Report to Ministry of Education
on
Draft New Zealand Curriculum 2006

Introduction

The Ministry of Education contract stated the paper should:

- *" Identify significant issues raised in the submissions;*
- *Provide a rationale for those issues you believe should impact on the development of the final curriculum;*
- *Highlight the nature and extent of changes to the Draft New Zealand Curriculum that you believe are required to take account of those issues;*
- *Recommend specific changes to the format, structure and content of the Draft New Zealand Curriculum;*
- *Highlight any implications for school-based implementation of the changes you recommend;*
- *Identify any implications for learning and teaching* (p. 6, Contract for Services, 2006)."

Approach

The following report is a result of examining Lift Education's draft report (LDR) and supplementary report (LSR) as well as the Colemar Brunton analysis. In addition, where the writer has taken into account comments, from the Australian Council for Education Researh (ACER) 2006 and the Le Metais' 2006 critique of the draft New Zealand Curriculum (draft NZC) against 'The Curriculum Stocktake Report' (CSR), these will be clearly identified.

It is important to signal that the writer found the LSR challenging since it is additional commentary and reads as a list of specific points made on every section of the draft NZC document.

An example of the challenge with LSR is best illustrated in the section *Key Competencies* (pp. 12-25). Within these pages is a total of 139 bullet points; whilst there are positive aspects about *Key Competencies*, most seek modifications in some form. Hence of the 139 bullet points most are individual submitters (124 individual). Having said that, the corresponding LDR does pull common threads together (elaborated upon later in the paper). Regardless, the writer concludes that judgment calls about how to deal with and make sense of the many disparate views within each section of LSR will reside with the MoE. In light of this, the writer focused more on the LDR compared to the LSR.

In relation to the Colemar Brunton analysis, where findings could be linked with the LDR these will be highlighted as will any major points of difference.

Problematic areas
As alluded to earlier, LDR identified one of the key issues was the question of weighting that would be given to submissions. Lift considered it was the role of the Ministry of Education (MoE) to determine which submissions should be given more weight (p. 6). However Lift did consider submissions from an organisation with specific expertise should be given "*detailed consideration* (p. 6)"

The approach the writer took was to determine whether similar themes occurred across at least three of the reports- LDR, LSR, Colmar Brunton, ACER, Le Metais- if it did then the writer concluded it was worthwhile extracting and highlighting.

<u>Tensions</u>
The writer was mindful of the possible effect of recommendations in terms of lengthening a slimline document yet equally aware it should not sacrifice clarity and coherence of the draft NZC document for stakeholders.

Part 1

1. Significant Issues & Rationale for Issues

Key Themes

1.1   LDR identified five key themes in relation to the *Conceptual Framework* extracted from 27 submissions:
- Sustainability and the environment
- Perceived outcomes focus of the curriculum
- Perceived lack of coherence within the document
- School level flexibility and the perceived focus on individualism

1.1.1   Sustainability of the environment and perceived lack of coherence are elaborated upon in later sections.

1.1.2   In light of the CSR, addressing the perceived outcomes focus of the curriculum is problematic since the pertinent CRS recommendation states "*The modified versions of the frameworks should be similar in structure to the existing frameworks...* (CSR 2002, p. 60)." Striking a balance between process and product will always be a challenge however the writer believes major revisions would have to occur in order to satisfy some submitters e.g. immediate removal of *Planning with a Focus on Outcomes and removal of* achievement objectives by level as well as consequential changes to all other sections. Notwithstanding this, it would be fair to say the greatest threat is future regulations overturning the intent of the proposed draft NZC; whether a balance between process and product had been 'struck' or not.

1.1.3   The tension between prescription and freedom arises with school flexibility; it was one of the major themes in the section on *Designing a School Curriculum* (LDR, pp. 12-13; p. 110). Essentially people want to know what 'must' be taught. The answer to this question has flow on effects- balanced curriculum, managing the curriculum, workload issues etc.

1.1.4   Striking a balance between individualism and collectivism will always occur. It is difficult to find a solution to this purely from those comments LDR decided to draw out. Having said that, one submitter suggested such a balance could be achieved by "*Broadening the overall focus on individualism to include the community...* (LDR, p. 13).

The idea of community input did arise (though some sought clarification on the role of communities) in various sections of the draft NZC- *Vision*, *Principles*, *Values*, *Designing a School Curriculum*. Whether scritunising these sections, with the view to 'broadening the overall focus', without creating more dissent is debatable. No comments specifically relating to the focus on individualism have been singled out in the Colmar Brunton analysis other than the concern about the community's role in *Designing a Curriculum*. There are no points of intersections in ACER and Le Metais' reports on this issue.

Common Themes

2.1   *Treaty of Waitangi*

The LDR concluded the absence of the Treaty of Waitangi (ToW) and issues relating to te reo Maori, biculturalism and Maori concepts and content attracted the most comment-commentary from 66 of 168 submissions call for the inclusion of the ToW; giving priority and status to te reo Maori; emphasising biculturalism; and the need to include Maori concepts and content through all learning areas. One submitter draws attention to the problems created for teachers and students in Maori medium because Te Marautanga o Aotearoa (TMoA) will be released at a different time.[1]

Given that the ToW and associated issues attracted the most comment then this area needs addressing. However the next question is exactly how this should be represented and in which section or sections of the NZC draft should statements reflect the ToW and associated issues?

Separate commentary under each section of the LDR provides some guidance. The lack of reference to the ToW, biculturalism, and te reo Maori appear in responses to the sections on- *Vision, Values, Learning Languages* (the non compulsory nature of te reo Maori and absence of the ToW is a key concern in this area) and social science.[2]

The Colmar Brunton analysis comprised 9117 questionnaires. Colmar Brunton accentuated particular comments in each section- questions 3-10 of the short submissions. Similar to the Lift analysis, the absence of the ToW and associated issues- biculturalism, te reo Maori, and to a lesser extent diversity were highlighted in all sections (pp. 15, 25, 33, 37, 39, 45, 47-48, 50-51, 53, 60, 64). Again submitters called for the inclusion of the ToW; acknowledgement of te reo Maori, and including biculturalism and te reo Maori for all pupils. The most frequent comment highlighted in the Colmar Brunton analysis was:

"*No Treaty of Waitangi/ Bicultural references included e.g. Social Sciences/Arts/Science/Te Reo not specified in languages* (pp. 42, 44, 45, 47, 48, 51, 53)."

---

[1]   Though one mentioned this, the issue of the TMoA document and its convergence or not with the NZC draft is critical since both documents set the direction for learning hence the reason for identifying this aspect.

[2] NB I disregarded individual comments relevant to this area if Lift did not identify it as a major theme.

In relation to structure and overall content, Le Metais (2007) points out "*The extent to which modifications reflect Maori social and academic aspirations is not clear* (p. 4). Since this comment was made under the heading 'Structure and overall content', the writer concluded that all sections of the draft NZC would have to be scrutinised if Maori social and academic aspirations were to be represented/ or clarified throughout. This line of thinking is not dissimilar to LDR and Colmar Brunton respondents.

It is also important to remember that under the New Zealand Teachers Council, *Satisfactory Teacher Dimensions* a teacher must demonstrate knowledge of, "*The Treaty of Waitangi, te reo and tikanga Maori.*"

Recommendations
The MoE considers:

1. Making the ToW explicit in the *Overview, Principles and Values*.
2. Including bicultural references in the learning areas- *Social Science, Arts,* and *Science.*
3. Making te reo Maori distinct in *Learning Languages* and that all students have an opportunity to learn te reo Maori.
4. Using recommendations 1-3, gauge whether Maori social and academic aspirations have been clarified.

2.2   *Diversity and Equity*

There were 25 submissions relating to diversity and equity in LDR and specific comment in LSR under *Principles* and *Values*. The range of comment in LDR and LSR express concern about the lack of emphasis on particular groups; nature of groups; the prominence of specific groups in separate sections of the draft NZC and other related issues.

It would be fair to say that submitters are concerned about social justice for 'all' and where groups and associated issues are not emphasised or made explicit they probably conclude such issues will not be addressed adequately- gender, sexuality, religion, ethnicity, ability/disability, social class and non-violence/peace etc.[3] Unlike the current national documents which make explicit, "*All programmes will be gender inclusive, non racist, and non discriminatory*"; it is not made explicit in the current draft NZC.

It may be worth reconsidering a statement making explicit the 'inclusive nature of the curriculum'; this would fit well in the sections- *Principles, Values, Effective Pedagogy* and an overarching statement- *Learning Areas*, draft NZC p.13.

Recommendation

---

[3] Under the highlighted comments section of Colmar Brunton analysis, diversity and equity was mentioned once. One should not read too much into this since the questions were structured differently.
Liz Patara NZC draft Report- MoE 20.2.07- 26.2.07

Consider making explicit the 'inclusive curriculum' emphasising its non-discriminatory nature in *Principles, Values, Effective Pedagogy* and an overarching statement- *Learning Areas*, draft NZC p.13.

2.3   *Economic Focus & Sustainability*
There were 19 submissions (LDR) on the perceived economic focus and 15 submissions on sustainability/environment. Familiar responses and tensions emerged:

- Vision is economically driven vs. lack of inclusion/emphasis on accounting; economics and financial literacy;
- Individualism vs. collectivism;
- Economy vs. sustainability and the environment.

In Colmar Brunton, under *Overall Intent and Direction* (p. 15) it was noted that 182 submitters considered there was an over emphasis on global and economic interests/business.

Not surprisingly sustainability featured highly. Getting the message across that a prosperous economy is one that is environmentally sustainable (to people's satisfaction) is the challenge.

At a minimum, a guide may be that where the word "*economy/economics*" appears in the draft NZC (e.g. *Vision*, p. 8; *Social Science*, p. 22), the interdependence of "*economy*" and "*sustainability*" are more clearly emphasised. Likewise, it would be reasonable to expect that this is also covered under *Science* and *Technology* since investigations in these areas automatically include consideration of the effect on the environment or at least a moral and ethical obligation to consider this factor.

Recommendations
Scrutinise sections of the draft NZC with the view to making the interdependence of "*economy*" and "*sustainability*" more transparent.

2.4 *Spirituality, religion and values education*
According to LDR and individual responses in LSR, this was the least common theme, more pertinent however, is its importance to those making comment and this should be noted. There were nine submissions in the LDR about these components.

Recommendation
The MoE notes the importance of *Spirituality, religion and values education* to respondents in this section.

3   Overall structure and format

3.1   There were 15 submissions for this in LDR. Though LDR has one section (pp. 30 – 31) about structure and format, the only aspect singled out for general comment in the introduction to this section was, "*It is interesting to note that while some submissions commented positively on the fold-out achievement objectives section in the document, others found them clumsy.*"

The concerns and recommendations LDR extracted from submissions where at least three respondents concurred were:

- Reorder to bring curriculum design and pedagogy sections further forward (5 respondents);
- Pull out AO section and fold-out sections are clumsy (5 respondents) yet other respondents were positive about this section;
- Need to number the achievement objectives, include curriculum level on each fold out and ensure consistency of format across learning areas.

In addition, LDR did not identify structure and format as an emerging theme under any of the separate sections in the table of contents rather one would have to comb the individual responses under sub-headings within sections.

The LSR does not have a corresponding section on overall structure. On the other hand, in Colman Brunton, responses to question 10, "*Do the achievement objectives state student outcomes in a way that teachers and students are likely to find useful?*" did offer more insight on AO's in general.

3.1.1 Reordering Sections

Some LDR respondents recommend bringing curriculum design and pedagogy sections further forward but the exact position is not stated. Colmar Brunton has not highlighted commentary specific to this area so it is difficult to gauge the extent of the concern. Likewise the ACER commentary on the draft NZC and subsequent recommendations do not refer to the specific reordering of sections. However Le Metais (2006) recommends restructuring the document as follows:

"*there may be merit in reordering the sections and, clearly grouping them, along the follwing lines*:

Forward
- *Context*

Aims and Principles
- *Vision (p.8)*
- *Principles (and values) Underpinning the Curriculum (p.9) with relevant parts of (p.10)*

The Learning Experience
- *Key competencies (p.11)*
- *Learning Areas (overview page and detailed descriptions, pp.13-23)*
- *Achievement Objectives and Curriculum Levels (an introductory statement on their purpose nature, and the graphics on p.34. Detailed achievement objectives, if retained remain at the end.)*
- *Future-based Themes (extracted from p.26)*
- *Values and attitudes and Dispositions (from p.10)*
- *Effective Pedagogy (pp.24-25)*
- *Purposeful Assessment (pp. 30-31)* [Le Metais, 2007, p. 16]"

Le Metais notes these aspects are especially important to schools, students and parents which depend on effective co-operation between them. On the other hand *Designing a School Curriculum* is of primary concern to school leadership and teachers. In terms of *Designing a School Curriculum*, Le Metais recommends:

- "*Designing a School Curriculum (the text current on p. 26, excluding the detailed paragraphs on themes, which would be relocated under 'The Learning Experience' above)*
- *School Curriculum Links to the Schooling Strategy and NEGs*
- *Planning with a Focus on Outcomes*
- *Planning for the Development of Key Competencies*
- *Planning for Coherent Pathways* (p. 17)

According to Le Metais, changing format and distinguishing between titles will make the document easier to track. Whilst on the face of it, the reformatting does not necessarily address LDR respondent's issue of bringing curriculum design and pedagogy forward; it is a partial solution.[4]

It should be pointed out this reformatting may provide a solution to a number of other concerns revealed in LDR, LSR and Colman Brunton that will be identified and discussed under respective headings later in the paper.

3.1.2 *Achievement Objectives (AOs)*
There were some points of commonality in the Colmar Brunton analysis under the heading *Overall Clarity* (p. 18) where 273 respondents thought fold-out pages annoying, cumbersome, lacked headings and did not show levels; 182 respondents called for leveling on each section and keep levels side by side.[5]

The bigger issue, relating to AO's in Colmar Brunton, is found in responses to the question, "*Do the achievement objectives state student outcomes in a way that teachers and students are likely to find useful?*" (p. 66); is the difference of opinion between primary and secondary teachers. Though there was a high level of agreement overall (80%) that AO's are stated in away that is useful across most learning areas (*Technology* and *Learning Languages* had the lowest score); the difference between primary and secondary teachers is more pronounced e.g. the largest difference being science where 58% of primary teachers agree AO's are useful compared to 15% of secondary teachers.

ACER also points out the relationship between AO's and the National Certificate of Educational Achievement (NCEA) needs to be clarified (p. 4). Le Metais (2006, p.9) adds, the organization of achievement objectives by learning area and level contradicts the intention of the new curriculum to give priority to the development of *Key Competencies.* Le Metais proposes changes to rectify this (refer section 4.3.1).

---

[4] Readers should note that this section of Le Metais' critique is dependent on previous 'suggestions' in the critique being actioned.

[5] The exact meaning of 'side by side' is unknown.

3.1.3 *Learning Area- Arts*
A common theme within the six submissions on *Arts* (LDR) was concern about the exclusion of the rationale 'why study arts' (p. 65). This was also highlighted in Colmar Brunton with 91 respondents drawing attention to this inconsistency. Similarly Le Matais (2006, p. 8) points out the rationale for the *Arts* should be included.

The breadth of commentary in the LSR and the different headings (compared to LDR) makes it difficult to glean any more information on structure and format unless meticulous bullet-by-bullet point analysis was conducted. Furthermore the points made are unique to the specific respondent and whilst one respondent finds an aspect positive another may not.

Recommendations
The MoE considers:
1. Restructuring the document as outlined in 3.1.1.
2. Making alterations to the AO pull out section:
   a) Level sections on each of the AO pull out pages;
   b) Decide whether to reorder the section whereby respective learning areas levels 1-8 are kept together or;
   c) Retain the current format of the AO pull out section and (as it does now) provide a supplementary AO section where respective learning areas levels 1-8 are kept together.
3. Reviewing the usefulness of how AO's are stated in light of the stark difference between primary and secondary teachers (even though there was a high percentage of overall agreement).
4. Adding the rationale to the learning area- *Arts* (p. 14).

4. Clarity

4.1   There were 23 LDR submissions on 'Language Used' however no emerging themes were identified. One positive comment- language used was concise- was immediately negated by eight bullet points of concerns and recommendations.

The areas where at least three respondents concurred were:
- *"Overly complicated language and use of jargon. Difficult for parents to understand* [11 respondents]
- *Confusion about the use of terms "critical literacy" and "literacy"*
- *Unnecessary and confusing repetition of concepts and words in Values, Principals* [sic]*, and Vision sections.*
- *Inconsistent use of key terms and style (e.g. analyse, evaluate, complex, outcomes)* [LDR, pp. 31-32].
- *Need for a glossary of key terms* [LDR, pp. 32-33]."

4.2   Each section (as stipulated in the table of contents) of LSR has two sub-headings relevant to this section- 'Comments relating to specific text' and 'Layout and language'; nonetheless all sections state concerns and recommendations. The extent and specificity

of the points respondents make are numerous and apply directly to a particular section therefore the writer has decided not to 'drill down' since LDR did not find any common threads/ or emerging themes in the section 'Language Used'.

4.3   The key findings in Colmar Brunton about *Clarity and Usefulness* of the draft NZC (p. 34) are:

- Overall there is agreement it is easy to read and understand (83%);
- Majority of family members also found it easy to read and understand (77%);
- Like layout, good headings, like colour coding.

Conversely the negatives were:

- Very vague, too broad, too difficult to interpret;
- Terminology could be simplified; too much jargon;
- The least clear, was *Designing a School Curriculum*.

Coleman Brunton noted secondary teachers were more likely to make the comments in bullet points 1-3.   In addition, tertiary providers also found *Designing a School Curriculum* the most difficult to understand.

Summary
Apart from overall agreement as cited in Colmar Brunton, it is difficult to know how to address areas of concern especially when there are conflicting views. This difficulty is compounded because the comments which are singled out (e.g. Terminology could be simplified; too much jargon) provide little direction beyond a general statement unless the full submissions were read. Considering this, the best conclusion one could make from 3.1-3.3 is that for different reasons respondents find the document unclear.
In order to gain more insight about clarity per se it is better to look at each section of the draft NZC- *Overview, Vision, Principles, Values, Key Competencies, Learning Areas, Effective Pedagogy, Designing a School Curriculum, and Achievement Objectives*.

Suggestions/ or recommendations from ACER and Le Metais will be considered.

4.3.1
There was one recurring question (LDR & LSR), "What is the relationship between (some or all of the sections) *Vision, Principles, Values, Key Competencies, Learning area descriptors, Effective Pedagogy, Designing a School Curriculum*?" The following comment probably encapsulates views- "*They are not well aligned nor do they present a cohesive overview to give the reader a clear direction to underpin the seven essential learning areas* (LDR, p. 39)." This view probably covers the points made in Colmar Brunton though expressed differently (pp. 25, 33-34).

ACER and Le Metais make similar points and offer suggestions:

- *"There could be a more direct relationship between this section* [Principles] *and the section on designing a curriculum*.
- *It may be useful to add to the learning areas some examples of ways learning area teachers can add to the development of skills* [Key Competencies].

- *The relationship between the three axes of achievement objectives, skills* [Key Competencies] *and values need to be made more clear* (ACER, p. 10)."

Le Metais (2006, p. 15) points out the draft NZC is unclear about the link between the learning areas and AO's on one hand and the *Key Competencies* on the other. Le Metais suggests adding a new section "*How XXX contributes to developing the key competencies' in the section for each of the learning areas*." Furthermore this additional section should highlight where a learning area takes a lead role (for detail refer Le Metais, 2006, p.15). Le Metais also suggests providing an overview of the 'Big Picture' where the relationship between the constituent parts and their interrelationship are outlined on a single page (Le Metais, p. 18).

Recommendations

The MoE further investigates ACER and Le Metais' proposed solutions in order to achieve more clarity and coherence in the draft NZC; specifically:
1. Restructuring the document as outlined in 3.1.1;
2. Adding a new section "How XXX contributes to developing the key competencies' in the section for each of the learning areas which should highlight where a learning area may take a lead role (examples provided in Le Metais 2006, p. 15);
3. Providing a diagram showing the relationship between the constituent parts and their interrelationship outlined on a single page (Le Metais, p. 18).

Part II

Part II aims to cover the significant issues not covered in Part I

1. **Key Competencies**

1.1 This attracted the largest number of submissions; there were 80 submissions (LDR). LDR reports the key themes were a long list of suggested additional *Key Competencies*. However the themes LDR highlighted were physical skills; clarification between *Key Competencies* and *learning areas* as well as *Key Competencies* and *Te Whariki*; and concern about the term *Key Competencies*.

1.2 As mentioned earlier, LSR had a 139 (mainly individual submitters) making comment and seeking modifications. Colmar Brunton comment included the necessity to clarify *Key Competencies* and its assessment and some submitters identified gaps (pp. 25, 33). In terms of gaps, Le Metais (2006) lists the skills in the NZCF that have been excluded from *Key Competencies* (p. 7).

1.3 The issue of clarification and coherence relating to *Key Competencies* has been covered previously (pp. 6, 9). However the decision to make modifications- additions, deletions, word changes etc- is up for debate. Having said that, since the addition of physical skills is a key theme in the LDR and taking into account the comment from Le Metais then it may be worthwhile reviewing the list of *Key Competencies*.

1.4   On the issue of more clearly linking *Key Competencies* to *Te Whariki* (LDR, p. 57), the commentary in this section of LDR provides little guidance on how to achieve this.

Recommendation
The MoE considers:
1. Whether or not to add 'physical skills' to the list of *Key Competencies* and the possible implications of the decision;
2. Reviewing the full submissions on linking *Key Competencies* to *Te Whariki* to determine how this can be accomplished.

2.   **Learning Areas**

2.1   The were 26 submissions and the key theme was the need for integration across all *Learning Areas* (LDR, p. 61; LSR, p. 27). There were no specific comments in Colmar Brunton referring to integration across curriculum as opposed to cross-curricular approaches (as in *Designing a Curriculum* where there was a lot of concern). ACER and Le Metais are silent on this.

2.2   LDR (p. 62) noted that a number of submissions suggested additional *Learning Areas* and focuses across *Learning Areas*.

2.3   Colmar Brunton reported a high level of agreement- that *Learning Areas* are described accurately. The levels of agreement about accuracy ranged from 91% for *English*, 75% *Learning Languages*, 74% *Technology* and 66% for *Science*. However there is a wide range and secondary teachers are more likely to disagree with the descriptions in- *Technology* (44%), *Science* (34%), and *Learning Languages* (31%). There is no commentary on this matter in ACER and Le Metais.

Considering there is a high level of disagreement about the accuracy of descriptors in *Technology, Science and Learning Languages* it would seem reasonable to probe further.

Recommendation
The MoE, through a focus group, considers revisiting the *Learning Area* descriptions for *Technology, Science and Learning Languages* with the view to increasing accuracy.

2.4   **Effective Pedagogy**

2.4.1   There were 56 submissions (LDR) and it was not possible for Lift to group these into themes. On the one hand Lift concluded "*However, review of the positive aspects indicates a level of support for this section of the Draft Curriculum*" then followed up with, "*A wide range of concerns and recommendations were expressed.*" ACER regards effective pedagogy as a positive addition but notes the omission of 'the role of assessment' since effective pedagogical practices are informed by assessment. Le Metais

(2006, p. 13) as stated earlier, suggests locating *Effective Pedagogy* and assessment closer together (refer Pt 1, 3.3.1).

When one reads the concerns and recommendations in the LDR there is such a range from "*Pedagogy doesn't belong in the curriculum*" to "*Overall effective pedagogy statement is not grounded in a pedagogical theory* (pp. 106, 107). On one level this is understandable considering this section is an addition to the curriculum however it is a crucial addition.

Recommendation
The MoE considers including a dedicated session on *Effective Pedagogy* if/when professional development occurs to implement changes.

2.5   Designing a School Curriculum

2.5.1   There were 42 submissions (LDR). Key themes included concerns about the implementation of future focused themes; concerns about school level flexibility to design a school's own curriculum and the role of the community in curriculum design.

2.5.2   Colmar Brunton concluded the main areas of concern in *Designing a School Curriculum were*:

- "*Adequate resourcing to assist in implementing the changes including assistance in designing a curriculum within the constraints of possible competing demands from NCEA, ERO and Ministry of Education*
- *For some, the document is seen as not detailed enough…and they request more 'how to' instructions and detail*
- *Not surprisingly therefore, the least useful and least understood section in the document is 'Designing a school curriculum'* (p. 6)."

ACER (p. 8) has similar reservations:

- Little guidance about bringing it all together;
- Nor is it clear whether schools have to plan for all aspects- *values, outcomes, key competencies, purposeful assessment and coherent pathways*;
- In terms of cross-curricular approaches, ACER sees the resources required to ensure this approach exacting; especially with "*discipline-based teachers.*"

ACER suggests strengthening *Designing a School Curriculum* with a statement explaining schools need to adopt a driver and that all aspects- *values, outcomes, key competencies, purposeful assessment and coherent pathways* need to be included (p. 8). Later in the paper, ACER suggests providing examples of how to design curriculum around e.g. values whilst still monitoring the other key components.

2.5.3   Le Metais' suggestions are on p.7 of this paper- advising restructuring.

Summary
The writer believes the issues raised cannot be addressed without a thorough review therefore has only made one general recommendation.

Recommendation
The MoE gives serious consideration to a review on this section of the draft NZC and provides a number of options for a way forward.

Liz Patara