

Assessment Report

New Zealand Scholarship Health and Physical Education 2023

Performance standard 93501

General commentary

Candidates produced a report that critically evaluated one or more aspects of a document selected from a provided list. The documents were all significant to New Zealand and were underpinned by knowledge, theories, and concepts that are embedded in the Health and Physical Education (HPE) curriculum.

Candidates were expected to frame their report around a critique of an aspect of their selected strategy document. The 'openness' of the topic allowed for candidates to come up with unique topics and insights and connect wider issues and practices with their own experiences. This also presented challenges as some candidates chose topics that sit outside of the HPE curriculum area and tried to tenuously tie them to one of the strategy documents. Some candidates also attempted to address the document in its entirety.

This year there were fewer balanced reports / critical evaluations. Even the better reports, were quite one sided. More guidance may be needed on how to develop a critical evaluative piece of writing.

Embedding HPE knowledge is critical for the integrity of the report as situated in the HPE learning area. It was clear there were candidates who had not taken senior HPE courses and had minimal knowledge of the relevant concepts and ideas.

In addition, the depth of Physical Education knowledge being drawn upon and integrated seems to be moving in a downward direction in recent years, especially in-depth application of bio-physical aspects that are typically drawn from Physical Education. The outstanding reports were mainly socio-culturally based.

Report on performance standard

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

- wrote a compelling piece of critical evaluation and used clever writing to capture and retain interest. This does not mean using a thesaurus to find more sophisticated words
- 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 this early on, setting up their critique and constantly revisiting this across the report
- made extensive links to the underlying concepts of the HPE learning area. These were woven through the report and showed a sophisticated understanding of the knowledge behind the concepts; for example, health promotion theory or socio-ecological perspective
- integrated social theories thoughtfully as an analytical lens to further develop the critique, and in a way that complemented the core HPE concepts the report drew on

- explored different perspectives but were able to state a position and justify it based on reasoned arguments and relevant supporting evidence
- used a strong structure that allowed their argument to develop in a persuasive manner, including the use of headings and subheadings
- embedded and integrated HPE knowledge throughout the report and demonstrated exceptional depth and breadth of understanding, in a convincing and interconnected way
- integrated and extrapolated theories and made connections with their own experiences or Aotearoa New Zealand examples
- had a strong sense of relevance to Aotearoa New Zealand, for example integration of mātauranga Māori or Pacific concepts
- 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
- used their critical evaluation to explore future consequences and outcomes of the selected topic, or to synthesise a possible solution
- demonstrated divergent thinking. This played out in terms of the topic choice, points of critique of the selected document, selection of data, selection and application of theories and HPE knowledge / concepts to underpin the evaluation.

Candidates who were awarded **Scholarship** commonly:

- set up a critical evaluation from the outset and consistently applied a strong critical perspective to appropriate issues, theories, practices and learning experiences
- critically evaluated an aspect of one of the strategy documents within the report and set this up early within the report
- honed in on a specific aspect of their chosen document, identified their point(s) of critique clearly, and sustained their critique across the report. The more sustained the critique was, including continual connection to the document, the more convincing the scholarship was
- selected a topic that meaningfully linked to the HPE learning area, as well as the selected strategy document
- constructed a logical report, including the use of headings and subheadings to develop an argument, often culminating in recommendations (e.g. to improve the selected document on the basis of their critique)
- drew upon HPE knowledge and concepts, including hauora. This was inclusive of the four underlying concepts (hauora, attitudes and values, health promotion and the socio-ecological perspective) but also other knowledge connected to Level 3 HPE courses, as relevant to their topic. For example, determinants of health, social (in)justice and (in)equity, hegemonic structures and power imbalances, technocentricity and healthism, skill learning and motivation
- used a range of data sources to support their evaluation
- referenced relevant supporting evidence 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
- included a theoretical and practical balance
- meaningfully weaved 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
- tried to cover too many issues or topics and did not focus on a key issue, which meant that work was difficult to follow, a clear argument was not developed, and it was superficial. This was particularly the case for those who chose the Women and Girls in Sport Strategy, often without a clearly defined topic other than (lack of) female participation in sport
- chose a topic with a narrow focus
- analysed an issue, rather than evaluating one
- 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 Achievement Standards that had little or no alterations to make it into a Scholarship report
- lacked explicit links to HPE underlying concepts
- inaccurately or insufficiently applied HPE theories and concepts
- wrote an opinion piece rather than using evidence from a range of sources to support personal reflections
- provided long examples, quotes 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 HPE
- made generalisations and assumptions without being critical
- submitted a report that was too short, OR treated 26 pages as a target and wrote too broadly in order to meet the target.