



NCEA Systems and Processes **Review**

Evaluation of Effectiveness, Compliance, and Impact on Student Achievement

KAWA : To connect, Strengthen and inspire each other to achieve personal excellence

Spotswood College Values : Manaakitanga (Caring), Whakawhanaungatanga (Relationships), Whakamana (Empowerment), Pono (Integrity)

Purpose

The purpose of this review is to evaluate the effectiveness of current NCEA systems and processes, identify areas of non-compliance or inconsistency, and determine the impact these issues are having on student achievement, engagement, and future pathways. This review also identifies solutions and recommendations to strengthen accountability, clarity, and outcomes for students, staff and whānau.

Summary

This review has identified significant inconsistencies in the implementation and adherence to agreed NCEA systems and processes. These inconsistencies are impacting:

- Student course suitability
- Credit attainment and achievement success
 - Student pathway alignment
 - Staff accountability
- Communication with students and whānau
 - NZQA compliance confidence

A key themes identified is that processes either:

- Are not being followed
- Are not fully understood
- Are being completed by management instead of the responsible staff member
 - Are not followed up when completed incorrectly

This has resulted in reduced accountability, confusion, and negative impacts on student progress and achievement.

Current Reality and Issues Identified

Students are changing subject selections in the portal after agreement without consultation or approval.

This has resulted in:

- Students enrolled in courses without prerequisite knowledge
 - Students missing essential foundation courses
 - Students enrolled in unsuitable courses
- Students being placed on pathways that do not align with their future goals
 - Reduced likelihood of achievement and success
 - Increased risk of disengagement and failure

This undermines the professional guidance provided by staff and the partnership with whānau.

Impact

- Lower student achievement and credit attainment
 - Poor pathway alignment
- Increased course changes during the year
- Increased workload correcting issues
 - Reduced confidence in systems

Recommended Solution

Subject selections must be entered into the portal by the Learning Advisor, not the student.

Proposed Process:

Students and whānau discuss subject options from the curriculum Handbook

Courses are confirmed during IDP meeting.

Learning Advisor enters the agreed selections into the portal. This process presented early to staff in term 3

Course confirmation at the beginning of the year. Poutiaki sign off

Any changes must be approved by:

Learning Advisor

Poutiaki

○ SLT

This ensures:

- Suitability Pathway alignment Accountability Accuracy

Key Findings

Subject Selection Process

Intended Process

The agreed subject selection process is:

1. Students receive guidance from:
 - Subject teachers
 - Pouārahi
 - Learning Advisor
2. Courses are discussed and confirmed during the student's IDP meeting with their Learning Advisor and whānau.
3. Students enter these agreed subjects into the Subject Selection Portal.

Administrative Accountability and Process Compliance

Administrative processes are not consistently being completed by the staff member responsible.

- Management completes the task as it is seen as easier or quicker.
 - The staff member responsible is not followed up.
 - The staff member does not learn the correct process.
 - The issue is repeated.

IMPACT

- Lack of accountability
- Reduced staff capability
- Process inconsistency
- Increased leadership workload
- Ongoing system weaknesses

Recommendation

Administrative responsibilities must remain with the staff member responsible.

Where errors occur:

- Follow-up must occur
- Support must be provided
- Clear expectations set
- Timeframes established
- Accountability maintained

Support plans should include:

- Training
- Guidance
- Clear deadlines
- Monitoring

Curriculum and Assessment Systems and Compliance

There is inconsistency in understanding and implementing Curriculum and Assessment expectations.

The Curriculum & Assessment folder contains essential processes, but these are not consistently unpacked or followed.

Areas of Concern

Reporting Process

Inconsistent completion of:

- Markbooks
- Report comments
- Progress tracking

Markbook Processes

Issues include:

- Assessments being removed without communication
- Credit projections reduced without replacement opportunities
- Inaccurate tracking of student progress

Assessment Expectations

Lack of clarity and consistency around:

- Assessment due dates
- Late submissions
- Resubmissions
- Extensions
- Alternative assessment opportunities

Curriculum and Assessment Systems and Compliance

There is inconsistency in understanding and implementing Curriculum and Assessment expectations.

The Curriculum & Assessment folder contains essential processes, but these are not consistently unpacked or followed.

Areas of Concern

Moderation and NZQA Obligations

Risk areas include:

- Internal moderation requirements
 - Evidence retention
- Assessment validity and authenticity

These create potential NZQA compliance risks.

Google Classroom Expectations

Inconsistency in:

- Posting assessments
- Providing clear instructions
- Providing timelines

Providing feedbacknt progress

Tracking Student Progress

Tracking systems are not consistently used to:

- Identify at-risk students early
- Implement interventions
- Communicate concerns

Impact

This results in:

- Reduced student achievement
 - Reduced credit attainment
 - Poor tracking of progress
- Increased risk of student failure
 - Reduced transparency

Communication Issues

Areas of Concern

Students being removed from classes

Students are sometimes removed by pouitiaki without communication to:

- Teacher
- Pouārahi
- Curriculum leaders

This disrupts:

- Learning continuity
- Achievement progress
- Tracking

Lack of home contact

Teaching staff are not consistently contacting home when concerns arise regarding:

- Engagement
- Behaviour
- Achievement

This weakens the partnership with whānau.

Lack of Pouārahi Support

Pouārahi are not consistently supporting teaching staff with relational or behavioural management.

Instead, issues are escalated immediately to pouitiaki/deans.

This reduces:

- Teacher capability
- Relationship building
- Classroom management development

Teaching and Learning Expectations

There is evidence of low expectations in some areas.

Concerns include:

- Agreed teaching and learning practices not followed
 - Templates not used
 - Assessment systems not followed
 - Tracking systems not used

Overall Impact on Students

- Reduced achievement
- Reduced credit attainment
- Poor pathway alignment
 - Reduced engagement
- Increased risk of failure
- Reduced student confidence
- Reduced whānau confidence

Interviews

Info here from interview

Q1. Credit Offer - 3-4 teacher & hod L1,2,3 - course outlines, student withdrawals internals& externals,

L1 Design & Build

- What standards were *intended* to be offered per course? 5 standards, mixture of (1 AS/4US) - 15.....normally 19 but with the AS took a US for time. Class was in LP1 - hrs
- How many credits were *actually available*? 15. If all completed and requiring work L2 US were available
- Where were there shortfalls? Undertaking AS for the first time just took time and ensuring that it was done correctly - writing component took time

JRB - Course Level 1 Digital Tech

- What standards were *intended* to be offered per course? 2 internals/2 externals
- How many credits were *actually available*? 20
- Where were there shortfalls? - Students entered for externals but did not show up - half of the students...this included mock - which could have affected derived grades if required

Interviews

Info here from interview

Q2. Assessment Delivery

- Which assessments:
 - did not occur? -
 - occurred but were not completed? AS - 1/3 completed
 - were completed but not marked or uploaded? (Koby Landers)
- Why (time, staffing, withdrawals, misunderstanding)? Markbook not updated when he joined which was after half way through the year.

Nothing from JRB on this qstn

Interviews

Info here from interview

Q3. Tracking & Follow-Up

- How were students tracked during the year? School point -good system. Contacting LA teachers/kamar entries/contact home - works well
- When students were off-track, what happened? Parents emailed
- Where did tracking systems fail? -

JRB - Course Level 1 Digital Tech

- How were students tracked during the year? School point - LA teachers and other staff could see updates on progress - Kamar communication through emails (updates to parents mock, students needing to complete work, internal submission dates (5th dec) Still did not have the desired effect.
- When students were off-track, what happened? Emails to whanau Pouitaki in class support - still was a challenge of engagement and achievement
- Where did tracking systems fail? - They didn't really. At the start of the year/course the class was at 17 students were added to the class that was not a choice but had space. This has obvious repercussions for student engagement & success. When choices are limited students being placed in a class such as L1 Digi tech will find it hard to achieve. Communication with student placement was poor. Students aiden, riley, leon, kama, sefa keshia coast, jayden to name a few. Did this result in them selecting Digi tech L2 for 2026? Nope

Interviews

Info here from interviews

QQ4. Student Access & Equity

- Which students were:
 - pulled out for support? -
 - excluded from assessments?-
 - not re-offered opportunities? All the time
- Were alternative pathways provided? Extra H&S work/ Level 2 opportunities e.g Wood manufacturing

JRB - Course Level 1 Digital Tech

- Which students were:
 - pulled out for support? Were part of the catch up programme. Attendance not bad. Poutiaki needing to sit in the class and support those students that got added and did not choose the course.
 - excluded from assessments? Coast 1 external as joined half way through the year. Did not achieve
 - not re-offered opportunities? -
- Were alternative pathways provided? –

Interviews

Info here from interview

Q5. Systems & Accountability

- What systems existed? Tracking / Dept action plan
- Where did they break?
- Who was responsible for monitoring at each stage? Teacher first / HOD support

JRB - Course Level 1 Digital Tech

- What systems existed? SLT - DSC. Using communication platforms between me as teacher with LA teacher and the Poutikai. Yr 11 Dean provided limited support - 2 roles in term 2/3

Tier 2 support ???
- Where did they break? Not communicated with from LA teacher or Poutiaki from any interventions that were implemented. Not up with the play!
- Who was responsible for monitoring at each stage? Me as the classroom teacher. I communicated with all stakeholders. Some situations that were passed on to check in on - were not.

Interviews

Q1. Credit Offer

- What standards were *intended* to be offered per course?
 - ROL - Level 1 English - 2 internal and 2 external and went with all 4. Students were expected to do all 4. Every learner was set up for success. Perhaps 2 externals were a bridge too far for only 2-3 learners. Should we remove some learners but very few. Wanted them to make sure that it wasn't public knowledge that students could be removed from externals. Quiet conversations on the side.
 - RTH - Level 2 History - 3 internal assessments and 1 external = five 5 writing credits for UE Literacy and the most achievable standard for students
- How many credits were *actually available*?
 - ROL - Level 1 = 20 (5 each)
 - RTH - Level 2 = 5 external and 14 in internals = 19 in total
- Were there shortfalls between what was intended and what was actually delivered? Why was this?
 - ROL - some unlikely to pass one of the externals - unfamiliar text. Some students had low attendance so quiet conversations and entered for one rather than two externals.
 - RTH - no shortfall. Some students were removed if they weren't attending. Some who didn't need UE literacy or didn't want to because they had enough credits chose not to do the externals.
 - ROL - Attendance at exams was poor. Students don't turn up- 2 papers offered and large percentage only complete one of the two. Reasons why they don't turn up for the exam is that they don't need the credits; know they will pass Level 1 by end of Term 3 so come to class but don't engage because not needing the learning because they're not going to do the exam. Some plan to only do the internals so they're done before the end of Term 2 - not doing externals. 15 weeks of students not engaging because not doing exam but others are engaging because they want to do the exams. Do workbooks instead in another subject which they can do in one day and get credits for. Term 3 is only working on externals. Hard to convince students to do learning for learning's sake.
 - ROL - No chance for students to come at end of year and do a reassessment. This is a big change for how things are done at school. Done for teacher time/workload/authenticity and that kids can do heaps at the end of the year and go credit harvesting to get credits at end of year.

Interviews

Q1.ROL - Attendance at exams was poor. Students don't turn up- 2 papers offered and large percentage only complete one of the two. Reasons why they don't turn up for the exam is that they don't need the credits; know they will pass Level 1 by end of Term 3 so come to class but don't engage because not needing the learning because they're not going to do the exam. Some plan to only do the internals so they're done before the end of Term 2 - not doing externals. 15 weeks of students not engaging because not doing exam but others are engaging because they want to do the exams. Do workbooks instead in another subject which they can do in one day and get credits for. Term 3 is only working on externals. Hard to convince students to do learning for learning's sake.

- ROL - No chance for students to come at end of year and do a reassessment. This is a big change for how things are done at school. Done for teacher time/workload/authenticity and that kids can do heaps at the end of the year and go credit harvesting to get credits at end of year.

RTH - not quite as strict as English. Submitted work that is not achieved and uncomfortable with assessing at end of year. Have not handed in but do hand in later in the year this is allowed. Do late marking for the student.

- Share with me the Course Outline document for this course.

Interviews

Q1.Q2. Assessment Delivery

- Were there any assessments which:
 - did not occur?
 - No for both ROL & RTH. Teacher management of time throughout the year - some don't do it well. Perhaps some assessments get left out due to teacher management rather than kids. Sometimes assessments are being rushed at the end of the year. Should be watching the clock better. Need to have this wrapped up by "x" time/date.
 - Assessments Weeks in English - managed by teacher and can't be done before or after. Everyone's doing the same thing at the same time. Allows for authenticity of the assessment.
 - occurred but were not completed?
 - No.
 - were completed but not marked or uploaded onto Kamar?
 - RTH - not that aware of.
 - Were added to the course during the year?
 - Not for English.
 - RTH - No. As department, if students are struggling with assessment we may offer another one. Course completely changed for ROL due to double ups with assessments being offered in another course. Course Selection/ Timetabling issue. Students are unaware after periods of time when doing assessments that they've done before.

Interviews

Q1. Why (time, staffing, withdrawals, misunderstanding)?

- What was the average time for assessments to be marked, resubmitted (if needed), moderated and returned to students? What do you think it should be?
 - ROL - as quick as possible. Would try to turn around in a week. Students deserve to have quick turnaround when they've worked really hard to do the assessment. Teachers should put in similar effort to students.
 - RTH - two weeks. Individual teachers are different. The sooner the better in case the student needs to redo/fix up something in the assessment. External moderation for Ben C with accounting etc . Add another week for situations such as this. Send the "boundary markers" away for assessment.

Q3. Tracking & Follow-Up

- How were students tracked during the year? What was tracked (academic, progression, attendance ...)?
 - ROL - English had a wellbeing column. Too many tracking systems - own ways; departments; school. Confusion. Not sure which one to use. Use one of them. High trust and hope that it works. Not priority. In head rather than in spreadsheet. Good to Average - what's the difference?
 - RTh - School Bridge and some staff had their own tracking sheets in Departmental folder. In reality tracking struggled. RTH knew in her head where students were at. Attendance, Progress during an assessment. Ticking a box/filling in column not priority. Would go to kamar in first instance to see about attendance (for example).
- When students were looking like they may not pass the assessment, what happened?
 - RTH - Mid-way through assessments, if students not looking like passing, email sent home and contact made with LA teacher. If they did not hand in work, another email was sent home encouraging to get the assessment handed in. Tracking not formalised as the school wants. Mostly in head. Not always documenting it.
 - ROL - as for RTH - email home/LA teacher. Talk to students as well. Finding out what's going on. What are the barriers?

Interviews

Q1 Did your tracking system reflect the actual student outcomes/assessment results?

- Tracking doesn't make a difference to student outcomes.
 - Not done well but no correlation between tracking sheet and outcome for the sheets. It's just an administrative task that gets told to be done.
 - RTH - no because not good at tracking. It should in theory. Tracking means working. Not criteria based. Focus needs to be on at risk students and track only those students and not whole class. Tracking every single student is time consuming.

ROL - Task just to do to cover butt. Not have any real worth. Mostly in head. Would be better spending time in a week talking to students in class and "tell me how you're doing"? Get honest reflection from students. at's going on. What are the barriers?

Q4. Student Access & Equity

- Were there any students who were:
 - pulled out for extra support?
 - RTH - one student who was late enrolment. They didn't do any work for the first 5 week. Went to dean and got class changed. Just weren't engaging in the subject. Not physically in class so withdrawn from assessment after say, 6 weeks.
 - ROL - couple of students who didn't attend and Dean made arrangement that they were doing other stuff (not sure what stuff that was).
 - excluded from assessments?
 - Absences or Ghosts or some who weren't going to do it (swimming length of pool if they can't swim)

Interviews

- not re-offered opportunities?
 - No. - see previous answers.
 - Ghosts on roll - year 9 students for eg. withdraw ghosts. Some just appear without communication. If students do appear, RTH wants to know goals and expectations for that student. Are they here for UE credits or class hasn't been working or that they catch up on all missed work?
- Were alternative assessments provided for students who were withdrawn from specific assessments? What were they? How was this communicated to affected parties (students, whanau, HOD, Line Manager)?
 - Not in either area.
 - ROL - English - there are no other assessments. There's only the 4 at Level 1.

Q5. Systems & Accountability

- Were you aware of the systems for the following:
 - Markbook set up on Kamar
 - RTH = yes
 - ROL = yes
 - Moderation (internal and external)
 - RTH = yes - need to be better about documenting internal moderation. Forms to complete. Internal moderation form needed.
 - ROL = yes

Interviews

- Withdrawal of students from assessments
 - RTh = do we withdraw students or leave them as a not submitted? Not handed in work = not submitted; Not NA because they didn't submit the work. Not in class = not submitted. Have the conversation every year. Mixed message from SLT = want to see available credits or taken out so you can see the actual picture. Clarification would be helpful.
 - ROL = yes
- Withdrawal of standards from courses
 - ROL = markbook set up by HOD. Don't go in as a teacher and make changes. Happy to fill out markbooks.
 - RTH = Not aware of this. Would need to be communicated changes to parents and SLT/HOD. Was done last year.
- Tracking systems
 - See comments above regarding tracking.
- Do you think there was a breakdown in the process and the implementation of what happened? What was this breakdown and how could this be rectified in the future?
 - See answers above - more clearer expectation about withdrawing students;
 - ROL = confusion about ticking in red on Kamar, things appear and disappear; Kamar knowledge; do important tasks by someone who knows what they're doing. (packing parachute)
- Who should be responsible for ensuring the system/s was accurately followed at each stage?
 - ROL = someone who is paid for the responsibility to ensure that it's done
 - RTH = HOD responsibility. Offered support, shown how to do it and then when someone's not done that then more support is needed. Line Manager needs to be brought in. Next step??

Other Considerations

NCEA Handbook for seniors at IDP - This can cover guidelines for assessments e.g turnaround for marked work, re submissions, externals v internals

Visible Timeframe in staffroom with dates - A visual reference for staff Hui etc, this could be a constant screenshot on the TV or each term printed large, whiteboard

Responses & letters - SLT access and coaching of the use of accountability emails when tasks are not completed by staff

Process of key Tasks - 1 page step process that is accessible and placed in staffroom e.g Report, markbook, assessment

Department Handbooks - Do Departments have a small Handbooks that is designed with support of C&A on the hows, whats, whens and whys of the department?

Other Considerations

Level 2&3 IDP Student Checksheet

Level Snr sheet

**1 pager process for staff - reports, assessments, moderation,
markbooks,**

**C&A and Teaching & Learning Folders updated and then unpacked at
key points with timeline of the year for clarity of expectations and
process to be followed**