

# 2015 NCEA Assessment Report

Health Level 2 91235, 91238

## Part A: Commentary

Comment on the overall response of candidates to 2015 examinations for all achievement standards covered by this report.

Successful candidates focused on the contexts provided. They understood that the ‘analysis’ compromised the combination of:

- factors that influenced the issue
- consequences for people's well-being as a result of the issue
- strategies to avoid the health issue (prevention and intervention).
- they used the resource material provided to support their responses to the sections of the examination question.

## Part B: Report on standards

### 1. Assessment Report for 91235: Analyse an adolescent health issue

<p><b>Achieved</b></p>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• explained the short term and long term consequences of stress</li> <li>• separated consequences into 4 dimensions of hauora rather than answer at a personal, interpersonal and societal level for short term and long term</li> <li>• explained only two areas of personal, interpersonal and societal influences and how they contributed to the health issue</li> <li>• explained influences that were all negative or all positive</li> <li>• provided at least two strategies, personal, interpersonal and societal and attempted to explain why they were health enhancing</li> <li>• used only the scenario provided as the only source of evidence</li> <li>• used evidence that did not link to the argument provided</li> <li>• explained the consequences of stress on well-being.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Not Achieved</b></p>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Not Achieved commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• wrote answers that were too brief to constitute an “explanation” or listed answers</li> <li>• wrote about strategies in (a) rather than influences</li> <li>• did not use any evidence including resources and scenario provided, or provided evidence that was not credible or not from a New Zealand source</li> <li>• explained only the physical personal consequences of stress, no discussion of interpersonal or societal</li> <li>• listed consequences</li> <li>• showed no understanding of societal influences, consequences and/or strategies</li> <li>• identified influences, positive or negative, at a personal, interpersonal or societal level from the scenario but made no link to influence on stress</li> <li>• listed strategies or a large range of strategies, without explanations and no explanation on how it would reduce stress</li> <li>• only described one of Personal, Interpersonal and Societal in their answer.</li> <li>• were unable to explain their ideas that they had stated briefly in bullet form.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Achieved with Merit</b></p>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved with Merit commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• explained in detail all three personal, interpersonal and societal influences contributing to the adolescent health issue</li> <li>• explained short term and long term consequences in at least two areas of personal, interpersonal or societal</li> <li>• supported arguments with relevant evidence from the resources or scenario</li> <li>• provided relevant and realistic strategies at a personal, interpersonal and societal level. There was a link to the scenario and supporting evidence was provided</li> <li>• the strategies addressed influences mentioned in (a) and made links to the</li> </ul>

	<p>consequences</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• used the resource and scenario provided as the only source of evidence</li> <li>• explained in detail how the influences contributed to the consequences for well being in relation to the issue</li> <li>• used some of their own research information and statistics occasionally</li> <li>• linked the long and short term consequences.</li> </ul>
<b>Achieved with Excellence</b>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved with Excellence commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• comprehensively explained how personal, interpersonal and societal influences contributed to adolescent health issue</li> <li>• explained in detail the personal, interpersonal and societal consequences at a more critical level and provided links within the consequences and to answers provided in (a)</li> <li>• showed an understanding of the link from short term to long term consequences</li> <li>• provided a range of relevant evidence to strongly support arguments throughout the paper, used evidence to back up statements from own research</li> <li>• selected and explained strategies that were the most crucial and relevant actions to enhance well being</li> <li>• the strategies addressed influences mentioned in (a) and made links to the consequences</li> <li>• wrote with detail, insight and clarity</li> <li>• used a range of resources from their own research as well as the evidence provided</li> <li>• developed a final paragraph that gave an argument/final statement for their comments and ideas throughout the paper.</li> </ul>
<b>Standard specific comments</b>	<p>Candidates need to be aware that at Level Two they are to talk about Personal, Interpersonal and Societal rather than the four dimensions of Hauora to structure their answers. They also need to ensure they discuss all three of these as well as answer the separate parts of the question e.g. Positive and Negative for Personal, Interpersonal and Societal. Long term and Short term for Personal, Interpersonal and Societal.</p>

## 2. Assessment Report for 91238: Analyse an interpersonal issue(s) that places personal safety at risk

<b>Achieved</b>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• described some analysis of factors, consequences and strategies that meet the standard, however not in great depth. A4 explained more in-depth answers.</li> <li>• If the answers were good in section a, b, c and only one or two strategies were provided we marked for achievement only</li> <li>• often one statement provided for questions with some explanation described</li> <li>• usually sections a, b, c were completed, however questions d, e, f often answered with lack of full understanding or depth.</li> </ul>
<b>Not Achieved</b>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Not Achieved commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• often missed questions particularly the strategies sections (questions d, e, f). Often little or no detail for understanding factors, consequences and strategies. Brief, sparse or minimal relevant information detailed, insufficient to meet the standard.</li> </ul>
<b>Achieved with Merit</b>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved with Merit commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• indepth understanding of discrimination right across the examination paper</li> <li>• clear and detailed description of factors, consequences and strategies</li> <li>• question linked to all aspects of well-being for many people and/or groups involved</li> <li>• clearly explanation of strategies in order to secure social justice for society and a variety of people.</li> </ul>
<b>Achieved with Excellence</b>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved with Excellence commonly:</p> <p>Comprehensive understanding of discrimination right across the examination paper. Extremely clear and insightful factors, consequences and strategies involved within the discriminating situation.</p> <p>A broad and global understanding and explanation of the complexities involved in securing social justice.</p> <p>In-depth analysis of how factors, consequences and strategies effect many people's total well-being.</p>

**Standard specific comments**

Candidates often answered a, b, and c, then seemed to struggle with answering d, e, and f. Some of the candidates answered a, b, c to a Merit level and then struggled with the latter questions.