

CU-SWUPL Joint Programme Coursework Brief
Semester:
Year:

Module Title:	Advocacy
Module Leader:	Alex Simmonds

Coursework Number:	2
Coursework Weighting:	50%

Release Date:	20/05/2020
Submission Date/Time:	10/06/2020 18:00 (China time)
Submission Place:	Open Moodle

Coursework Information

This coursework is designed to assess learning outcomes:

2. Demonstrate an awareness of the specific skills of an advocate and some ability to reflect on and evaluate learning from experience.
4. Demonstrate an ability to reflect on the relationship between learning law and legal skills developed.

This assignment is an individual assignment.

This assignment requires you to:

A) Write a reflective essay on the bail application you did for Assessment 1, considering the strengths and weaknesses of your performance and what skills you believe are needed to be an effective advocate in legal practice (1500 words)

And

B) Compare the system of bail in the English Legal System with similar provisions within the 2012 Criminal Procedure Law of the People's Republic of China. Would Chris Wilson, the defendant in Assessment 1, be released on bail under Chinese Law? (500 words)

Criteria for Assessment

Please see the **Assessment Rubric** on pages **4 to 6** for details of how your work will be assessed.

If you have any questions about the Assessment Rubric you **must** contact your tutor in good time before the assessment.

Word Count

The word count for A) is **1500** words

The word count for B) is **500** words

There will be a penalty of a deduction of 10% of the mark (after internal moderation) for work exceeding the word limit by 10% or more.

The word limit excludes the references list.

How to submit your assessment

The assessment must be submitted by **18:00 on 10/06/20**. No paper copies are required. You can access the submission link through the module web.

- Your coursework will be given a zero mark if you do not submit via Open Moodle. Please take care to ensure that you have fully submitted your work.
- Please ensure that you have submitted your work using the correct file format - PDF.
- All work submitted after the submission deadline without a valid and approved reason (see below) will be given a mark of zero.
- The University wants you to do your best. However we know that sometimes events happen which mean that you can't submit your coursework by the deadline – these events should be beyond your control and not easy to predict. If this happens, you can apply for an extension to your deadline for up to one week, or if you need longer, you can apply for a deferral, which takes you to the next assessment period. You must apply before the deadline by making an application to your SWUPL personal tutor.
- Students **MUST** keep a copy and/or an electronic file of their assignment.

GUIDELINES AND BACKGROUND TO THIS COURSEWORK

Plagiarism

As part of your study you will be involved in carrying out research and using this when writing up your coursework. It is important that you correctly acknowledge someone else's writing, thoughts or ideas and that you do not attempt to pass this off as your own work. Doing so is known as plagiarism. It is not acceptable to copy from another source without acknowledging that it is someone else's writing or thinking. This includes using paraphrasing as well as direct quotations. You are expected to correctly cite and reference the works of others.

Self-plagiarism or reuse of work previously submitted

You must not submit work for assessment that you have already submitted (partially or in full), either for your current course or for another qualification of this and any other university, unless this is specifically provided for in your assignment brief or specific course or module information. Where earlier work by you is citable, ie. it has already been published/submitted,

you must reference it clearly. Identical pieces of work submitted concurrently will also be considered to be self-plagiarism. Self-plagiarism is unacceptable because you cannot gain credit for the same work twice.

Copying another student's work, using previous work of your own or copying large sections from a book or the internet are examples of plagiarism and carry **serious consequences**. Please familiarise yourself with the Oxford University Standard for Citation of Legal Authorities (OSCOLA) and use it correctly to avoid a case of plagiarism or cheating being brought. The OSCOLA quick reference guide can be found on your Module Moodle page.

Return of Marked Work

You can expect to have marked work returned to you **by the 8th of July (08/07/2020)**. If for any reason there is a delay you will be kept informed. Marks and feedback will be provided **online/in class/face to face**. As always, marks will have been internally moderated only, and will therefore be provisional; your mark will be formally agreed later in the year once the external examiner has completed his / her review.

Assessment Rubric

	Reflection	Comparison	Insight	Focus	Referencing
80+	Candidate must have written about these three points: 1) What did they do, 2) what were their thoughts and feelings on how they did it, 3) What they could improve for next time. There must also be a comprehensive analysis of the process as experienced along with a description of how the candidate feels they performed at every stage. There must also be strong and relevant reference made to an academic model of reflection such as Kolb, Gibbs or Driscoll.	Strong contrasts identified between procedure in China with procedure in the UK with specific examples used.	Clear, insightful and original links have been made between the learner's experiences and Advocacy as practiced in Courts across the world.	Candidate has focussed strongly and evenly on the subject. Writing highly relevant to the topic at hand.	Accurate referencing throughout. It is very clear where a candidate is using information from a source and when they are using their own words and ideas.
70 – 79	Candidate has written about at least these three points with reference to their actual experience of the assessment: 1) What they did, 2) How well they think they did it, 3) What could they improve upon for next time. Strong and relevant reference should be made to an academic model of reflection such as Kolb, Gibbs or Driscoll.	Strong contrasts identified between procedure in China with procedure in the UK with specific examples used	Learner makes strong connections between their experience of advocacy on the course and beyond, and the question under discussion.	Candidate has focussed strongly and evenly on the subject. Writing highly relevant to the topic at hand.	Accurate referencing throughout. It is very clear where a candidate is using information from a source and when they are using their own words and ideas.
60 – 69	Candidate shows some evidence of having reflected on their overall performance provides some indication as to how they feel they could improve. Some reference may have been made to one of the academic models of reflection, but this may not be particularly strong.	Differences between procedure in China and procedure in the UK identified and explored but no significant examples used	Some connections have been made between own experience and advocacy as practised in the legal world.	Good, even level of focus. Writing is relevant to the topic with few deviations.	Accurate referencing throughout. It is very clear where a candidate is using information from a source and when they are using their own words and ideas but a limited amount of confusion may be evident.

50 – 59	Candidate may have written about their experience but the details lack precision and there is little or no evidence of them having considered ways in which they can improve. Likely that no or no meaningful reference has been made to any of the academic models of reflection as discussed.	Differences between procedure in China and procedure in the UK identified	Limited connections have been made based upon the learner's own experiences.	Candidate may have focussed on one area at the expense of another or deviated from the topic multiple times.	Referencing may be confused in parts. Some referencing may not be accurate or correct.
40 – 49	Candidate has written broadly about their experience but there is no evidence that they have reflected on how they can improve their performance. No or no meaningful reference has been made to any model of reflection.	Few or few significant differences identified	No significant attempt to make any connections to real-world advocacy.	Focus is scattered – at times it may not be clear which aspect of the topic the candidate is writing about.	Referencing may be confused in parts. Some referencing may not be accurate or correct.
30 – 39	Candidate has not written in any or any sufficient detail about their advocacy experience and has not considered in any or any sufficient detail, the ways in which they could improve their work. No or no meaningful reference made to any model of reflection.	Some irrelevant or insubstantial differences identified	No connections made to practice.	Very limited focus. Candidate may focus on only one area of advocacy and not on others at all.	It may be unclear which parts of the writing is the candidates and which parts are the authors they are citing.
0 – 30	Work of no substantial value or meaning has been produced with no relevance to the assessment criteria or learning objectives.	No significant effort to compare the two systems has been attempted	No connections made to practice or no attempt to see the exercise in context made	Complete lack of focus or strong focus on a completely irrelevant area	Evidence of copying and pasting from the internet with no references given and no quotation marks used to discern the difference between their work and the authors or the candidate may have copied and pasted large amounts of text and simply added a footnote at the end or copied and pasted large amounts of text and put it in quotation marks or no referencing may have been done at all

WRITING STRATEGIES - using specific, concrete details - comparing, contrasting - naming, describing	60 – 100% Effectively uses writing strategies to enhance reflection. Uses a variety of writing strategies. Uses specific, concrete details to make the reflection clear to the reader.	0 – 60% Uses few purposeful writing strategies Uses some details and sensory language Does not attempt to elaborate ideas or elaborates only through repetition of the initial statement
COHERENCE AND STYLE	Consistently uses appropriate language. Shows deep insight through a natural flow of ideas and an effective conclusion. Achieves unity through a natural progression of ideas. Uses precise language.	Uses only simple, generic language. Has lapses in coherence. Has the tendency to digress. Does not have coherence in writing. Is not organised in writing.
REFERENCING STYLE	OSCOLA referencing should be used throughout	OSCOLA referencing not used or otherwise poor referencing techniques employed throughout which may be, or border on, academic malpractice