

Commentary on candidate 4 evidence

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

Section 1 - Philosophy of Religion

Question 1

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

The candidate was awarded **14 marks** because the essay falls short in knowledge and understanding, analysis and evaluation. The essay is more focussed on the topic than the question. Knowledge and understanding is inconsistent in depth but is mainly accurate and relevant. There is some evidence that the candidate has drawn together relevant and appropriate information but references to sources and perspectives tend to be in general terms and limited (**5 marks**). The analysis identifies a mix of specific and general issues that are related to the question but there is insufficient depth and explanation of them. There is evidence of some understanding of their relevance to the question but this is general in nature (**5 marks**). The evaluation is valid but not clearly reasoned. There is relevant judgement on the issues and perspectives however; it is simply a judgement with brief reasoning (**4 marks**).

Question 5

Section 2 – Medical Ethics

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

The candidate was awarded **5 marks** because the essay does not deal with any of the issues in depth. Evaluation is very thin and short of the required standard at Advanced Higher (SCQF level 7) level. Knowledge and understanding lacks depth overall but is mainly accurate and relevant. There is some evidence that the candidate has attempted to draw relevant information together but references to sources and perspectives are brief, under developed and general in nature (**3 marks**). The analysis identifies a few issues but they are not clearly related to the question. The issues are briefly explained and there is evidence of some understanding of their relevance to the topic, but not to the question (**1 mark**). There is limited valid evaluation but it is not clearly reasoned and lacks sufficiency. There are judgements on the issues but there is some brief reasoning behind them. Conclusions are restricted to closing comments (**1 mark**).