



PPTA TE WEHENGARUA ANNUAL CONFERENCE 2017

NCEA REVIEW 2018

AN OPPORTUNITY FOR CHANGE



Between October 2017 and December 2018, there will be a major review of the design of NCEA conducted by the Ministry of Education, with technical support from NZQA. This paper recommends that PPTA input to the review be guided by the eight criteria for an educationally valid qualifications system, established by PPTA's Qualifications Framework Inquiry in 1997 and endorsed by previous PPTA conferences. The paper identifies areas where the review could be used as an opportunity for positive change, to address issues such as manageability, excessive inclusivity, and motivation.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the report be received.
2. That the eight criteria for an educationally valid qualifications system developed originally by the Qualifications Framework Inquiry (1997) guide PPTA's input into the NCEA Review 2018.
3. That PPTA seek to ensure that adequate provision is made by the Ministry of Education for comprehensive consultation with secondary teachers.

CONTENTS

Recommendations	2
Contents	3
1. Background	4
2. Scope of the review	4
3. The PPTA Qualifications Framework Inquiry (1997)	5
4. Reassessment of NCEA against the QFI criteria	6
5. Conclusions	15

1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1 The NCEA certificates at all three levels are up for review by the end of December 2018. This is the first full review of the NCEA qualifications.
- 1.2 The review will operate within the guidelines developed by NZQA for the Targeted Review of Qualifications covering all qualifications between Levels 1 and 6.¹ As the “qualification developer”, the Ministry of Education is responsible for designing the process of the review in consultation with NZQA, who will monitor the progress and ensure that it is completed by the due date of December 2018.
- 1.3 The purpose of reviewing a qualification is described in the NZQA guidelines as:

To ensure each level 1 – 6 qualification remains useful and relevant and continues to meet the needs of the learners, industry and stakeholders for which it was initially developed.
- 1.4 The 2018 NCEA review is a review of the three certificates, Levels 1, 2, and 3 NCEA, not of the individual standards which are used to gain credits on these certificates, nor of how the qualification is resourced or administered. This review will focus on the design of the qualifications, and the rules laid down for achieving them.
- 1.5 However, decisions about the rules for gaining the certificates could have implications for the standards themselves, for example decisions in terms of the number of standards able to be assessed through an exam, the size of standards, etc. This would be addressed through the review of achievement standards that is planned for 2019. (All achievement standards now carry a review date of December 2019 to reflect this.)

2. SCOPE OF THE REVIEW

- 2.1 The kinds of issues that the 2018 review could address are listed below:
 - The continuation (or not) of three levels of NCEA certificates
 - The number of credits required to achieve each certificate
 - Whether 20 credits should continue to be able to be carried forward to the certificate at the next level
 - The multi-field nature of the NCEA certificates
 - The grade levels
 - The mix of internal and external assessment for the certificates
 - Literacy and numeracy requirements
 - Certificate and course endorsement requirements.

These issues are all touched on in this paper.

¹ See <http://www.nzqa.govt.nz/assets/Studying-in-NZ/New-Zealand-Qualification-Framework/guidelines-review-qualifications.pdf>

- 2.2 What will **not** be addressed through this review, and are therefore not relevant to this paper, are the operational processes for the NCEA, the detail of the assessment rules, the quality of the resources provided, external marking processes, the moderation system, etc. Information about what is in scope, and what is not, and how members can address issues that are out of scope, is provided on the PPTA website.²
- 2.3 Issues in those areas continue to be raised by PPTA at every opportunity, for example through the ongoing work following the workload working group, through the regular meetings of the Secondary Qualifications Advisory Committee on which PPTA is well represented, and through other meetings with NZQA and ministry officials. Lack of progress in these areas during 2018 would clearly leave only the collective bargaining process as a means of addressing them.

3. THE PPTA QUALIFICATIONS FRAMEWORK INQUIRY (1997)

- 3.1 The 1997 report of PPTA's Qualifications Framework Inquiry (QFI) *Te Tiro Hou* established the pathway for what became NCEA. It was the key to resolving the long-running conflict between NZQA and the school sector about the proposal to use unit standards to assess the senior school curriculum.³
- 3.2 Among the design elements of NCEA that stem from the QFI's recommendations were:
- The fact that NCEA certificates are qualifications on the NZ Qualifications Framework
 - The standards-based nature of NCEA assessment
 - The existence of both external and internal assessment in NCEA
 - The grade levels
 - The relative breadth and openness of achievement standards compared with unit standards.
- 3.3 On the other hand, the QFI did not recommend that all three of the existing qualifications, School Certificate, Sixth Form Certificate and Bursary, should be replaced by new standards-based certificates. In fact, having assessed a number of options against their criteria (see below), they recommended retiring School Certificate, and having qualifications only at Years 12 and 13.
- 3.4 They also did not appear to envisage the extent to which the new qualifications would be multi-field, with students able to credit standards from anywhere on the framework to NCEA, nor did they recommend any particular accumulation of credits leading to the awarding of certificates.

² <http://ppta.org.nz/advice-and-issues/assessment/>

³ <http://ppta.org.nz/dmsdocument/134>

3.4. THE QFI CRITERIA

- 3.4.1 The Qualifications Framework Inquiry established eight criteria for an educationally valid school qualifications system, and used these to assess seven possible scenarios for future school qualifications.
- 3.4.2 The criteria were that a qualification must be:
- i. Manageable
 - ii. Inclusive
 - iii. Constructive
 - iv. Motivating
 - v. Cumulative
 - vi. Fair
 - vii. Clear
 - viii. Coherent
- 3.4.3 These eight criteria were confirmed by annual conference in 1997 as the basis for a qualifications system that could be endorsed by PPTA.
- 3.4.4 In 2005, an annual conference paper used the criteria to evaluate the NCEA after its first three years of implementation. That paper rated the NCEA as meeting the criteria of *inclusivity*, *constructiveness* and *cumulative*, but raised questions about whether it was meeting the other five criteria.

4. REASSESSMENT OF NCEA AGAINST THE QFI CRITERIA

- 4.1 Recommendation 2 requires that PPTA's input to the current review be guided by the QFI's eight criteria.
- 4.2 The following sections of this paper reassess how the NCEA measures up to each of these QFI criteria today, what the issues are, and how the review might possibly address them. The criteria are covered here in approximate order of their continued significance for teachers today.
- 4.3 CRITERION: MANAGEABLE
- 4.3.1 The biggest area in which the NCEA still falls short is *manageability*. A number of the NCEA recommendations of the workload working group sought to address this, with recommendations around reducing over-assessment, focusing assessment on Years 12 and 13, promoting units of work that assess more than one standard, emphasising quality rather than quantity of evidence, stopping the "over-engineering" of school assessment procedures, and the like.⁴

⁴ The Working Group report can be found at <http://ppta.org.nz/dmsdocument/479>

- 4.3.2 Probably no secondary teacher would disagree that the pendulum in the senior secondary school has gone too far towards assessment, at the expense of curriculum. In fact, when teachers talk about their courses, they often don't discuss the curriculum that underpins their courses, but talk instead about which standards they are going to "teach" as if a standard, of itself, constitutes the curriculum.
- 4.3.3 Government decisions that have interfered with the initial design of NCEA do not help with this. The worst of these was the government decision in 2012 to set a target of 85 percent of 18 year olds achieving NCEA Level 2 or an equivalent qualification by the end of 2017. This exacerbated an existing trend towards schools focusing on credits achieved rather than high quality learning. Although the target does not feature among the government's new set of Better Public Service targets for the 2017 - 2021 period, state services minister Paula Bennett's announcement of the new targets noted that the existing targets "...will continue to be a focus of the ministry and wider education system".
- 4.3.4 There have been efforts to encourage schools and individual teachers to reduce the number of credits assessed in their courses, and some schools appear to have been quite successful in this area, but on average, students are still assessed each year for twice as many credits as they need to achieve the qualification. This suggests that mere encouragement is not sufficient to reduce over-assessment across the board.
- 4.3.5 One of the possible design solutions that the review might canvas is reducing the number of credits required for one or more of the certificates, such as reducing Level 1 to 40, and Levels 2 and 3 to 60 each (which they effectively are now, because of the ability to transfer 20 credits from the previous level).
- 4.3.6 The rules could be changed to say that each certificate must consist of X number of credits at that level, e.g. Level 2 being 60 credits at Level 2 or above, with no credits able to be carried forward from Level 1. This would be simpler, and might reduce over-assessment. It would also be useful for students entering NCEA at a higher level, e.g. international students or students returning from overseas.
- 4.3.7 Reducing the number of credits required to achieve Level 1 would make it more achievable for the small proportion of students for whom it is the highest level they can expect to reach, but at the same time significantly reduce the amount of assessment done in Year 11 in those schools that choose to continue to offer Level 1 to all their students.
- 4.3.8 It is important to remember that no school is required to offer all levels of NCEA, and there are already some schools that are simply not doing qualifications assessment in Year 11. This is courageous, especially if other schools in the area are continuing to assess at Year 11, but it can have very positive implications for student engagement and for teacher assessment loads.

- 4.3.9 It is time to ask whether all three certificates are still needed, given the emphasis being placed on achievement of Level 2. Abolishing the Level 1 certificate, for example, would not stop students for whom it was appropriate doing Level 1 standards. These could be credited to other certificates on the framework, or simply be recorded on their Record of Achievement. On the other hand, about 15 percent of students never achieve Level 2 NCEA. Should they be deprived of a certificate to aim for?
- 4.3.10 An even more radical approach would be to do away with the certificates altogether. Professor Paul Black of King's College, London, was asked by the ministry of education to review the design of NCEA before it began. In his report in 2001 he described the notion "...that the collection of qualifications by students has to be marked by giving particular recognition to particular aggregations by way of the national certificates" as a questionable assumption underlying the design.
- 4.3.11 He went on to write: "Why give a particular cachet to (say) 80 credits which (say) 75 does not deserve, and to which 90 will be seen to add little?" The fundamental question should be "What is meant by educational achievement?"
- 4.3.12 The review must, if nothing else, produce solutions to reduce the excessive assessment at the expense of learning that is endemic in our secondary schools. It is not only having a negative impact on teachers' wellbeing, it is also having a negative impact on students' wellbeing.

4.4 CRITERION: INCLUSIVE

- 4.4.1 In 2005, PPTA rated NCEA as meeting the criterion of *inclusivity*, but 12 years later it might be argued that the qualification is **too** inclusive.
- 4.4.2 Many of today's secondary teachers can remember when school qualifications had built-in failure rates, where approximately 50 percent of students had to fail in order for the other 50 percent to succeed. NCEA has shown that failure on that scale is not necessary, and that within the same three qualifications (NCEA Levels 1 to 3), a wide range of areas of learning and levels of achievement can be recognised. NCEA is a qualification that has something for everyone.
- 4.4.3 NCEA certificates are 'multi-field' qualifications, so that theoretically any standard from across the entire framework can be credited to a certificate (as long as the institution has consent to assess those standards), and a student can emerge from a school or a private training establishment with an NCEA certificate that contains no curriculum-referenced achievement standards at all.
- 4.4.4 This gives NCEA a huge amount of flexibility, and it means that students can build their qualifications to reflect their areas of interest.
- 4.4.5 On the other hand, the perception that there is a lack of parity in credit value and difficulty level between the NZC-referenced achievement standards and some of the unit standards developed by NZQA and industry training organisations (ITOs) has become a credibility issue for NCEA.

- 4.4.6 Teachers have big concerns about the high number of credits that students can earn from some unit standards, such as those developed by ITOs, relative to how many they can earn from achievement standards. The school sector has no ability to influence the credit values of tertiary standards, but it can influence the value of its own achievement standards.
- 4.4.7 The framework rule that one credit should represent about 10 hours of learning and assessment for an average learner does not seem to be reflected in some achievement standards, and this may stem from the fact that in the initial design of NCEA, subjects were allowed a maximum of 24 credits' worth of standards per level.
- 4.4.8 The review could recommend reassessment of the credit value of all achievement standards, to ensure that they are consistent with the 10 hours per credit framework rule.
- 4.4.9 The other credit parity issue is around the difficulty level of the two kinds of standards. This is particularly an issue because achievement standards are written to Levels 6 to 8 of the NZ curriculum rather than to the framework levels, and increasingly these two sets of levels appear out of kilter.
- 4.4.10 At level one the qualifications framework is 'flexible downwards', in other words it includes standards that are very easy to achieve for an average or above student but can offer challenge for the struggling student, e.g. some of the generic life skills unit standards, or the supported learning standards. There have been documented cases of schools that have used these standards inappropriately.
- 4.4.11 A further issue about *inclusivity* is that the secondary sector has in some ways lost a set of qualifications it can call its own. While the original designers of NCEA believed passionately that students should be able to have a wide range of learning recognised, they perhaps did not expect the take-up of the qualification from the foundation levels of the tertiary sector, e.g. private training establishments.
- 4.4.12 Their vision of a new set of school qualifications has to some extent been challenged by the increasingly enthusiastic adoption of NCEA in non-school settings such as private training establishments.
- 4.4.13 On the other hand, increasing links between secondary schools and tertiary institutions, such as through trades academies and school-tertiary partnerships, have been able to thrive because of the multi-field nature of the three NCEA certificates, and these links have offered new and engaging opportunities for students.
- 4.4.14 The review needs to consider whether any change to the multi-field nature of NCEA would be warranted.
- 4.4.15 One possible solution would be to restrict the number of credits that are not from achievement standards that can contribute to NCEA. This might assist with the

credibility issue, but it would restrict the *inclusivity* of the qualification and might have negative impacts on achievement for some students.

- 4.4.16 Another issue that crosses three of the QFI's criteria, *inclusivity*, *motivating* and *manageability*, is the increasing trend for teachers to enable students to have personalised assessment programmes. This may involve students in a single class working towards completely different standards, sometimes at different levels, because of their particular interests and abilities. Teachers offering this argue that it helps to enable more authentic and relevant learning experiences, however they admit that the workload ramifications for themselves are enormous.

4.5 CRITERION: CONSTRUCTIVE

- 4.5.1 This criterion was defined as "Learners and teachers receive clear and helpful feedback on progress, and have more than one opportunity to attain the required standards". The QFI's hope was that the new qualifications system would promote learning, through students receiving feedback and feed forward and then having the opportunity to try again.
- 4.5.2 The QFI, in 1997, did envisage external exams being able to gain credit towards a framework qualification though they did not envisage a system where some standards would be assessed internally and some externally. However, this became one of the compromises in the development of NCEA. A guideline was established that standards which could validly be assessed externally, usually in an exam, would be, because external assessment was seen to reduce teachers' workloads.
- 4.5.3 Thus external assessment is a pragmatic solution to teacher workload, but does not meet the criterion of learners being able to have "more than one opportunity to attain the required standards".
- 4.5.4 During the limited review of the certificate requirements that occurred alongside the alignment of standards to the revised curriculum, a decision was made to limit the number of standards assessed in an exam to three, giving a full hour for each so that students had the opportunity to produce sufficient evidence for all the grade levels. While this improved the reliability of external assessment, it meant that in some subjects, standards previously assessed by an exam became internally assessed. This shift to more internal assessment has been part of what has made teachers' loads so unmanageable.
- 4.5.5 At the same time, the number of achievement standards allowed per subject increased from the original 'set menu' (five to eight standards worth no more than 24 credits per level per subject) to a 'smorgasbord' with no maximum number of standards or credits. This was to allow some curriculum-based unit standards developed during the 1990s to remain because teachers had been using them, they were relevant to the revised curriculum, and they provided choice in course design. These standards were changed into achievement standards, but are all internally assessed.

- 4.5.6 Unfortunately, the negative side of the switch from a 'set menu' to a 'smorgasbord' of standards has been an increase in over-assessment, with some courses worth as many as 30 credits. This does not promote the wellbeing of students or teachers, and impacts negatively on the quality and depth of learning.
- 4.5.7 It also cuts across the principle in NCEA that students should, if manageable, have one further opportunity to achieve an internally assessed standard. It is not good practice to cram a course full of standards on the basis that 'then it doesn't matter if they miss one'. The assessment programme should reflect what is important in the curriculum, and students should have sufficient opportunity to learn, including opportunities to learn from their mistakes.
- 4.5.8 On the other hand, there is also pressure to provide multiple opportunities to attempt a standard, as a result of the BPS goal of 85 percent of students achieving NCEA Level 2 (see above). That incentivised schools to ignore NZQA guidelines in order to ensure that their students' achievement met or exceeded the target.
- 4.5.9 The profession needs to develop a new understanding of what a '*constructive* qualification' looks like. Some of the ideas that circulated in the early years of NCEA, such as about making judgements using evidence that emerged in the course of teaching rather than through discrete assessment events, could be revisited.
- 4.5.10 Some schools no longer issue "assessment plans" to students at the beginning of the year, but instead describe the programme of learning planned. Assessment then happens when the students are ready to succeed, rather than according to an assessment timetable. This should be encouraged by NZQA.

4.6 CRITERION: MOTIVATING

- 4.6.1 Early in the development of NCEA it was decided to use three levels of achievement: Achieved (originally called Credit), Merit and Excellence. This was necessary in order to break the impasse that had raged during the 1990s when NZQA was trying to get schools to use pass/fail unit standards to assess the school curriculum. This was unacceptable to the vast majority of teachers, partly because it was seen as not *motivating* for students to achieve at higher levels than those required to simply pass.
- 4.6.2 The three grade levels were adopted as a compromise position between the pass/fail model and those who wanted to retain percentage marks or something similar.
- 4.6.3 Over the years there have had to be refinements to ensure consistency of interpretation of the margins between the grade levels and year to year consistency in results distributions. These include the 0 to 8 marking and cut score system adopted for scholarship in 2005 which was later developed into what is called grade score marking for external exams, the profiles of expected

performance, and greater exemplification of grade boundaries through online materials and best practice workshops.

- 4.6.4 It would be appropriate for the review to at least consider whether these current three grade levels are still the right approach.
- 4.6.5 There are also some theoretical questions that might merit asking, such as:
- In a standards-based system, what should the response be if there is evidence that significantly increasing proportions of students are able to achieve what is currently required for excellence? Should the standard be changed, or the expectation of how many students can achieve excellence be expanded, or what?
 - Does an excellence in one standard equate reasonably well to an excellence in another standard in the same or a different subject? How can this be judged? Does it matter?
- 4.6.6 Issues about *motivation* were raised in the 2005 conference paper, particularly regarding concerns that students in the middle range of ability were tending to aim just to achieve, rather than higher. Certificate and course endorsement were introduced to try to address these concerns.
- 4.6.7 When certificate endorsement was first created as a way of incentivising students to pay attention to grade levels rather than just credits, no requirements were imposed about having to include a mix of internal and external standards.
- 4.6.8 However, when course endorsement was created a little later, it was decided that the 14 credits at merit or excellence level must include at least three credits from external standards and at least three from internal standards, in order to ensure that the endorsement recognises students who can excel in both modes of assessment.
- 4.6.9 The review needs to ask whether certificate and course endorsement are achieving their purpose, whether the requirements are still appropriate, and whether they need to be available at all levels. (It has been suggested that one way of getting schools to de-emphasise assessment at Year 11 would be to remove certificate and course endorsements from Level 1.)
- 4.6.10 Furthermore, new issues with *motivation* have raised their head in more recent times, related to the impact of over-assessment. ERO identified excessive assessment as a threat to student wellbeing in its 2015 report *Wellbeing for Young People's Success at Secondary School*.⁵ They recommended that schools review their assessment programmes in the senior school, "in particular the number of credits available for each year". Some schools have taken this recommendation seriously and made significant reductions in students' assessment loads, and are finding that not only student wellbeing improves, but also engagement and *motivation*.

⁵ <http://www.ero.govt.nz/publications/wellbeing-for-young-peoples-success-at-secondary-school/>

CRITERION: CUMULATIVE

- 4.6.11 The 2005 conference paper saw NCEA as meeting this criterion: “Standards are at a range of levels and students can build towards Certificates at Levels 1, 2 and 3 over the course of their senior years. In addition, they can earn credits towards the NCEA but also towards other Framework qualifications.”
- 4.6.12 It cited PPTA’s 2004 research report *Teachers talk about NCEA*⁶ as providing evidence that “Subject departments are also beginning to offer a very diverse range of Certificates or parts of Certificates other than the NCEA, many of which are linked to Industry Training Organisations”.
- 4.6.13 Over time, the usage of many of those other framework qualifications has reduced, and the ministry has indicated that the rules around these will be reviewed next year.
- 4.6.14 However the number of students doing, or at least beginning, industry qualifications while still at school, through secondary-tertiary partnerships such as trades academies has increased significantly. This is more about industry standards being able to be credited towards NCEA than the other way round.

4.7 CRITERION: FAIR

- 4.7.1 The QFI described *fairness* as being “Credits and qualifications accurately describe learner achievement, and are trusted”.
- 4.7.2 The 2005 conference paper raised issues about *fairness* because of issues at the time with the moderation system and inconsistency in marking of external exams. These issues have since been addressed with reasonable success.
- 4.7.3 Efforts to address *fairness* issues have included such changes as appointment of full-time moderators in most (but not all) subjects, the grade score marking system, profiles of expected performance, provision of more assessment samples to guide teachers (although still not enough), and better monitoring of exam marking as it proceeds.
- 4.7.4 However, there are still major concerns in this area. These are not design issues, and will be outside the scope of the review, except in the form of recommendations for further work.
- 4.7.5 A new area where *fairness*, as the QFI envisaged it, is raising its head today is the processes for evidencing literacy and numeracy.
- 4.7.6 Around the same time as the alignment discussions, a decision was made to require students to achieve the literacy and numeracy requirements which had originally applied only to level one for all three certificates. This stopped students

⁶ <http://ppta.org.nz/advice-and-issues/assessment/#section-1>

who hadn't achieved Level one because their literacy and numeracy fell short from still achieving level two, and even level three.

- 4.7.7 However, the decision means that the literacy and numeracy requirements don't increase in difficulty level as a student moves through the certificates. If a student achieves level one, they don't need further credentials of their literacy and numeracy unless they want to gain the university entrance award, in which case the literacy requirements are higher (level two), but the numeracy requirements are the same as for level one.
- 4.7.8 In recent discussions about the UE requirements, consideration was given to increasing the UE numeracy requirements, but this was shelved on the grounds that this would be reviewed as part of the 2018 NCEA review anyway, and it would be confusing to change the UE numeracy requirement at this stage.
- 4.7.9 The ministry has produced evidence that students who achieve NCEA literacy and numeracy requirements do not necessarily have the levels of literacy and numeracy this would tend to indicate. This may be because the vast majority of students gain these through curriculum standards that are deemed to be de facto evidence of literacy and numeracy, and too many of these don't really provide that evidence. Furthermore, the literacy and numeracy unit standards reflect levels that are well below curriculum level six. It is likely that the ministry will bring this issue into the review.

4.8 CRITERION: CLEAR

- 4.8.1 *Clarity* as a criterion was described as "learners and teachers can readily obtain clear and helpful information and guidance about the content, criteria and expected standards for particular credits or qualifications". This is also an area where teachers express concerns, for example about the *clarity* of assessment specifications, shortages of sample assessment tasks or exemplars of student work, etc.
- 4.8.2 This is a resourcing issue and will not be addressed through the review process. However, it is something that is constantly raised by PPTA representatives at every opportunity.

4.9 CRITERION: COHERENT

- 4.9.1 The QFI described this criterion as being that "Assessment arrangements promote *coherence* and integration of learning and teaching". Their report talked about the need to avoid fragmentation of learning, and expressed a concern that teachers might "see learning as a series of narrow tasks to be ticked off on a checklist" and that they would tend to assess easily measured outcomes rather than the ones that are more difficult to assess.
- 4.9.2 It is arguable that NCEA has still not met this criterion because so much course design appears to be centred around assessment rather than around wider learning goals, with assessment following curriculum.

5. CONCLUSIONS

- 5.1 In developing this paper, executive has made a deliberate decision to identify matters of principle, in the form of the QFI's eight criteria, rather than to seek through this paper to determine technical solutions. This is to give PPTA's representatives on the review working group room to find the solutions that will work best, given that the working group will no doubt hear many ideas from different parties, including large numbers of teachers.
- 5.2 PPTA's representatives on the review will not be short of indicators of membership views, and can seek further information through the normal PPTA channels such as surveys of members, branch and regional consultations, and the like.
- 5.3 In the 15 years from 2002, there have been nine annual conference papers on NCEA (including two in 2002). This is the tenth. This means that PPTA has established, over the years, a considerable body of evolving policy about NCEA through conference decisions.⁷
- 5.4 There are also other key documents that our representatives will be able to consult, such as the report of the workload working group.⁸ PPTA's input into that working group was informed by the work of our own workload advisory group, which reported in April 2016. This included an extensive survey of members which provided a lot of input on NCEA matters.⁹
- 5.5 In addition, recommendation 3 requires PPTA to try to ensure that the ministry consults adequately with teachers during the review. The current proposed timeline includes one round of consultation during February/March 2018, but PPTA will be demanding further rounds of consultation, should radical recommendations for change be on the table.

⁷ See <http://ppta.org.nz/advice-and-issues/assessment/> for previous conference papers, research reports and other material.

⁸ [Secondary Teacher Workload Working Group Report](#)

⁹ [PPTA Workload Taskforce report 2016](#)