

### 36 Family Behavioural Indicators Table

Criteria	Method of Assessment	Behavioural Indicators	Rating Scale & Illustrative Guidance			
			0 Not met	1 Partially met	2 Fully met	3 Exceeds
<b>Academic Attainment</b>	Application form	High levels of academic attainment	Below 2.2	2.2	2.1 or 2.2 with other evidence (e.g. significant scholarship, postgraduate qualification or mitigating circumstances)	1 <sup>st</sup> or 2.1 with other evidence (e.g. significant scholarship, excellence in postgraduate qualification or mitigating circumstances)
<b>Interpersonal skills</b> *#	Application form and interview	(i) Listening skills (ii) Problem solving (iii) Negotiation skills (iv) Ability to manage difficult people (v) Respect for others (vi) Empathy alongside objectivity (vii) Emotional intelligence	No evidence.	Information about experience in an environment where interpersonal skills would be essential.  Some evidence of use of interpersonal skills in engaging with members of the interview panels during the interviews.	Evidence of engagement with the situation and effective application of interpersonal skills.  Reasonably strong evidence of effective use of interpersonal skills in engaging with members of the interview panels during the interviews.	Situation(s) in which interpersonal skills were engaged, applied effectively and changed the outcome in a difficult situation. Shows ability to remain objective whilst empathic.  Very strong evidence of effective use of interpersonal skills in engaging with members of the interview panels during the interviews.
<b>Commitment and motivation</b>	Application form	(i) Drive and dedication and commitment to success (ii) Perseverance / staying power (iii) Choices are consistent with stated practice intention (iv) Genuine interest in specialist practice (v) Committed to remaining in chambers	No evidence of commitment to family law or the bar.	If undertaken / sought to acquire mini pupillage or other work experience / marshalling etc this included family law. Chose family law option in studies. Evidence of committing to something and sticking with it – e.g. could include sporting / music activity.	Demonstrable evidence of commitment to practice area e.g. essays on family law, volunteering in family law, evidence that the candidate's choices or interests have a family law focus or independent exploration such as case law awareness. Specific reasoned interest in aspects of family law in question. Evidence of commitment to areas of interest e.g. persistence and drive with	High level of commitment demonstrated e.g. sustained choices consistent with stated practice intention, strong level of awareness of family law issues, independent expression of interest to a significant extent e.g. blogging, sustained commitment to projects or initiatives relevant to family law  Strong evidence of sustained commitment to areas of outside interest e.g. persistence and drive with outside interests / commitment to a project or cause

		<p>(vi) Takes the initiative in furthering knowledge</p> <p><i>NB, be cautious not to equate experience with commitment when the former might be easier to come by for some particularly during the global pandemic.</i></p>		Cogent answer to question.	outside interests / commitment to a project or cause.	/ sustained involvement in the establishment and running of an event or project.
<b>Working under pressure /resilience</b> *#	Application form and interview	<p>(i) Ability to produce high quality work in short period of time</p> <p>(ii) Copes with high volume of work and difficult working conditions</p> <p>(iii) Ability to remain calm when under pressure</p> <p>(iv) Ability to juggle multiple stressors</p> <p>(v) Ability to cope well when put on the spot</p> <p>(vi) Time management / prioritisation</p> <p>(vii) Ability to withstand the pressure of distressing cases</p> <p>(viii) Learning from experience</p> <p>(ix) Coping with day-to-day successes and failures</p> <p>(x) Bounceback from difficult people</p>	No evidence.	Information about a situation in which the ability to work under pressure would be essential.	Evidence of having worked under immediate pressure, coped with stressors and remained calm, successfully and with resilience	Evidence of effective application of working under pressure to a high degree of success within an applicable high-pressure situation, particularly when 'on the spot'. Evidence of remaining calm, coping with stressors (possibly multiple), and demonstrating resilience in bouncing back/learning from experience.
<b>Analytical skills</b> *#	Application form and interview	<p>(i) Ability to identify key information from a large volume</p>	No evidence.	Key points identified and communicated.	Key points identified and evaluated accurately.	Key points of complex/technical information identified and scrutinised with precision,

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(ii) Assimilate and manage complex/ voluminous/ technical information</li> <li>(iii) Can understand, unpick and make complex arguments</li> <li>(iv) Ability to 'filter' / distil</li> <li>(v) Ability to see patterns</li> <li>(vi) Attention to detail</li> <li>(vii) Lateral thinking</li> <li>(viii) Clarity</li> </ul>			Communicated effectively.	identifying patterns/ conclusions. Communicated with ingenuity/impact.
<p><b>Written communication /advocacy *</b></p> <p><i>(Cannot receive a 3 for this criterion if their form contains SPG errors unless they've disclosed dyslexia or another relevant disability /neurological difference)</i></p>	Application form	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Evidence of high level of preparation and research</li> <li>(ii) Quality of written English (discretion to move from 2 to a 3 if relevant extenuating circumstances, or to move to a lower rating scale if errors with no mitigating circumstances)</li> <li>(iii) Ability to distil volume / complexity into key points</li> <li>(iv) Ability to focus on the most relevant / persuasive points</li> <li>(v) Ability to reason logically / draw analogy</li> <li>(vi) Answering the question asked</li> <li>(vii) Understands the competing</li> </ul>	No use of persuasion or reasoning, lack of logical and digestible structure.	Key points made in a logical, digestible format.	Key points are persuasive, impactful and make a reasoned argument. Presented in a distilled, digestible format.	Refined key points expressed with a high degree of persuasion and impact. Presentation is structured and unified. Thread of logical and persuasive argument flows throughout.

		arguments of the relevant topic (viii) Ability to present work in a way which is digestible and impactful				
<b>Oral advocacy #</b>	Application form and interview	(i) Persuasion (ii) Articulacy (iii) Ability to structure responses on the spot (iv) Adaptability to the situation and the audience (v) Answering the question asked	No evidence of the relevant skills being utilised successfully.	Evidence of mooting, debating experience or advocacy experience in another setting e.g. public speaking, presentations, sales, lecturing.  In interview, candidate delivers oral advocacy but with little or no identifiable demonstration of relevant skills.	Success in mooting competition, advocacy competition, real tribunal / court setting. Evidence of advocacy applied effectively in a practical scenario e.g. Supporting someone effectively in a non-legal advocacy role such as in school, hospital or care home or, effective pitch in business /charity setting or effective advocacy when teaching. Evidence of oral advocacy in a formal/legal setting should not be weighted more heavily than advocacy in a different setting.  In interview, candidate presents a persuasive, structured argument demonstrating that they are able to 'think on the spot'. Responds to questions and intervention well. Relevant skills are demonstrated to a high level.	Success(es) in significant/competitive mooting competition(s), advocacy competition(s), or difficult court / tribunal case. Demonstrable evidence of advocacy changing the outcome in a real-life situation or practical scenario involving a non-legal advocacy role, see examples for '2'. Evidence of success of oral advocacy in a formal/legal setting should not be weighted more heavily than success in a different setting.  In interview, candidate presents a highly persuasive well-structured argument flowing throughout, demonstrating that they are able to 'think on the spot' to an impressive degree. Responds to questions and intervention very well. Relevant skills are demonstrated to an outstanding level.

<b>Overcoming Adversity</b>	Application form	(i) Grit and determination (ii) Strength and confidence in the face of adversity (iii) Overcoming barriers (iv) The significance of the candidate's achievements are elevated / enhanced	NA	NA	Applicant has chosen not to answer OR has provided information about some adversity which elevates the significance of the individual's achievements to a limited extent.	Information about adversity or difficult obstacles which the applicant has faced with grit and determination and overcome successfully. The significance of their achievements is elevated to a great extent.
<b>Ethical Integrity</b>	Interview  <i>NB at application form stage a candidate is assumed to have ethical integrity unless evidence to the contrary</i>	(i) Ability to identify where ethical and moral issues arise (ii) Intuition (iii) Discretion (iv) Standing up for others / addressing injustice or wrongdoing (v) Strength and confidence in the face of adversity or obstacles	Skills are demonstrated poorly and/or unsuccessfully.	Candidate is able to identify that ethical issues arise.	Candidates identifies the ethical issues arising and examine them. Relevant skills are demonstrated to an acceptable level.	Candidate is able to identify key ethical issues and articulate their intuition as to consequences and actions appropriately. The candidate will also be able to draw a reasoned conclusion of their own. Evidence of relevant skills is demonstrated to a high level.

## Notes

### **Application form questions**

Where a question on the application form is directed at a particular criterion this is noted for the assessor's reference. However, assessment of the relevant criterion is not limited to consideration of that question and can be assessed with reference to the whole application form.

### **Disability**

Our pupillage recruitment process must comply with our positive duty to make reasonable adjustments for disability, where known about, throughout the process. This is distinct from the discretion to take into account mitigating factors, which may also include disability. Chambers will take active steps to reduce the obstacles that disability presents in the application process. Where reasonable adjustments are requested, required or implemented this plays no part in marking applications or deciding whether to offer a candidate an interview or a pupillage. The Head of Pupillage should be made aware of any applicants for pupillage disclosing disability so that we can comply with our obligations. The Head of Pupillage is not involved in marking application forms or interviewing

1. Interpersonal skills (200 words)

Give an example of a time when you've had to advise someone against doing what they wanted to do. What was the situation, what was your approach and what was the outcome?

2. Commitment and motivation (200 words)

Why do you want to be a family law barrister?

3. Working under pressure / resilience (200 words)

Give an example of a time when you have had to work under pressure. What was your approach and what was the result? Were you successful?

4. Written communication and advocacy & analytical skills (400 words)

'Fault-based divorce should be abolished'. Do you agree? Why?

5. Overcoming adversity (200 words)

(Optional) If you have faced adversity or obstacles in your journey to the bar so far, please use this opportunity to tell us about the nature of the challenge you have faced and what steps you have taken to overcome it.

### **Weighting**

Criteria marked \* have a higher weighting at application form stage. Criteria marked # have a higher weighting at interview stage.

The criteria are weighted having had regard to importance but also the extent to which assessment is suited to the method used.