

## **Steering: National Standards support the professional leadership in our school to implement the New Zealand Curriculum in a way that is relevant to our community.**

“Teaching will lose much of its spark and spontaneity, and children become bored. There will be less time for the teachable moment, when a child brings a pet to school, or class excursions to the zoo or the fire station. There will be less time for class visitors, or reading and discussing a great story, or discussions about moral issues – bullying or racial prejudice.”

Elley, W.B. (2010). Flaw 11 from Twenty Fundamental Flaws in the National Standards Policy. <http://www.nzei.org.nz/site/nzeite/files/misc%20documents/TWENTY%20FUNDAMENTAL%20FLAWS%20may%202010.pdf>

“When asked how confident they (principals) were that they’d had enough time and professional learning to implement the National Standards policy, only 2.5% said they felt very confident, while 75% said they were not very confident or severely lacking in confidence.”

NZEI. (2010) Results from an online Principals’ survey. [http://www.nzei.org.nz/article/x\\_category/00546/uid/00507.html](http://www.nzei.org.nz/article/x_category/00546/uid/00507.html) Retrieved on 16 June 2010.

“If teachers in different classes and schools are to apply the national standards consistently, they will need training, time to work together, and detailed guidance on how to use nationally available assessment resources to “tune their antennas” to the standards. That detailed guidance will not be fully available until mid 2011.”

Crooks, T. (2010). Issues in Thinking About and Implementing National Standards. *The New Zealand Principal*. vol.25, no2

“In addition to its specific elements [of its education strategy] , the Ontario approach is respectful, comprehensive, coherent, and aligned which will make the changes significant and sustainable.....The Ontario focus on student outcomes rests on the belief that educators have enormous skill and knowledge to contribute to school improvement. Respect for professionals is shown in a variety of ways.”

Levin, B., Glaze, A., & Fullan, M. (2008). Results without rancour or ranking: Ontario’s Success Story, *Phi Delta Kappan*, vol 90, no 04, Dec pp 273-280

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

**Safety: National Standards are safe and supportive of student learning (achievement and progress), motivation and self esteem.**

"Students assessed as not achieving the Standards could lose motivation for learning, affecting their achievement. Enhanced student achievement is an aim of the Standards yet National Standards themselves do not raise achievement levels, it is the teaching and learning that is invested in students that improves achievement levels. This may not be adequately provided for under the Standards."

Oakley, C. (2010) National Standards. New Zealand Parliamentary support. Research papers, June.

<http://www.parliament.nz/en-NZ/ParlSupport/ResearchPapers/a/b/e/00PLSocRP10031-National-Standards.htm>

Retrieved on 14 June 2010

"The NS [National Standards] system as proposed, threatens to be more punitive than educative. The same groups of low achieving children will be measured within an inch of their lives and found wanting. The same groups of children will be effectively punished by a system that is supposed to nurture every child."

Fraser, D. (2009). National Standards, individual differences and children's motivation. Unpublished manuscript. Hamilton, The University of Waikato.

<http://www.nzei.org.nz/site/nzeite/files/misc%20documents/deborah%20fraser%20NS%20and%20motivation.pdf>

"... the intended national standards system wrongly assumes that children are failing if they do not meet the standard for their age. This will lead to repeated labelling of many young children as failures and will be self-fulfilling because it will damage children's self esteem and turn them off learning and achieving in literacy and numeracy and other curricula areas."

Thrupp, M. et. al. (2009). Open letter to the Minister of Education, Hon Anne Tolley. Warning about the new national standards system. Education Review, 23 Nov

"From the motivation literature, we know that learners are more likely to enjoy learning when activities are meaningful, fun, or interesting. Yet, again and again, high stakes testing diminishes the fun and meaning of learning. Under pressure to prepare students to perform well in math and reading, teachers engage in repetitious instruction that boils down content to isolated bits of information, leaving little time to engage in creative interdisciplinary activities or project-based inquiry."

Nichols, S.L. and Berliner, D.C. (2008) 'Testing the Joy Out of Learning'. *Reaching the Reluctant Learner*, 65, 6, March. pp141-148

"...by believing that educational problems are solved by demanding higher standards, we forget that those who did not meet the previous standards will not meet the new ones, and there will be a larger group of failing and demotivated students who are just not willing to pay the price needed to achieve goals that they have not chosen, take little interest in, and have no control over, and, moreover, which seem unattainable."

Stiggins, R.J. (2002) *Assessment Crisis: The absence of assessment FOR learning*. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 83, 10 pp758-765

"Classroom evaluation affects students in many different ways. For instance, it guides their judgement of what is important to learn, affects their motivation and self-perceptions of competence, structures their approaches to and timing of personal study (eg spaced practice) consolidates learning, and affects the development of enduring learning strategies and skills. It appears to be one of the most potent forces influencing education."

Crooks, T. (1988). 'The Impact of Classroom Evaluation Practices on Students'. *Review of Educational Research*, vol. 58, no. 4, 438-481.

## Structure: National Standards are robust, transparent and evidence based.

"The Standards have been designed and implemented in a short time frame that has not allowed a trial to determine whether they have been set at the correct level."

Oakley, C. (2010) National Standards. New Zealand Parliamentary support. Research papers, June.

<http://www.parliament.nz/en-NZ/ParlSupport/ResearchPapers/a/b/e/00PLSocRP10031-National-Standards.htm>

Retrieved on 14 June 2010

"The National Standards policy assumes 'One Size Fits All'. But our children vary enormously in backgrounds, interests, needs and abilities. They learn best if their teaching is pitched just above their present level. Each child should work to his/her own standard."

Elley, W.B. (2010). Flaw 1 from Twenty Fundamental Flaws in the National Standards Policy.

<http://www.nzei.org.nz/site/nzeite/files/misc%20documents/TWENTY%20FUNDAMENTAL%20FLAWS%20may%202010.pdf>

"The Standards have been hastily prepared by committees, and untested for difficulty or intelligibility. They may well prove to be too hard, or too easy for the majority of children."

Elley, W.B. (2010). Flaw 2 from Twenty Fundamental Flaws in the National Standards Policy.

<http://www.nzei.org.nz/site/nzeite/files/misc%20documents/TWENTY%20FUNDAMENTAL%20FLAWS%20may%202010.pdf>

"The wording of the Literacy Standards is vague and capable of many interpretations. They do not specify clearly how difficult the pupils' tasks are to be, or how well pupils need to be able to perform, to pass the standard. Many are very similar from one year level to the next."

Elley, W.B. (2010). Flaw 3 from Twenty Fundamental Flaws in the National Standards Policy.

<http://www.nzei.org.nz/site/nzeite/files/misc%20documents/TWENTY%20FUNDAMENTAL%20FLAWS%20may%202010.pdf>

"There is no research which shows that passing NCEA Level 2 requires the levels of progress indicated by the published National Standards. This is sheer guesswork."

Elley, W.B. (2010). Flaw 4 from Twenty Fundamental Flaws in the National Standards Policy.

<http://www.nzei.org.nz/site/nzeite/files/misc%20documents/TWENTY%20FUNDAMENTAL%20FLAWS%20may%202010.pdf>

"The glossy, recently published New Zealand literacy and numeracy standards have no data, no evidence and no evaluation...they are pronouncements without evidence. If there is evidence outside committee contemplations, where is it? Until there is evidence the standards remain untested and experimental...we seem complacent in our ignorance of the evidence and ignorance of standards-setting methods."

Hattie, J. (2009). Horizons and whirlpools: The well travelled pathway of national standards, p8. <http://www.cognitioninstitute.org/files/docs/horizons-whirlpools-the-well-travelled-pathway-of-national-standards.pdf>

Retrieved on 25 May 2009.

"A further problem is that standards-setting committees rarely use evidence – claiming often that this will come later. Standards not based on evidence are perverse as they may have little relation to what students actually can do, they may have little relation to a hierarchy or development path, and they have no valid evidence to defend them."

Hattie, J. (2009). Horizons and whirlpools: The well travelled pathway of national standards, pp2-3. <http://www.cognitioninstitute.org/files/docs/horizons-whirlpools-the-well-travelled-pathway-of-national-standards.pdf>

Retrieved on 25 May 2009

“As the critics and supporters of NCLB have claimed, a major mistake has been indexing the standards to years of schooling. By such indexing, the implication is that students are taught as if all in the year are of a similar “standard.” If we know anything, then the ‘years’ refer more to the amount of spread in achievement within a year not the stages of growth – that is, year 4 means they are spread by a factor of 4, and year 8 spread by a factor of 8! To then assume that a standard based on a year refers to what the majority of students in that year can achieve is folly and should be resisted.”

Hattie, J. (2009). Horizons and whirlpools: The well travelled pathway of national standards, p6. <http://www.cognitioninstitute.org/files/docs/horizons-whirlpools-the-well-travelled-pathway-of-national-standards.pdf>

Retrieved on 25 May 2009

**Direction: National Standards align clearly with the New Zealand Curriculum and its intent to have confident, connected, actively involved, lifelong learners.**

“Overseas experience also shows that other key subjects in the curriculum will be downgraded, as more time is devoted to literacy and numeracy. There will be less time for science experiments or social studies projects, or oral language, or drama, or art, or music, or developing a lifelong interest in reading, and all the other desirable things that teachers do. Yet this is the time when teachers are expected to introduce an exciting new curriculum.”

Elley, W.B. (2010). Flaw 10 from Twenty Fundamental Flaws in the National Standards Policy. <http://www.nzei.org.nz/site/nzeite/files/misc%20documents/TWENTY%20FUNDAMENTAL%20FLAWS%20may%202010.pdf>

“While the Minister says the Standards and Curriculum reinforce each other, it is difficult to see how they line up at this stage. The New Zealand Curriculum provides a breadth and richness of learning and seeks local answers and innovative responses. It nurtures individual talents, cultivates creativity, celebrates diversity, inspires curiosity, and acknowledges the importance of a student’s personal learning journey. All these are basic building blocks for life-long learning. In contrast the National Standards policy encourages more standardisation, treats learning as linear and age-related, and is the first step down a slippery slope towards high stakes testing and test-based accountability”.

<http://www.nzei.org.nz/FAQs.html>

“What will happen to oral language, science, social studies, health, computer skills, listening skills and the many other responsibilities of the schools? We can be sure that schools will be less interesting places for children to grow and thrive in, and that many more pupils will be turned off learning.”

Elley, W. (2008). Standards that will fall short. *Education Review* 13, 39.

“Of course, focusing on a narrow slice of curriculum in a repetitive way means teachers are likely to see a boost in performance in that narrow area. students can be put on a treadmill of rote learning, backed up by worksheets, and there is likely to be a result. However, the overseas experience suggests improvements quickly plateau, and it is not clear that overall standards are improved or sustained. Nor is it clear what effect such an approach has on student motivation, and the development of a positive attitude towards learning throughout life.”

NZCER (2008). NZCER background paper on national standards for literacy and numeracy. NZCER paper 18 November, p7.

**Speed: The Government has ensured the National Standards process has been given sufficient time to allow for confident implementation by the profession and to gain parent support.**

"The Standards have been designed and implemented in a short time frame that has not allowed a trial to determine whether they have been set at the correct level."

Oakley, C. (2010) National Standards. New Zealand Parliamentary support. Research papers, June.

<http://www.parliament.nz/en-NZ/ParlSupport/ResearchPapers/a/b/e/00PLSocRP10031-National-Standards.htm> Retrieved on 14 June 2010

"Full implementation means that schools are required to develop their capability to assess in relation to the Standards whilst simultaneously applying them."

Oakley, C. (2010) National Standards. New Zealand Parliamentary support. Research papers, June.

<http://www.parliament.nz/en-NZ/ParlSupport/ResearchPapers/a/b/e/00PLSocRP10031-National-Standards.html> Retrieved on 14 June 2010

"...However, the very brief time frame allowed for the development of the standards and associated guidelines and requirements has resulted in fundamental flaws."

Thrupp, M. et. al. (2009). Open letter to the Minister of Education, Hon Anne Tolley. Warning about the new national standards system. Education Review, 23 Nov

More than 700 principals responded to the online survey carried out by the NZEI Te Riu Roa. The survey aimed to get an overview of how principals and their schools are responding to the Government's National Standards policy and how well prepared they are to implement them. The overwhelming message from the survey is that schools feel implementation is being rushed, professional training has been inadequate,

- "I belong to a cluster that hasn't met yet."
- "Unfortunately the professional development provision has not kept pace with the implementation timeline"
- "The PD provided is too little too late. Our staff are dedicated people who want to get it right - but the lack of time and PD for them has meant they lack confidence - where as normally they report with confidence at parent interviews."

NZEI. (2010) Results from an online Principals' survey. [http://www.nzei.org.nz/article/x\\_category/00546/uid/00507.html](http://www.nzei.org.nz/article/x_category/00546/uid/00507.html) Retrieved on 16 June 2010.

"The timing of implementation threatens the smooth implementation of the new national curriculum. These are now expected to occur simultaneously which will make it very difficult for schools to do both well."

Crooks, T. (2010). Comments About Implementing National Standards. Unpublished.

"National Standards were developed behind closed doors by the ministry with its hired consultants and with a round of farcical consultation meetings controlled by the Ministry. Fewer than 1% of parents participated in consultations and a substantial number of those who did take part expressed their serious concerns or opposition to the proposed system, which is set up to label children in plain English twice a year, every year of their primary and intermediate schooling."

Flockton, I. (2009) Letters to the editor. Otago Daily Times. 7 December

**Interior: Information from your school's assessment tools (eg AsTTle, STAR, PAT etc) can be confidently aligned to the National Standards.**

"Concern has also been expressed that with no trial of the Standards there has been no opportunity to establish whether they have been set at the correct level, or to see how they relate to actual patterns of student progression over time. Not all students follow the same developmental trajectory to get to the same level of performance at the same time. Schools were given the opportunity in the consultation phase to comment on the level of the Standards however that was when they were only broadly outlined. What happens when students actual reading and writing is compared to the Standards may be different. Whilst the Independent Advisory Group has been assembled to monitor any issues that occur, this is a retrospective function and students will already have been assessed against standards that may be incorrectly aligned to student progression."

Oakley, C. (2010) National Standards. New Zealand Parliamentary support. Research papers, June.  
<http://www.parliament.nz/en-NZ/ParlSupport/ResearchPapers/a/b/e/00PLSocRP10031-National-Standards.htm>  
Retrieved on 14 June 2010

As a result of the Government's decision to backward map the National Standards from NCEA Level 2, the Standards are not benchmarked to what current tools show students are achieving and therefore the National Standards are aspirational rather than actual.

### **The Ministry states:**

"One thing you may notice when you study these results is that often there is not a consistent relationship between a test's norms (e.g. stanines, average scale scores for a year level etc.) and the most likely national standard reporting category. This is not a cause for concern. Test norms are based on what the average student of a given age can do; the standard relates to what all students should be able to do, if they are on track for a successful educational outcome. In some areas of learning, the two coincide – the average student (i.e. stanine 5) is at the required level. In other areas, there may be a general shortfall – only high-performing students (e.g. stanine 7+) are likely to reach the standard, with others needing to improve their achievement in order to do so. This is an important feature of national standards, and one of the ways in which they are intended to drive improved learning for all students".

<http://assessment.tki.org.nz/Assessment-tool-resources/Alignment-of-assessment-tools-with-National-Standards>  
Retrieved on 16 June 2010

### **In addition, the Ministry advises**

"...The standards have been designed so that students who meet them will be on track to achieve NCEA Level 2.

### **Based on current data we estimate that in reading approximately:**

50 percent of students are likely to be at or above the standard after 1 year at school  
60 percent are likely to be at or above the standard at Year 4  
60 percent are likely to be at or above the standard at Year 8.

### **We estimate that in mathematics approximately:**

80 percent of students are likely to be at or above the standard after 1 year at school  
70 percent are likely to be at or above the standard at Year 4  
50 percent are likely to be at or above the standard at Year 8."

Ministry of Education. (2010) Q&A – National Standards. *Education Gazette*: 89, 7, 3 May  
<http://www.edgazette.govt.nz/Articles/article.aspx?articleId=8053>  
Retrieved on 7 May 2010

**Exterior: Parents will easily understand the difference between the Standards and norm-referenced assessment tools.**

“Having a national standard – and knowing if your child has passed or failed – does not guarantee parents get better, more useful information. What may make a difference are longer parent-teacher and child sessions, at which progress and goals are discussed, as well as the respective contributions of home and school to achieving that. The assessment tools that most schools already use can provide useful data to share with parents but they do need explaining – a grade is not enough.”

NZCER (2008). NZCER background paper on national standards for literacy and numeracy. NZCER paper 18 November.

“If we are going to be using the standards, the best approach is to report which standard best describes the achievement of each child, and then to focus on the progress they have made over the past year. This offers the best chance of getting progress into the foreground, recognising the motivational value of this. The more normative approach of describing class members as “above”, “at”, “below” or “well below” a standard can often hide or distort evidence of growth. For instance, some students may have advanced by two standards over a year of schooling, but because they were initially very low, have remained “well behind” the standard for their year of schooling. Less drastically, but still very unfortunately, more typical students who advanced by one standard over a year of schooling would also see no difference in what was reported about their achievement.”

Crooks, T. (2010). Issues in Thinking About and Implementing National Standards. The New Zealand Principal vol.25, no2

“Many schools already report well to parents, and many report more than twice a year. Schools are encouraged to find out what parents find most useful.”

\_\_\_\_\_ (2010) Q&A National Standards. What reports do I sent to parents this year? New Zealand Education Gazette, 4 May

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

**Fuel: There is sufficient resourcing to ensure good quality professional learning for all appropriate staff to understand and implement the Standards.**

"In 2010, an estimated 7000 trustees, principals and lead teachers will attend Ministry of Education professional development workshops on the Standards. Those teachers who receive the professional development training are required to facilitate the training of their colleagues in assessing and developing moderation processes. This responsibility is likely to create quite a burden on some teachers. Professional Development is also being provided in the form of materials online and schools can contact their regional Ministry of Education office if they need help. Because the Standards are being implemented simultaneously with professional development training, teachers and schools may have to start implementation before opportunities to access professional development arise. This minimal professional development could lead to inadequate assessment and moderation practices in schools."

Oakley, C. (2010) National Standards. New Zealand Parliamentary support. Research papers, June.  
<http://www.parliament.nz/en-NZ/ParlSupport/ResearchPapers/a/b/e/00PLSocRP10031-National-Standards.htm>  
Retrieved on 14 June 2010

"With the money that has been set aside – 36 million over three years – we're talking 12 million a year. And 10 percent of primary school population is about 48000 students. You divide \$12 million by 48000 students and you get a figure of money for 10 per cent which is about one teacher day a year..... Reading Recovery typically costs around \$2000 per child. "

Crooks, T. (2010) Interview by Kathryn Ryan on Nine to Noon, Radio NZ – National, 4 Feb at 0908

"Funding to School Support Services (SSS) for professional development across the curriculum for primary has been cut for 2010, and SSS is required to focus entirely on literacy and numeracy in their work with primary teachers. While disastrous for the broad and balanced curriculum in primary, including PPTA members in Years 7 and 8, this will also reduce access to professional development across the curriculum for years 9-10 teachers."

PPTA. (2010) PPTA position on National Standards. Retrieved on <http://www.ppta.org.nz/index.php/-issues-in-education/897-national-standards-ppta> on 25 May 2010.

"If the national standards were to be meaningful in terms of boosting learning, they would need to be accompanied by substantial professional development and resources, such as exemplars and stories of how other schools are making use of the data. This kind of infrastructure investment could pay dividends in consolidating the expertise schools are already building up in this area."

NZCER (2008). NZCER background paper on national standards for literacy and numeracy. NZCER paper 18 November p8.

## Windscreen wipers: The National Standards provide clear guidance about how to achieve consistent teacher judgement nationally.

"Schools may not have time and sufficient professional development support to become familiar with the National Standards and develop effective moderation processes before they are required to implement the National Standards in mid 2010."

Oakley, C. (2010) National Standards. New Zealand Parliamentary support. Research papers, June.  
<http://www.parliament.nz/en-NZ/ParlSupport/ResearchPapers/a/b/e/00PLSocRP10031-National-Standards.htm>  
Retrieved on 14 June 2010

"Teachers need professional development support to help them effectively assess against the Standards to create reliable Overall Teacher Judgements."

Oakley, C. (2010) National Standards. New Zealand Parliamentary support. Research papers, June.  
<http://www.parliament.nz/en-NZ/ParlSupport/ResearchPapers/a/b/e/00PLSocRP10031-National-Standards.htm>  
Retrieved on 14 June 2010

Principals responding to the NZEI online survey were not very confident (39%) or had a severe lack of confidence (25%) that their teaching staff have the tools to make an overall teacher judgement which is nationally consistent and moderated. In response to a further question listing concerns, 89% of principals responding and issues with moderation and national consistency.

NZEI. (2010) Results from an online Principals' survey. [http://www.nzei.org.nz/article/x\\_category/00546/uid/00507.html](http://www.nzei.org.nz/article/x_category/00546/uid/00507.html)  
Retrieved on 16 June 2010.

"Teachers will be expected to make their 'Overall Teacher Judgements' of their students' achievement levels, based on various sources of evidence, which teachers and their students are to select. These sources will vary widely, from teacher to teacher, making comparisons between schools and between classes quite unfair and impossible to interpret."

Elley, W.B. (2010). Flaw 5 from Twenty Fundamental Flaws in the National Standards Policy. <http://www.nzei.org.nz/site/nzeite/files/misc%20documents/TWENTY%20FUNDAMENTAL%20FLAWS%20may%202010.pdf>

"The Ministry advice provided to teachers, in the Ministry website, on how to moderate teacher judgements is naive. It ignores the many problems which have dogged such policies."

Elley, W.B. (2010). Flaw 6 from Twenty Fundamental Flaws in the National Standards Policy. *Unpublished*. <http://www.nzei.org.nz/site/nzeite/files/misc%20documents/TWENTY%20FUNDAMENTAL%20FLAWS%20may%202010.pdf>

"It is well known that teachers are very good at identifying which students are achieving best or worst in their classes, but that it is much harder for them to interpret and apply standards consistently with teachers in other schools. This has been one of the major challenges for secondary school teachers undertaking internal assessment in the NCEA. All experts agree that words are not sufficient to define standards. The new standards include some annotated exemplars of student work, which is a good start but not enough. Teachers will need substantial professional development and opportunities to work together towards understanding and consistent implementation of standards, and they also will need clear guidance on how nationally available tests can be used to help them to adjust their interpretation of the standards so that the standards are applied more consistently. Such clear and trustworthy guidance is not likely to be available until the second half of 2011."

Crooks, T. (2010). Comments about implementing National Standards, 7 April. Unpublished

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

**Brakes: National Standards can improve current under-achievement, particularly of Māori and Pasifika students, by providing appropriate resources for the school to raise achievement.**

"Of the oft-quoted 20% of children that our politicians say are failing in school, NEMP results suggest that at most 10% of year 8 students seem to lack the required skills to succeed in secondary school. The others who do not achieve good NCEA results are not applying themselves to their secondary school studies: they have sufficient ability and grounding in skills, but apparently are not motivated to do the required work or lack an appropriate physical and social environment outside of class to concentrate on that work."

Crooks, T. (2010). Issues in Thinking About and Implementing National Standards. *The New Zealand Principal*. vol.25, no2

Māori academics, Māori principals and Māori Party co-leader Pita Sharples have all raised concerns about the danger that the Standards may label children as failures and increase the perception of low-decile schools and communities as "failing". There has been no consultation with Māori principals in mainstream schools, where 80% of Māori children are. National Standards are not being trialled, unlike the ones being developed for kura. Why will standards essentially monocultural in design and development — that fail to acknowledge a Māori world view — suddenly work to help Māori children succeed?

Marae A tale of two schools standing defiant against Government's National Standards.

<http://tvnz.co.nz/marae/s2009-s2010-e25-video-3455513>

"...it is not the identification of students that leads to improved educational achievement; it is effective teaching and learning support that is provided to students that improves achievement...However, a lot of the professional development provided to schools and teachers focuses on assessing against the Standards to identify struggling students as opposed to improving classroom learning. For education to improve, it will be important that teachers are provided with adequate opportunities to participate in programmes that improve their teaching capacity."

Oakley, C. (2010) National Standards. New Zealand Parliamentary support. Research papers, June.

<http://www.parliament.nz/en-NZ/ParlSupport/ResearchPapers/a/b/e/00PLSocRP10031-National-Standards.htm>

Retrieved on 14 June 2010

"Of course, we want all our children to be able to read, write and calculate. But if the National government, in its haste to rush through an ill considered Act, thinks that national standards will solve the problems of the long tail of under-achievement, they clearly have not given much thought to such questions as these."

Elley, W. (2009). Standards that will fall short. *Education Review*