

2024 NCEA Assessment Report

Subject:	Health Education
Level:	3
Achievement standard(s):	91462, 91465

General commentary

The most effective responses across these two standards came from candidates who skilfully incorporated the resource material and applied it to their answers in a clear and focused way. Candidates who thoroughly integrated all relevant underlying concepts and explained their significance, produced the strongest responses.

Report on individual achievement standard(s)

Achievement standard 91462: Analyse an international health issue

Assessment

This year's examination focused on tuberculosis (TB) in Mozambique. The exam consisted of a single question divided into four parts. Candidates were required to demonstrate their understanding of how key determinants of health affect both individuals and society. Additionally, they needed to propose local and international strategies to address these determinants and their associated impacts. To support their analysis, candidates were expected to draw on evidence from the resource booklet as well as their own knowledge.

Commentary

The most effective responses were those in which candidates thoughtfully incorporated the provided resource material, blending it with their own knowledge to address the question. Candidates who answered concisely and coherently tended to achieve higher grades, as their focus was on the quality of the response rather than the volume of writing. Those who accurately referenced relevant resource material to support their points also received higher marks. Additionally, candidates who demonstrated a clear application of the relevant underlying concepts in their responses produced the strongest answers.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- explained two major determinants of health and their implications of these on the well-being of people and society
- used consistent evidence throughout their response
- provided two different strategies but not necessarily national and international.

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

- provided two clear determinants of health that were significant to the health issue
- referenced evidence throughout all answers
- explained impacts with detailed references to Hauora strategies provided included one local and one international solution, related directly to the determinants of health and implications identified.

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

- utilised a range of evidence from the different sources in the resource booklet and applied these to all parts of the question, in a concise and coherent manner
- identified two significant determinants of health and applied their knowledge and understanding of the underlying concepts to each part of the question, showing clarity and understanding throughout
- effectively linked the underlying concepts, i.e. health promotion in the strategies by discussing the models used in their strategies; the attitudes and values when discussing determinants; the socio-ecological perspective in and impacts on Hauora in the implications.

Candidates who were awarded **Not Achieved** commonly:

- did not identify why this issue was of international concern
- provided only one determinant or strategy
- did not provide sufficient evidence to support their analysis
- did not provide an explanation of the impact that the determinants of health that was identified would have on people and society.

Achievement standard 91465: Evaluate models for health promotion

Assessment

The examination consisted of a single question with three parts. Candidates were tasked with identifying two distinct models of health promotion from the strategies outlined in the Immunisation Campaign. They were then required to apply their knowledge of the selected health promotion models, alongside the supporting documents of the Treaty of Waitangi and the Bangkok Charter. In addition, candidates needed to compare and contrast the effectiveness of the identified models and supporting documents in enhancing the well-being of New Zealanders, specifically in relation to immunisation protection against Meningitis.

Commentary

Candidates typically demonstrated a strong understanding of the topic and effectively utilised the information from the resource booklet. Those who consistently referenced the resource booklet and incorporated supporting evidence into their answers, tended to achieve higher grades. To attain an Excellence grade, it was essential for candidates to clearly apply the relevant underlying health concepts within their responses.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- provided accurate advantages and disadvantages of the models for health promotion they identified within the Meningitis Immunisation campaign
- provided an effective comparison of the effectiveness of the identified models for health promotion and the supporting documents within the campaign
- demonstrated some understanding of the effect on well-being of the campaign
- provided some supporting evidence from the resources.

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

- offered detailed, and mostly accurate, comparisons of the identified models for health promotion and the supporting documents
- provided reasoned conclusions about the advantages and disadvantages of the identified models for health promotion used in the immunisation campaign
- demonstrated understanding of the links between the models and supporting documents and how they could improve the well-being of New Zealanders relating to immunisation against meningitis
- provided in-depth explanations of the inclusion or lack of inclusion, of the supporting documents
- used the resource materials appropriately to support their explanations.

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

- demonstrated conceptual understanding of the models for health promotion and the supporting documents
- provided accurate comparisons of their identified models for health promotion and the supporting documents within the campaigns
- recognised that the collective action model ensured long term sustainable changes
- showed insight when explaining how the models and supporting documents related to the underlying concepts
- demonstrated critical thinking when evaluating how effective the models and documents would be for improving well-being relating to Meningitis Immunisation
- included consistent and coherent evidence.

Candidates who were awarded **Not Achieved** commonly:

- did not attempt all parts of the question or provided only brief responses to one or more parts
- did not explain how the wellbeing of New Zealanders could be affected by the campaign
- provided inaccurate explanations of the models for health promotion and / or the supporting documents
- did not compare and contrast the identified models or the supporting documents.