

# **National Certificate of Educational Achievement**

## **2011 Assessment Report**

### **Health Level 3**

- 90709 Analyse an international health issue**
- 90711 Explain a contemporary dilemma or ethical issue in relation to well-being**
- 90712 Examine models of health promotion and their implications for well-being**

## **COMMENTARY:**

The best candidate responses were a reflection of their own thinking and learning applied in the examination, rather than prepared responses.

Candidates generally showed a good understanding of the socio-ecological perspective.

Candidates were most effective when answering questions concisely, as the emphasis is on the quality of the response, not the quantity of writing.

Candidates generally showed more use of the resource material in their responses. Where students used their own evidence, it needed to be relevant, accurate, and current.

## **STANDARD REPORTS**

### **90709 Analyse an international health issue**

#### **ACHIEVEMENT**

**Candidates who were awarded Achievement for this standard demonstrated the required skills and knowledge. They typically:**

- explained clearly two significant contributing factors, from cultural, economic, or political (environmental was often mentioned in conjunction with one of these but not as a sole contributor)
- linked factors with implications e.g. economic/education: many children in Sub-Saharan Africa do not attend school because of the high costs of education, therefore they do not receive adequate education on HIV transmission
- supported with real-life experiences from school trips and ideas relevant to the health issues
- showed some understanding of implications at personal and societal levels
- applied relevant and appropriate health promotion actions including a basic understanding of social justice and equitable outcomes.

#### **NOT ACHIEVED**

**Candidates who were assessed as Not Achieved for this standard lacked some or all of the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement. They typically:**

- did not convincingly relate items e.g. gender inequality, poverty, or education to a specific determinant
- referred consistently to “getting AIDS” – HIV is transmitted; AIDS is the outcome
- did not provide valid supporting evidence
- provided factually incorrect evidence e.g. “it has been proven that male circumcision prevents the spread of HIV”
- focused only on physical symptoms of HIV and familial grief as implications
- made inappropriate recommendations e.g. “provide clean surgical instruments with which to perform female genital mutilation”
- did not discuss societal implications
- demonstrated minimal understanding of social justice.

## **ACHIEVEMENT WITH MERIT**

**In addition to the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement, candidates who were awarded Achievement with Merit typically:**

- linked influencing facets of determinants e.g. poverty, gender inequality, and education, to the appropriate determinant to provide an in-depth explanation and analysis of the issue
- supported discussions with a range of accurate, relevant, and current evidence
- demonstrated an in-depth understanding of the implications on a personal and societal level
- explained recommendations for future action that were relevant and applicable, including strategies that embraced the concepts of human rights and social justice.

## **ACHIEVEMENT WITH EXCELLENCE**

**In addition to the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement with Merit, candidates who were awarded Achievement with Excellence typically:**

- comprehensively explained two factors contributing to the health issue
- provided appropriate and accurate supporting evidence from a wide range of credible sources
- perceptively analysed the implications using a convincing discussion of all levels of the implications with an emphasis on societal aspects from a top-down aspect
- made comprehensive, sensible, and appropriate recommendations for action that would address the issue in ways that actively promoted human rights and social justice through each determinant, with an emphasis on equitable outcomes e.g. economic: applying to the World Bank for a reduction or cancellation of SSA's overall debt. This could free up government funding that could be redirected into local production of ARV drugs, thus lessening the cost of production, creating employment, and making the ARV drug accessible to all.

## **OTHER COMMENTS**

Although the general focus was on the issue of HIV in Sub Saharan Africa, some candidates discussed other topics from the provided list.

Some candidates, when writing about education, poverty, and gender inequality, did not specify which determinant/s these related to.

Some candidates provided too much information, writing up to six extra sheets.

Many candidates provided outdated or incorrect information and references e.g. "6½ people are dying each day" or "HIV can be cured by circumcision". It is important that evidence is factual and current.

Some candidates answered using bullet points. Although bullet points may list information, they do not provide understanding and are not considered an explanation.

Some candidates were judgmental in their discussions of HIV transmission, using the phrase "these people need to ..." or "these people should ..."

## **90711 Explain a contemporary dilemma or ethical issue in relation to well-being.**

### **ACHIEVEMENT**

**Candidates who were awarded Achievement for this standard demonstrated the required skills and knowledge. They typically:**

- described why the selected issue was an ethical dilemma and described two clear opposing perspectives on the issue
- answered the whole paper and used some evidence or evidence-based thought, to support the responses, particularly for criterion one
- explained the attitudes, values, and beliefs of at least one group “for” and “against” the issue with a balanced view of the issue
- responded with brief or factually inaccurate answers in places
- explained implications for the well-being of individuals, for relationships between people and for society as a whole. Implications were brief and unclear in places, and not so much about the implications of the perspectives themselves, but implications of the practice or non-practice
- provided answers for both criteria that were direct opposites of each other, rather than presenting a variety of ideas across the perspectives and implications.

### **NOT ACHIEVED**

**Candidates who were assessed as Not Achieved for this standard lacked some or all of the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement. They typically:**

- did not attempt all questions
- provided factually incorrect responses or did not attempt to use evidence or evidence-based thought, and wrote on the wrong topic (or focused on an incorrect aspect e.g. the ethics of AFT itself, rather than access to AFT)
- did not explain the values, attitudes, and beliefs underpinning the opposing perspectives
- did not provide valid societal implications – often, the answer for “societal” was in fact focused on personal well-being
- gave personal opinions, especially for the opposing perspectives.

### **ACHIEVEMENT WITH MERIT**

**In addition to the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement, candidates who were awarded Achievement with Merit typically:**

- used accurate and detailed evidence to support the explanation of perspectives (a clear, reasoned explanation) and often used evidence in their response for implications
- began to link their answers to established ethical principles – showed some understanding of ethics
- provided societal impacts that related clearly and meaningfully to culture and/or opportunities for health promotion
- presented impacts of the perspectives that encompassed short-term and long-term, positive and negative.

## **ACHIEVEMENT WITH EXCELLENCE**

**In addition to the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement with Merit, candidates who were awarded Achievement with Excellence typically:**

- selected the most significant groups for the “for” and “against” perspectives as well as explaining the most critical health-related beliefs, values, and attitudes of each group – factually accurate and well supported by evidence
- showed a clear understanding of the ethical nature of the issue by linking their responses to ethical principles – had a clear understanding of ethics and provided thoughtful links
- explained impacts that were clearly focused on the implications arising from the differing perspectives
- discussed the implications with insight – showing understanding of the underlying concepts (hauora, attitudes and values, SEP, and health promotion). The more critical implications were addressed by considering a range of relevant stakeholders.

## **OTHER COMMENTS**

Access to AFT was the issue that was most commonly selected by candidates. Within AFT, a range of the five factors were covered.

Candidates who did well typically avoided the religious argument.

Students who chose ‘government funding’ provided a clear and logical response.

PGD was covered by few students but was generally completed extremely well.

Across the AFT responses, supporting evidence that students used was usually relevant, related to New Zealand, and current or recent.

Exposure to SEM was also covered by a significant number of candidates.

Parental rights and the treatment of children was the option least-often selected, and most who attempted this did not complete it accurately.

Overall, candidates who achieved higher grades showed a greater understanding of ethics, why their issue was an ethical dilemma, and who in society was “for” and “against” the issue. A lot of responses were not based in facts.

## **90712 Examine models of health promotion and their implications for well-being**

### **ACHIEVEMENT**

**Candidates who were awarded Achievement for this standard demonstrated the required skills and knowledge. They typically:**

- demonstrated understanding of the difference between collective action, behavioural change, and self-empowerment
- explained how one of these models was most closely aligned to the campaign
- used appropriate quotes from the resource material to support their responses
- correctly linked at least one principle of the Ottawa Charter to the campaign
- explained possible implications for the well-being of individuals, families, and society.

## **NOT ACHIEVED**

**Candidates who were assessed as Not Achieved for this standard lacked some or all of the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement. They typically:**

- quoted from the resource material but did not interpret or examine it in the context of the campaign
- focussed on the negative aspects of behaviour change and self-empowerment models and, therefore, did not recognise their contribution to the campaign
- did not identify specific implications for well-being of individuals, families, or society.

## **ACHIEVEMENT WITH MERIT**

**In addition to the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement, candidates who were awarded Achievement with Merit typically:**

- provided clear and valid links between the campaign and collective action
- recognised that the campaign also had links to the self-empowerment and/or the behaviour change model
- used specific examples and/or re-phrased the resource materials to explain the links between the campaign and the principles of the Ottawa Charter
- showed some understanding of the determinants of health in relation to family violence
- described possible implications for individuals, families and the wider community and linked these to Goal 4 of the campaign.

## **ACHIEVEMENT WITH EXCELLENCE**

**In addition to the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement with Merit, candidates who were awarded Achievement with Excellence typically:**

- showed a clear conceptual understanding of the 'It's Not OK' campaign and its links to all three of the health promotion models and the Ottawa Charter
- demonstrated understanding that collective action is the most effective model for long-term sustainable health changes
- recognised those factors outside the control of individuals, i.e. the determinants of health that influence family violence
- clearly understood that 'creating supportive environments' is about changing societal attitudes towards family violence
- included some of the more critical and insightful implications for well-being of individuals, families, and communities and made valid links to Goal 4 of the campaign.

## **OTHER COMMENTS**

Many candidates demonstrated critical thinking skills by making a decision and justifying it. Many students used the resource material to good effect.

Generally, candidates' responses were more structured and they recognised that if Goal 4 is successful, then other goals must also be working effectively.

The weakest area for candidates was identifying community/societal implications.