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|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Area | Not yet Satisfactory | On the right track P | Good: Cr | Very Good D | Excellent HD |
| Identification of problem or issues | Demonstrates limited or no understanding of the wider context in which reform is occurring, little or no identification of relevant issues and problems in family law. | Demonstrates an understanding of some aspects of the wider context in which reform is occurring, | Demonstrates a good understanding of wider context in which reform is occurring | Demonstrates a very good understanding of context in which consideration of reform is occurring, and mentions some complexity. | Demonstrates a thorough understanding of context in which consideration of reform is occurring, and demonstrates an appreciation of complex factors and standpoints. |
|  | Does not explicitly identify a problem, or if one is identified, it is not persuasively argued or it is not significant or has been misunderstood. | Identifies a problem in family law, only supports this with evidence | clearly draws on relevant factors (policy, historical, economic, social, theoretical etc) to identify a relevant issue or problem in family law, although either not clearly or completely . | Discusses relevant issues and/or problem for family law that is well supported by evidence. | Discusses relevant issues and/or problems in a sophisticated and creative way. |
|  | Does not address a term of reference | Addresses a term of reference, but not explicitly, or does not appropriately narrow the term of reference to suit the argument. | Addresses a term of reference explicitly, and is mostly linked with the body of the submission. Focused but with some lapses. | Explicitly addresses a term of reference and submission is well focused. | Submission clearly, and coherently, and in appropriate depth, addresses the term of reference in a creative way. |
| Sources | Submission does not go beyond the resources provided in the course.  Submission relies too heavily on evidence/ argument from other parliamentary submissions.  Secondary sources not used, or if used, not reliable or omits key, recent work for that area. | Submission goes beyond the resources of the course, but only minimally.  Primary sources (cases/ legislation) referred to are appropriate and correct. Some omissions.  Some appropriate secondary sources selected, however omissions evident. | Submission demonstrates good research strategy.  Primary sources (cases and legislation) are used appropriately, correctly and in sufficient depth for the argument, although some loss of focus.  No omissions for key secondary works. | Submission demonstrates a very good research strategy.  Primary sources (cases and legislation) appropriately and clearly used, and no loss of focus.  No omissions for key secondary works, and some interesting additional works used. | Submission demonstrates an excellent research strategy.  Primary sources (cases and legislation) used effectively and creatively. Well explained and treated.  No omissions for key secondary works, and a number of interesting additional works used and appropriately incorporated. |
| Legal content | Does not identify relevant legal principles of family law relevant to the question, or does not explain the relevant principles of family law. | Locates relevant legal principles and concepts of family law, although may also include less relevant principles.  Has breadth of understanding of family law but limited in its depth.  Explanations of the principles of family law are vague or inaccurate in places. | Clearly and accurately explains the main principles and concepts of family law relevant to the issue chosen.  Clearly links how these legal principles are relevant to the problem, although perhaps some loss of focus, some oversights, or some incompleteness or errors. . | Accurately and clearly presents legal principles and concepts that are relevant to the problems. However, the submission needs more depth, or breadth is needed to help explain the problem or support the recommendation. A few minor errors or omissions in legal content allowed. | The coverage is comprehensive (in width and depth) with no irrelevant material included.  The relevance of the relevant legal principles and concepts are concisely, correctly and appropriately explained. |
| Recommendations and critical evaluation. | The submission’s recommendation/s is/ are not clearly thought through or explained.  Either no point of view (or argument) is clearly communicated, or there might be an argument stated but it is not supported by analysis, or the analysis is very fragmented and/or superficial. | Submission communicates a point of view and recommendation.  Breaks down ideas and problems and explains the components into a number of factors which links to the recommendation/s.  Obvious arguments for and against the recommendation/s are identified clearly, but their relative merits are not analysed or weighed. | Submission communicates clearly and coherently a point of view. Persuasively identifies appropriate recommendation/s.  Counter arguments only superficially addressed, or only partially relevant. More obvious counter arguments not raised. | Recommendations proposed clearly and persuasively supported throughout the submission with no loss of focus.  Significant counter arguments identified although not always adequately addressed, or responded to in appropriate depth | Articulates and addresses the basis and the limits of the proposal and can challenge boundaries to disciplinary understanding.  A recommendation that contributes to the development of the law in this area.  Counter arguments clearly identified and cogently responded in appropriate depth. |
| Research/ Evidence | The submission is not based on relevant research, or supports claims with limited or inappropriate or unreliable sources.  Submission comes across as being partisan, biased or unbalanced in the way that it explains and weighs up the evidence. | Demonstrates evidence of key academic sources to establish claims made, although limited.  Evidence that is incomplete or irrelevant is also included.  Evidence is linked to the conclusion/ recommendation, but it might be unclear in places. | Demonstrates a good breadth and depth of academic sources.  Evidence included that is clear and relevant, although not necessary consistently.  An attempt to weigh the evidence, but only partly coherent and/ or logical. | Draws on key reliable and credible sources in a balanced way to identify the claims made.  Submission draws upon key evidence which supports and counters the arguments put forward.  The evidence is weighed appropriately and objectively (including the limitation of any evidence) and linked to the conclusion/ recommendation. | Draws on a wide, high quality and credible range of relevant sources (historical, economic, social, policy, theoretical) to inform the basis of the claims made.  A wide range of relevant evidence which both supports and counters the argument put forward in a sophisticated and complex way, which gives the reader confidence that the conclusion/ recommendation is objective and reliable (including scoping the limitation of any evidence/ argument) |
| Written expression | Frequent minor or a few significant errors with use of language that make writing difficult to understand.  Multiple writing styles apparent in the submission. | Clear and fluid expression with some errors in expression.  Minor proofing errors.  Message and style is mostly clear and consistent style used throughout. | Message and style is clear and consistent throughout the submission.  Adheres to all expected attributes, with some translation to suit the specific task and individual style.  Loss of focus in places. | The submission has no spelling, grammar or typographical mistakes.  An accessible presentation of complex ideas with no loss of accuracy, and consistently clear throughout. | The submission has no spelling, grammar or typographical mistakes.  Graceful, clear and succinct language that skillfully communicates meaning to readers and is error free.  Communicates a message that ‘stands out’. |
| Use of Academic conventions | Absence or inaccurate use of referencing and citation conventions | Basic referencing accurate and use of a bibliography or reference list. Sometimes lacks consistency, but nevertheless acknowledges the sources of information used.  Use of AGLC. | Use of academic conventions such as referencing and citation is accurate, consistent and appropriate (use of AGLC). | Use of academic conventions such as referencing and citation is accurate, consistent and appropriate for the legal discipline. | Use of academic conventions such as referencing and citation is accurate, consistent and appropriate for the legal discipline. Able to adapt to draw upon, use effectively and cite evidence from wider and interdisciplinary fields of knowledge (use of AGLC). |
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