

# Assessment Report

---

## New Zealand Scholarship Health and Physical Education 2022

---

### Standard 93501

---

#### Part A: Commentary

Candidates produce a report that critically evaluates one or more aspects of a document selected from a provided list. The documents are all significant to New Zealand and are underpinned by knowledge, theories, and concepts that are embedded in the Health and Physical Education curriculum. Candidates are expected to use the selected document as a platform for analysis and critical thinking of broad and relevant themes.

The 'openness' of the topic allows candidates to come up with unique topics and insights, while connecting wider issues and practices with their own experiences. The report is framed around the critique of an aspect of the chosen strategy document. Candidates do not need to critique the document in its entirety, nor should they select a topic of interest and superficially connect it to the document.

This year there were fewer balanced reports / critical evaluations than in previous years. Even the better reports were quite one sided. Candidates would do well to develop their skills critical in evaluation.



It was clear that some candidates have minimal knowledge of the relevant concepts and ideas surrounding health and physical education. The depth of knowledge being drawn upon and integrated into these reports appears to be declining in recent years – especially in the in-depth application of bio-physical aspects.

There were a large number of social science-based reports this year. Candidates who were awarded Outstanding Performance were commonly socio-culturally based.

The 26-page limit allows candidates to demonstrate excellent depth of understanding, without being too long.

## Part B: Report on performance standard

Candidates who were awarded **Outstanding Scholarship** commonly:

- were specific in their focus for the critical evaluation from the outset of the report, choosing a specific aspect of one of the strategies, introducing it early on, and setting up their critique and constantly revisiting it throughout the report
- made extensive links to the underlying concepts of the health and physical education learning area.
- wove links throughout the report and showed a sophisticated understanding of the knowledge behind the concepts, e.g., health promotion theory or determinants of health
- drew from wider sociological theories to inform their critical evaluation, but in a way that complemented the core health and physical education concepts the report drew on
- explored different perspectives but were able to state a position and justify it on the basis of reasoned arguments and relevant supporting evidence
- made a compelling argument and used clever writing to capture and retain interest
- used a strong structure that allowed their argument to develop in a persuasive manner, including the use of headings and subheadings
- applied knowledge throughout the report that demonstrated exceptional depth and breadth of understanding in a convincing and interconnected way

- integrated and extrapolated theories while making connections with their own experiences or Aotearoa New Zealand examples
- synthesised highly developed knowledge, concepts, and ideas in a complex manner that was always relevant to the argument, and often had been foregrounded at the front of the report
- selected a unique, “out-of-the-box” topic, or if they had chosen a common topic (e.g. gender inequality in sport, child poverty, mental health) presented a unique take on the issue
- used their critical evaluation to explore future consequences and outcomes of the selected topic, or to synthesise a possible solution
- integrated social theories thoughtfully as an analytical lens to further develop the critique
- demonstrated divergent thinking in terms of the topic choice, points of critique of the selected document, selection of data, selection and application of theories and health and physical education knowledge / concepts to underpin the evaluation.

Candidates who were awarded **Scholarship** commonly:

- selected a topic which meaningfully linked to the health and physical education learning area, as well as the selected document
- set up a critical evaluation from the outset and consistently applied a strong critical perspective to appropriate issues, theories, practices and learning experience
- constructed a logical report, including the use of headings and sub-headings to enable them to develop an argument, often culminating in recommendations (e.g. to improve the selected document on the basis of their critique)
- drew upon health and physical education knowledge and concepts, including the four underlying concepts (hauora, attitudes and values, health promotion and the socio-ecological perspective) but also other knowledge connected to Level 3 health and physical education courses, as relevant to their topic (determinants of health, social (in)justice and (in)equity, hegemonic structures and power imbalances, technocentricity and healthism, skill learning and motivation)
- referenced relevant supporting evidence from a range of sources, and integrated this evidence effectively into their report so that it added value

- provided Aotearoa New Zealand-based examples and often included a strong Māori or Pacific cultural perspective
- balanced theoretical and practical aspects
- meaningfully weaved their own experience and / or own evidence into report
- identified, questioned, and challenged assumptions, issues, theories, practices, the status quo and commonly held beliefs.

Candidates who were **not** awarded Scholarship commonly:

- lacked a coherent report structure
- did not select a topic that lent itself to being critically evaluated, or did not demonstrate an understanding of what an evaluation meant
- did not link their report to one of the strategy documents stated in the assessment specifications, mentioned the strategy document only fleetingly, or referred to it in general terms. This especially happened with the idea that “Balance is Better”
- tried to cover too many issues or topics and did not focus on a key issue, which meant that work was difficult to follow, superficial, and lacking a clear argument
- chose a topic with a narrow focus
- analysed an issue, rather than evaluating it
- used few references or poor-quality references such as Wikipedia or YouTube clips
- provided an account-based discussion with minimal critical evaluation
- submitted work from NCEA standards that had little or no alterations to make it into a Scholarship report
- lacked explicit links to health and physical education underlying concepts
- inaccurately or insufficiently applied HPE health and physical education theories and concepts
- wrote an opinion piece rather than using evidence from a range of sources to support personal reflections
- provided long examples or visuals that did not clearly add value to the argument
- provided a large number of statistics with little or no independent reflection

- made few Aotearoa New Zealand links and relied on foreign examples (athletes, sports, political / cultural environments / research)
  - wrote comments that went against the attitudes and values of health and physical education
  - made generalisations and assumptions without being critical.
- 

## [Subject page](#)

### **Previous years' reports**

 [2021](#)

 [2020](#)

 [2019](#)

 [2018](#)

 [2017](#)