in 4 areas of technology. Preparing BOT annual report (analysis). Attending HOD meetings, professional PD etc. Managing disruption & stress (students & staff) due to Canterbury earthquake.*

- *Also the increased reporting and expectations placed on HOD's for analysis of results and general paperwork. Will increase with more internals and less externals.*

The 19 Principal's Nominees were conspicuous by their silence, on the other hand.

3.4 Causes of increased workload - impact of school decile

There are aspects of the changes that are tending to impact more on teachers in low decile (1-3) schools than higher decile schools. These aspects are particularly the loss of unit standards below curriculum level 6, the introduction of course endorsement, and the need to redesign courses to cater to the new literacy and numeracy. The data below reflects responses from 589 teachers.

Table 11 – Workload pressures for teachers in low decile schools

Task	2010 actual increased workload - Decile 1-3 schools	2010 actual increased workload – Total sample	2011 predicted increased workload – Decile 1-3 schools	2011 predicted increased workload – Total sample
	% rating as 'A lot' or 'Quite a bit'	% rating as 'A lot' or 'Quite a bit'	% rating as 'A lot' or 'Quite a bit'	% rating as 'A lot' or 'Quite a bit'
Developing new assessment tasks and resources	79	78	86	87
Adapting content to revised assessment resources	76	74	84	84
Demands of internal moderation	74	73	86	84
Quantity and assembling of material for external moderation	68	62	77	74
Redesigning courses because of loss of unit standards below Curriculum Level 6	63	55	69	63
Redesigning courses because of reduction in number of external standards	51	52	63	64
Increased internal assessment because of reduction in number of external standards	53	51	68	69
Redesigning courses because of new literacy/numeracy requirements	49	40	62	53
Redesigning courses because of introduction of course endorsement	42	37	59	51

Comments that reflect the realities for teachers in low decile schools included:

- *Constant research and reading for material and stress over the removal of the core skills and work and study skills learning areas.*
- *I have always had a heavy workload as most of my programmes are predominantly internally assessed. Getting ready for 2011 will add another strain.*
- *Limited number of unit standards at Level 1 for Science means I must design a 'new' course that requires significant scaffolding for the less able students my old course used to cater for.*
- *Elimination of unit standards has generated a significant amount of work this year.*

- *We anticipate a complete reorganisation of all senior programmes, probably involving cross-curricular programmes.*
- *A lot of one-to-one tuition is required due to our school being decile 1 and assessments are thoroughly checked several times before despatching them for marking by the providers.*

One teacher commented that the reduction in external standards would not affect them because they have always done a lot of internal assessment, which would no doubt be the case in most low decile schools:

- *Our school has always used a high proportion of unit standards - so I don't expect an increase in internal assessment.*

3.5 Access to professional development

Only just over a third of all respondents (37%) said that they had had sufficient access to subject-specific professional and development about the NCEA changes. Some subjects appeared to have struggled more than others to access subject-specific PD, and these mostly appear to be subjects with smaller numbers within a school and across the country. The following table shows in ascending order the percentage of respondents in each subject who answered Yes to the question about whether they had had sufficient access to subject-specific PLD about the changes.

Table 12 – Respondents answering Yes on sufficiency of access to subject-specific PLD about the changes

Subject taught most in Years 11-13	% of respondents answering Yes
Agriculture/Horticulture	16
Home Economics	16
Biology	21
Music	21
Chemistry	22
Physics	24
Computing/Digital Technologies/Information Mgt	28
Drama	28
Media Studies	28
Classical Studies	33
Science	33
Technology	35
Total sample	37
English	39
Geography	40
History	41
Physical Education	42
Visual Arts	43
Mathematics	44
Languages	45
Religious Studies	47
Te Reo Maori/Te Reo Rangatira	47
Graphics/Design & Visual Communication	48
Health	48
Economics	49
Accounting	76

(Subjects with samples below 20 are not shown in this table.)

There were 607 separate comments made in response to this question, an indication of the passion that respondents feel about this issue. Only a small sample of these can be quoted here.

A perceived absence of support from MOE or NZQA attracted considerable comment:

- *Using school resourced PD and time - I am not aware of any direct support or help from the Ministry or NZQA.*
- *There has been nothing from the Ministry/NZQA - what PD we have done was privately and very expensive.*
- *There has been very little information from the ministry to support these changes. There has been NO professional development at all.*
- *It has been non-existent. It has depended on finding out for yourself, and informal conversations with colleagues.*
- *I have been told to look online and that is the extent of my PD.*

Contradictory messages bothered respondents:

- *Have attended one day with an advisor who had been in contact with a moderator and they both contradicted the written documentation given. Lots of gaps in knowledge that teachers will just fill with the same old.*
- *Team Solutions as a SSS has been brilliant in trying to keep people reliably informed about changes but they have also been hamstrung with lack of information or changing information.*

There were some semi-positive or positive comments made. Team Solutions (SSS in Auckland/Northland) in particular attracted positive comment:

- *We were lucky to have a few half sessions, but this is still nowhere near enough.*
- *What we got was good but need more.*
- *Some information but too little too late. Still don't know what the new UE maths requirement is and need to plan for that NOW.*
- *English advisor ran one course which covered the principles and ONE std and how the assessment exemplars could be adapted to exemplify the changed L1 criteria - so what we had was good, but not nearly enough. Nothing at all on new standards.*
- *Team Solutions has been extremely helpful but the ministry and NZQA's exemplar tasks have been far too late in arriving.*
- *Team Solutions have been well organised and prepared.*
- *Our Team Solutions contact goes above and beyond her job to make sure we have new innovative units and ways of assessing work.*
- *Excellent assistance in Maths.*
- *Because of a proactive Science Advisor who we have regular contact with.*
- *As an HOD I have had some - HOD day in Wellington - but insufficient for new literacy standards.*
- *Yes, I've been lucky enough to have subject specific in-service this year and 2 visits from the English advisor.*
- *I went to the Science Best [Practice] Moderation workshop.*
- *Moderation and Team Solutions courses.*

Subject association efforts to support teachers were commented on positively:

- *Only one day designed by the local English teachers' association.*
- *HOD'S planning workshops have been very good.*
- *Cluster meetings have been vital.*

- *The single best thing I did was attend the NZHTA conference. I am always paranoid that I have missed something on TKI.*
- *I did attend the PENZ Conference in my 'holiday' time and purposefully attended those seminars but no other PD has been on offer' - also as that conference was lots of \$ I am unlikely to be 'allowed' more, crucial PD!*
- *This was done by teachers for teachers however. It was OUR subject association not the Ministry.*
- *Only because of the initiative of our local subject association.*
- *Maths cluster group meetings very helpful as was Saturday AMA [Auckland Maths Assn?] workshop.*
- *We have arranged our own in our area of the country which it sounds like is more than other areas are getting. I have attended one other day recently which was helpful but it just scratches the surface. We are having to organise our own PD rather than have days offered in Technology.*
- *Only because I was fortunate enough to have school pay for me to attend SCICON in Nelson.*
- *Have had some from local geog teachers' assn, but only because locals organised and ran it. Was great but still lots of unanswered questions.*
- *Subject organisation has organised PD day focussed on Year 11.*

A tendency for schools to offer only generic PD was an issue for some:

- *Practically none at all so far, all PD has been very general. We have been given some time, approx 6 hours to work on new curriculum for our subject. Blind leading the blind.*
- *Very little though - one PD day put on by the school. Nothing from the MOE.*
- *No - all PL has been generic and in house. The one course that was specific, only our HOD was allowed to go.*

Lack of funding at school level for PD and other issues around equity of access were mentioned:

- *Our school has not had enough \$\$\$ to get us much PD.*
- *The school cut funding, so I could not attend.*
- *My Principal refused my application for PENZ Conference saying it was too expensive.*
- *It is difficult to access in the Far North - attending courses in Auckland requires a whole day off school, which is not an option when relievers are not available.*
- *Living in the provinces does not enable me to travel to regional events where the changes to my subject area are discussed. Everything coming from the MOE is so slow and you have to interpret it yourself.*
- *I was only aware just recently that there had actually been changes to Visual Art. Area Schools can be isolated in that respect and I haven't been making the most of VC this year.*

A beginning teacher commented on a total absence of subject-specific PD:

- *I have not had ANY subject-specific education since becoming a teacher one year and one term ago.*

3.6 Time to collaborate about the changes

There were also differences between subjects as to whether respondents believed that they had had sufficient time to collaborate with colleagues about the changes. The table below shows in ascending order the percentage of respondents in each subject who answered Yes to the question about whether they had had sufficient time to collaborate about the changes:

Table 13 - Respondents answering Yes on sufficiency of time to collaborate with colleagues about the changes

Subject taught most in Years 11-13	% of respondents answering Yes
Agriculture/Horticulture	16
Classical Studies	21
Physics	22
Chemistry	23
Drama	28
Computing/Digital Technologies/Information Mgt	30
Economics	30
Music	30
Geography	31
English	31
Technology	31
Biology	32
Health	32
Home Economics	32
History	33
Science	33
Total sample	34
Mathematics	36
Media Studies	38
Religious Studies	39
Physical Education	40
Visual Arts	41
Graphics/Design & Visual Communication	43
Languages	44
Te Reo Maori/Te Reo Rangatira	54
Accounting	50

(Subjects with samples below 20 are not shown in this table.)

This question also attracted a large number of comments (482).

Some respondents felt that enough time had been made available by the school, but many of these still qualified their comments:

- *My school has given us professional learning time to devote to departments working on the new standards alignment.*
- *Our school has been really proactive about implementing not only school wide changes but subject specific ones.*

- *Any teacher who requests time gets it.*
- *Extra time given by school and huge investment of time and effort by colleagues.*
- *The school has made time available but so busy with what we are doing now that it is hard to fit it in. Need to spend more time but when?*
- *Our school has been very generous, but it still is not enough time - an hour here and there.*
- *Our college has done the best it can, but the job is so large it will take at least 1 period per week for the duration of 2011.*
- *Has provided some time but is insufficient.*
- *The school has done its best under difficult circumstances - they have tried to give us as much time as possible but in reality this is not enough. Things are going to be very pressured next year implementing L1 and planning for L2.*

Others said that there had not been enough time:

- *We have used our "own" time.*
- *Some time but not enough - trying to create school wide system/process and this takes time and negotiation!!!*
- *Neither sufficient school time nor sufficient meetings with colleagues in other schools.*
- *So many other changes happening in the school that providing this time solely for NCEA changes has not been possible.*
- *As a sole charge teacher I need release time to liaise with other subject specific teachers from other schools but have not been given this time.*
- *All time is after school time when everyone is tired and wanting to go home.*
- *I have received nil time so far.*
- *There has been no time marked for this, although we will meet as a department to collaborate in our regular department meeting time.*
- *As a department we have asked and we will not have time before next year so we will be planning as we go, which is not at all ideal.*
- *We have lost our extra time in term 4 due to teaching the underachieving students until week 9 - full teaching programme when senior students leave.*
- *Management have tried but time and finances won't allow.*

4. Conclusions

Clearly the NCEA changes that are being implemented from 2011 to 2013 are presenting some major challenges for all teachers, and teachers in some subjects, roles and schools are feeling these challenges disproportionately. The survey provides useful fine-grained data about these pressure points, and officials need to take this into account in ongoing planning of support.

Some of the comments quoted in this report are really quite distressing to read. Some teachers are suffering extreme stress, and many are operating in sub-optimal conditions in terms of things like access to professional learning, and access to up to date information. The qualitative data conveys a picture of teachers soldiering on, trying to do the best they can for their students in the face of inadequate support.

The change processes of the Ministry of Education and NZQA have not been adequate for a project of this scale. It is almost unbelievable that at one stage, the government was committed to introducing all three levels of revised standards in one year, 2010, and that it required considerable pressure from PPTA to get this changed to phased implementation beginning one year later. Even with the extension to 2011 and the phasing of the levels from 2011 to 2013, NZQA and MOE have had to publish a circular (SecQual 2011/005, dated 2 February) apologising for the fact that some of the promised assessment resources will still be draft until the end of February, long past the date when teachers would have expected to be able to download final versions.

Teachers will be hoping that the finalising of Level 2 and 3 standards and assessment resources with matching exemplars will run to a timeline more appropriate to the needs of schools.

Appendix – Sample characteristics

Table 14 –Subject taught most in Years 11-13

Subject	Number	Percentage
Accounting	48	1.7%
Agriculture/Horticulture	20	0.7%
Art History	2	0.1%
Biology	86	3.0%
Business Studies	14	0.5%
Classical Studies	29	1.0%
Chemistry	93	3.2%
Computing/Digital Technologies/Information Management	130	4.5%
Dance	6	0.2%
Drama	60	2.1%
Economics	61	2.1%
Education for Sustainability	2	0.1%
English	470	16.3%
Geography	106	3.7%
Graphics/Design & Visual Communication	53	1.8%
Health	26	0.9%
History	102	3.5%
Home Economics	47	1.6%
Languages	103	3.6%
Legal Studies	3	0.1%
Mathematics	392	13.6%
Media Studies	31	1.1%
Music	72	2.5%
Physical Education	135	4.7%
Physics	90	3.1%
Science	146	5.1%
Religious Studies	32	1.1%
Social Studies/Sociology	15	0.5%
Te Reo Maori/Te Reo Rangatira	59	2.0%
Technology	133	4.6%
Visual Arts	97	3.4%
Other (please specify)	216	7.5%
Answered question	2879	
Skipped question	380	

Table 15 - Decile level of respondents' schools

School decile	Number	Percentage
Decile 1-3	680	22.3%
Decile 4-7	1355	44.5%
Decile 8-10	950	31.2%
Don't know	60	2.0%
Answered question	3045	
Skipped question	214	

Table 16 – Type of schools respondents taught in

Type of school	Number	Percentage
Co-educational	2209	72.6%
Boys' school	313	10.3%
Girls' school	520	17.1%
Answered question	3042	
Skipped question	217	

Table 17 - Roll size of respondents' schools

School roll	Number	Percentage
Below 500	630	20.6%
500-899	798	26.1%
900-1199	502	16.4%
1200-1999	832	27.2%
2000 +	284	9.3%
Don't know	11	0.4%
Answered question	3057	
Skipped question	202	

Table 18 - Main role in school of respondents

Main role in school	Number	Percentage
Senior management	205	6.7%
Middle management (e.g. HOD/TIC)	1072	35.1%
Principal's Nominee (for NZQA)	19	0.6%
Guidance counsellor	44	1.4%
Careers advisor	20	0.7%
Classroom teacher	1459	47.8%
Special education teacher	40	1.3%
Other (please specify)	191	6.3%
Answered question	3050	
Skipped question	209	

Table 19 - Applicable collective agreement for respondents

Applicable collective agreement	Number	Percentage
Secondary Teachers' Collective Agreement (STCA)	2882	95.0%
Area School Teachers' Collective Agreement (ASTCA)	118	3.9%
Secondary Principals' Collective Agreement (SPCA)	27	0.9%
Area School Principals' Collective Agreement (ASPCA)	7	0.2%
Answered question	3034	
Skipped question	225	

Table 20 - PPTA regions of respondents' schools

PPTA region	Number of responses	Sample Percentage	Membership Percentage
Aoraki	56	2	3
Auckland	734	24	23
Bay of Plenty	197	7	4
Canterbury	337	11	11
Central Northland	39	1	2
Central Plateau	26	1	1
Counties-Manukau	108	4	4
East Coast	32	1	2
Hawkes Bay	145	5	4
Hutt Valley	60	2	3
Lower Northland	39	1	1
Manawatu-Whanganui	169	6	6
Marlborough	34	1	1
Nelson	82	3	3
Otago	155	5	5
Southland	85	3	3
Taranaki	85	3	3
Thames Valley/Western Bay of Plenty	31	1	5
Upper Northland	44	1	2
Waikato	212	7	6
Wairarapa	40	1	1
Wellington	287	9	7
West Coast	31	1	1
Don't know	11	0	
Answered question	3039		
Skipped question	220		

End Notes

¹ Unit standards are the primary assessment tool of the New Zealand Qualification Framework. Results for unit standards have traditionally been either Achieved or Not Achieved, although a recent change to NZQA rules allows for unit standards to be amended so that achievement can be awarded at Merit and Excellence levels. Achievement standards, developed for the NCEA qualification for use from 2002 onwards for subjects in the NZ curriculum, have always offered Merit and Excellence levels. One of the causes of duplication has been that prior to the development of NCEA, unit standards for assessment of curriculum subjects were developed for an earlier school qualification. Until this phase of reform, these standards had not been removed from the Framework and could be used instead of achievement standards.

² Until this review, some achievement standards assessed a mix of Level 5 and Level 6 achievement objectives. Furthermore, many of the curriculum-referenced unit standards referred to in (1) above assessed knowledge/skills at levels below Level 6. These included standards able to be credited towards the literacy or numeracy requirements of NCEA, and standards commonly used in Science courses for lower achieving students. Many of these standards will expire at the end of 2011 and others have been rewritten to Level 6 of the curriculum. In this report, for brevity, these standards are termed 'low level unit standards'.

³ A general rule applies to the whole Framework that a credit should reflect 10 "notional hours of learning". NZQA defines "notional hours of learning" as including direct contact time with teachers and trainers, time spent in studying and doing assignments and undertaking practical tasks, and time spent in assessment. <http://www.nzqa.govt.nz/studying-in-new-zealand/nzqf/qualifications-overview>. There has been criticism from teachers that this guideline has been incorrectly applied to some standards, resulting in a lack of credit parity between standards. The Standards Review sought to ensure that this did not happen.

⁴ See <http://www.nzqa.govt.nz/about-us/publications/newsletters-and-circulars/secqual/course-endorsement> for an explanation of how course endorsement will work.