
From: India Tasker
Sent: Thursday, 22 August 2024 10:56 am
To: India Tasker
Subject: FW: Feedback on DPS

From: Young, Mike 9(2)(a)
Sent: Sunday, May 7, 2023 11:45 AM
To: Christina Webster <Christina.Webster@education.govt.nz>
Subject: Feedback on DPS

Hi Christina,

I have had a detailed read of the Draft Proposed Standards Breakdown of Capabilities and Assessments (Post SEG Meeting). Congratulations to those involved as a huge amount of work has gone in and some of the Standards are very clear. There is a clear progression between A, M and E capabilities. When comparing the activities to the Draft Matrix Curriculum Level 7 I was able to correlate each Big Idea to a learning activity that would be encompassed by one or more Draft Standard.

As far as the list of bulleted Significant Learning in the Matrix goes, many of those learnings are evident within the Draft Standards. Presently I feel there are too many Significant Learnings and we have set ourselves an impossible task to design courses which have so, so many. Whoever highlighted the yellow, green and blue it would be good to understand what those meant, but at the moment I don't see yellow, green or blue #1 being touched on in the Draft Proposed Standards. Perhaps this informs us that they are beyond Level 7?

There could be a clash of intent between SL2 (yellow) and 2.3 – are we asking students to disregard tikanga and simply make wholesale alterations to music? How can this be handled to avoid situations of cultural appropriation?

Looking ahead to the blank documents for 2.1a, b, c, 2.2a, b, c and Proposed Externals I can see (and agree with) the logical correlation between which Draft Proposed Standards might be internal and which might be external. Well designed 2.1a, b, c tasks will be welcomed by teachers and students in a “pick-up-and-go” form. I can see 2.2. being very localised, individualised and therefore tricky to assess.

From the perspective of an outsider looking in (as I was unable to attend the recent online hui) it looks like we are in a very good place with Music A.

I am looking forward to Wellington,
Mike Young



Mike Young
Head of Co-Curricular Music

P 9(2)(a)
D
E

St Cuthbert's College – 122 Market Road
Epsom, Auckland 1051, New Zealand
stcuthberts.school.nz



Please consider the environment before printing this email

This message (and any associated files) is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is confidential, subject to copyright or constitutes a trade secret. If you are not the intended recipient you are hereby notified that any dissemination, copying or distribution of this message, or files associated with this message, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by replying to the message or contacting helpdesk@stcuthberts.school.nz, and deleting it from your computer. Messages sent to and from us may be monitored.

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

From: Marc Clement
Sent: Thursday, 7 December 2023 9:33 am
To: Evan Sutherland; Henry Collette
Subject: FW: Commissioned work from the June hui

Kia ora korua

I thought it prudent to forward this bit of comms from one of the physics SEG members. You will note that he refers to the physics product development being a special case and that there is hesitation to allow the process to continue without further face to face hui.

Kia pai tō rā

Marc Clement | Lead Secondary Advisor
Te Poutāhū (Curriculum Centre)
DDI 9(2)(a)

From: Thrasher, David 9(2)(a)
Sent: Thursday, 30 November 2023 12:01 pm
To: Marc Clement <Marc.Clement@education.govt.nz>; Alvin Chand 9(2)(a); Hilary Takarangi; Louise Gray; David Housden; Marcus Wilson; Mary Rabbidge; Rosa Hughes-Currie
Cc: Thrasher, David
Subject: RE: Commissioned work from the June hui

Hey Marc – I see all L2 SEG folk finally heard from the MoE mothership a few minutes ago.

It's been a while.

The MoE/RAS email that came out today (Nov 30 2023) seems to assume we are ready to work on our own – or online – on L2 standard stuff.

This may be the case for some SEGs **but is not for the physics SEG**. The same issues that existed after our June session in Wellington remain... as explained in the email below from early July – to which we got no reply.

Big decision remain for L2 physics (much less the landscape of L2 and L3). Much of this is summarized in the googledoc below – which seg members have access to. Marc – I have given you viewing access.

9(2)(ba)(ii), 9(2)(f)(iv)

There is a similar summary of what COULD be in each external of L2 inside the teams folders from our June gathering in Wellington – assuming those files have not been moved/removed. Much of this circles around the discussion we had (or started to have but did not complete) on our last day in wellington.

Along with the decisions of what's to be covered in each external is also the decision to **downsize the 2 internals to be 4 credits and the 2 externals to be 6 credits** based on the logic explained in the google doc above.

With all of this – a face-to-face gathering of the L2 physics SEG would be better than a zoom-fest.

These things have not moved 1 iota since June of 2023. And must be sorted before any meaningful work can occur in 2024.

Let us know what you and MoE think and WHEN these issues can be addressed.

Other SEG members may have other thoughts – but I will leave that for them to articulate.

And given the new gov't and months between our June gathering and now, other things may have shifted inside MoE that we are not aware of.

Cheers
Dave



David Thrasher
Physics and Sciences Teacher

P 9(2)(a)
D [Redacted]
E [Redacted]

St Cuthbert's College – 122 Market Road
Epsom, Auckland 1051, New Zealand
stcuthberts.school.nz



Please consider the environment before printing this email

This message (and any associated files) is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is confidential, subject to copyright or constitutes a trade secret. If you are not the intended recipient you are hereby notified that any dissemination, copying or distribution of this message, or files associated with this message, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by replying to the message or contacting helpdesk@stcuthberts.school.nz, and deleting it from your computer. Messages sent to and from us may be monitored.

From: Thrasher, David 9(2)(a)
Sent: Wednesday, July 5, 2023 1:37 PM
To: Marc Clement <Marc.Clement@education.govt.nz>; Alvin Chand 9(2)(a); Hilary Takarangi; Louise Gray; Marcus Wilson <Marcus.Wilson@education.govt.nz>; Mary Rabbidge; Rosa Hughes-Currie
Subject: RE: Commissioned work from the June hui

Howdy Marc and fellow SEG-ites

as was stated on our last afternoon – and restated a few days later via SEG communications:

work on each of the internals (3 exemplars and such) can easily continue – assuming SEG members have time.

But work on the 2 externals CANNOT progress until a few things happen:

- MoE devote time for the SEG to come to agreement on the boundaries of each external (what's in and what's not)... this would imply DETAILED explanatory notes for each including associated equations – with likely more detail than MoE would allow (but hopefully not).
- MoE needs to accept that a subject wide scope-document needs to exist that overlaps all 4 standards – as David Housden explained on our last afternoon – similar to the scope document for any given scholarship exam. This is an NCEA-wide issue – not just physics.

without the 1st one above – there is no way work can progress on either external. Marcus and I were chatting about this yesterday in fact over a cup of coffee (at the nzip conference). The 2nd one above is essential in the long run. But without the 2 externals sorted no year-plan nor sample course-plans can ever exist. We have a shared document with 1 interpretation of the 1st bullet point above but no time has been given or allocated by MoE for the SEG to even attempt to come to consensus, much less the technical writer and others to word-smith the explanatory notes into a workable state.

Marc – my question to you: have you fed back to your higher-ups in MoE/RAS those limitations to progressing the 2 externals of the L2 physics standards? If so, what was their response. If not, please do so ASAP and let us know what their response is.

cheers
dave



St Cuthbert's

David Thrasher

Physics and Sciences Teacher

P 9(2)(a)

D

E

St Cuthbert's College – 122 Market Road
Epsom, Auckland 1051, New Zealand
stcuthberts.school.nz

Released under the Official Information Act 1982



Mānawatia

Please consider the environment before printing this email

This message (and any associated files) is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is confidential, subject to copyright or constitutes a trade secret. If you are not the intended recipient you are hereby notified that any dissemination, copying or distribution of this message, or files associated with this message, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by replying to the message or contacting helpdesk@stcuthberts.school.nz, and deleting it from your computer. Messages sent to and from us may be monitored.

From: Marc Clement <Marc.Clement@education.govt.nz>

Sent: Wednesday, July 5, 2023 1:05 PM

To: Alvin Chand^{9(2)(a)}; Thrasher, David; Hilary Takarangi; Louise Gray; Marcus Wilson; Mary Rabbidge; Rosa Hughes-Currie

Subject: Commissioned work from the June hui

Kia ora tatou

I am glad to be able to get back in touch after this hiatus. It would be great to get a reading on product development at this point in time. We are aware that our work on the standards 'is not finished'. There was a collective agreement on this at the end of the June hui. However, work on the assessment activities and other related products does need to be taken as far as it can before the blockers and uncertainties pop-up. This actively informs Achievement Standard development, as this work 'finds' the weaknesses in and strengths of the proposed standards. Please do share how you have gotten on.

Ngā mihi nui

Marc Clement | Lead Secondary Advisor
Te Poutāhū (Curriculum Centre)

DISCLAIMER:

This email and any attachments may contain information that is confidential and subject to legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, dissemination, distribution or duplication of this email and attachments is prohibited. If you have received this email in error please notify the author immediately and erase all copies of the email and attachments. The Ministry of Education accepts no responsibility for changes made to this message or attachments after transmission from the Ministry.

From: India Tasker
Sent: Thursday, 22 August 2024 10:55 am
To: India Tasker
Subject: FW: Better Now Activity
Attachments: 9(2)(ba)(ii), 9(2)(f)(iv)

From: Young, Mike 9(2)(a)
Sent: Monday, January 29, 2024 10:43 AM
To: Christina Webster <Christina.Webster@education.govt.nz>
Subject: Re: Better Now Activity

Hi Christina, HNY.

I have had a second look at this after my head cleared (TGFH). Very tricky to pick wording that could encompass a range of learners and music skills and styles and I worry that it is very "old school". You will want to massage it according to all sorts of parameters.

9(2)(ba)(ii), 9(2)(f)(iv)

I hope this is the sort of thing you were after?

I am unable to upload it. On Teams I can only find the pre-F2F stuff from mid 2022. Perhaps you will position this in the correct place once you are happy with it.

Regards,
Mike



Mike Young
Head of Co-Curricular Music

P 9(2)(a)

D
E

St Cuthbert's College – 122 Market Road
Epsom, Auckland 1051, New Zealand
stcuthberts.school.nz



This message (and any associated files) is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is confidential, subject to copyright or constitutes a trade secret. If you are not the intended recipient you are hereby notified that any dissemination, copying or distribution of this message, or files associated with this message, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by replying to the message or contacting helpdesk@stcuthberts.school.nz, and deleting it from your computer. Messages sent to and from us may be monitored.


From: Christina Webster <Christina.Webster@education.govt.nz>
Date: Thursday, 14 December 2023 at 11:25 AM
To: Young, Mike 9(2)(a)
Subject: Better Now Activity

Kia ora Mike

I hope you have survived the year. We have used the activity you wrote during the F2F and wondered if you would be willing to give a few minutes and fill out the attached Assessment Schedule as to how you would see student learning evidenced at each level? I am wanting to have a broad spectrum of advice on this and believe you have a great deal of knowledge in this area. I placed the details of the activity below in this email as I see you currently have not accessed the TEAMS site since there was an update. Thank you I advance if this is possible for you to complete.

Ngā mihi
Chrissie

9(2)(ba)(ii), 9(2)(f)(iv)



Released under the Official Information Act 1982

9(2)(ba)(ii), 9(2)(f)(iv)

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

Christina Webster | Lead Secondary Advisor
Te Poutāhū (Curriculum Centre)

DDI 9(2)(a) [redacted]
National Office 1 The Terrace
education.govt.nz

He mea tārai e mātou te mātauranga kia rangatira ai, kia mana taurite ai ōna huanga
We shape an education system that delivers equitable and excellent outcomes



DISCLAIMER:

This email and any attachments may contain information that is confidential and subject to legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, dissemination, distribution or duplication of this email and attachments is prohibited. If you have received this email in error please notify the author immediately and erase all copies of the email and attachments. The Ministry of Education accepts no responsibility for changes made to this message or attachments after transmission from the Ministry.

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

From: Evan Sutherland
Sent: Friday, 16 February 2024 2:31 pm
To: Thrasher, David
Subject: RE: RAS L2 Physics - new LSA

Hey Dave

Thank you for your email, I always appreciate having some insight before going into meeting, particularly in this case as I will be resuming work that was started quite a while ago, by someone else, so having the backstory and potential concerns/ talking points is very valuable.

The points that you wish to raise do not surprise me and is what I imagined the SEG would want to discuss. The "finalisation" of the Learning matrix and 4 Achievement standards are key to anything else we produce and need to have most consensus. They also have the highest amount of pressure attached as NZQA needs these for all their publication requirements. The remaining products are still important but can be divided off and will be easier to get consensus on as they are exemplifications of what could be done.

I'm unclear what you mean by this: (2) the boundary conditions MoE required and if any of those have shifted in the last 3/4ths of a yr. Being new to the RAS team, I do not have all the historical knowledge on past decisions so I will chat with the Science team next week about this, but any clarity you can offer would be appreciated.

As for timelines. My current tech writer and I are hoping to have most of our current subject checked by the critical perspective teams and signed off in the next two to three weeks. During that time, I will be dipping in and out of Physics as and where I can, including reading the documents you've linked below, next week. I'm also planning to arrange smaller, shorter meetings with SEG members a few at a time to put names to faces and get initial feedback, like yours, on points that need attention, willingness to continue with the SEG, etc before we have a full SEG hui. Following that I will properly switch gears and dig into Physics development in early to mid-March. Looking ahead, I would like to see the Physics Learning Matrix and the 4 Achievement standards at a place we are all happy with by mid (ish) May.

I look forward to working with you on Physics in this different way. We have emailed and communicated over Facebook about Physics teaching a few times over the years but never had a chance to meet, so it will be nice to put a face rather than a helmet to the name.

Cheers

Evan Sutherland | Lead Secondary Advisor
Te Poutāhū (Curriculum Centre)

DDI 9(2)(a) | Mobile
National Office 1 The Terrace

education.govt.nz

He mea tārai e mātou te mātauranga kia rangatira ai, kia mana taurite ai ōna huanga
We shape an education system that delivers equitable and excellent outcomes



From: Thrasher, David 9(2)(a)
Sent: Friday, February 16, 2024 11:55 AM
To: Marc Clement <Marc.Clement@education.govt.nz>; 9(2)(a) Hilary Takarangi 9(2)(a) Louise Gray
Mary Rabbidge Rosa Hughes-Currie
Cc: Evan Sutherland <Evan.Sutherland@education.govt.nz>; Elspeth Cotsilinis <Elspeth.Cotsilinis@education.govt.nz>; Henry Collette <Henry.Collette@education.govt.nz>
Subject: RE: RAS L2 Physics - new LSA

You don't often get email from 9(2)(a) [Learn why this is important](#)

Hi Mark, Evan & all the rest

Good to hear that L2 SEG work will start sometime... the physics SEG has many yet-to-be-discussed things that were never done, nor consensus ever reached back in mid-2023 Wellington face-to-face workshop.

I am foreshadowing 2 topics that I will bring to our 1st 2024 SEG discussion:

- 1 being a review of what we crafted (incompletely) back in mid-2023 (in that week around King's Birthday) – specifically (1) the appropriateness (or lack of) that package of standards, (2) the boundary conditions MoE required and if any of those have shifted in the last 3/4ths of a yr, (3) if SEG members are still happy (or not) with the 4 draft standards partially crafted back in mid-2023.

For a frame of reference I remind everyone of the lay of the land in the current L2ncea physics programs nation-wide – [via this document](#) – that shows what most physics teachers include and what most physics teachers do not include in the current 24-possible credit package.

- My 2nd point – is 9(2)(ba)(ii), 9(2)(f)(iv) – that was shared with SEG and MoE folk after mid-2023s session and again in late 2023 but has yet to be discussed in any way as the phy-SEG ran out of time on our last day in Wellington in mid-2023.

Other SEG members may have items to bring up to that have surfaced in the many months since we last discussed or did anything related to L2-SEG work.

As you can tell from the above – the phy-SEG are in no way near to being at a point “close to publication” of L2 products. This reflects the 1 less year that the physics SEG has had compared with biology and chemistry to work on the iterative crafting of the 4 standards as well as the lack of any work since mid-2023.

Finally, please let us know in what timeframe MoE expect L2 SEG work to commence as well as what MoE expects to be the 2024's timeline for L2 work. As you are obviously aware, many of us have other responsibilities other than our teaching positions.

Cheers
Dave



St Cuthbert's

David Thrasher
Physics and Sciences Teacher

P 9(2)(a)

D
E

St Cuthbert's College – 122 Market Road



Please consider the environment before printing this email

This message (and any associated files) is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is confidential, subject to copyright or constitutes a trade secret. If you are not the intended recipient you are hereby notified that any dissemination, copying or distribution of this message, or files associated with this message, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by replying to the message or contacting helpdesk@stcuthberts.school.nz, and deleting it from your computer. Messages sent to and from us may be monitored.

From: Marc Clement <Marc.Clement@education.govt.nz>

Sent: Thursday, February 15, 2024 3:29 PM

To: 9(2)(a) Thrasher, David

Hilary Takarangi ; Louise Gray

Mary Rabbidge

Rosa Hughes-Currie

Cc: Evan Sutherland <Evan.Sutherland@education.govt.nz>; Elspeth Cotsilinis <Elspeth.Cotsilinis@education.govt.nz>; Henry Collette <Henry.Collette@education.govt.nz>

Subject: RAS L2 Physics - new LSA

Kia ora Koutou

I do hope you all have had an enjoyable summer and are getting back into the swing of Term 1. I am writing to advise you that there has been a bit of a reshuffle of portfolios, and I wish to formally introduce you to Evan Sutherland. Evan will oversee the L2 Physics products through refinement and into publication. I believe Evan is already acquainted with several of you from engagements prior to the RAS program. We are working through hand-over, and I believe he will be in touch with you in the next couple of months as we look towards our publication goal for L2.

I will still be involved with L2 Sciences, so you have not seen the last me. All the very best, team!

Kia pai tō rā

Marc Clement | Lead Secondary Advisor
Te Poutāhū (Curriculum Centre)

DDI 9(2)(a)
National Office 1 The Terrace

education.govt.nz

*He mea tārai e mātou te mātauranga kia rangatira ai, kia mana taurite ai ōna huanga
We shape an education system that delivers equitable and excellent outcomes*



DISCLAIMER:

This email and any attachments may contain information that is confidential and subject to legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, dissemination, distribution or duplication of this email and attachments is prohibited. If you have received this email in error please notify the author immediately and erase all copies of the email and attachments. The Ministry of Education accepts no responsibility for changes made to this message or attachments after transmission from the Ministry.

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

From: Thrasher, David 9(2)(a)
Sent: Monday, 19 February 2024 12:17 pm
To: Evan Sutherland
Subject: RE: Thanks Evan!

You don't often get email from 9(2)(a) [Learn why this is important](#)

Roger that. good luck. It's always tricky jumping into a very long-running program with folk continually shifted about. But I just wanted to give you my opinions – as well as some of the other seg members. I'll leave it to them to voice their own opinions though.

As you've actually taught physics in high school I'll be curious on your take of or 1st draft of standards.

dave



David Thrasher
Physics and Sciences Teacher

P 9(2)(a)
D
E

St Cuthbert's College – 122 Market Road
Epsom, Auckland 1051, New Zealand
stcuthberts.school.nz



Please consider the environment before printing this email

This message (and any associated files) is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is confidential, subject to copyright or constitutes a trade secret. If you are not the intended recipient you are hereby notified that any dissemination, copying or distribution of this message, or files associated with this message, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by replying to the message or contacting helpdesk@stcuthberts.school.nz, and deleting it from your computer. Messages sent to and from us may be monitored.

From: Evan Sutherland <Evan.Sutherland@education.govt.nz>
Sent: Monday, February 19, 2024 12:09 PM
To: Thrasher, David 9(2)(a)
Subject: RE: Thanks Evan!

Thanks for this Dave, and on a Saturday no less.

I will go through everything you have provided and get some clarity on the “has any of this changed” aspects. There is a lot for me to get my head around and a lot more that will likely be better to discuss during a call than via email.

I'll be in touch.

Cheers

Evan Sutherland | Lead Secondary Advisor
Te Poutāhū (Curriculum Centre)

DDI 9(2)(a) Mobile
National Office 1 The Terrace

education.govt.nz

He mea tārai e mātou te mātauranga kia rangatira ai, kia mana taurite ai ōna huanga
We shape an education system that delivers equitable and excellent outcomes



From: Thrasher, David 9(2)(a)
Sent: Saturday, February 17, 2024 2:27 PM
To: Evan Sutherland <Evan.Sutherland@education.govt.nz>
Cc: 9(2)(a)
Mary Rabbidge
Rosa Hughes-Currie
Dave H personal nzip

Subject: Thanks Evan!

Hi Evan

Thanks heaps for replying Friday avo. Much appreciated! Really.

I've forwarded your reply to the other phy-SEG members as they need to understand your (and MoE's) very... “optimistic” timeline you mention in that email.

When you and your new tech-writer are reviewing the incomplete, insufficient information in the pile of documents in MoE's physics-SEG folders, just remember that the physics-SEG started in late Nov 2022, almost year after the chem and bio SEGs started. That first session for phy-SEG work in Nov/Dec 2022 was a also flawed model of writers in the room and critiquers outside the room. MoE rightly jettisoned that model for a multitude of reasons before the phy-SEG's only other session in mid-2023 in Wellington just after King's B-Day.

To be blunt: there have simply not been enough days or time allocated to get the required tasks done with the restrictions (boundary conditions) imposed by MoE.

The physics learning matrix which has questionable use (much less understandability or meaning) has not been through the needed and essential iterations that chem's and bio's have had the opportunity given the very truncated timeline and flawed processes physics has had.

Also complicating the process have been MoE's questionable premises at the start of each session. In 2022 every SEG of every subject was being advised to revisit their subject, what is taught and what is assessed, with the overt direction of attracting more students to opt into that subject. Anyone with a whiff of timetabling or deaning experience can understand this is a flawed premiss as more students taking 1 subject means less taking another in any high school program of 6 or 5 subjects per student. The premiss also flies in the face of the repeated statements from MoE officials as well as multiple Ministers of Education that the new version of L2 and L3 NCEA were not to be objectively or significantly or substantively different from the current NCEA programs so that tertiary outfits in and outside of NZ would not be unduly impacted (not to mention the students) and that the L2 and L3 NCEA qualification would not decrease in their standing or perception.

In the mid-2023 session MoE directed all L2 phy/bio/che/ess work to be based on the assumption that all incoming L2 students would have only had experiences with the 4 L1 NoS science NCEA standards and nothing else. Again, this was a laughable proposition given the true variety and complexity of planned 2024 Yr11 programs across NZ that was known at the time – including approximately 30% of NZ's students having no pathway to a L1 NCEA certificate at all, and those in schools who were opting into L1 NCEA, the L1 NoS standards were in no way the most common inclusion of assessment plans made from possible 12 standards of sci, che-bio & phy-ess as well as the 4 ag-hort standards. [The survey reflecting that complexity in NZ's Yr 11 science programs can be found here.](#)

My point here is at the start of both sessions productive SEG work was hindered by flawed conditions imposed by MoE. The 2 above are simple 2 examples that come to mind quickly.

To further explain what I mean by “boundary conditions imposed by MoE”: these include things like:

- From the start, SEG members were told repeatedly there could not be an external on “mechanics”... or any other traditionally examined block of content like “electromagnetism” or “waves”... even though these have worked for over 20 years inside NCEA and are common practice around the globe in a plethora of assessment systems in the assessment of high school physics.
- Another example is the restriction MoE has set that any new external exam will be limited to be a 1-hr exam per standard with a max of 3Qs... basically what we have now. As opposed to the possibility of 2 90-min external exams with 4Qs each.
- Other restrictions system-wide in the review of NCEA imposed by MoE include the overt “push” by MoE in relation to how much specificity goes into any set of explanatory notes (or not). This led to the situation where SLO's per standard were drafted by subject associations over the 2023-2024 summer break for every L1 standard – to finally reach the required level of specific needed by staff (and students) for a workable assessment system.
- Much farther back in time: MoE's restriction of only 4 standards per subject manifested just after the start of the NCEA-review while the actual the wording of “four or five” standards per subject was used in MoE documentation in the early days of the NCEA review. “Fewer and larger standards” in the goals of the NCEA review does not necessarily require 4 standards per subject.

Some of the above reflect the one-size-fits all approach that many have complained about. At the same time, it is now known that exceptions have been allowed by MoE as the stipulation imposed on L1 SEGs that only 1 external examination per subject was disregarded in the case of learning a foreign language.

That all being said, the SEG work yet to happen is critical to the success of NCEA with it's new set of standards and detailed explanatory notes. If anyone in NZ is being brutally honest, they will admit

that those documents (the standards and explanatory notes) will continue to be the assessed curriculum in NZ when NCEA is in play for Yr 11, 12 and 13. Thus it's gargantuanly important that we, as a physics-SEG, continue to help advise MoE to get things right for the future of NZ's students, NZ as a whole, as well as the future of NZ high school physics education. No pressure, eh?

Anyway, thanks again for replying – and for reading this very lengthy back-story and reply back to ya!

Reach out when you'd like to chat.

Dave



David Thrasher
Physics and Sciences Teacher

P 9(2)(a)
D
E

St Cuthbert's College – 122 Market Road
Epsom, Auckland 1051, New Zealand
stcuthberts.school.nz



Please consider the environment before printing this email

This message (and any associated files) is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is confidential, subject to copyright or constitutes a trade secret. If you are not the intended recipient you are hereby notified that any dissemination, copying or distribution of this message, or files associated with this message, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by replying to the message or contacting helpdesk@stcuthberts.school.nz, and deleting it from your computer. Messages sent to and from us may be monitored.

DISCLAIMER:

This email and any attachments may contain information that is confidential and subject to legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, dissemination, distribution or duplication of this email and attachments is prohibited. If you have received this email in error please notify the author immediately and erase all copies of the email and attachments. The Ministry of Education accepts no responsibility for changes made to this message or attachments after transmission from the Ministry.

From: Evan Sutherland
Sent: Monday, 8 April 2024 10:52 am
To: Thrasher, David
Subject: RE: Level 2 Physics Learning Matrix initial draft

Hey Dave

Thanks for your email. Timeframes seem to be my tripping point, forgot them in my last email as well.

I will send an email out to the entire SEG shortly, need to think about how to word it, but you are correct considering Friday's announcement things will change and we have been told to cease all SEG commissioned works until further notice. So, if you have already done the feedback, please send it through and claim those hours, if not commit your time to something else.

Expect another more formal email from me in a bit.

Cheers

Evan Sutherland | Lead Secondary Advisor
Te Poutāhū (Curriculum Centre)

DDI 9(2)(a) | Mobile
National Office 1 The Terrace

education.govt.nz

*He mea tārai e mātou te mātauranga kia rangatira ai, kia mana taurite ai ōna huanga
We shape an education system that delivers equitable and excellent outcomes*



From: Thrasher, David 9(2)(a)
Sent: Saturday, April 6, 2024 8:56 AM
To: Evan Sutherland <Evan.Sutherland@education.govt.nz>; Rosa Hughes-Currie 9(2)(a)
Alvin Chand David Housden 9(2)(a)
Hilary Takarangi Louise Gray Marcus Wilson
Mary Rabbidge
Cc: Elspeth Cotsilinis <Elspeth.Cotsilinis@education.govt.nz>; Henry Collette <Henry.Collette@education.govt.nz>;
Ahmed Hemady <Ahmed.Hemady@education.govt.nz>
Subject: RE: Level 2 Physics Learning Matrix initial draft

You don't often get email from 9(2)(a) [Learn why this is important](#)

Howdy Evan (and others)

While I'm entirely happy to give feedback on the next version of the physics learning matrix... given Friday's announcement from the Minister of Education, that may be putting the cart in front of the horse now.

You also never mentioned in what timeframe you wanted feedback from how I read your email. But you may now also be having a few conversations about how things inside the MoE may flux in light of Friday's announcement.

Thus let us know when you know... when you learn the new short-term landscape of the MoE's plans. And if you still want feedback on this draft learning matrix, let us know that too (and in what timeframe).

Cheers
Dave



David Thrasher
Physics and Sciences Teacher

P 9(2)(a)
D [Redacted]
E [Redacted]

St Cuthbert's College – 122 Market Road
Epsom, Auckland 1051, New Zealand
stcuthberts.school.nz



Please consider the environment before printing this email

This message (and any associated files) is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is confidential, subject to copyright or constitutes a trade secret. If you are not the intended recipient you are hereby notified that any dissemination, copying or distribution of this message, or files associated with this message, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by replying to the message or contacting helpdesk@stcuthberts.school.nz, and deleting it from your computer. Messages sent to and from us may be monitored.

From: Evan Sutherland <Evan.Sutherland@education.govt.nz>
Sent: Thursday, April 4, 2024 4:30 PM
To: Rosa Hughes-Currie 9(2)(a); Alvin Chand 9(2)(a); Thrasher, David 9(2)(a); Hilary Takarangi; Louise Gray; Marcus Wilson; Mary Rabbidge
Cc: Elspeth Cotsilinis <Elspeth.Cotsilinis@education.govt.nz>; Henry Collette <Henry.Collette@education.govt.nz>; Ahmed Hemady <Ahmed.Hemady@education.govt.nz>
Subject: Level 2 Physics Learning Matrix initial draft

I apologize for the slight delay, but as promised, Ahmed and I have completed an updated Learning Matrix. These materials are based on your initial contributions, our collective experience, and adjustments stemming from the Review of Assessment (RAS) program.

We would like you to engage with this document at your convenience. Your feedback is invaluable to us, whether it's in-depth or brief. Our goal is to ensure that we're on the right track and producing materials that meet your expectations.

All documents are accessible via the Microsoft Teams drive 9(2)(f)(iv), Out of scope, specifically in the active files folder where you can leave comments directly on the document. Additionally, I've created a SEG administration folder containing reimbursement instructions and forms for those with outstanding claims. If you have any issues accessing the material or questions on reimbursement, please let me know.

With respect to the Learning Matrix, we want to note that level 8 is still a work in progress. However, we are confident in the state of the rest of the document. Ahmed and I would like your input on the following:

1. Does the Learning Matrix align with your expectations, and can you envision a coherent teaching and learning program derived from it? (Note: Subject Learning Outcomes (SLOs) will be provided later to further support teachers, although exact details are not available yet.)
2. Are there any significant gaps or areas of learning that you believe should be included but are currently missing?
3. Did anything in the document surprise you? If so, why?
4. Is there anything in the document that particularly resonates with you or sparks excitement?
5. Please share any additional comments or suggestions you have regarding the Learning Matrix.

The achievement standards are also underway, and it was in the process of drafting this email that I realised that they are not quite ready to share and by the time I gave you the background and needed materials this email would be massive and be asking for far too much feedback all at once. Expect an update on those and the sharing of drafts in the next week or 2.

Look forward to your feedback.

Cheers

Evan Sutherland | Lead Secondary Advisor
Te Poutāhū (Curriculum Centre)

DDI 9(2)(a) | Mobile
National Office 1 The Terrace

education.govt.nz

He mea tārai e mātou te mātauranga kia rangatira ai, kia mana taurite ai ōna huanga
We shape an education system that delivers equitable and excellent outcomes



DISCLAIMER:

This email and any attachments may contain information that is confidential and subject to legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, dissemination, distribution or duplication of this email and attachments is prohibited. If you have received this email in error please notify the author immediately and erase all copies of the email and attachments. The Ministry of Education accepts no responsibility for changes made to this message or attachments after transmission from the Ministry.

From: Evan Sutherland
Sent: Monday, 1 July 2024 11:02 am
To: Thrasher, David
Subject: RE: Survey summary of how Yr13 and Yr12 physics is happening - that hopefully flavours the future of NCEA

Hey Dave

9(2)(a)

I will have a read through the data you have collected and pass it on to anyone else who I think would find it interesting, I may also grab some of it to retrospectively add to the correspondence folder in the RAS archive that was set up as it may be useful for when that team is stood back up.

Cheers

Evan Sutherland | Lead Secondary Advisor
Te Poutāhū (Curriculum Centre)

DDI 9(2)(a) | Mobile
National Office 1 The Terrace

education.govt.nz

He mea tārai e mātou te mātauranga kia rangatira ai, kia mana taurite ai ōna huanga
We shape an education system that delivers equitable and excellent outcomes



Te Mahau

From: Thrasher, David 9(2)(a)
Sent: Friday, June 28, 2024 9:39 AM
To: Evan Sutherland <Evan.Sutherland@education.govt.nz>
Cc: Thrasher, David
Subject: Survey summary of how Yr13 and Yr12 physics is happening - that hopefully flavours the future of NCEA

Hiya Evan

I hope this email finds you well. David Housden mentioned he bumped into you recently and learned you're still at MoE (for the moment at least). Hopefully whatever happens, you land on your feet.

I wanted to pass onto you (and any others inside MoE that you think should know) the summary of that survey I ran for the 1st half of term 2 this year: regarding Yr13 & Yr12 physics as well as Yr11 science(s).

The data will hopefully help folk make evidence-based decisions in the years ahead.

Let me know if you have any questions – or know of anyone inside MoE that I should personally forward this to.

Here's the link – that's already been shared on fb pages and already shared with every person that kindly submitted a survey response – thus it's entirely public:

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1PUcrZu8fc4RdMvHOFdm9XCzrd_BTfg5ggOD5P1fOEq/edit?usp=sharing

Cheers
Dave



David Thrasher
Physics and Sciences Teacher

P 9(2)(a)
D
E

St Cuthbert's College – 122 Market Road
Epsom, Auckland 1051, New Zealand
stcuthberts.school.nz



Please consider the environment before printing this email

This message (and any associated files) is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is confidential, subject to copyright or constitutes a trade secret. If you are not the intended recipient you are hereby notified that any dissemination, copying or distribution of this message, or files associated with this message, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by replying to the message or contacting helpdesk@stcuthberts.school.nz, and deleting it from your computer. Messages sent to and from us may be monitored.

From: Evan Sutherland <Evan.Sutherland@education.govt.nz>

Sent: Monday, April 8, 2024 11:12 AM

To: Rosa Hughes-Currie 9(2)(a)

Thrasher, David

Alvin Chand 9(2)(a)

Hilary Takarangi

9(2)(a)

Louise Gray 9(2)(a)

Marcus Wilson

Mary Rabbidge

Cc: Ahmed Hemady <Ahmed.Hemady@education.govt.nz>; Elspeth Cotsilinis <Elspeth.Cotsilinis@education.govt.nz>

Subject: Change in lieu of Friday's announcement

Hello, Physics, SEG members.

As I am sure you are all aware by now the Minister announced on Friday that the NCEA change programme will be rephased by 2 years to enable better alignment between curriculum and NCEA. This will influence us and the work we are/ have been doing.

In the short term we have been asked to cancel all SEG huis and commissioned works until further notice. What this means for you is if you have already done the feedback on the draft learning matrix, please send that through to Ahmed and me as we would love to see it and have it recorded against the draft. If you haven't done this yet, please shelve it for now. Any work hours that you have done towards the change program can still be logged and paid for. Let me know if you have any questions on how to do this or to verify hours. Additionally, you may notice that your access to things changes over the next few days as Content Workflow (formerly gather content) is updated and changed.

As I have more information on the longer-term impacts, I will share this with you. Our release so far is attached below.

You may be aware that the Minister has announced that the National Certificate of Educational Achievement (NCEA) Change Programme will be rephased by two years to enable better alignment between curriculum and NCEA. Rephasing will allow time for the refreshed schooling curricula to be developed and put in place before further work is progressed on NCEA Levels 2 and 3 assessments and standards.

In summary:

- The roll-out of NCEA Level 2 qualifications, previously planned for 2026, will be rephased to 2028.*
- The roll-out of NCEA Level 3 qualifications, previously planned for 2027, will be rephased to 2029.*
- Work on the refreshed schooling curricula (The New Zealand Curriculum and Te Marautanga o Aotearoa) will continue.*

You can read the Government's press release [here](#).

The Ministry is working as quickly as possible to assess the impacts of this decision. We will be in touch soon with more information.

Ngā mihi

Evan Sutherland | Lead Secondary Advisor
Te Poutāhū (Curriculum Centre)

DDI 9(2)(a) | Mobile
National Office 1 The Terrace

education.govt.nz

*He mea tārai e mātou te mātauranga kia rangatira ai, kia mana taurite ai ōna huanga
We shape an education system that delivers equitable and excellent outcomes*



DISCLAIMER:

This email and any attachments may contain information that is confidential and subject to legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, dissemination, distribution or duplication of this email and attachments is prohibited. If you have received this email in error please notify the author immediately and erase all copies of the email and attachments. The Ministry of Education accepts no responsibility for changes made to this message or attachments after transmission from the Ministry.

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

From: RAS Review
Sent: Thursday, 11 July 2024 9:26 am
To: India Tasker
Subject: FW: 2 things: 1 thing to pass onto sci curriculum panel & 1 question for MoE
Categories: Action, Reading

From: Thrasher, David 9(2)(a)
Sent: Tuesday, August 1, 2023 7:10 AM
To: Rob Mill <Rob.Mill@education.govt.nz>; Matthias Sauberlich <Matthias.Sauberlich@education.govt.nz>; National Curriculum Refresh <NationalCurriculum.Refresh@education.govt.nz>; Henry Collette <Henry.Collette@education.govt.nz>; RAS Review <Ras.Review@education.govt.nz>
Cc: Thrasher, David 9(2)(a)
Subject: 2 things: 1 thing to pass onto sci curriculum panel & 1 question for MoE

Hi Rob, Mattias, Henry, the RAS crew and the curriculum refresh folk

The email below contains 2 very different, yet related things:

- a summary of an unofficial 4-question survey on teacher's opinions on the 1st draft of the science refreshed curriculum
- a question as to how the RAS systems, and thus MoE and NZQA, will cope with the refreshed curriculum not being overtly linkable to any year level of any NCEA course

First, that survey: As many of you know, the teaching community as well as the wider community are very interested in the ongoing processes circling around the NZ science curriculum refresh. So much so that 183 teachers who have read the 1st draft have contributed their thoughts to a short & unofficial survey that was run from July 3rd to July 31st. This survey overlapped the winter holiday break of NZ teachers and the 1st few weeks of Term 3. This window also included the time when the media ran quite a few articles and interviews related to the 1st draft of the science, arts and technology refreshed curriculum.

[Here is the summary of that short 4-question survey.](#) As you can see, the 3rd question reflects the spread of what subjects the responders teach. For a more detailed look, you can also look at [this spreadsheet](#).

While the science curriculum writing panel is surely deep into their 2nd draft by now it would be nice if [this summation could be forwarded to them](#).

The summary is in its most raw form with the 1st 3 of 4 questions summarized as pie charts or bar graphs and the optional open 4th question just being a stream of comments. Similar to the MoE survey on the 1st draft for those involved in the fast-testing process around King's Birthday, this survey was limited to 1 submission per individual.

Second, that question as to how any NCEA subject from this [MoE approved subject list](#) will be connectable to any redrafted curriculum: Currently, in each set of explanatory notes of any NCEA standard there is an overt

reference to level 6, 7 or 8 of the NZ curriculum for that subject. While most subjects (other than maths) have only a few sentences devoted to each curriculum level (the achievement objectives found on TKI) there is some differentiation between Yr11, 12 and 13. From the refreshed English, maths and social sciences which includes history, as well as the draft science, art and technology documents there is no overt breakdown between these last 3 years, nor any overt achievement objectives for the numerous NCEA subjects in each area: 15 different subjects in the social sciences, 8 in science, 11 in art, 7 in technology, 3 in maths. These can all be seen in the [MoE approved subject list](#) that came out in 2020.

Thus, the question: how does MoE (and therefore the RAS group) plan to cope with this new aspect of the NZ curriculum not including specific and unique learning objectives for Yr11, 12 and 13? Thus, how will NCEA rest on top of and be overtly linked to the NZ curriculum?

In both the mathematics and English refreshed curriculum there are occasional "progress steps" for certain phases (or year levels). Are more of these expected to be added, especially for the phase Yr11-13 in each curriculum?

As explained on the [TKI site](#) where NZ's curriculum is explained, the only required years the curriculum must be followed are Yr1-10. With Yr 11, 12 and 13 allowing for further specificity in any given field. Thus quite a few of us are curious how the last phase of Yr11-13 will allow for that catering of further specificity in any given field, and thus how the assessments will ringfence appropriate levels of curriculum inside any given subject.

Any info that anyone inside MoE can provide on this complex situation that is manifesting of NCEA seeming to become more decoupled from the NZ curriculum documents would be extremely informative.

Cheers
Dave



St Cuthbert's

David Thrasher

Physics and Sciences Teacher

P
D
E

122 Market Road, Epsom
Auckland 1051, New Zealand
stcuthberts.school.nz





Please consider the environment before printing this email

This message (and any associated files) is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is confidential, subject to copyright or constitutes a trade secret. If you are not the intended recipient you are hereby notified that any dissemination, copying or distribution of this message, or files associated with this message, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by replying to the message or contacting helpdesk@stcuthberts.school.nz, and deleting it from your computer. Messages sent to and from us may be monitored.

Released under the Official Information Act 1982