

SELECTION CRITERIA		APPLICATION FORM MARK SCHEME			GUIDANCE FOR APPLICANTS (APPLICATION FORM)	
Criterion	Definition	Marks Available	Award of Marks	Mark Scale	Evidenced by	Further guidance
1. Intellectual Ability	1. Academic achievement.	4	<p>1 mark for consistently high grades (A* or equivalent) in all or almost all subjects at A-level or equivalent.</p> <p>1 mark for a 2:2</p> <p>2 marks for a 2:1</p> <p>2 marks for a 2:2 together with a high mark in a postgraduate qualification (excluding the Bar Course)</p> <p>3 marks for a 1st or a 2:1 together with a high mark in a postgraduate qualification (excluding the Bar Course).</p> <p>4 marks for a 1st together with a high mark in a postgraduate qualification (excluding the Bar Course).</p> <p>All reference to degree results include projected results where applicable.</p>	<p>As set out under "Award of Marks"</p> <p>The possible total 5 marks in this section are pro rata'd to 4 in the final assessment, hence the total "Marks Available" for the Academic achievement element of Intellectual Ability is correctly stated as 4.</p>	Academic achievement.	<p>Name and institution information (schools and universities) fields will be redacted on the application forms (all monitoring data such as gender, ethnicity, etc is automatically excluded by the Gateway). As far as possible, please avoid referring to institution names in the other fields of the form.</p> <p>We will not take account of the institution attended in awarding marks for academic achievement (although see our Selection Process for use of contextualised recruitment methods in selection for the written case study round).</p> <p>Equivalent qualifications from outside the UK will be accepted; it is essential that you please explain in your form the correlation between your qualifications and UK marking (and provide the equivalent UK mark). If this is not done, or done in an unclear way, any doubt will be resolved against the candidate with either a lower mark or no mark for that aspect of the application.</p>
	<p>2. The ability rapidly to analyse complex and voluminous facts and materials to identify relevant points.</p> <p>3. Use and application of rules to factual situations to produce accurate assessments.</p> <p>4. Ability to think and respond under pressure.</p>	3	<p>3 marks for other evidence in the whole of the application form, including answers to the Keating Questions, evidencing intellectual ability as defined in parts 2, 3 and 4 of the definition.</p> <p>Post-school scholarships and awards and an Outstanding grade on the Bar Course will also be taken into account here.</p>	<p>0 mark = weak demonstration of criterion</p> <p>1 mark = satisfactory demonstration of criterion</p> <p>2 marks = good demonstration of criterion</p> <p>3 marks = excellent demonstration of criterion</p>	<p>Post-school scholarships, academic/professional publications, prizes, etc.</p> <p>Any experience demonstrating intellectual ability as defined, including by way of example only specific instances from academic study and life or work/career experience (which could include permanent or temporary jobs and/or internships/training schemes/work experience including on mini-pupillages).</p>	<p>For older applicants/career-changers: evidence of career success post-academia is relevant and welcome here.</p> <p>For academic/professional publications, candidates are advised that higher marks will be awarded for publications of substantial weight. Low marks or no marks will be awarded for small examples of published work. By way of example only, 100 words in a student newspaper will be regarded as weak or no demonstration of the criterion.</p> <p>Markers will take into account the number and quality of the examples of experience and evidence given and, in particular, the degree to which candidates have explained or demonstrated how those examples show that the criterion is met: see further the guidance on our website.</p>

SELECTION CRITERIA		APPLICATION FORM MARK SCHEME			GUIDANCE FOR APPLICANTS (APPLICATION FORM)	
Criterion	Definition	Marks Available	Award of Marks	Mark Scale	Evidenced by	Further guidance
2. Ability to work in teams	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ability to develop clear shared goals and build consensus. 2. Ability to collaborate with others to plan and execute, including effective delegation and team member support. 3. Ability to recognise and respect the needs and skills of other team members. 4. Ability to communicate effectively, including listening and addressing conflict. 	3	3 marks for other evidence in the whole of the application form, including answer to the Keating Question 1, evidencing ability to work in teams as defined.	0 mark = weak demonstration of criterion 1 mark = satisfactory demonstration of criterion 2 marks = good demonstration of criterion 3 marks = excellent demonstration of criterion	Any experience involving working in a team and demonstrating the skill as defined, including by way of example only on committees, any form of organising or campaigning, teamwork in a job or project or sports team of any kind, voluntary work, etc.	Markers will take into account the number and quality of the examples of experience and evidence given and, in particular, the degree to which candidates have explained or demonstrated how those examples show that the criterion is met: see further the guidance on our website.
3. Written advocacy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clear, articulate, succinct, structured and accurate presentation of argument. 2. Ability to anticipate and address opposing arguments. 3. Presentation of documents including spelling and grammar. 	3	3 marks for other evidence in the whole of the application form, including answers to Keating Question 2, evidencing skill in written advocacy as defined in parts 1, 2 and 3 of the definition.	0 mark = weak demonstration of criterion 1 mark = satisfactory demonstration of criterion 2 marks = good demonstration of criterion 3 marks = excellent demonstration of criterion	Any experience involving written communication, including by way of example only documents such as skeleton arguments for moots/debates, essay writing, report writing, journalism, written presentations, advice to a person, etc. The application form itself.	Except for the example of the application form itself, markers will take into account the number and quality of the examples of experience and evidence given and, in particular, the degree to which candidates have explained or demonstrated how those examples show that the criterion is met: see further the guidance on our website.

SELECTION CRITERIA		APPLICATION FORM MARK SCHEME			GUIDANCE FOR APPLICANTS (APPLICATION FORM)	
Criterion	Definition	Marks Available	Award of Marks	Mark Scale	Evidenced by	Further guidance
4. Oral advocacy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Structured, relevant and accurate argument. 2. Succinct, clear and articulate presentation of argument. Ability to anticipate and address opposing arguments. 3. Ability to respond to and deal with interventions, while maintaining own position as appropriate. 	3	3 marks for other evidence in the whole of the application form, including answers to Keating Question 3, evidencing skill in oral advocacy as defined in parts 1, 2 and 3 of the definition.	0 mark = weak demonstration of criterion 1 mark = satisfactory demonstration of criterion 2 marks = good demonstration of criterion 3 marks = excellent demonstration of criterion	Any type of informal or formal oral advocacy, including by way of example only mooting, debating, work for FRU or similar, at a CAB or law centre or similar, voluntary work, experience on committees, experience via jobs, teaching, acting, presenting, etc.	<p>We emphasise that evidence relating to informal oral advocacy experience is equally as valid and persuasive as formal advocacy experience.</p> <p>Markers will take into account the number and quality of the examples of experience and evidence given and, in particular, the degree to which candidates have explained or demonstrated how those examples show that the criterion is met: see further the guidance on our website.</p>
Total marks available		16	Note for candidates: Chambers puts no limitation on the type of experiences and evidence which a candidate may rely on to demonstrate each of the criteria. The examples are given as guidance only and are not intended to be prescriptive.			

SELECTION CRITERIA		WRITTEN CASE STUDY MARK SCHEME			GUIDANCE FOR APPLICANTS (WRITTEN CASE STUDY)	
Criterion	Definition	Marks Available	Award of Marks	Mark Scale	Evidenced by	Further guidance
1. Intellectual Ability	1. Academic achievement.	N/A	Not assessed at this stage.		N/A	Not assessed at this stage.
	2. The ability rapidly to analyse complex and voluminous facts and materials to identify relevant points.	3	3 marks for demonstration of part 2 of the definition of the criterion. Material features arising out of the legal/factual scenario provided which demonstrate strength against the criterion have been identified and provided to markers in advance.	0 marks = weak demonstration of criterion 1 mark = satisfactory demonstration of criterion 2 marks = good demonstration of criterion 3 marks = excellent demonstration of criterion	The written case study.	For the written case study, applicants are identified solely by their candidate number. Candidates are required to name their opinion file with their candidate number only. The markers do not know what mark the candidate scored on the application form. Markers do not have any other information whatsoever available to them other than the written case study itself. Applicants will be asked to produce an Opinion (between 1,500 - 2,000 words depending on the exercise). The Opinion must be your own unaided work; if we discover you have had any assistance, you will immediately be disqualified. Candidates invited to participate in this round will be provided with a template to use in producing their document, and clear instructions will be given as to expected content. Candidates are also provided with an extract from the relevant legal textbook. The intention of Keating's process is to assess skills/ability and not knowledge of the law and candidates will be asked to keep citation of authority to a minimum. Keating does not publish the "Material features" or the "Specific points of difficulty" lists (referred to in the Mark Scheme) to candidates because they themselves analyse the materials, identify relevant points, apply rules to factual situations and identify accurate assessments: in other words, they tell candidates both the answer(s) and how to go about providing it/them. However, these lists are standardised prior to any assessment taking place. All candidates will be given 10 days to produce their document. On a discretionary basis and subject to logistical constraints, this time may be extended whether in individual cases or generally to all candidates. If any candidate requires a reasonable adjustment to be made for any disability, please do contact us (contact details will be given in the letter inviting candidates to participate
	3. Use and application of rules to factual situations to produce accurate assessments.	7	5 marks for identifying 5 specific points of difficulty arising out of the legal/factual scenario provided. The 5 points of difficulty have been identified and are provided to markers in advance - 1 mark per point. 2 marks available for overall correctness of advice given.	As stated in "Award of Marks"		
	4. Ability to think and respond under pressure.	Inc above	Included in marks above.			

SELECTION CRITERIA		WRITTEN CASE STUDY MARK SCHEME			GUIDANCE FOR APPLICANTS (WRITTEN CASE STUDY)	
Criterion	Definition	Marks Available	Award of Marks	Mark Scale	Evidenced by	Further guidance
2. Ability to work in teams	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Ability to develop clear shared goals and build consensus. Ability to collaborate with others to plan and execute, including effective delegation and team member support. Ability to recognise and respect the needs and skills of other team members. Ability to communicate effectively, including listening and addressing conflict. 	N/A	Not assessed at this stage.		N/A	Not assessed at this stage.
3. Written advocacy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Clear, articulate, succinct, structured and accurate presentation of argument. Ability to anticipate and address opposing arguments. Presentation of documents including spelling and grammar. 	3 1	<p>3 marks for demonstration of parts 1 and 2 of the definition of this criterion.</p> <p>1 mark for demonstration of part 3 of the definition of this criterion.</p>	<p>0 marks = weak demonstration of criterion</p> <p>1 mark = satisfactory demonstration of criterion</p> <p>2 marks = good demonstration of criterion</p> <p>3 marks = excellent demonstration of criterion</p>	The written case study.	See comments above.
4. Oral advocacy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Structured, relevant and accurate argument. Succint, clear and articulate presentation of argument. Ability to anticipate and address opposing arguments. Ability to respond to and deal with interventions, while maintaining own position as appropriate. 	N/A	Not assessed at this stage.		N/A	Not assessed at this stage.
Total marks available		14				

SELECTION CRITERIA		FIRST INTERVIEW MARK SCHEME			GUIDANCE FOR APPLICANTS (FIRST INTERVIEW)	
Criterion	Definition	Marks Available	Award of Marks	Mark Scale	Evidenced by	Further guidance
1. Intellectual Ability	1. Academic achievement.	N/A	Not assessed at this stage.		N/A	Not assessed at this stage.
	2. The ability rapidly to analyse complex and voluminous facts and materials to identify relevant points. 3. Use and application of rules or propositions to factual situations to produce accurate assessments. 4. Ability to think and respond under pressure.	3	3 marks for demonstration of parts 2, 3 and 4 of the criterion, excluding "The ability rapidly to analyse complex and voluminous facts and materials" and focusing on the ability "to identify relevant points." To cover performance in the whole of the interview, including answers to pre-defined Structured Questions.	0 marks = weak demonstration of criterion 1 mark = satisfactory demonstration of criterion 2 marks = good demonstration of criterion 3 marks = excellent demonstration of criterion	Interview performance.	The first round interview does not involve any complex or voluminous facts or materials, so this element of the definition is not assessed at this stage. Ability to identify relevant points does form part of the assessment. The interview will involve a question directed specifically at demonstration of the Intellectual Ability criterion. Please see the Selection Process section of our website for further guidance.
2. Ability to work in teams	1. Ability to develop clear shared goals and build consensus. 2. Ability to collaborate with others to plan and execute, including effective delegation and team member support. 3. Ability to recognise and respect the needs and skills of other team members. 4. Ability to communicate effectively, including listening and addressing conflict.	1.5	3 marks for performance against the definition, using answers to pre-defined Structured Questions. These 3 marks are divided by 2 after marking, so as to weight this criterion at 50%. Therefore the total marks available of 1.5 marks are correctly stated.	0 marks = weak demonstration of criterion 1 mark = satisfactory demonstration of criterion 2 marks = good demonstration of criterion 3 marks = excellent demonstration of criterion	Interview performance.	The interview will involve a question directed specifically at the Ability to work in teams criterion.
3. Written advocacy	1. Clear, articulate, succinct, structured and accurate presentation of argument. 2. Ability to anticipate and address opposing arguments. 3. Presentation of documents including spelling and grammar.	N/A	Not assessed at this stage.		N/A	Not assessed at this stage.

SELECTION CRITERIA		FIRST INTERVIEW MARK SCHEME			GUIDANCE FOR APPLICANTS (FIRST INTERVIEW)	
Criterion	Definition	Marks Available	Award of Marks	Mark Scale	Evidenced by	Further guidance
4. Oral advocacy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Structured, relevant and accurate argument. 2. Succinct, clear and articulate presentation of argument. Ability to anticipate and address opposing arguments. 3. Ability to respond to and deal with interventions, while maintaining own position as appropriate. 	3	<p>3 marks for performance against part 1 of the definition, to cover performance in the whole of the interview, including answers to pre-defined Structured Questions.</p> <p>3 marks for performance against parts 2 & 3 of the definition, to cover performance as above.</p> <p>Each of the above 3 marks are divided by 2 after marking, so as to weight the parts at 50%. Therefore the total marks available of 3 marks are correctly stated.</p>	<p>0 marks = weak demonstration of criterion</p> <p>1 mark = satisfactory demonstration of criterion</p> <p>2 marks = good demonstration of criterion</p> <p>3 marks = excellent demonstration of criterion</p>	Interview performance.	
Total marks available		7.5				

SELECTION CRITERIA		SECOND INTERVIEW MARK SCHEME			GUIDANCE FOR APPLICANTS (SECOND INTERVIEW)	
Criterion	Definition	Marks Available	Award of Marks	Mark Scale	Evidenced by	Further guidance
1. Intellectual Ability	1. Academic achievement.	N/A	Not assessed at this stage.		N/A	Not assessed at this stage.
	2. The ability rapidly to analyse complex and voluminous facts and materials to identify relevant points. 3. Use and application of rules to factual situations to produce accurate assessments. 4. Ability to think and respond under pressure.	3	3 marks for performance against parts 2 to 4 of the definition, assessed by reference to the candidate's performance in the discussion of their written case study.	0 marks = weak demonstration of criterion 1 mark = satisfactory demonstration of criterion 2 marks = good demonstration of criterion 3 marks = excellent demonstration of criterion	Interview performance.	Please see the Selection Process section of our website for further guidance.
2. Ability to work in teams	1. Ability to develop clear shared goals and build consensus. 2. Ability to collaborate with others to plan and execute, including effective delegation and team member support. 3. Ability to recognise and respect the needs and skills of other team members. 4. Ability to communicate effectively, including listening and addressing conflict.	N/A	Not assessed during the interview.		N/A	Not assessed during the interview.
3. Written advocacy	1. Clear, articulate, succinct, structured and accurate presentation of argument. 2. Ability to anticipate and address opposing arguments. 3. Presentation of documents including spelling and grammar.	N/A	Not assessed during the interview.		N/A	Not assessed during the interview.

SELECTION CRITERIA		SECOND INTERVIEW MARK SCHEME			GUIDANCE FOR APPLICANTS (SECOND INTERVIEW)	
Criterion	Definition	Marks Available	Award of Marks	Mark Scale	Evidenced by	Further guidance
4. Oral advocacy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Structured, relevant and accurate argument. 2. Succinct, clear and articulate presentation of argument. Ability to anticipate and address opposing arguments. 3. Ability to respond to and deal with interventions, while maintaining own position as appropriate. 	3	<p>3 marks for performance against part 1 of the definition, to cover performance in the whole of the interview, including answers to pre-defined Structured Questions.</p> <p>3 marks for performance against parts 2 & 3 of the definition, to cover performance as above.</p> <p>Each of the above 3 marks are divided by 2 after marking, so as to weight the parts at 50%. Therefore the total marks available of 3 marks are correctly stated.</p>	<p>0 marks = weak demonstration of criterion</p> <p>1 mark = satisfactory demonstration of criterion</p> <p>2 marks = good demonstration of criterion</p> <p>3 marks = excellent demonstration of criterion</p>	Interview performance.	Please see the Selection Process section of our website for further guidance.
Total marks available		6				

SELECTION CRITERIA	
Criterion	Definition
1. Intellectual Ability	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Academic achievement. 2. The ability rapidly to analyse complex and voluminous facts and materials to identify relevant points. 3. Use and application of rules to factual situations to produce accurate assessments. 4. Ability to think and respond under pressure.
2. Ability to work in teams	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ability to develop clear shared goals and build consensus. 2. Ability to collaborate with others to plan and execute, including effective delegation and team member support. 3. Ability to recognise and respect the needs and skills of other team members. 4. Ability to communicate effectively, including listening and addressing conflict.
3. Written advocacy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clear, articulate, succinct, structured and accurate presentation of argument. 2. Ability to anticipate and address opposing arguments. 3. Presentation of documents including spelling and grammar.
4. Oral advocacy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Structured, relevant and accurate argument. 2. Succint, clear and articulate presentation of argument. Ability to anticipate and address opposing arguments. 3. Ability to respond to and deal with interventions, while maintaining own position as appropriate.