

Commentary on candidate evidence

The candidate evidence has achieved the following marks for each question of the question paper.

Candidate 4

Question 28(a)

The candidate was awarded **5 marks**.

Although the question was intended to sample knowledge about palliative care and hospice, the candidate sees assisted dying and euthanasia as forms of end-of-life care, and because this is a widely held view, it gets credit here. **2 marks** were awarded for the definitions of assisted suicide and euthanasia (1 per definition). **3 marks** were given for explaining the role of hospices, given at 'home', at the end of the quotation, and at 'condition' for the idea that the patient is reassured their specific needs will be met.

Question 28(b)

The candidate was awarded **6 marks**.

2 marks were given at 'human life' for the ideas of devaluing human life and going against sanctity of life. **1 mark** was awarded at 'chance of life', **1 mark** was awarded at 'want us to' and another **1 mark** at 'dignified death'. Although the remainder of the answer was not needed, taken as a whole it would be worth 3 marks, reflecting the level of development.

Question 29

The candidate was awarded **4 marks**.

1 mark was awarded for the idea that it devalued life, and **1 mark** was awarded for sending the message that a person is a burden and would be 'better dead'. The point about the role and motivation of doctors is developed, so it was awarded **2 marks** at 'available'. At this point the candidate had achieved full marks, but the final point about the impact on disabled people was also nicely developed, so it would have been worth 2 more marks.

Question 30(a)

The candidate was awarded **3 marks**.

2 marks were awarded at the end of the first paragraph for a developed point about IVF. **1 mark** was awarded for the point about saviour siblings but the idea that they would be 'merely [for] spare parts' is not really accurate so a second mark was not awarded. There were no marks for the final part of the answer as it strayed into evaluation.

Question 30(b)

The candidate was awarded **7 marks**.

2 marks were awarded at 'later on'. There are two ideas: better understanding about how to develop them, and 'fixing' embryos with inherited diseases. The answer then gets side-tracked into an explanation of how an embryo is made outside the body, however within this part there is **1 mark** for understanding why pregnancy might not be happening and developing safer and more effective ways of using embryos to help people to become parents. There is **1 mark** for the idea that designer babies go against nature, but nothing for the idea that IVF is a private practice as it is available for many on the NHS. **2 marks** were awarded for the point about saviour siblings and the potential negative impact on the child selected as a match. **1 mark** was awarded at 'potential life'.