

Assessment Report

On this page

[Level 2 Health 2020](#) ▾

Level 2 Health 2020

Standards [91235](#) [91238](#)

Part A: Commentary

The scenario provided a large range of key ideas that the candidates were able to use. Most candidates were able to identify key ideas in the scenario. The resource booklet also provided a range of evidence that candidates could use throughout.

Some candidates did not notice the slight change from previous years in the structure of the questions, and therefore answered in a similar way to previous papers. e.g. giving all three strategies personal, interpersonal and societal in question C, when only asked for societal.

Successful candidates linked their key ideas, giving strategies that addressed the focus of the question. Some candidates gave explanations that lacked depth – merely listing key ideas without any further investigation.

The amount of writing produced in an answer is not as important as the quality of the response.

Part B: Report on standards

91235: Analyse an adolescent health issue

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- explained personal, interpersonal and/or societal influences
- explained short-term and long-term consequences on individuals and community from the scenario
- provided clear strategies that could be used to promote well-being and provided some detail on why they were health enhancing
- provided answers that were at times brief, general or in some way superficial
- did not make links between questions
- made limited use of the resource material.

Candidates whose work was assessed as **Not Achieved** commonly:

- only wrote one sentence or gave a key idea instead of explaining influences
- mis-identified personal influences as societal – for example “Jo saw an advertisement and it looked like fun.”
- listed consequences of well-being without explanation
- listed strategies with no explanation on how it was health-enhancing
- provided strategies that were weak
- did not complete all parts
- described connections between influences and consequences with no strategies
- wrote only from their personal point of view
- did not provide sufficient detail reflecting understanding at Level 2 of NCEA.

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

- explained in detail personal, interpersonal and / or societal influences

- explained in detail short-term and long-term consequences for individuals and / or the community
- showed how short-term and long-term consequences were linked
- explained how influences linked to consequences
- explained how strategies promoted well-being for individuals and the community
- supported arguments with relevant evidence from the scenario and / or resources
- analysed in depth, and provided detailed explanations
- interlinked their responses across questions
- provided a balanced view which reflected critical thinking.

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

- 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 influences
- provided a range of relevant evidence to strongly support arguments
- chose the most critical strategies and justified why these were health-enhancing
- chose strategies that clearly addressed the influences and made connections to the consequences
- comprehensively analysed the health issue, providing detailed explanations
- used the resources to support their answers throughout
- showed thoughtful understanding of the underlying concepts of health
- wrote clearly and succinctly.

91238: Analyse an interpersonal issue(s) that places personal safety at risk

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- included answers that went straight to the point - often with limited connections and explanations. No in-depth analysis was provided
- provided answers that included some consequences for those involved in the scenario, but did not adequately describe the influences that could lead or contribute to the situation.
- recommended strategies in detail, but often not health-enhancing – Some candidates only provided two strategies to enhance health.

Candidates whose work was assessed as **Not Achieved** commonly:

- gave limited or no descriptions of influences, consequences and strategies connecting to the scenario
- gave no societal strategy, or did not complete all parts of the question.
- did not provide enough information to support the standard.

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

- provided clear understanding of the influences, short-term and long-term consequences that impacted in the situation
- connected consequences towards the impact on total well-being
- identified health-enhancing strategies and explained them with links to the influence, and the impacted consequences on well-being.

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

- explained and analysed strategies in detail, with links to previous influences and consequences.
- explained a diverse range of influences that could have impacted the behaviour of individuals in the scenario.
- clearly identified underlying factors to influences that contributed to behaviour and attitudes / values.
- provided clear links between influences and the impact toward short-term and long-term well-being
- recommended strategies that were health-enhancing and critically analysed for personal, interpersonal, and societal effect.

[Health subject page](#)

Previous years' reports

[2019 \(PDF, 234KB\)](#) [2018 \(PDF, 112KB\)](#) [2017 \(PDF, 46KB\)](#) [2016 \(PDF, 213KB\)](#)