

2025 NCEA Assessment Report

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

General commentary

Each assessment consisted of a single question divided into parts, with a supporting resource booklet. The most effective responses were those where the candidate skilfully incorporated the resource material and applied it to their answers in a clear and focused way. Candidates who produced the strongest responses thoroughly integrated all relevant underlying concepts within their analysis and explained their significance.

Report on individual achievement standard(s)

Achievement standard 91462: Analyse an international health issue

Assessment

This year's topic was access to quality sexual health services in some developing countries. Candidates were required to demonstrate their understanding of how key determinants of health affect the issue and the implications for the well-being of people and society. In addition, candidates were required to analyse the effectiveness of possible national and international strategies to address the issue.

Commentary

Candidate responses were most effective when they integrated the provided resource material with their own knowledge and applied this understanding directly to the question to link it to relevant points. Concise, well-structured, and coherent responses generally achieved higher grades, as greater emphasis was placed on clarity and quality of explanation rather than overall length. The strongest responses consistently demonstrated a clear and effective application of relevant underlying health concepts throughout.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded Achievement commonly:

- explained why the lack of access to quality sexual health services in some developing countries is an international concern
- identified two major determinants of health influencing this issue and discussed the implications for the well-being of individuals and society
- suggested two strategies to address the issue, though perhaps without distinguishing between local and international strategies
- supported their response with some evidence from the resource material

- demonstrated a basic application of underlying health concepts.

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

- provided detailed and accurate explanations of two significant determinants of health related to the lack of access to sexual health services
- explained the implications of these determinants on well-being with reference to hauora and other health perspectives
- proposed two strategies, including one local and one international, explicitly linked to the determinants and their impacts on well-being
- used referenced evidence consistently throughout their responses to support analysis
- demonstrated a clear understanding of the links between determinants, strategies, and well-being outcomes.

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

- identified two major determinants of health and applied their knowledge of underlying health concepts to explain these when they applied to the issue, the implications, and the strategies
- integrated health concepts into their discussion of strategies, such as Health Promotion models, attitudes and values when considering determinants, and the socio-ecological perspective when evaluating impacts on well-being
- demonstrated insight and critical thinking by linking determinants, strategies, and well-being outcomes to equitable solutions
- provided a range of consistent, detailed, and well-referenced evidence to support concise observations throughout.

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

- identified fewer than two determinants of health, without explaining why the issue is an international concern or its implications on well-being or did and without referencing hauora or other health perspectives
- provided insufficient supporting evidence from the resource or their own learning
- suggested strategies that were not linked to equitable outcomes or the identified determinants, or neglected to suggest strategies at all
- provided responses that were often brief, incomplete, or lacked coherent connections between the issue, determinants, implications, and strategies.

Achievement standard 91465: Evaluate models for health promotion

Assessment

This year's assessment centred on the Pink Shirt Day campaign. Candidates were required to identify two distinct health promotion models evident within the campaign strategies provided. They then applied their understanding of these health promotion models, alongside the supporting frameworks of the Treaty of Waitangi and the Bangkok Charter.

Commentary

Candidates were expected to compare and contrast the effectiveness of the identified health promotion models and supporting documents in enhancing the well-being of New Zealanders, particularly in relation to bullying prevention and the promotion of safe, inclusive school environments. Those who made effective use of the resource booklet and incorporated consistent, relevant supporting evidence in their responses generally achieved higher grades.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- identified advantages and disadvantages of the health promotion models evident in the Pink Shirt Day Campaign
- showed a basic understanding of how the campaign influenced well-being
- compared the effectiveness of the selected health promotion models and relevant supporting documents within the campaign
- included some relevant supporting evidence to back up their points.

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

- made mostly detailed and accurate comparisons between the identified health promotion models and the supporting documents
- explained how the models and supporting documents were connected and how they could enhance the well-being of New Zealanders in relation to bullying prevention and creating inclusive environments
- drew reasoned conclusions about the strengths and limitations of the health promotion models used in the Pink Shirt Day Campaign
- gave more detailed explanations about the inclusion or omission of supporting documents
- used the provided resource materials effectively to support their explanations.

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

- demonstrated a strong conceptual understanding of health promotion models and of the supporting documents
- made clear and accurate comparisons between the models and the supporting documents used in the Pink Shirt Day Campaign
- showed insight when explaining how the models and documents related to underlying health concepts clearly and convincingly
- recognised the role of collective action in supporting long-term and sustainable change
- applied critical thinking to evaluate how effective the models and documents were in improving well-being related to bullying prevention and social inclusion
- supported their responses with consistent, coherent, and well-integrated evidence.

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

- provided limited responses, or left aspects of the question unaddressed
- gave incorrect or unclear explanations of health promotion models and / or supporting documents that did not compare or contrast them
- neglected to explain how the Pink Shirt Day Campaign could impact the well-being of New Zealanders.