

Sample Assessment Schedule

Scholarship Religious Studies (93603)

Skill 1: Analysis and critical thinking

The candidate should consider alternative points of view about religious and secular ideas of the concepts of holiness, holy land and Godzone, for instance, in the New Zealand context. They should examine key assumptions about these concepts (and how they have played out in Aotearoa) in response to the question in a structured and coherent discussion. They are not merely paraphrasing and presenting alternative points of view from within and without their chosen religious tradition(s) but demonstrating their ability to engage perceptively and skillfully with the question. They should make judgements about the nature of the evidence they use in their analysis.

Responses might include:

- An examination of what holiness means in a religious tradition
- Discussion around concepts of the secular
- Debate about concepts of Godzone as a secular or religious term
- Reflection on the role of religion in society
- Consideration of whether there are religious foundations to secular laws

Score Allocation – Skill 1: Analysis and critical thinking

| No scholarship | | | | Scholarship | | Outstanding scholarship | |
|--|---|---|---|--|---|--|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| The candidate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • makes simple assumptions and does not defend them • gives limited or inaccurate alternative viewpoints • dismisses other points of view or is disengaged from them • provides an argument that relies on rhetoric, slogans or stereotypes • may identify and explain some of the possible key ideas from the question | | | | The candidate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • gives a clear, precise interpretation of the question, and answers consistently • bases their answer on clearly articulated reasons or arguments • clearly explains the assumptions their argument makes; anticipates and defends these assumptions • accurately identifies rival points of view, and the assumptions behind these rival points of view • offers logical reasons for rejecting rival points of view • will score a 5 if there is a lack of clarity, or inadequate consideration of important points, or some unsupported generalisations | | The candidate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • demonstrates perceptive and insightful understanding of religious ideas related to the concept of Godzone in the Aotearoa New Zealand context • chooses the strongest and most representative versions of the views they are discussing • adopts for the sake of argument the alternative viewpoints and can explain how and why they give the answers they do from the point of view of a person who affirmed those viewpoints • explains why someone who held those views would find their position compelling and reasonable • articulates the assumptions behind various viewpoints and explains why they come to different conclusions • can score an 8 if the analysis and critical thinking is sustained throughout the response; if there are minor weaknesses in critical evaluation, or a lack of sustained reference to source evidence, this will be a 7 | |

Skill 2: Integration, synthesis and application of highly developed knowledge, skills, and understanding to complex situations

Candidates must integrate their ideas from their own content knowledge to communicate their argument effectively. They will demonstrate highly developed religious knowledge and skills as they substantiate their ideas and argument in response to the complex challenge of whether Aotearoa New Zealand has a claim to be called Godzone. Their selections and use of texts and references will be appropriate to answering the question. Their synthesised response will show their ability to form relationships and connections between religious ideas.

Responses might include:

- Reference to relevant scripture passages
- Reference to key beliefs and practices of a religious tradition that add to key evidence
- Reference to pertinent events in NZ’s history, past and present
- A drawing together of theology, history, ethics and scripture to support their argument

Score Allocation – Skill 2: Integration, synthesis and application of highly developed knowledge, skills, and understanding to complex situations

| No scholarship | | | | Scholarship | | Outstanding scholarship | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| <p>The candidate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • draws on scripture, or history, or doctrine and not on each of these • draws from these sources in isolation without showing how they fit together or mutually support each other • shows an inaccurate or overly simplistic picture of the information from these sources • uses these sources selectively and does not note any nuance or complexity • will score 3 or 4 for integrated ideas based on knowledge and skills; a 3 has appropriate bits of evidence, but has not integrated them well | | | | <p>The candidate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • is aware of the multiple ways religion and culture combine in New Zealand society that could support different answers to the question • draws from a mixture of history, tradition, doctrine, and ethics • demonstrates awareness of any subtly and nuance in these sources • explains how the information from these sources relates to each other, how they support each other or are in tension with each other • will score a 6 if there is a balanced integration of texts and references appropriate to the question • will score a 5 if there is clear, informed integration, but this may not always be consistent or clearly expressed | | <p>The candidate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • displays a synthesis of highly developed knowledge and skills with independent reflections and extrapolation, very ably showing relationships and connections between religious ideas • demonstrates sophisticated integration and abstraction • demonstrates the implications of various answers beyond the immediate context into other areas where religion and culture intersect • takes principles from one context and shows how these relate to another context in which the relevance was not immediately clear • can score an 8 if they demonstrate sophisticated skills of integration, synthesis and application consistently throughout their response • will score a 7 if there are minor lapses in the consistency of sophistication or independent thought | |

Skill 3: Logical development, precision and clarity of ideas

Candidates should communicate their own substantive argument on whether Aotearoa New Zealand can claim to be Godzone or not. Their argument should show logical development, precision and clarity of ideas as they access relevant knowledge and skills in response to the question. They should be able to advance their argument accurately, non-pejoratively, fluently, and logically, establishing a valid position for their answer to the question.

Responses might include:

- Arguments for isolated pockets of holiness through to the earth being “God’s own” creation
- An apologetic presentation of the significant development, presence and raison d'être of a religious tradition without pejorative judgement of those outside the tradition

Score Allocation – Skill 3: Logical development, precision and clarity of ideas

| No scholarship | | | | Scholarship | | Outstanding scholarship | |
|---|---|---|---|--|---|--|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| The candidate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • interprets the question inconsistently • asserts a point of view without giving arguments or reasons for this view • provides ideas unsupported by systematic discussion • repeats ideas without developing them further • will score a 4 for communicating a relatively simple argument that is explicit; a 3 will have provided a simple argument but with inconsistencies, inaccuracies, or a lack of clarity | | | | The candidate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • writes a response that has a logical shape to its development • presents ideas systematically, dealing with different topics consecutively • develops ideas and facts that are clearly elucidated, with clarity in the use of terms and religious ideas • will score a 6 if they have a balanced and valid argument that is mostly substantiated and sustained throughout • may score a 5 if the argument wavers or is not consistent | | The candidate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provides a novel line of argument that advances the discussion and does not just repeat the standard arguments • chooses the strongest and most representative versions of the views they are discussing and expounds them with precision and clarity • discusses key rival stances for and against the conclusion they are proposing and anticipates the main objection to this position • extensively and thoroughly explores the ideas they have chosen • provides an argument with convincing logical development, precision and clarity, while demonstrating originality • can score an 8 for a powerful and sustained argument; a 7 will be slightly less convincing | |