

# **National Certificate of Educational Achievement**

## **2014 Assessment Report**

### **Health Level 3**

**91462 Analyse an international health issue**

**91465 Evaluate models for health promotion**

## COMMENTARY

Candidate responses that reflected their own thinking and learning were the most effective. Prepared responses that did not enable the student to answer the questions that were being asked limited students from achieving higher grades.

Candidates who answered questions concisely and coherently generally achieved higher grades as the emphasis is on the quality of the response not the quality of the writing.

Candidates using resource material relevant to their identified issue is increasing. A number of candidates still need to ensure that their evidence is sourced, current, accurate and relevant.

Candidates are showing a greater understanding of the application of the determinants of health to their chosen health issue.

## STANDARD REPORTS

### 91462 Analyse an international health issue

Successful candidates provided concise, focused answers rather than lengthy responses that demonstrated limited relevance to the question.

Candidates are encouraged to read the question carefully and only provide relevant material in their response.

### ACHIEVEMENT (3 OR 4)

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

- outlined a health issue which is causing international concern.
- explained the influence of two of the major Determinants of Health and how these were contributing to the issue
- showed an understanding of well being
- explained an understanding of relevant recommendations that related to the Determinants of Health, though the links may be loose
- recommended strategies which allowed for more equitable outcomes
- used some referenced evidence throughout the paper.

### NOT ACHIEVED (0, 1 OR 2)

**Candidates who were awarded Not Achieved for this question lacked some or all of the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement. They commonly:**

- failed to complete all parts of the paper
- failed to discuss why the chosen issue was of international concern
- failed to link the most important Determinants of Health to their explanation of the influence on the issue
- failed to provide implications that related to the societal or wider community

- focused predominately on the issue within New Zealand, rather than using NZ as a comparison, e.g. obesity of Pacific Islanders in New Zealand
- failed to provide adequate supporting evidence that was credible and referenced
- recommendations did not address the issue
- recommendations did not reflect equitable outcomes
- only one recommendation was made
- showed little understanding of health key concepts.

### **ACHIEVEMENT WITH MERIT (5 OR 6)**

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

- provided in-depth credible, referenced supporting evidence from differing sources
- explained in-depth the two most relevant determinants for the chosen international health issue
- explained in-depth implications that related to the stated determinants
- explained in-depth a local and international strategy that linked to the influencing factors previously discussed and displayed an understanding of how these created more equitable outcomes.

### **ACHIEVEMENT WITH EXCELLENCE (7 OR 8)**

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

- outlined a health issue which is causing international concern and outlined the impacts on wellbeing
- provided a wide range of supporting evidence from a wide range of credible sources
- made use of referenced evidence where appropriate
- demonstrated a perceptive analysis of the two most significant Determinants of Health for the identified international health issue and comprehensively explained how these are influencing the issue
- perceptively analysed the significant implications and how these relate to the socio-ecological perspective
- coherently explains two recommendations one local and one international that are linked to the influencing factors previously outlined with details about how these can be actioned
- the recommendations often provided supporting evidence to support their proposal, linking it to parts of the Ottawa Charter or strategies from WHO, UN or from successful previous health campaigns
- provided a perceptive analysis of how outcomes would be more equitable if recommendations were implemented
- concise and coherent answers with little preamble or repetition within or between questions.

## **OTHER COMMENTS**

A number of students who utilised a number of extra pages failed to achieve higher grades as they repeated information throughout the three parts of the question. This prevented the candidate from achieving higher grades as their answers were not concise and coherent.

The quality of the paper is far more important than the quantity written. The amount of space in the exam booklet is an indication of the space that is required to answer the question effectively.

### **91465 Evaluate models for health promotion**

Successful candidates provided concise, focused answers rather than lengthy responses that demonstrated limited relevance to the question. Candidates are encouraged to read the question carefully and only provide relevant material in their response.

#### **ACHIEVEMENT (3 OR 4)**

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

- provided information about 1 or 2 models but had little or no explanation about how they would be represented in the campaign
- provided limited information about why the models would be included in the campaign
- correctly explained the models, but only as they were represented in the Resource Booklet campaign
- demonstrated some understanding of the differences between the chosen models
- provided possible implications for those directly affected by the chosen issue (e.g. individuals who smoked)
- correctly described principles from the Bangkok Charter and/or the Treaty of Waitangi that could be incorporated into the campaign.

#### **NOT ACHIEVED (0,1 OR 2)**

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

- quoted extensively from the Resource Booklet, but did not interpret (re-phrase) or explain the quoted material or explain how it would be represented in the campaign
- inaccurately explained the models, Bangkok Charter and/or the Treaty of Waitangi
- did not attempt all parts of the paper or provided very brief responses to one or more parts
- explained the Ottawa Charter instead of a model for health promotion or instead of the Bangkok Charter and Treaty of Waitangi
- provided little information on how well-being would be improved.

## **ACHIEVEMENT WITH MERIT (5 OR 6)**

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

- provided clear in-depth explanations of the models chosen and why they chose to include them
- demonstrated understanding of the models but how they would be represented was often simplistic, e.g. the collective action could have speakers from the community go and talk at schools
- demonstrated some understanding of how well-being could be improved that went beyond those individuals directly affected, e.g. included families, community and/or NZ society
- demonstrated some understanding of the Bangkok Charter and/or the Treaty of Waitangi, how they could be included in the campaign, and how well-being would then improve for New Zealanders
- applied the resource material appropriately e.g. re-phrased it or gave a brief quote from the resource followed by an explanation.

## **ACHIEVEMENT WITH EXCELLENCE (7 OR 8)**

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

- provided a clear conceptual understanding of the models of health promotion, the Bangkok Charter and the Treaty of Waitangi
- recognised that the collective action model was required for the campaign to effectively provide long term sustainable changes
- included insightful and critical implications for people's well-being, which was inclusive of all those affected
- correctly related the models and why they were included to the underlying concepts
- recognised that there are factors outside the control of individuals, such as determinants of health, that needed to be addressed in their chosen campaign.

## **OTHER COMMENTS**

Some candidates used what appeared to be memorised answers (particularly for the models of health promotion and the Bangkok Charter). They did not tailor their answers to the questions provided. This severely disadvantages them from achieving the results they may have been capable of had they considered their answers in relation to the actual question posed in the paper.

The collective action model was not clearly understood by a significant number of candidates. Many merely quoted the resource then gave simplistic explanations of how it would be represented, e.g. professionals can do a survey; people will go and talk at school assemblies.

The implications for well-being were often brief and focused on the most obvious (the well-being of the individual) rather than "the well-being of those affected", e.g. individual, family, community.

The Treaty of Waitangi was not well understood and was often misrepresented by candidates, e.g. the Crown works for all New Zealanders; the Treaty makes sure Maori get equal access to the campaign. Many candidates did not acknowledge the importance of the principles and provisions of the Treaty of Waitangi in ensuring health promotion works towards equitable health status for Maori.