CRIMINAL LAW – MOCK TRIAL EVALUATION RUBRIC

Student: _____ Case: _____ Role: _____

	4 (80-100% of the time)	3 (70-79% of the time)	2 (60-69% of the time)	1 (50-59% of the time)
Knowledge				
Witness (all)	Expert knowledge of case and trial procedure. Demonstrates an expert understanding of witness and their role in the case.	Good knowledge of case and trial procedure. Demonstrates a good understanding of witness and their role in the case.	Satisfactory knowledge of case and trial procedure. Demonstrates some understanding of witness and their role in the case.	Limited knowledge of case and trial procedure. Demonstrates a limited understanding of witness and their role in the case.
Lawyer Opening Statement	Provided a clear and concise description of team's side of the case.	Provided a semi-clear and concise description of the case.	Although there was a description of the case, it was unclear.	There was no clear, concise description of the case.
Lawyer Direct Examination	Used questions with straightforward answers; direct questions, brought out key facts for their case.	Most of the questions were direct and straightforward, brought out key facts of the case.	Half of the questions were direct and straightforward, brought out some of the key facts of the case.	Very few of the questions were direct or straightforward, very few of the facts were brought out.
Lawyer Cross-Examination	Brought out contradictions or problems with testimony and weakened other side's case; used properly phrased questions; all questions were leading.	Brought out some contradictions of testimony and did not really weaken the other side's case; most questions were clear; most questions were leading.	Brought out few contradictions of testimony and did not weaken the other side's case; some questions were not clear; some questions were leading.	Did not contradict or weaken other side's case; questions were completely unclear; questions were all direct.
Lawyer Closing Statement	Made an organized and well-reasoned presentation summarizing the important points of the case.	Made a semi-organized and reasoned presentation summarizing the important points of the case.	Presentation was unorganized and was not well-reasoned; the facts of their side were not really presented.	The presentation was completely unorganized and did not represent their side.
Thinking				
Witness	Superior accuracy of responses during direct examination. Extremely well prepared for cross-examination.	Good accuracy of responses during direct examination. Well prepared for cross-examination.	Some accuracy of responses during direct examination. Somewhat prepared for cross-examination.	Limited accuracy of responses during direct examination. Poorly prepared for cross-examination.
Lawyer (all)	Questions are relevant, logical, and clear; questions are properly formed and delivered, brought out important information for side.	Questions are relevant, logical, and clear; questions are properly formed and delivered; brought out good information for side.	Questions have some relevance, logic, and clarity. Questions are formed with some accuracy and provided limited importance for side.	Questions are irrelevant, illogical, and unclear. Questions are formed with limited accuracy and do not help the case for side.
Communication				
Voice (all)	Easily understandable; consistent use of appropriate voice rate and speed; loud enough for everyone to hear; intonation (tone)	Understandable most of the time, appropriate voice rate in most of the performance, usually loud, has a decent tone.	Not easily understood; delivery needs work.	Is not understandable and does not have appropriate voice.
Eye Contact (all)	Establishes appropriate eye contact for the situation and setting.	Establishes eye contact most of the time.	Very rarely establishes eye contact.	Does not establish eye contact.
Application				
Authenticity (all)	Seems very real, excellent use of body and facial expressions, words and gestures match character; well adapted to setting; appropriate costume; did not unfairly deviate from the facts.	Believable character, adequate use of expressions, adapted to setting fairly well.	Needs to be more convincing, unbelievable character, inadequate expressions, has not adapted to setting.	Not in character; no expressions, not adapted to setting.
Research (all)	Evidence of substantial research to enhance case.	Good evidence of research to enhance case.	Some evidence of research.	Limited evidence of research.

CRIMINAL LAW – MOCK TRIAL EVALUATION RUBRIC

Student: _____ Case: _____ Role: _____