

Assessment Report

New Zealand Scholarship Health and Physical Education 2024

Performance standard 93501

General commentary

Reports this year were based around a variety of the documents from the provided list, mainly having a socio-cultural focus, however there was an increase in attempts to integrate biophysical knowledge. Less effective reports selected topics with only a tenuous link to these documents, which meant that they did not really sit inside the Health and Physical Education learning area of the curriculum.

Strengths this year were good knowledge of social determinants of health, and concepts such as intersectionality, self-determination and healthism, as well as the application of the socio-ecological perspective.

Successful reports were evaluative, weighing up different perspectives on an issue and coming to an overall conclusion ((in this case, in relation to the strengths or weaknesses of the chosen strategy document and/or recommendations for future actions). However, many reports were one-sided, with the conclusion outlined from the outset of the report, rather than being evaluative and considering different ideas and perspectives.

A general weakness this year was the level of HPE knowledge displayed. Hauora was often dealt with in a formulaic, surface-level way. Health promotion, and attitudes and values were not as clearly and convincingly embedded as in previous years. Despite more attempts to integrate biophysical aspects, this knowledge appeared to be weaker than in previous years. Some use of skill and motor learning, functional anatomy, and sports psychology were observed, but this was not deeply embedded.

Many reports focused on issues related to diversity and inequitable opportunities. A deeper understanding of in(equity) and social (in)justice, and drawing on related theories, would be helpful for candidates choosing a topic in this area.

It is not advised that candidates submit work from other Achievement Standards, with minimal or no alterations to meet the requirements of a scholarship report. Taking a piece of work and adding a paragraph to link the topic to one of the strategy documents is insufficient.

Report on performance standard

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

- wrote a compelling piece of critical evaluation, using clever writing to capture and retain interest. This does not mean using a thesaurus to find more sophisticated words
- developed a high level of critical thinking, synthesising arguments and ideas, including the use of headings and subheadings
- were specific in their focus from the outset of the report, choosing a specific aspect of one of the strategy documents, introduced this early on, set up their critique, and revisited this across the report
- communicated in-depth knowledge and understanding of relevant HPE underlying concepts and knowledge, integrating both these and their chosen strategy document in an insightful manner
- 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
- showed critical and independent, divergent thought in relation to the topic and the critique of the chosen aspects of the strategy document
- explored different perspectives but were able to justify ideas/opinions with good reasoning and evidence to support this
- used up-to-date research throughout their report, in a way that questioned and challenged taken for granted assumptions. Much of the research and examples were Aotearoa New Zealand based
- used up-to-date research and examples throughout their report, that is mostly Aotearoa New Zealand based
- demonstrated a strong sense of relevance to Aotearoa New Zealand, for example integration of mātauranga Māori or Pacific concepts
- 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:

- established a critical evaluation from the start of the report
- sustained a point(s) of critique of the chosen strategy document in relation to their topic across the work
- selected a topic which clearly linked to the HPE curriculum area along with the strategy document and integrated them throughout their report
- evaluated the strategy document thoroughly, which often culminated in future
- solutions being suggested in relation to how the document could be improved
- communicated obvious links to subject specific knowledge, such as determinants of health, social inequality, healthism, theories of motivation and hegemonic structures. These were effectively linked within the report
- structured and developed their arguments in a logical and persuasive manner. This included the effective use of subheadings
- linked current Aotearoa New Zealand based research or examples into their report, which supported and/or challenged what they were thinking
- supported ideas with good personal insight and/or experience, which were integrated and added value to the report
- incorporated a theoretical and practical balance.

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

- selected a topic that was unsuitable for critical evaluation and / or sat outside the broader scope of the HPE curriculum area
- were not able to adequately sustain a critique of their chosen strategy document, or did not connect their topic to one of the strategy documents from the assessment specifications
- wrote long descriptions or explanations of theories, concepts, information from evidence / sources and topic-related ideas, without meaningfully integrating this into the development of the argument / critique of the document
- omitted including their own experience
- did not demonstrate an understanding and/or ability to integrate underlying HPE concepts or key Health or Physical Education content knowledge drawn from level 8 of the NZC
- covered too many ideas at a superficial level, or the report focus was too narrow, therefore not allowing a balanced argument to occur
- lacked a clear structure and flow, with little or no evidence of referencing across the report
- submitted work from Achievement Standards that had little or no alterations to make it into a Scholarship report
- used research that was too old or based primarily on overseas contexts, without showing clear links to Aotearoa New Zealand
- used too many theories, which undermines the depth and development of the argument and the application of knowledge. Some candidates inserted multiple theories but did not integrate these convincingly in context of the topic and argument development. Theories were much more successfully used when a small number of pertinent theories were woven across the work, and the critique of the strategy document
- provided a large number of statistics with little or no independent reflection
- included an excessive amount of pictures and images, which often added no value to the development of the argument or the application of knowledge
- submitted a report that was too short, OR treated 26 pages as a target and wrote too broadly in order to meet the target.