

Commentary on candidate 3 evidence

The evidence for this candidate has achieved the following marks for each question of this course assessment component.

Question 1

Section 1 - Philosophy of Religion

“Aquinas’s cosmological arguments prove the existence of a first cause and not the existence of God”. Discuss. (30 marks)

The candidate was awarded **21 marks** because the essay is well written and has a flow with a clear line of argument. It does, however, lack reasoned viewpoints and evidence to support conclusions. Knowledge and understanding is mainly in depth, accurate and relevant. There is clear evidence that the candidate has drawn together relevant and appropriate information from some specific sources (**8 marks**). Analysis identifies specific issues related to the question but the depth is uneven at times. The explanation of issues takes account of some perspectives and demonstrates good understanding of their relevance to the question (**8 marks**). Evaluation is valid but not clearly reasoned and lacks sufficiency. Relevant judgements are made on issues and perspectives on the issues, however, in places it is simply a judgement with brief reasoning. There is an attempt to draw brief conclusions but these lack depth (**5 marks**).

Question 5

Section 2 – Medical Ethics

“Palliative care replaces the need for euthanasia.” Discuss. (30 marks)

The candidate was awarded **24 marks** because the essay is a good length and raises a lot of good points. The latter part of the essay seems to add more and more valid points without proper support. The essay is clearly focussed on the question, although at times refers generally to the topic. Knowledge and understanding is consistently in depth, accurate and relevant. There is clear evidence that the candidate has drawn together relevant and appropriate information from a range of specific sources (**9 marks**). The analysis clearly identifies specific issues related to the question. The explanation of issues takes account of a range of clearly identified perspectives and demonstrates a clear understanding of their relevance to the question (**9 marks**). Evaluation is valid but not consistently. It has some relevant judgements on the issues raised and perspectives on the issues (**6 marks**).