



National Certificate of Educational Achievement
TAUMATA MĀTAURANGA Ā-MOTU KUA TĀEA

Exemplar for Internal Achievement Standard Social Studies Level 1

This exemplar supports assessment against:

Achievement Standard 92049

**Demonstrate understanding of perspectives on a contemporary social
issue**

An annotated exemplar is a sample of student evidence, with a commentary, to explain key aspects of the standard. It assists teachers to make assessment judgements at the grade.

New Zealand Qualifications Authority

To support internal assessment

Grade: Achieved

For Achieved, the student needs to demonstrate understanding of perspectives on a contemporary social issue.

This involves describing a contemporary social issue and differing perspectives on it, how these influence people's viewpoints in relation to the issue, and a description of the differing responses in relation to these perspectives. Relevant evidence must be included.

This student has selected access to equitable education for disabled learners as their contemporary social issue. The description has been supported with evidence, such as quotations and statistics from a recent ERO report.

There is a description of two different perspectives – one humanitarian and one social. The evidence makes a connection between the perspectives and viewpoints held by the two selected individuals by describing what has influenced their perspective, and how this has influenced their values and actions. This is supported by relevant evidence, such as direct quotations and specific reference to the actions they have taken.

The different responses for both perspectives have also been described. The description of the humanitarian perspective (Trish Grant) better reflects the depth of evidence required by the standard.

For Merit, the explanation of the impacts should focus on the responses already discussed. For example, the evidence could have explained how Grant's response of educating government officials on education for disabled students may have the impact of building understanding/awareness of the issue, thus potentially improving educational policy.

Achieved

NZQA Intended for teacher use only

Schools around New Zealand are failing their disabled students and families. Disabled students have the same rights as other students to receive a good school education. However, a research that ERO (Education Review Office) undertook showed that “a quarter of families have been asked to keep their disabled child away from class, at home or at daycares”. As well as this, “1 in 5 parents of disabled students have been discouraged by schools to enrol their child.” (Information from ERO) Another thing that the report revealed was that there is between 1.4 to 3 times more of a chance for disabled students to be stood down, expelled or to move schools. One of the main causes of these issues is that teachers do not have the resources and knowledge to be able to confidently teach a disabled learner. In addition to this, almost all the disabled learners they asked said that they felt excluded from school activities inside and outside of class.

Trish Grant is the Society for Intellectually Handicapped Children (IHC) NZ director of advocacy, and says “The Government has failed to engage with the discrimination disabled students' experience”. Trish Grant has a humanitarian perspective. Grant holds these perspectives from extensive experience as a social worker, counsellor and a secondary school teacher, which gave her real life insight of the education system from a disabled and abled students point of view. Grant then became the Senior Advocate at the Office of the Children's Commissioner, giving her further knowledge and experience into a disabled child's perspective and life challenges. Grant has over 20 years of experience working as an advocate for disabled youth and has worked tirelessly for the Government to change policies for more inclusion and support in schools. Change is happening slowly with the Education and Training Act 2020 making those students' rights more explicit, “students who have special educational needs (whether because of disability or otherwise) have the same rights to enrol, attend, and receive education at State schools as students who do not”- The Education and Training Act 2020.

Grant's humanitarian perspective is influenced by her values of equality, inclusion and human rights along with her experience of knowing that the education system is slowly failing their disabled students.

Her response as a result of her perspectives is that she regularly speaks to the media and presents to the government. She also holds workshops for elected members of the government, who are decision makers. “A charity approach to supporting disabled students at school is out of step with the Government’s commitment to Whaikaha and Enabling Good Lives.” she says, clearly stating that a charity should not be doing the work that the government should be doing

XXX holds a social perspective as a parent of a disabled child who is struggling in the education system. XXX’s son has autism (ASD) and has been stood down three times so far this year. “The

reason for her son being stood down is not because he is misbehaving in class”, but because his school and teachers do not have the experience or resources to be able to teach him. XXX has had to give up her office job and her freelance contracts, losing her family over \$110,000 per year so that she can look after her son as the education system refuses. XXX says “it is the Ministry of Education’s responsibility, not the parent’s responsibility, to provide children with an education”.

It’s not that XXX’s son does not want to go to school, it is that the MoE will not provide funding for him to attend school full time with additional support such as a teacher aid. Tomorrow Schools is currently under public consultation with the Government seeking change. XXX says, “much respect to Deputy Education Minister Tracey Martin – who is driving the review, for recognising the need for systemic change and acting on it. But the elephant in the room is not being addressed: funding.”

XXX’s perspective is influenced by her values of wanting the best for her child and seeing that he is being rejected by the educational system that has a responsibility to educate him. XXX’s viewpoint is that she is viewing this as a loving parent who wants the best for her child and other families that are in the same position as her own.

XXX’s response as a result of her perspectives was to spread the word in her own voice online to encourage New Zealanders to take action and submit on the Tomorrow’s School consultation.

Both Trish Grant and XXX are advocating for change and are both coming from different viewpoints and perspectives, Grant as an advocate and XXX as an end user of the education system, with her child being directly affected. The long term impact is that there are disabled youth missing out on the quality education that the MoE is responsible for providing. Additional funding would be used to upskill teachers in working with disabled youth and gaining more access to resources like teacher aids. This affects the families of disabled students as their child is not receiving the education they deserve as well as the student themselves. This also directly affects the students future and their future family if they wish to have one. They may struggle to find a job and help provide for their family. This could even lead to poverty or homelessness.

Grade: Merit

For Merit, the student needs to explain perspectives on a contemporary social issue.

This involves discussing how differing perspectives have influenced responses in relation to the issue, and explaining the impacts of the responses to the issue. Evidence must be used to support the explanation.

This student has discussed two different perspectives – liberal progressive (the Green Party) and conservative (the National Party and Liam Hehir), and the discussion explains how the responses have been shaped by the perspectives. For example, the evidence gives reasons why Golriz Ghahraman introduced the Strengthening Democracy Member’s Bill as a response to the issue. The reasons for her response are linked to the liberal perspective values (the environment and accessible democracy) and points of view (giving 16-year-olds the right to vote would strengthen democracy).

Several impacts have been explained in relation to the responses. These include the government review on electoral law, political parties gaining or losing support from youth voters based on their stance on the issue, and how a change of law is unlikely if National/Act are the government.

For Excellence, the student could have developed an examination of the identified implications by considering the wider consequences for society. For example, the discussion could have considered how an increase in younger votes would shape the nature of political party policies to appeal to a younger demographic.

Voting is important. In the past, voting was restricted to just men and even landowners. In 1893 women received the right to vote. In 1960s and 70s NZ shifted the voting age from 20 to 21. Nowadays, people are arguing that we should Make it 16. Proponents of this believe the government should lower the voting age because they believe that more young people should get their voices heard. Young people deserve the right to vote as decisions about the future have greater implications for them than for older people. Voting young will enhance the habit of participation, I also think it will be great for new and young ideas for the future of our country.

Make it 16 is a Youth organisation that is youth-led, a non-partisan campaign aiming to lower the voting age to 16 in Aotearoa. They believe in the power of youth voice, and letting young people have a say on the decisions that will impact them the most. They have tried to take their case to the High Court, and Court of Appeal After failing, the Make it 16 groups took their case to the Supreme Court earlier this year and succeeded, but it didn't do anything to change the law it just puts pressure on the government to change the law.

The Greens party believes that 16 & 17-year-olds should be able to vote because it will strengthen democracy. The Green party thinks that 16 and 17-year-olds should vote because they're allowed to give consent, drive, work, and pay tax so it should make sense for youth to vote. Green Party electoral reform spokesperson Golriz Ghahraman says "16 and 17-year-olds can work, pay tax, drive, and leave home. They deserve to have a say in the decisions that affect them, both now and in the future. My Strengthening Democracy Member's Bill would help ensure more people's voices count in our democracy by lowering the voting age to 16."Not only would this change create a more representative democracy, but it would also provide more opportunities to engage young people in politics while they're at school.

The Greens party is a liberal progressive party. They care about environmental issues and social change. Young people are more likely to vote for them because climate change is likely to affect younger people like us. The Greens party cares about the rights of 16- & 17-year-old more than the National party does because of their voter base. The Green Party says Parliament must take action to make democracy more accessible by lowering the voting age to 16. The Green Party has long pushed for there to be a thorough review of electoral law. The Government finally agreed and announced a review of the system in 2021. This review will allow for a long overdue public debate about the voting age. The Green party's view is more supportive of young people and therefore I am likely to sign up to their campaign or support them in the future.

The National Party believes that 16 & 17-year-olds shouldn't be able because Young people are not informed enough, are too immature, and lack enough life experience to vote, and they might

get influenced to vote for a certain party. The National Party have publicly said that 16 & 17-year-olds shouldn't be able to vote because we're too immature and are not informed enough. Nicola Willis says "You can't marry at 16, you can't buy alcohol at 16, you can't serve in the army at 16 and I don't think you should be able to vote then either.

Liam Hehir says "That includes presenting to select committees, bringing petitions forward... it includes lobbying and petitioning their local MPs and Members of Parliament, it includes the right to protest. So I'd argue that youth should and do have a voice, but a vote isn't necessary. Mr. Heir also says "he's against it [reducing the voting age]," he said. "We shouldn't be changing the electorate to include children. You know - children still have developing brains. When you're 16/17, you're still in school. You're subject to a whole lot of influences. You haven't had a lot of experience outside the family or living on your own. And with that experience comes a lot of perspectives that you just don't have as a child." I am more likely to vote than present to a select committee, therefore I don't really have a voice.

The National Party is a Conservative party. They care about economic issues and are more traditional and don't often like change on social issues. Young people are less likely to vote for them because their focus is on economics and is not likely to affect younger people like us. The National Party cares less about 16 & 17-year-olds than the Green Party.

The National party has done nothing to stop the voting age from being lowered, other than voicing their opinion but Parliament now has to consider a law change, National and ACT have said they would strike it down, and that the Supreme Court was going too far. So if National are in power when the vote happens, the law probably won't pass. The National Party doesn't believe in my right to vote, therefore when do turn 18, I am less likely to vote for them. The impact of their response is that young people feel excluded but also will not vote for them.

I think that if we lower the voting age more voices of young people will be heard. Only a handful of countries allow under-18s to vote, but in recent years, international campaigns to lower voting ages have grown, with many arguing that young people should have a say on long-term democratic decisions, given they will have to live with the consequences. When countries like Austria and Scotland lowered the voting age, more people ended up voting between the ages of 16-18. Therefore a similar thing may happen in New Zealand.

However, I think the long-term implications are that 16-year-olds will start to be influenced by their parents or friends to vote for a specific party and many other groups. This means more votes but who gets those votes? Young people might not know what they are voting for and I agree with National and think some 16-year-olds are not mature enough to vote as well.

Grade: Excellence

For Excellence, the student needs to examine perspectives on a contemporary social issue.

This involves examining the implications on society of differing perspectives and responses in relation to the issue. Implications are the wider consequences for society. Evidence must be used to develop the explanation.

This student has examined two implications related to the social justice and conservative perspectives, and responses in relation to lowering the voting age.

The examination of the potential increase in youth political engagement reflects the depth of evidence expected at Excellence. For example, the implication of the potential increase is connected to wider society through a discussion on how a change in voter demographics could influence the issues that gain political attention. This examination links back to the earlier discussion around the social justice perspective, referencing the example set by the Makeit16 campaign and youth engagement in other social justice issues (such as LGBTQI+ rights).

Evidence has been used throughout to develop the explanation. This takes the form of carefully selected quotations to support key ideas, appropriate use of statistical evidence, and detailed examples of actions taken by individuals which reflect their broader perspectives.

Outline of the issue:

The argument about the social and political issue of lowering the voting age to 16 years old has become an extensive debate in New Zealand. Notably, it has been an issue among the younger generations. The advocacy group, Make It 16 is a non-partisan youth-led campaign advocating to lower the voting age. They argue that current laws restricting people aged 16-17 from voting is a form of discrimination against them under the Bill of Rights. Their court case was based on inconsistencies between the Electoral Act of 1993 and the Local Government Electoral Act of 2001, stating that these documents prevent them from voting and breach the Bill of Rights.

On the side opposed to lowering the voting age is the National Party, notably Nicola Willis. They as a party reached a collective consensus that 18 is the most fitting age for voting and appears that their standing on the issue will not be changing. They have convinced other parties within the government to also back them up with their decision of trying to make sure that this never passes through parliament.

Perspectives, Viewpoints and Responses:

Caeden Tipler's (founding member of the Make it 16 campaign) outlook on making the voting age 16 in New Zealand is a social justice and political perspective because they co-lead the campaign advocating in support of this topic. They also addressed government officials regarding this on the grounds of going against the Bill of Rights Act. They have this outlook on lowering the voting age because they believe that the situations they are debating in parliament negatively affect future generations. They also believe that this is their future being decided they need to hold a voice in what transpires.

Caeden expressed in an address at the youth parliament in 2022 "We're part of tens of thousands of young people who are told we aren't smart enough or informed enough to vote but thousands of us marched in the school strikes and thousands of us signed the petition to ban conversion therapy." Caden values giving voice to young people within a political environment as it gives significance to their voices and further enables them to make impacts that will have a positive effect on their future. Because of this, they responded by going to the Youth Parliament and delivering a speech on this subject. An impact of this is that it influenced Caeden to become involved within the Youth Parliament of New Zealand and was a part of bringing the Make It 16 case to the High and Supreme Courts. The impact of Caden going to the Supreme Court gave them the ruling that showed that not letting 16 and 17-year-olds vote was discrimination. The Supreme Court ruled in favor of Makes It 16 and their case.

On the opposing side of this social issue sits the national party, specifically Nicola Willis. Nicola's perspective on decreasing the voting age is political and conservative because her beliefs appeal to a substantial majority of people who are already able to vote in elections. Their belief concerning

lowering the voting age is that 18 is the most appropriate age to vote. In an interview with Newshub Nicola stated "You can't marry at 16, you can't buy alcohol at 16, you can't serve in the army at 16 and I don't think you should be able to vote then either".

Nicola values the current laws and policies that are in place in the New Zealand government. She believes that the way things currently are working well and have no need of changing. The impact of her being publicly opposed to lowering the age of voting is that this compelled other government parties to reject the idea publicly and influence their voters to do the same. As shown in the 2020 poll run by the national party. It showed that 88% of New Zealanders were satisfied with the voting age standing at 18.

In an interview with RNZ Paul Goldsmith spoke person for the national party stated "I'm puzzled that there's a justice system which treats 16- and 17-year-olds very differently, often on human rights grounds, thinks it's discriminatory to not have the vote so the logic doesn't quite follow." As Goldsmith is the spokesperson for the party he is showing the overall thoughts and beliefs of the party as a whole. This statement backs up all of Nicola's previous statements and opinions that she has shared during interviews. It helps her to have created a united front within her party on the issue of lowering the voting age to 16 and showing other parties what side they should be picking. This worked and convinced the ACT party to back up National and David Seymour Leader of the ACT party came out and said "ACT rejects calls to lower the voting age to 16 following the Supreme Court's ruling, we don't want 120,000 more voters who pay no tax voting for lots more spending. "

The Bigger Picture:

The possible implication of Cadens/make it 16 perspectives and action is a larger engagement on political issues by the younger generations. With the lowering of the voting age and Make It 16 being such a large supporter, pushing people to protest, has created a larger engagement of political issues. With this happening, this could change the way politicians are thinking in the future about their approach to politics. They would need to realize they need to cater to younger people as they have a different perspective on what is important such as climate change, gender equality and LGBTQ+ rights. As more young people have the chance to vote policies that would be passed so the policies would benefit them because they would make up a large part of the voting demographic. These issues will come to the spotlight due to younger generations having more votes.

Another probable implication as result of lowering the voting age is potential intergenerational conflict. Intergenerational conflict is when older voters or people of differing opinions feel that their voices are being overshadowed by younger individuals with more political power. The older generation could start to assume that all the new legislation and laws passing through parliament will be guided towards the values and beliefs of the youth. This is currently already happening because of Nicola's actions to keep the voting age eighteen. This is a negative implication because older generations will become disconnected from their youth. As well as priority changes, what is a priority for the older generations e.g. pension or old age health care might not be the younger generations.