Source: https://ncea.education.govt.nz/literacy-and-numeracy/literacy/reading/unit-standard

Writing

Teacher Speak	Student Speak
Areas of strength demonstrated by candidates who were clearly at, or above, the required standard: ● Reading and following the instructions for each question carefully. ● Using the suggestions provided for each question as a guideline. ● Using the planning spaces to plan and organise their ideas. ● Focusing on the questions consistently and not going "off topic". ● Providing relevant, credible, and appropriate supporting details to develop their ideas. ● Grouping and linking their ideas so they met the writing purpose and audience. ● Structuring their response to achieve overall cohesiveness. ● Conveying a sense of engagement/authenticity/personal voice with the topic/question. ● Selecting appropriate language that had some impact (sentences, phrasing, vocabulary). ● Using a variety of sentences (e.g., variation of sentence lengths, beginnings, types). ● Using a wide variety of vocabulary, including specific, precise vocabulary as appropriate. ● Selecting precise and varied vocabulary that added interest for the reader. ● Demonstrating knowledge and control of writing conventions (e.g., full stops, capital letters). ● Reviewing, editing, and proofreading their answers (particularly for technical accuracy). ● Meeting the text length recommendations.	**Areas of strength demonstrated by candidates who were clearly at, or above, the required standard:** ● They read and followed the instructions for each question carefully. ● They used the suggestions given for each question as a guide. ● They used the spaces provided for planning to organise their ideas. ● They stayed focused on the questions and didn't stray away from the main topic. ● They gave relevant and believable details to back up their ideas. ● They grouped their ideas together well, making sure they fit the purpose and who they were writing for. ● They organised their writing in a way that made sense and flowed smoothly. ● They made their writing sound interesting and personal to the topic. ● They chose words that had an impact and sounded good. ● They mixed up their sentence lengths and how they started them. ● They used lots of different words, including ones that were very specific and clear. ● They got the basics right, like using full stops and capital letters. ● They checked their work over, fixed any mistakes, and made sure it all made sense. ● They wrote enough to meet what was asked for.
Areas requiring improvement for candidates who were not at, or were borderline in meeting the required standard: ● Following the assessment instructions (e.g., complete all three sections: two pieces of writing and the multiple choice questions). ● Following the instructions and guidelines for each task (e.g., select only one topic, follow the recommended text length). ● Planning their answers to avoid going "off topic" (e.g., brainstorming, mind maps, listing ideas). ● Grouping their ideas together to form structure (e.g., to avoid "jumping around", repetition). ● Linking their ideas to each other and to the specified purpose. ● Providing relevant examples and sufficient detail when developing ideas. ● Using language appropriate for the audience and purpose as specified in the task (e.g., appropriateness of register and tone). ● Using a variety of sentence types (short/long, variation in beginnings and sentence type). ● Using appropriate vocabulary for the purpose and audience (e.g., avoidance of slang, using specific and precise words to clarify meaning and for interest). ● Editing and proofreading their work for technical accuracy (e.g., runon/incomplete sentences, spelling, punctuation, capital letters).	**Areas requiring improvement for candidates who were not at, or were borderline in meeting the required standard:** ● Some didn't follow all the instructions, like doing all the different parts of the test. ● They didn't always stick to what they were told to do, like picking just one topic or keeping their writing to the right length. ● They should have planned better to make sure they didn't go off track. ● Their ideas weren't always organised well, which made their writing messy and confusing. ● They didn't connect their ideas together very well or make sure they fit the purpose. ● They didn't give enough good examples or enough details to explain their ideas. ● Sometimes, they used the wrong kind of words for who they were writing to or what they were writing about. ● Their sentences were a bit boring because they didn't mix them up enough. ● They didn't use the best words for what they were trying to say or who they were talking to. ● They needed to go back and fix their mistakes, like long sentences or spelling errors.

Reading

Teacher Speak	Student Speak
Areas of strength demonstrated by candidates who were clearly at, or above, the required standard: ● They had a reading vocabulary that included general academic and specialised words. ● They could figure out the meaning of unfamiliar words by understanding word families, prefixes, and suffixes. ● They recognized and understood various language features and text structures such as punctuation, tables, illustrations, etc. ● They could connect the choices made by the writer (vocabulary, text structure) to the purpose and audience. ● They were able to compare, contrast, summarise, and link information from different sources. ● They could identify the writer's point of view or purpose, even if it wasn't explicitly stated. ● They were skilled at locating main points and relevant information. ● They could identify and reject misleading or inaccurate information. ● They used strategies to ensure that the text they were reading matched their purpose, such as using headings and looking for keywords.	**Areas of strength demonstrated by candidates who were clearly at, or above, the required standard:** ● They knew a lot of words, including ones used in school and specific subjects. ● When they found a word they didn't know, they could figure out what it meant by looking at parts of the word. ● They understood things like punctuation and how a text is set up, like with tables or pictures. ● They could see why a writer chose certain words or how they organised their writing based on who they were writing for. ● They were good at comparing different information from different places and putting it together. ● They could tell what the writer was trying to say or what they wanted the reader to think, even if it wasn't obvious. ● They could find the most important parts of a text or find what they needed. ● They were good at spotting wrong information and not believing it. ● They knew how to pick the right things to read based on what they needed, like using titles and important words.
Areas requiring improvement for candidates who were not at, or were borderline in meeting, the required standard: ● They needed to expand their reading vocabulary. ● They should work on strategies to understand the meanings of less familiar words, including topic-specific, specialised, and academic vocabulary. ● They needed to develop knowledge of a variety of language features and text structures, along with understanding why they are used. ● They should improve critical thinking skills and awareness, including understanding the writer's purpose and its implications for the reader. ● They needed to improve their close reading strategies to locate, check, and select relevant information effectively.	**Areas requiring improvement for candidates who were not at, or were borderline in meeting, the required standard:** ● They needed to learn more words to understand things better. ● They should practise figuring out what new words mean, especially ones related to certain topics or subjects. ● They needed to learn more about how writing works, like different types of sentences and how paragraphs are put together. ● They should get better at thinking about what a writer is trying to do and how it affects the reader. ● They needed to get better at reading carefully to find the right information.

Numeracy

Teacher Speak

Areas of strength demonstrated by candidates who were clearly at, or above, the required standard:

1. Formulating Mathematical and Statistical Approaches:
    - Candidates demonstrated proficiency in various problem-solving scenarios, such as calculating total pay with hourly rates, probabilities of drawing cards, and finding averages from given data.
    - They effectively applied mathematical operations in real-life contexts, like dividing masses, finding multipliers between units, and estimating dimensions from photographs.
2. Using Mathematical and Statistical Procedures Accurately:
    - Candidates accurately interpreted graphs and diagrams, such as bar graphs and line graphs, to extract relevant information and solve problems.
    - They displayed competence in performing calculations, including percentages, rates, discounts, and area calculations, using appropriate mathematical procedures.
3. Describing and Evaluating Methods and Calculations:
    - Candidates demonstrated critical thinking by justifying the reasonableness of methods and calculations used in various scenarios.
    - They evaluated claims made by others, such as assessing the validity of population data, interpreting graphs to verify assertions, and deciding whether certain actions were correct based on given ratios.

Areas requiring improvement for candidates who were not at, or were borderline in meeting, the required standard

1. Formulating Mathematical and Statistical Approaches:
    - Some candidates struggled to select appropriate approaches for problem-solving, as evidenced by their inability to create suitable mathematical models for given situations.
    - For example, they might have failed to recognise the correct mathematical operations needed to solve problems or misunderstood the demands of the situation.
2. Using Mathematical and Statistical Procedures Accurately:
    - Candidates who did not meet the standard often misinterpreted questions, resulting in incorrect calculations or procedures.
    - For instance, they might have misapplied percentages, misinterpreted graphs, or used incorrect formulas to solve problems.
3. Describing and Evaluating Methods and Calculations:
    - Some candidates failed to provide clear positions or evidence-based justifications for their evaluations of methods and calculations.
    - For instance, they might have left open response sections blank, restated claims without proper reasoning, or provided their own incorrect solutions without justifying them with evidence.