Overall the standard of examination answers was high. It was pleasing to see students allocating examination time equally amongst the four questions with answers reflecting an effort to address each question.

**Question 1**

This question is in two parts. Answers to Part A were generally well done – particularly when answers focused upon the historical evolution of the Australian legal system. Answers that tended to be awarded less marks were those that did not address all parts of the question – as answers were required to look at both the NSW and the Commonwealth Constitution and had opportunity to demonstrate deeper understanding by explaining differences between these legal frameworks. Answers to Part B tended to be more general rather than answering the specific question asked. Marks reflected the ability of the student to apply to relevant information to address the question.

**Question 2**

A two part question. Part A was completed at a high standard, almost every answer was able to provide relevant rules of statutory interpretation and identified some relevant issues. Part B seemed to divide students between those that clearly understood the historical classification of the Australian legal system and those that had a looser understanding of the Mabo decision. The question required students to explain the relevance of English legal history – the better answers did this well.

**Question 3**

Most answers were able to competently identify differences between courts and tribunals. Fewer answers were able to identify differences between the State and Federal systems and fewer still provided appropriate authority (as asked in the question). Overall most students were able to provide a competent response to the topic area.

**Question 4**

This question was divided into two parts. In general Part B (which asked four separate descriptive questions) was handled more competently than Part A which referred to a specific case and asked about executive power. This question highlights the importance of choosing a question to which a student can address both parts competently as a high standard of answer in Part B could be negatively impacted by a lesser quality answer in Part A.

**Question 5**

A two part question. Part A required relevant examples - this was a problem for many answers. While most students who attempted this were able to answer the question marks were reduced the use of examples to explain the answer was sporadic and generally not well done. Part B was well done overall. Each part
was addressed well and students appeared to have a good understanding of legal theory.

**Question 6**

This was arguably the best answered question in the paper. Most students drew from various aspects of the subject and used relevant authority and other examples to argue a clear response to the question. Interestingly it was also the question where answers were clearly structured and articulated. The use of law, particularly case law was at a high standard. Again the answers that did not do well were not able to clearly identify State and Commonwealth powers and to draw upon constitutional case law.