This assessment is based on a now-expired version of the achievement standard and may not accurately reflect the content and practice of external assessments developed for 2026 onwards.

Assessment Schedule – 2025

Digital Technologies: Design a digital technologies outcome (92007)

Assessment Criteria

Achievement	Achievement with Merit	Achievement with Excellence
Design a digital technologies outcome involves:	*Refine a design for a digital technologies outcome* involves:	*Evaluate a design for a digital technologies outcome* involves:
• describing a need or opportunity • describing potential user(s) • describing the requirements • generating design ideas • generating a completed final design • describing how the completed final design addresses the need or opportunity and meets the identified requirements • describing how manaakitanga or kaitiakitanga has been used / applied in the design, or at the design stage or phase.	• using feedback to make improvements to the design throughout the design process • explaining how design decisions improve the quality of the proposed digital technologies outcome.	• justifying how decisions made during the design phase / process contribute to the completed design's fitness for purpose.

Cut Scores

Not Achieved	Achievement	Achievement with Merit	Achievement with Excellence
0 – 2	3 – 4	5 – 6	7 – 8

Portfolio Evidence

N1	N2	A3	A4	M5	M6	E7	E8
Responses are relevant but may be incomplete or limited, or have only images with no written responses.	The need or opportunity is not authentic.	**Describes** a need or opportunity.	Describes, **in detail**, a need or opportunity.				
Has used AI to generate written responses in the portfolio evidence	**Identifies** potential end users, but no specific requirements.	**Describes** potential user(s) and one of their specific requirements.	Describes potential user(s), and **at least TWO** of their specific requirements.				
Some design images used in the portfolio evidence include written responses – e.g. feedback received, documentation evidence, justifications, brief, etc.	The use of manaakitanga or kaitiakitanga is not evident, or relevant or authentic to the design.	**Describes** how manaakitanga or kaitiakitanga has been used in their design stage / phase.	Describes how manaakitanga or kaitiakitanga has been used in their design stage / phase.				
Responses and images only relate to a digital outcome, rather than the design.	Includes no or limited generation of design ideas, or no completed design.	Evidence that some design ideas have been generated.	Evidence that a **range of design ideas** have been generated.				
Images relate to other people's designs or work from the Internet.	The final completed design shown is the digital technologies outcome, not the completed final design.	Evidence of a completed final design.	Evidence of a completed final design.	Evidence of the design being **refined.**	Evidence of the design being refined.		
	The design for a proposed digital technologies outcome is not at Level 6 of the New Zealand Curriculum, or it is not clear what digital technologies outcome the design is for.	**Explains** how the completed final design addresses the need or opportunity, and meets some of the identified requirements.	Explains how the final design **clearly** addresses the need or opportunity, and meets the identified requirements.	Evidence of using feedback to make ONE improvement to the design.	Evidence of using feedback to make TWO improvements to the design.		

				Explains how decisions during the design stage/phase have improved the quality of the design of the proposed digital technologies outcome.	Explains, **in detail**, how decisions during the design stage/ phase have improved the quality of the design of the proposed digital technologies outcome.	**Justifies** how decisions made during the design stage/ phase contribute to the completed final design's fitness for purpose, relating back to the need or opportunity and the potential users.	Justifies **comprehensively** how decisions made during the design stage / phase allow the completed final design to be judged as fit for purpose by meeting the need or opportunity AND the requirements of the potential users and context.
				Must include a description of how manaakitanga or kaitiakitanga has been used in their design stage or phase (at Achievement level).			
Response is limited to little or no work.	Some relevant responses in parts of the paper.	Some aspects may be partial or weak.		Some aspects may be partial or weak.		Some aspects may be partial or weak.	

N0 = No response; no relevant evidence.

Appendix: Authenticity of candidate work.

To assess whether a candidate's evidence is genuine, the marker uses their professional judgement, considering all the evidence provided. Where the marker believes there is a possibility the work is inauthentic, they must raise a ‘malpractice exception’, flagging the issue for further review.

Evidence might be considered inauthentic if:

- large portions of the text are identical to other candidates' work
- the evidence does not match the assessment prompt or task
- the response shows evidence of someone else’s input other than the candidate’s (e.g., teacher feedback)
- the style or voice of the writing is inconsistent with the rest of the candidate's work
- complex pieces of evidence are copied from other sources but are presented as the candidate's own work, or the evidence is deemed significantly unnatural.

Properly referenced, relevant, and integrated information is acceptable. Uncertainty about the authenticity of evidence should be resolved in favour of the candidate.