



# Mock Trial Rubric—Attorney

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Witnesses were well-prepared. Case theory well-constructed.</li> <li>Appropriate interaction with justices and attorneys. No distractions or behavior that slows the “wheels of justice”.</li> <li>Attorney made full and wise use of witness and evidentiary resources.</li> <li>Provides an accurate synopsis of the case in opening and closing. No notes used.</li> <li>Direct examination questions were relevant, logical, clear. Cross-examination questions were strategically useful. Redirect was affective when needed. All examination was purposeful and calculated. There were few or no objections sustained against this attorney.</li> </ul>	100
		94
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Witnesses were well-prepared. Case theory adequate.</li> <li>Appropriate interaction with justices and attorneys. No distractions or behavior that slows the “wheels of justice”.</li> <li>Attorney made mostly good use of witness and evidentiary resources.</li> <li>Provides an accurate synopsis of the case in opening and closing. No notes used.</li> <li>Direct examination questions were relevant, logical, clear. Cross-examination questions were strategically useful. Redirect was affective when needed. All examination was purposeful and calculated. There were few or no objections sustained against this attorney.</li> </ul>	85
		78
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Witnesses were mostly prepared. Case theory was acceptable.</li> <li>Some disruptive behavior evident during trial and/or trial preparations.</li> <li>Attorney made some use of witness and evidentiary resources.</li> <li>Provides an accurate synopsis of the case in opening and closing. No notes used.</li> <li>Direct examination questions were mostly relevant, logical, clear. Cross-examination questions were mostly strategically useful. There were only a few objections sustained against this attorney.</li> </ul>	71
		65
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Attorney was mostly unprepared. Witnesses were poorly prepared. Case theory had serious flaws.</li> <li>Behavior like constant objections without cause or disruptions out of order occasionally hurt the trial process.</li> <li>Attorney made little or no use of witness and evidentiary resources.</li> <li>Opening and closing argument are irrelevant, inconsistent, and/or poorly constructed.</li> <li>Direct examination questions were irrelevant, illogical, unclear. Cross-examination questions were ineffective. Examination of witnesses seemed whimsical. There were many objections sustained against this attorney.</li> </ul>	58
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Attorney was unprepared. Witnesses were poorly prepared. Case theory ill-conceived.</li> <li>Behavior like constant objections without cause or disruptions out of order hurt the trial process.</li> <li>Attorney made little or no use of witness and evidentiary resources.</li> <li>Opening and closing argument are irrelevant, inconsistent, and/or poorly constructed.</li> <li>Direct examination questions were irrelevant, illogical, unclear. Cross-examination questions were ineffective. Examination of witnesses seemed whimsical. There were many objections sustained against this attorney.</li> </ul>	0



# Mock Trial Rubric—Witness

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Witness remained consistently and convincingly in character. Witness was fluent, persuasive, clear, understandable. Shows mastery of the case and materials.</li> <li>• Witness speaks clearly and loudly enough to be heard.</li> <li>• Witness made no errors in testimony (inconsistent with the story line).</li> <li>• Witness used no notes.</li> </ul>	100
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Witness remained mostly convincingly in character. Witness was fluent, persuasive, clear, understandable. Shows strong knowledge of the case and materials with some gaps in unimportant matters.</li> <li>• Witness speaks clearly and loudly enough to be heard.</li> <li>• Witness made no errors in testimony (inconsistent with the story line).</li> <li>• Witness used no notes.</li> </ul>	94
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Witness had difficulty remaining consistently and convincingly in character. Witness was seldom fluent, persuasive, clear, understandable. Shows adequate knowledge of the case and materials.</li> <li>• Witness made errors in important elements of testimony (inconsistent with the story line).</li> <li>• Witness used no notes.</li> </ul>	85
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Witness remained rarely in character. Witness was often unsure, illogical, uninformed, unprepared, ineffective in communication. Shows little knowledge of the case and materials.</li> <li>• Witness made important errors in testimony (inconsistent with the story line).</li> <li>• Witness may have used notes or been prompted in obvious ways by attorneys.</li> </ul>	78
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Witness could not maintain character. Witness was unsure, illogical, uninformed, unprepared, ineffective in communication. Shows almost complete ignorance of the case and materials.</li> <li>• Witness made many errors in testimony (inconsistent with the story line).</li> <li>• Witness may have used notes or been prompted in obvious ways by attorneys.</li> </ul>	71
		65
		58
		0