



National Certificate of Educational Achievement  
TAUMATA MĀTAURANGA Ā-MOTU KUA TAEA

## Exemplar for Internal Achievement Standard

### Health Level 3

This exemplar supports assessment against: 91464


Analyse a contemporary ethical issue in relation to well-being

An annotated exemplar is an extract of student evidence, with a commentary, to explain key aspects of the standard. It assists teachers to make assessment judgements at the grade boundaries.

New Zealand Qualifications Authority

To support internal assessment

	Grade Boundary: Low Excellence
1.	<p>For Excellence, the student needs to analyse, perceptively, a contemporary ethical issue in relation to well-being.</p> <p>This involves:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• examining the perspectives on the issue with insight into the reasons for these differing perspectives and their ethical foundations</li> <li>• linking the examination to underlying health concepts.</li> </ul> <p>The student has introduced the selected ethical issue (euthanasia) by explaining the nature of the issue and the ethical debate (1).</p> <p>The student has identified two major societal groups who support and two who oppose the issue and has explained their perspectives - attitudes, values and beliefs. The discussion of the supporting perspective (2) clearly explains attitudes, values and beliefs, with supporting evidence. Some reference is made to attitudes and values, and ethical principles, but the latter is not fully developed.</p> <p>The student has explained implications of current practice (euthanasia is illegal in New Zealand) at personal (3), interpersonal and societal levels. This is an evidence-based account, which explores short-and long-term impacts, with some evidence of critical thinking (who is disadvantaged by the impacts).</p> <p>For a more secure Excellence, the student would need to provide more extensive links to the underlying concepts, and more fully develop the links between groups' perspectives and the underlying ethical principles.</p>

Student 1: Low Excellence
 Intended for teacher use only

The ethical issue I am analysing is euthanasia in New Zealand. This is an ethical issue because it is controversial – it is about life and death decisions. There are many different views towards the issue in society, with people feeling very strongly about whether it is right or wrong. Euthanasia means ‘a good death’ (1) and it is concerned with a person’s right to choose to end their own life (and get help to do so) if they choose.

1

Two main groups ‘for’ euthanasia in NZ are (some) people suffering from a terminal illness and the Voluntary Euthanasia Society (VES). People suffering from a terminal illness believe that they should have the right to ‘die with dignity’ and be free from suffering, and that it is their choice as to when and how they die (3). They value the ability to have control over their end of life decisions and that they do not want to suffer a slow and painful end. For example, the recent case of Lecretia Seales in NZ. Some of her key beliefs were that she should be able to have her doctor help her die when her quality of life was gone and that others in similar situations should also have the option to choose how they live and die (lecretia.org). This point of view links to the ethical principle of the rights approach. The second group who support euthanasia in NZ are VES – the Voluntary Euthanasia Society of NZ. They believe in ‘dignity in death’ which means people have the right to not suffer and to be in control of their body, while they are still in a clear state of mind (4). They believe that this is what the majority of people want (7/10 NZers – 4) and therefore it is wrong for euthanasia to be illegal. This links to the underlying attitudes and values of care and concern and respect for the rights of others – to make sure people who are dying don’t suffer, and those who might help them are not prosecuted.

2

Two main groups ‘against’ euthanasia are The Catholic Church – Nathaniel Centre and Hospice NZ [...]

As stated before, euthanasia is illegal in NZ. I will explain implications of this situation at personal, interpersonal and societal levels.

At a personal level, the fact that euthanasia is illegal means that most people who are terminally ill will not choose to end their own life or seek help from others to speed up their death. As a result, they may be in physical pain and suffer from a long decline in health, which will be distressing for themselves and others. An extract from Lecretia Seales’ legal argument is: (if she cannot access euthanasia she will have a) cruel choice between taking her own life through potentially violent, painful and ineffective means, or suffering intolerably from a potentially slow, painful and undignified death" (10). Those who seek and gain support from someone else to die risk their doctor, friend or family member being prosecuted, as this is illegal. This could lead to long-term impacts for the support person who helps them die (for example, the Lesley Martin case in NZ) such as being charged and being found guilty and going to prison. Those disadvantaged by the situation in NZ are those who are suffering, as they are unable to choose how/when to end their suffering. This may also disadvantage the taxpayer and health system, as they may need more time in expensive care.

3

Interpersonally [...]

Societally [...]

Note that a chart was provided by the student to show bibliographic details for the references used in the evaluation.

	Grade Boundary: High Merit
2.	<p>For Merit, the student needs to analyse, in depth, a contemporary ethical issue in relation to well-being.</p> <p>This involves providing a balanced view of the differing and opposing perspectives with some reference to underlying health concepts (hauora, socio-ecological perspective, health promotion, attitudes and values).</p> <p>The student has introduced the selected ethical issue (euthanasia) by explaining the nature of the issue and the ethical debate (1).</p> <p>The student has identified two major societal groups who support and two who oppose the issue (thus providing a balanced view) and has explained their perspectives - attitudes, values and beliefs. The discussion of the opposing perspective (2) clearly explains attitudes, values and beliefs, with supporting evidence.</p> <p>The student has explained implications of current practice (that euthanasia is illegal in New Zealand) at personal, interpersonal and societal levels. The discussion at a societal level (3) is an evidence-based account, which explores short-and long-term impacts.</p> <p>To reach Excellence, the student would need to show insight into the reasons for the differing perspectives and their ethical foundations (e.g. by explaining links to ethical principles such as virtues, rights, utilitarianism, autonomy). The student would also need to make more explicit and consistent links to underlying health concepts. The response for Hospice NZ includes some copied/pasted information from their website - this should have been integrated into the response in the student's own words.</p>

Euthanasia is an ethical issue because there are strong views 'for' and 'against' this moral, controversial issue in society. This is a current issue in New Zealand due to the legal case from Lecretia Seales, who wanted the right to die (or to be helped to die) on her own terms (1) and although it is illegal, most New Zealanders want euthanasia to be allowed.

1

Two main groups 'for' euthanasia in NZ are [...]

Two main groups 'against' euthanasia are The Catholic Church – Nathaniel Centre and Hospice NZ. The Nathaniel Centre is the bioethics part of the Catholic Church in NZ. They believe that dying is a part of life and any form of interfering with the natural course is seen as killing (5). They believe that the medical profession is equipped to ease any pain, so no one needs to suffer (a view shared by Hospice). They value the sacredness of life; that God gives and takes away life (5). They believe that it is important to grow compassion in our relationships and in society, and care for people, rather than take the 'easy way out'. The second group is Hospice NZ and they provide care for people who are dying. Hospice believe that it is important to invest money and resources into palliative care such as what they provide, rather than legalising euthanasia (6). Hospice values providing high quality care and support to people with terminal illnesses and their families. Hospice care involves not hastening or postponing death, so like the Catholic view, it is about allowing nature to take its course. From the hospice website, their philosophy is:

2

- people who are dying can still live life well
- no one has to die in avoidable pain and suffering
- care is given to whoever needs it, whenever and wherever it is needed
- carers and the bereaved get the help and support they need
- people accept that dying is part of the experience of living (6).

As stated before, euthanasia is illegal in NZ. I will explain implications of this situation at personal, interpersonal and societal levels.

Personally [...]

Interpersonally [...]

Societally, euthanasia being illegal means that few people will choose this option in NZ. This means that more people will require care from hospices, and funding will be needed in order to provide high-quality care. According to Hospice NZ (5), "palliative care should be routinely available to all who need it, and Government should ensure that public funding is made available to increase the availability of palliative care, whether provided by the hospital, at home, in residential aged care facilities or in hospices." With an ageing population, this will be an increasing cost to the taxpayer in the future. On the other hand, there is a law up for consideration to legalise euthanasia. IF the law was to change, this means that the opposite might occur, where people use euthanasia and less funding is needed for hospice care. This ends up costing the taxpayer less, BUT also means that less funding will be given for end-of-

3

life care, and therefore people may feel pressured to use ethanasia as they do not want to be a burden to families and society (this is known as the 'slippery slope' argument – 13).

Note that a chart was provided by the student to show bibliographic details for the references used in the evaluation.

	Grade Boundary: Low Merit
3.	<p>For Merit, the student needs to analyse, in depth, a contemporary ethical issue in relation to well-being.</p> <p>This involves providing a balanced view of the differing and opposing perspectives with some reference to underlying health concepts (hauora, socio-ecological perspective, health promotion, attitudes and values).</p> <p>The student has introduced the selected ethical issue (medicinal use of cannabis) by explaining the nature of the issue and the ethical debate (1).</p> <p>The student has identified two major societal groups who support and two who oppose the issue (thus providing a balanced view) and has explained their perspectives – attitudes, values and beliefs. The answer for the supporting perspective (2) briefly explains attitudes, values and beliefs, with some use of supporting evidence.</p> <p>The student has identified current practice in NZ and has explained implications of this at personal, interpersonal and societal levels, with the personal level exemplified (3). This explores short-and long-term impacts and makes some reference to underlying concepts (hauora, attitudes and values).</p> <p>For a more secure Merit, the student would need to further develop the links to underlying concepts throughout the work, and make more extensive use of evidence from relevant sources to support the analysis.</p>



Student 3: Low Merit

NZQA Intended for teacher use only

The ethical issue I am analysing is legalising the use of cannabis for medical reasons in New Zealand. This is an ethical issue because cannabis is currently illegal, being a Class C drug, but it has been decriminalised or legalised in many places around the world, and has been seen by many people as effective for a number of serious health conditions. Therefore, there are a lot of people who strongly believe it should be made legal for medical reasons. ①

Two main groups who support legalising cannabis for medical use are people who are suffering from illness (eg for pain relief) and parents of children with illnesses (eg seizures) and NORML. Firstly, those suffering from illness or caring for someone suffering from an illness believe that cannabis can be used to effectively manage the pain or the illness. For example, in the case of Zoe Jeffries, the use of cannabis is effectively controlling her seizures and making her more settled (2). Her family, and others like them, believe that it is unfair to deny a person access to a treatment that is known to be effective in certain situations. Another group 'for' the use of cannabis for medical purposes is NORML, who are an organisation who lobby for cannabis reform in NZ (4). NORML believe that the medicinal benefits of its use far outweigh the harms. They say that "more than 60 international health organizations support granting patients immediate legal access to medicinal cannabis under a doctor's supervision." (4). ②

Two main groups who are against legalising cannabis for medical use are [...]

As stated before, cannabis is illegal in NZ. However, it (sativex) can be accessed for medical use in some cases by seeking approval from the Government. This is a difficult process however. I will explain implications of this situation at personal, interpersonal and societal levels.

For individuals directly affected by the issue, this is a frustrating and stressful situation, which results in them feeling out of control. Many people in this situation risk a criminal record, as they feel there is no choice but to obtain medical products illegally (cannabis oil, eg Helen Kelly, who is terminally ill with lung cancer - 10) or buy marijuana from a drug dealer which is risky. Although accessing this has some positive impacts as their pain/symptoms will be relieved, it creates ongoing stress (mental and emotional well-being) as to whether they can continue to access it, worry about being caught breaking the law, and frustration at not being able to make that decision themselves. This situation shows a lack of respect for an individual's right to make their own choice about their body and how they can control their illness or pain. ③

For individuals indirectly affected (family, friends, doctors) [...]

Implications for the well-being of society [...]

Note that a chart was provided by the student to show bibliographic details for the references used in the evaluation.

	Grade Boundary: High Achieved
4.	<p>For Achieved, the student needs to analyse a contemporary ethical issue in relation to well-being.</p> <p>This involves providing a critical account of the ethical issue through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• explaining the differing and opposing perspectives on the issue, and the reasons for these different perspectives</li> <li>• explaining the implications of current related health practices for the well-being of those directly affected by the issue, others associated with those people, and the well-being of people and society.</li> </ul> <p>The student has identified two major societal groups who support and two who oppose medicinal use of cannabis, and has explained their perspectives - attitudes, values and beliefs. The answer for the opposing perspective (1) briefly explains attitudes, values and beliefs, with some use of supporting evidence. The explanations of the differing perspectives may not be balanced - the explanation for both groups who hold the opposing perspective needs further development.</p> <p>The student has identified current practice in NZ related to the ethical issue and has explained implications of this at personal, interpersonal and societal levels. The discussion at the societal level (2) predominately explores short-term impacts and uses one piece of evidence but does not include explicit links to underlying concepts.</p> <p>To reach Merit, the student would need to provide a balanced view of the differing and opposing perspectives, and include some reference to underlying health concepts.</p>

The ethical issue I am analysing is medicinal use of cannabis in New Zealand. This is an ethical issue because [...]

Two main groups who support legalising cannabis for medical use are [...]

Two main groups who are against legalising cannabis for medical use are the NZ Government and some conservative people in NZ society. The NZ Government believes that the current restrictions and laws are adequate. According to John Key, in response to Helen Kelly's request to ease up on access to medical cannabis, "Prime Minister John Key said he sympathised with Kelly, but the Government was not looking to broaden access to medicinal cannabis" (stuff.co.nz; October 12 2015). He believes that the systems that are in place are working. The Government has the attitude that people can apply for treatment and therefore this retains control of the drug's use in the Minister's hands, which is safer for everyone in NZ. Another group opposed to cannabis use for medicinal purposes are some conservative people/groups in society, such as Family First, however this group acknowledges there are some benefits and more research is needed (Family First website). Other people have firm anti-drug stances and believe that if access is given to medical cannabis, this is the start of a slippery slope to legalisation of cannabis.

1

As stated before, cannabis is illegal in NZ. However, it (sativex) can be accessed for medical use in some cases by seeking approval from the Government. This is a difficult process however. I will explain implications of this situation at societal, interpersonal and personal levels.

Implications for the well-being of society include that policing and legal systems could spend time and resources on prosecutions, court cases and fines for otherwise law-abiding citizens who access cannabis/marijuana for medical reasons. This means that valuable resources are taken away from other issues that need attention. In terms of healthcare, the lack of access to cannabis for medical purposes means that more expensive drugs are needed and more hospital time is needed – this also costs the taxpayer more money (NORML website). This may also have impacts for the Government, if they are going against popular opinion of society.

2

For individuals indirectly affected (family, friends, doctors - interpersonal) [...]

For individuals directly affected by the issue (personal) [...]

	Grade Boundary: Low Achieved
5.	<p>For Achieved, the student needs to analyse a contemporary ethical issue in relation to well-being.</p> <p>This involves providing a critical account of the ethical issue through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• explaining the differing and opposing perspectives on the issue, and the reasons for these different perspectives</li> <li>• explaining the implications of current related health practices for the well-being of those directly affected by the issue, others associated with those people, and the well-being of people and society.</li> </ul> <p>The student has identified two major societal groups who support and two who oppose euthanasia and has explained their perspectives - attitudes, values and beliefs. The discussion of the opposing perspective (1) briefly explains attitudes, values and beliefs, with some use of supporting evidence. Bullet-pointed lists sourced from the groups' websites are provided to outline each group's key beliefs - ideally this would have been integrated into the response, in the student's own words.</p> <p>The student has identified current practice in NZ and has explained implications of this at personal, interpersonal and societal levels. The discussion of the interpersonal level (1) explores short-term impacts, and makes some reference to hauora (social well-being). The answer is not supported by evidence.</p> <p>For a more secure Achieved, the student would need to further develop the explanations, and make more extensive use of evidence from relevant sources to support the analysis.</p>

Euthanasia is an ethical issue because [...]

Two main groups 'for' euthanasia in NZ are [...]

Two main groups 'against' euthanasia are Hospice NZ and Family First. Hospice provides end-of-life care for people who are dying. Hospice values providing high quality care and support to people with terminal illnesses and their families. Hospice care involves not hastening or postponing death. Their philosophy is:

- people who are dying can still live life well
- no one has to die in avoidable pain and suffering
- care is given to whoever needs it, whenever and wherever it is needed
- carers and the bereaved get the help and support they need
- people accept that dying is part of the experience of living (3).

1

Family First has recently launched a new website, [protect.org.nz](http://protect.org.nz). They believe that:

- Legalising euthanasia would be the start of a slippery slope
- People would be pressured to end their lives as not to be a burden
- People are not in their right mind to make decisions when they are dying
- Like Hospice NZ believes, investment in palliative care is needed (4).

Family First therefore strongly oppose euthanasia and do not see it as being in the best interests of society.

As stated before, euthanasia is illegal in NZ. I will explain implications of this situation at personal, interpersonal and societal levels.

Personally [...]

Interpersonally, the current state of euthanasia in NZ may create some situations where family members are placed under huge pressure to look after patients who are seriously ill or dying. This can place strain on households, especially if money problems are also involved. This could lead to disagreements and tension in relationships and family disagreements, negatively impacting on social well-being. If euthanasia became legal, this could also raise the issue of disagreements between family members/friends about accessing euthanasia, and may create pressure to make use of it, rather than "becoming a burden on others".

2

Societally [...]

Note that a chart was provided by the student to show bibliographic details for the references used in the evaluation.

	Grade Boundary: High Not Achieved
6.	<p>For Achieved, the student needs to analyse a contemporary ethical issue in relation to well-being.</p> <p>This involves providing a critical account of the ethical issue through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• explaining the differing and opposing perspectives on the issue, and the reasons for these different perspectives</li> <li>• explaining the implications of current related health practices for the well-being of those directly affected by the issue, others associated with those people, and the well-being of people and society.</li> </ul> <p>The student has introduced the selected ethical issue (euthanasia) by explaining the nature of the issue and the ethical debate (1).</p> <p>The student has identified two groups who support and two who oppose the issue and has explained their perspectives - attitudes, values and beliefs. The response about the supporting perspective (2) makes generalisations about these two groups and is not factually accurate (e.g. the NZ Medical Association, doctors' professional body, opposes euthanasia). A link to the ethical principle of 'rights' is briefly but accurately established.</p> <p>The student has explained implications of current practice (euthanasia is illegal in New Zealand) at personal, interpersonal and societal levels. The answer about the interpersonal level (3) explores short-and long-term impacts, however it is not evidence-based.</p> <p>To reach Achieved, the student would need to more accurately explain the perspectives of group(s) supporting the ethical issue, as supported by evidence. The student would also use evidence to support the explanation of implications of current practice.</p>

Student 6: High Not Achieved

NZQA Intended for teacher use only

The ethical issue I am analysing is euthanasia in New Zealand. This is an ethical issue because [...]

1

Some who agree with euthanasia include doctors and people who are suffering from a terminal illness. These two groups of people believe that it is a person's choice, if they know all the facts and are of sound mind, to choose to end their own life or seek help from someone (a family member, friend, doctor) to do so if that is what they wish. They feel that this will avoid unnecessary suffering (2). This links to the ethical principle of "rights" because they value people's rights and freedom of choice and their decision should be respected by others.

2

Groups who disagree with euthanasia include [...]

Implications of the legal situation in NZ (euthanasia is illegal) at personal, interpersonal and societal levels.

At a personal level [...]

Interpersonally, euthanasia being illegal means that family members and friends need to support the terminally ill person through their illness and through their death. This will be very stressful and tiring, but is a good thing as it will develop in them empathy as well as compassion. This will enhance social bonds at the same time. In the long-term, they will be better able to support others who are going through similar situations.

3

Societally [...]

Note that a chart was provided by the student to show bibliographic details for the references used in the evaluation.