2020 Health Subject Assessment Advice

Overview

Subject assessment advice, based on the 2020 assessment cycle, gives an overview of how students performed in their school and external assessments in relation to the learning requirements, assessment design criteria, and performance standards set out in the relevant subject outline. They provide information and advice regarding the assessment types, the application of the performance standards in school and external assessments, and the quality of student performance.

2020 is the last year of teaching the current subject outline. The new Health and Wellbeing will be taught from 2021. Teachers should refer to the 2021 subject outline for specifications on content and learning requirements.

School Assessment

Assessment Type 1: Investigation and Presentation

Students must complete a presentation to an audience and also recommend a health-promoting strategy as proposed by the group. Topics covered included domestic violence, cyber-bullying, and sexuality issues. The presentation should refer to a health-promoting activity or social action; however, the presentation itself should not be the health-promoting activity. Teachers are reminded it is a requirement that they provide evidence of the presentation for moderation, e.g. video and/or presentation slides.

For this assessment type evidence should be provided primarily in relation to the assessment design criteria of Investigation, Application and Critical Analysis and Evaluation.

The more successful responses commonly:

* discussed the contemporary issue investigated along with an evaluation of the group processes including group life and group roles
* included discussion on the effectiveness of the group and suggested improvements
* reflected on the researched information and used this information to justify and evaluate the effectiveness of the health-promoting activity proposed by the group
* included feedback sheets for the audience to evaluate the presentation
* analysed the researched information and personalised their response
* students clearly articulated their role in the group activity and provided evidence of their participation and involvement
* provided evidence of the group social action and/or presentation.

The less successful responses commonly:

* provided a recount of what the group did
* did not evaluate the health promoting strategy or recommended social action
* demonstrated limited analysis of the issue researched
* lacked evidence of a presentation e.g. only submitted an individual discussion
* lacked evidence of participation and involvement in the group activity e.g. surveys, interviews, feedback, group work.

Assessment Type 2: Issues Analysis

A wide range of topics was addressed including sexuality, environmental health, racism, indigenous health, refugees, abortion, cyber bullying, addictions and abuse. The dilemma solving task remains a popular choice. Teachers need to ensure that videos, songs, or articles that are used, allow students to highlight a health issue which can be related to and discussed from a student’s local, community perspective. It is not sufficient for students just to ‘review’ the materials as a recount.

For this assessment type, evidence should be provided primarily in relation to the assessment design criteria of Understanding and Critical Analysis and Evaluation.

The more successful responses commonly:

* showed evidence of health literacy by personalising their response
* demonstrated discerning use of appropriate health literacy terms
* analysed the health issue in relation to the individual and community
* investigated explanations for trends and statistics
* utilised primary and secondary sources
* analysed current health promotion strategies and/or education along with suggesting new ways to minimise the issue.

The less successful responses commonly:

* had word counts which limited the student’s ability to achieve at a higher standard
* lacked referencing of sources of information
* provided limited understanding of social justice issues related to the issue being investigated
* demonstrated limited analysis of health promotion strategies and/or education in relation to the issue being investigated
* provided a recount of the media and other sources referenced in regard to the issue being discussed.

Assessment Type 3: Practical Activity

Many schools use two practical tasks with one focusing on the personal health of the students and the other on the health of others. First Aid and Lifestyle Contract remain popular topics. Other topics included Save-a-Mate, P.A.R.T.Y Program, Mental Health First Aid, fundraising and volunteering in health promoting charities or agencies. Teachers are reminded to ensure students have the opportunity to actively participate in the activity to show sustained application.

For this assessment type evidence should be provided primarily in relation to the assessment design criteria of Understanding, Application and Critical Analysis and Evaluation.

The more successful responses commonly:

* included a range of sources including primary sources such as an interview with a community expert connected to the issue
* completed sustained practical activities and linked these activities with individual and community health
* supported activities undertaken with evidence and related research
* analysed the activity undertaken in relation to social justice issues
* for the Lifestyle Contract chose a S.M.A.R.T goal which enabled them to clearly analyse and reflect on effectiveness of program.

The less successful responses commonly:

* provided a recount of the activity completed with no analysis or reflection
* attended a whole class activity which limited the student’s ability to achieve higher in the application specific feature
* saw a whole class attend a session from a guest speaker without actually being involved in a practical activity
* lacked evidence of the activities undertaken.

External Assessment

Assessment Type 4: Investigation

Students selected a wide range of relevant contemporary health topics. Many students investigated a topic they had a personal interest in. Teachers are reminded to de-identify students work when submitting to SACE for marking and to encourage students to manage their responses within the 2000-word count.

The more successful responses commonly:

* utilised 2-3 carefully established focus questions that had scope for contrast, evaluation and application to specific communities rather than investigating a general topic. This tended to enrich and provide a natural connection to a Health Promotion Application (HPA)after the student applied their investigation of a health issue to a specific community whether small in size or global in size
* used more than one primary source (e.g. survey + interview)
* demonstrated the ability to interpret and critically analyse information
* included graphs, images and relevant tables which were referenced and analysed in the text
* discussed multiple points of view or multiple contexts
* included evidence of their HPA
* sought feedback to determine the effectiveness of their HPA
* made links and connections to external agencies, support networks and government initiatives relating to the topic
* thoughtfully included evidence in the body of their investigations regarding their health promoting activity as well as the evaluation of trends in their research. This was much more common this year than previously and typically very beneficial to the student demonstrating a higher level of: Understanding, Application, Critical Analysis and Evaluation for the task
* demonstrated student choices of issue they clearly had a personal connection to, or a passion for. This interest and deep understanding appeared to propel students in undertaking and writing up their investigations.

The less successful responses commonly:

* recounted HPA or research with no analysis or interpretation
* used minimal secondary resources
* incorporated statistics but without any analysis or evaluation of trends
* were rushed or incomplete
* put important information/evidence into the appendices (which are not assessed) after they had exceeded the wordcount
* were misleading about the actual word count or openly exceeded the 2000 word limit
* did not use or reference primary source(s) in the investigation
* contained whole sections analysing primary information rather than incorporate information from a discerning array of sources into a flowing investigation.