

2025 NCEA Assessment Report

Subject:	Physical Education
Level:	1
Achievement standard(s):	92018, 92019

General commentary

Both assessments were submitted in the form of a portfolio, based on the 2025 task provided to schools at the end of Term 1 and submitted by the end of October. Some issues relating to authenticity were still evident; the professional judgement of teachers, alongside their knowledge of students' capabilities, remains essential to ensuring that all work is the student's own and has not been completed with external assistance. Late submissions also presented difficulties, and schools are reminded of the importance of collecting portfolios ahead of the submission deadline to allow sufficient time to address any issues.

Report on individual achievement standard(s)

Achievement standard 92018: Demonstrate understanding of the influence of personal movement experiences on hauora

Assessment

The assessment required candidates to compile a portfolio demonstrating their understanding of how personal movement experiences influence hauora, with reference to one model of health from the list provided. Candidates were required to reflect on three distinct experiences within a single movement context. To achieve with Excellence, candidates needed to provide a final reflection that evaluated their learning and addressed all aspects or dimensions of their chosen model of health, including an evaluation of how this understanding may influence their future movement experiences.

Commentary

A number of schools did not use the correct 2025 assessment task, and some did not use the official NZQA materials, which limited candidates' ability to produce evidence aligned with the standard. Instances of excessive scaffolding, adjusted instructions, mandated models of health or contexts and template-driven formats also affected authenticity, and reduced opportunities for independent, in-depth reflection.

Candidates most commonly selected Te Whare Tapa Whā and movement contexts such as Ki o Rahi, netball, and volleyball, with fewer submissions drawing on broader or more diverse contexts. Depth of analysis was reduced when reflections addressed multiple dimensions superficially, or when taha whānau was discussed in relation to others, rather than the candidate themselves.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- implied the selected model of health or movement context, with some responses omitting these entirely or choosing contexts that were too broad
- explained two movement experiences adequately but did not meet the requirement for the third
- provided limited or generic examples, lacking specific evidence from personal movement experiences
- focused on dimensions or aspects instead of three distinct movement experiences
- attempted to address multiple dimensions within one movement experience, resulting in a broad but shallow reflection
- included both positive and negative influences, which diluted depth of their explanation
- used discrete skills (e.g. shooting, passing) as movement experiences, limiting reflective potential
- included future influences at the expense explanation of the current experience
- demonstrated surface-level understanding of hauora influences, using only brief, descriptive examples
- omitted clear reasoning for how the movement experience influenced the specified hauora dimension, linking impacts to skill improvement rather than wellbeing
- made partial links to personal impact, sometimes mixing personal (“I”) and collective (“we/our”) perspectives, reducing the focus on individual hauora.

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

- identified the movement context and specified their chosen model of health at the start of the portfolio
- contained at least two (and often three) strong reflections that effectively explained how and why an aspect of health was impacted by the movement experience
- explained in detail how the movement experience influenced their well-being, including the reasoning ('why')
- contained specific and relevant evidence, often including multiple examples from the lesson or event, such as using names, dialogue, types of movements, and dates to support their analysis
- identified the positive or negative impact of the relevant element of the model of health and linked this impact to the significance of hauora
- repeated information from the reflections in the conclusion, simply recapping influences rather than synthesising or concluding what was learned
- discuss only three dimensions or aspects of the chosen model of health in the conclusion.

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

- identified both the movement context and experiences clearly
- followed a clear and consistent structure, were clear and concise, and often made use of a planning space
- followed the task prompts throughout, clearly identifying at the start the chosen model of health, movement context, and three distinct movement experiences
- explained in detail how and why the movement experience influenced their well-being, providing this high-level analysis for all three reflections
- included multiple in-depth, specific, and personal examples from their movement experiences, sometimes supported by data such as heart-rate measures, to justify their reasoning. The evidence was explicit, individualised, and directly connected to the candidate’s own experience, moving beyond generic statements

- demonstrated a holistic understanding of how the experience influenced their wellbeing, frequently noting the interconnectedness of the hauora dimensions
- explicitly discussed four dimensions or aspects of their chosen model of health in the conclusion, with clear and relevant reasoning supporting the claims
- referred to the context or movement in the final reflection, not just the experiences
- explained how their developing understanding of hauora would influence their future involvement in movement, making connections to past and future movement experiences or contexts.

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

- did not follow the NZQA provided prompts on the 2025 assessment task
- did not identify a suitable movement context and did not specify their chosen model of health at the start of the paper
- reflected on one movement experience or wrote about only one dimension of health
- misunderstood the distinction between a movement context and a movement experience. Many responses described the context without identifying three distinct experiences, or drew on multiple contexts instead of three experiences within one. Common errors included selecting contexts that were too broad (e.g. 'striking games'), defining an entire season or sport as the context (e.g. 'rugby season'), or choosing an inappropriate context altogether
- discussed how the dimension or aspect influenced their movement ability or performance rather than describing how the movement experience influenced the dimension or aspect
- discussed or explained how the dimension or aspect influenced the team or class rather than themselves, using collective pronouns such as 'we', 'our', or 'team', instead of focusing on their own personal impact
- failed to provide any substantive detail, including specific, personal examples, in their reflections
- used experiences that occurred many years ago (historic dates) or discussed irrelevant activities (e.g. pitching a tent).

Achievement standard 92019: Demonstrate understanding of influences on movement in Aotearoa New Zealand or the Pacific

Assessment

The assessment required candidates to produce a portfolio demonstrating their understanding of two influences on movement within a single movement context. One influence was required to be biophysical, while the second could be either te ao Māori or sociocultural. To achieve at Excellence, candidates were expected to draw well-supported conclusions about their learning from the impact of each influence and clearly articulate how this understanding could be applied to enhance their future performance in movement.

Commentary

Overall, candidate performance was most clearly differentiated by depth of understanding, quality of personal participation examples, and the ability to explain, evaluate, and draw conclusions rather than describe.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- identified correctly: one biophysical principle *and* either a te ao Māori or socio-cultural influence within a *single movement context*
- described how each influence affected their participation, focusing on what occurred, what actions they took, or who was involved, rather than providing deeper insight into the influence itself
- included personal examples, though these were frequently brief and descriptive rather than explanatory, repetitive, or lacking the detail needed to demonstrate depth of understanding
- demonstrated surface-level understanding, recognising that an influence existed but not clearly explaining why it had an impact
- recounted experiences rather than reflecting on them
- demonstrated better understanding one influence over the other
- included unnecessary information not required (e.g. drills, rules, context description)
- provided brief conclusions, repeating earlier descriptions rather than offering insight.

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

- identified and defined both required influences clearly
- explained how and why each influence impacted their participation
- used specific, relevant personal examples that demonstrated authentic engagement in the movement context
- showed understanding of relationships, e.g. how feedback improved performance or how teamwork influenced confidence
- demonstrated learning that occurred during participation, not just after participation
- structured responses logically, often using multiple paragraphs per influence
- explored one influence in more depth than the other
- included explanations in the conclusion paragraphs rather than evaluation and judgement
- mentioned future implications but these were not always clearly linked to learning or justified
- showed emerging evaluation skills but these were not consistently demonstrated.

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

- demonstrated a deep, coherent understanding of both influences within one movement context
- integrated description, explanation, and evaluation cohesively rather than as separate tasks
- evaluated the effectiveness and impact of influences, making well-justified judgements about what was effective, what was not, and the reasons outcomes occurred
- drew insightful and well-supported conclusions about their learning, often identifying shifts between initial participation and later performance, or between expectations and actual outcomes
- clearly articulated how their learning could transfer to future participation, other movement contexts, or wider situations where such transfer was relevant and justified
- used concise writing, avoiding unnecessary description and focusing on depth and critical thinking
- wrote cohesively, logically, and reflectively, showing strong evaluation skills

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

- wrote very briefly or failed to answer the prompts on the 2025 assessment task
- demonstrated misunderstanding of key concepts, including using fitness components (e.g. speed, strength) in place of biophysical principles; interpreting tikanga as rules of the game; and referring to nutrition or training methods, which do not constitute biophysical principles for this standard
- mentioned only one influence, or failed to include any biophysical principle

- used multiple movement contexts, reducing the depth of analysis
 - provided generalised examples or wrote about hypothetical participants rather than their own participation
 - included irrelevant or incorrect examples that showed limited understanding
 - included too many influences, resulting in diluted and confused responses.
-