

The following report gives feedback to assist assessors with general issues and trends that have been identified during external moderation of the internally assessed Home Economics standards in 2021. It provides further insights from moderation material viewed throughout the year.

## Using Internal Assessment Evidence Gathering Templates

The purpose of the Internal Assessment Evidence Gathering Template is to help teachers identify and record evidence of student achievement seen or heard within the teaching and learning programme. These templates do not signal a reduction in what is accepted for each grade, but rather a means of summarising evidence for reporting achievement when more formal assessment has not been possible.

These templates must be viewed in conjunction with the assessment advice forwarded to schools, in order to ensure that valid, credible and reliable assessment has occurred before the standard is awarded. Further guidance can be found [here](#).

Where evidence gathering templates have been used to identify evidence in lieu of a formal assessment opportunity, these should not be sent in for moderation.

## Assessor Support

The Best Practice Workshops (online and face-to-face) offered by Assessment and Moderation Services continue to be viewed by the sector as significantly contributing to improved assessor practice:

*"The workshop helped to review my own knowledge, and great to share ideas."  
"It was great having time to challenge my thinking in assessment."*

Based on the success of the 'on request' model and the ability to have targeted support, Assessment and Moderation Services will continue delivering this support model in 2022. Workshops or presentation slots can be requested to provide targeted support to regional or national audiences.

Additionally, we will continue to run the Transforming Assessment Praxis programme, an online course relevant to all subjects which helps assessors learn about re-contextualising assessment resources and collecting evidence in different ways to better meet the needs of learners.

New online subject-specific short courses introduced this year have complemented the traditional workshops. These can be accessed using your Education Sector Logon. Courses available for Home Economics include:

- Making Assessor Judgments (91299, 91466, 91468)
- 91466 A nutritional issue
- 91468 A food related ethical dilemma.

Check the NCEA subject pages on the NZQA website regularly, as more online courses will be added throughout 2022.

More detailed information, including how to request or register for a workshop or online course, can be found on our [Assessor Support](#) pages or by emailing [workshops@nzqa.govt.nz](mailto:workshops@nzqa.govt.nz).

## Quality of evidence

Indicators of quality are provided in Explanatory Note 1, which links the standard to the curriculum level, and in the Achievement Criteria, which use descriptors such as describe, explain or analyse.

At Level 3, the evidence needs to clearly show the progression from explanation to analysis. This will require a relatively complex understanding of the underlying concepts of the curriculum. The analysis will show in-depth and well-reasoned explanations, not just surface level responses. The supporting evidence will be critically selected and concise, and explain why it is relevant to the point being analysed.

A critical analysis will question and/or judge the evidence, and examine the relevance and significance of interactions, irregularities, consequences and/or implications which become apparent in the analysis.

## Volume of evidence produced

An excessive volume of evidence continues to be presented. Evidence beyond the criteria of the standard is not expected. For example, the students need to have explored a topic in depth and breadth to enable them to fully understand the issue or dilemma. However, the assessment evidence only needs to include the most critical points, such as key factors/determinants and viewpoints.

Where assessors have provided guidance on how to structure responses, a greater depth of analysis or evaluation has been presented. When responses had been planned, (occasionally shown as mindmaps) a more critical selection of key ideas and relevant supporting evidence for the chosen issue or dilemma was evident. These responses also showed understanding of interrelationships between the determinants and contributing factors, and were more concise. For example, when explaining the viewpoints for 91468, students analysed the key viewpoints from differing perspectives, rather than providing extended responses for numerous viewpoints.

## Analysis and Evaluation standards

Evidence for the Level 2 standard 91299 should reflect a progression from the Level 1 standard on individual food choices. For example, a focus on the specific food needs of a group of people, like high energy users, rather than one individual with specific food preferences, tended to provide more depth in the analysis.

In addition to explaining the issues related to the provision of food from a personal perspective, students who secured achievement connected or linked their responses to the specific food needs from an interpersonal and a societal perspective.

The Te Kete Ipurangi (TKI) Resource enables the standard to be achieved, but an extended investigative activity needs to gather evidence beyond the personal perspective. For example, students who demonstrated the depth of understanding required at this level explained the interpersonal and societal perspective by clearly focusing on the people with specific food needs, and linking health enhancing strategies to address their requirements.

Evidence that achieved Merit and Excellence connected strategies such as food selection and reading labels at the supermarket, in order to justify through detailed reasoning why the requirements of the people with specific food needs had been met.

For 91466, the choice of a nutritional issue was key to ensuring the required evidence was provided. When the focus was clearly on a nutritional issue rather than a lifestyle disease, students gained achievement. Information related to lifestyle diseases such as type two diabetes and obesity may be used in the effects on societal well-being, but should not be the focus of the investigation.

When the chosen issue was clearly defined, showing how it did not follow the recommendations of the Ministry of Health Food & Nutrition Guidelines, investigations were more successful. For example, 'underconsumption of fruit and vegetables' suggests that less than the recommended amounts are being consumed. Whereas 'portion sizes and obesity' refers to a potential nutritional issue, and further detail such as how portion sizes are an issue compared to the Ministry of Health recommendations can help to focus students on the issue.

91468 was Achieved when the phrase 'ethical dilemma' was clearly understood. While this phrase is defined in the Explanatory Notes, it is still occasionally confused with a nutritional issue (3.1). For example, explaining what the dilemma is, why it is a dilemma, who the key stakeholders are and which groups in society are most affected. Successful achievement of this standard occurred when the contrasting stakeholder viewpoints and perspectives were understood and supported with evidence. There is no expectation that the students' opinion of the stakeholders' action and/or perspective is included.

Merit was secured when the underlying beliefs, values and practices were explained and the ethical principles that underpin the viewpoints were included. For example, students were successful when they showed they understood and could explain the ethical lens through which each stakeholder views the dilemma. The evidence moved towards Excellence when the consequences and challenges such as social justice and equitable outcomes were explored, showing insight into the effects for groups directly or indirectly affected by the dilemma.

## **Communications**

### **Changes to moderation requirement for 2022**

Changes have been made to what schools are required to send in for moderation in 2022. Only 6 samples of student evidence must be sent in, one sample each at N, A, M, E, and two more from A, M, E. There will be no level 1 external moderation, unless requested by the school.

### **Outcome statements in external Moderation Reports**

Moderation Report outcomes are reported using consistency statements. These are not based on a numerical assessment of how many grades the moderator agreed with, but on a qualitative assessment of how the overall judgements align with the standard.

**"Consistent"** is used where clear and accurate understanding of all (or most) aspects of the standard have been demonstrated. There may be some misunderstandings, but these are minor.

**“Not yet consistent”** does not imply major issues on the part of the assessor. This is used where a clear understanding is shown of some aspects of the standard, and any issues can be identified and corrected using the feedforward in the Moderation Report.

**“Not consistent”** is used where there are significant issues with the assessor decisions. This may include issues such as assessment materials not being at the correct curriculum level, or when the intent or criteria of the standard have been misunderstood.

### **Moderating assessment materials**

For most moderation submissions in 2021, the assessment materials were not moderated, as most assessment tasks were variations of the NZQA Approved tasks developed by the Ministry of Education.

NZQA welcomes the submission of innovative assessment tasks. An overview of case studies showcasing how innovative assessment practices have been implemented in schools can be found on the [Spotlights homepage](#), with the full case studies on the [Future State](#) section of the NZQA website.

Please click on [this link](#) to give your feedback about this report.