Year 9 RPE Crime and Punishment

	Knowledge	Skills
Strong	• Shows an excellent understanding of the different causes of crime, supported by well-chosen evidence and clear explanation. • Can compare and critique religious views on different types of crime, the aims of punishment and the types of punishment. • Can construct balanced arguments on the death penalty, applying sanctity of life and principle of utility confidently.	• Can accurately identify, define and apply a wide range of key religious vocabulary in context. • Uses a wide range of accurate religious teachings and applies them confidently, showing how they might be interpreted differently by believers. • Can explain religious beliefs accurately, in depth and with clear insight and explain how they might impact a believer. • Can respond to an evaluative statement with logical, well-structured chains of reasoning; considers different viewpoints thoughtfully and critically; reaches a justified, well supported conclusion that integrates beliefs, teachings and evidence confidently.
Confident	• Shows a clear understanding of different causes of crime, supported by appropriate evidence and explanation. • Can compare and critique religious perspectives on types of crime, aims of punishment and forms of punishment, showing secure understanding. • Can construct balanced arguments on the death penalty, confidently applying key principles such as sanctity of life and the principle of utility, leading to a mostly well-supported conclusion.	• Can identify and correctly define most key religious vocabulary; uses terms appropriately in explanations, though application may not always be precise. • Uses relevant religious teachings accurately and applies them to issues. Recognises different interpretations, though explanations may not be fully developed. • Explains key religious beliefs clearly and correctly and can describe how beliefs influence a believer's actions. Recognises variation within a religion, though explanations may be less detailed. • Can respond to an evaluative statement with clear explanation of different views and some logical reasoning; can make links between beliefs, teachings and arguments, though reasoning may not always be fully sustained; conclusion is mostly supported.
Developing	• Shows a general understanding of several causes of crime, with some relevant examples or partial evidence. • Can describe and begin to compare religious views on types of crime and aims of punishment, though explanations may be brief or unbalanced. • Can give reasons for or against the death penalty, with some reference to religious principles, though application may be limited or unclear.	• Can identify some key religious vocabulary but accurate application of it is inconsistent. • Can recall some religious teachings and give a basic explanation; may recognise different interpretations; application to issues is simple or only partly correct. • Can describe key beliefs in simple terms; shows limited understanding of how beliefs might impact a believer and little awareness of variation within a religion. • Can give a simple response to an evaluative statement and recognise that different views exist; offers some reasons but chains of reasoning are brief or unbalanced; conclusion may be present but not clearly justified.

Emerging	• Shows a basic awareness that crime has different causes, but explanations are simple or lack supporting evidence. • Can describe a religious view on crime or punishment, but with little detail or comparison. • Can give a simple opinion on the death penalty but struggles to apply religious principles such as sanctity of life or utility.	• Can recognise a few religious terms but does not yet use religious vocabulary accurately or confidently. • Can name or quote a teaching but cannot explain its meaning; unaware of different interpretations; application to issues is minimal or inaccurate. • Can state a basic belief but cannot explain its meaning or impact on a believer. • Can give a simple opinion on a statement; may mention a religious idea but with little explanation; reasoning is limited with no clear conclusion or comparison of views.