



New Zealand Qualifications Authority
Mana Tohu Matauranga O Aotearoa

Home > NCEA > Subjects > Assessment Reports > Health - L3

Assessment Report

Level 3 Health 2016

Standards [91462](#) [91465](#)

Part A: Commentary

Many candidates answered the questions effectively and in a coherent and concise manner. Application of knowledge to either the candidate's own learning, or the reference material provided, was more evident than in previous years.

Candidates who chose to sit both papers needed to divide their time between the two examinations effectively, so they had time to complete both papers to the best of their knowledge and ability.

Part B: Report on Standards

91462: Analyse an international health issue

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- explained the influence of two relevant determinants of health and how these were contributing to the health issue
- explained how people and society were impacted by the determinants, in relation to the health issue they had chosen
- showed an understanding of well-being
- explained two strategies that related to the health issue and allowed more equitable outcomes
- provided credible, sourced evidence.

Candidates who were assessed as **Not Achieved** commonly:

- failed to discuss why the issue was of international concern
- failed to use the determinants of health, or used other factors that were not determinants of health
- did not provide adequate, credible evidence within their answers

- failed to provide two recommendations
- explained how the health issue influenced the determinant, rather than how the determinants influenced the health issue
- showed little understanding of health key concepts.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Merit** commonly:

- provided credible sourced evidence throughout much of the paper
- explained how the issue was a cause for international concern
- provided an explanation that showed a clear understanding of the most significant and relevant determinants, and how these contributed to the health issue
- explained implications that related to the identified determinants
- explained relevant strategies that linked to the identified determinants and how these created more equitable outcomes
- explained the impact these strategies would have on well-being for the individual and society.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Excellence** commonly:

- provided a range of supporting evidence throughout the paper that was credible and accurately sourced
- outlined in depth, a health issue that is causing international concern
- provided a perceptive analysis that included the most significant and relevant determinants of health for the issue and provided a comprehensive explanation of how these influenced the issue
- explained the impacts on individuals and society which were linked to the influences of the issue
- provided recommendations that explicitly looked at improving the outcomes of individuals and society by addressing the identified determinants of health
- provided an in-depth understanding of the underlying concepts and made links to these where relevant within the paper
- provided a perceptive analysis of how outcomes would be more equitable if recommendations were implemented.

Standard-specific comments

Many candidates identified and explained a health issue of international concern concisely and coherently, with credible evidence.

The failure to identify and apply knowledge around the underlying health concepts prevented some candidates from achieving Excellence grades.

Some candidates used incorrect or minor determinants of health, which meant their responses were limited to an Achievement level.

Fewer responses repeated information across the questions.

91465: Analyse models for health promotion

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- provided some information of how model(s) were evident in the campaign
- demonstrated some comparison of at least two models for health promotion
- demonstrated some understanding of the advantages and disadvantages of the models
- correctly described principles of one or more supporting documents and their application within the campaign
- provided possible implications for the well-being of New Zealanders
- provided a valid strategy.

Candidates who were assessed as **Not Achieved** commonly:

- identified inaccurately the models evident within the campaign
- failed to provide information or provided inaccurate information on the supporting documents
- quoted extensively from the resource booklet or provided rote-learned information, but did not explain how it was related to the campaign
- did not explain how their strategy would be added to the campaign
- did not attempt all parts of the paper, or provided very brief responses to one or more parts
- provided little information on how well-being would be improved for New Zealanders.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Merit** commonly:

- provided clear, in-depth explanations, and comparisons of the models evident in the campaign
- provided mostly accurate information in relation to the models and supporting documents
- explained the advantages and disadvantages of the models and supporting documents used within the campaign
- applied the resource material appropriately, e.g. re-phrased it, or gave a brief quote to support their explanation
- demonstrated understanding of the links between the models and supporting documents and how they could improve the well-being of New Zealanders.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Excellence** commonly:

- demonstrated conceptual understanding of the models for health promotion and its supporting documents
- explained the models and supporting documents accurately in the campaign, as well as those added within their strategies, and how their inclusion related to the underlying concepts
- recognised that the collective action needed to be applied for long-term sustainable changes
- recognised that there are factors outside the control of individuals, such as determinants of health, e.g. social gradient, culture, in relation to obesity and inactivity

- demonstrated insightful and critical thinking when considering the implications for the well-being of New Zealanders.

Standard-specific comments

Overall, candidates showed a sound understanding of the models for health promotion and the supporting documents. Many candidates utilised the space provided effectively, avoiding repeating information, or writing lengthy responses that strayed from the question. These candidates provided concise and coherent answers that met the assessment criteria for higher grades.

Candidates who fully and clearly understood the questions and provided information from the supporting documents were more likely to achieve higher grades.

Collective action model explanations were sometimes too simplistic and some candidates did not outline how it could be included in the campaign, e.g. have a community event, or get the sports stars to talk at assemblies.

[Health subject page](#)

Copyright © New Zealand Qualifications Authority