

Student Name: _____

Role: _____

Mock Trial Rubric

| | 10 (Excellent) | 8 (Good) | 7 (Fair) | 8 (Poor) |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| Evidence of Persuasion /Point of View | Maintains a clear position throughout the entire presentation. Opposing view mentioned and then refuted, making case stronger. Jury member/research attorney shows understanding of multiple perspectives. | Maintains a clear position throughout the entire presentation. Opposing view not mentioned or mentioned but not well refuted. Jury member/research attorney member shows some understanding of multiple perspectives. | Moves from one side to the other, never maintaining a solid position. Jury member/research attorney shows limited understanding of multiple perspectives. | Does not establish a clear position for either side of the case. Jury member/research attorney shows little or no understanding of multiple perspectives. |
| Preparation: Quality of Information | Examples and references are well chosen to best exemplify main points in defense or prosecution of the character during questioning. All points are well supported on preparation sheet and reflection sheet. | References support the main point. Research is used to support defense or prosecution of the character. Main points are adequately convincing on preparation sheet and reflection sheet somewhat complete. | References are not connected to research or the reading. Arguments are random and unconvincing on preparation sheet and reflection sheet. | Information is not based on research or is unrelated to the main points. Arguments are random and unconvincing on preparation sheet and reflection sheet / incomplete. |
| Group Cooperation | Group works together to share speaking time and information equally. Information refers to and complements that of other group members. Transitions from one speaker to the next are smooth and well prepared. | Time allotted to each member is somewhat uneven. Information connects to that of other group members. Transitions are present. | Time allotted to each speaker is imbalanced. Information conflicts with or repeats that of other group members. No noticeable transitions from one speaker to the next. | No evidence of group planning or cooperation. |
| Understanding of the Issue | Presentation/research uses specific details and examples. Examples are applied to the main points. Actions of character are evaluated relating to issues raised in the trial. | Presentation/research uses details and examples that connect to the main point. The information shows how actions in the reading contribute to the character's guilt or innocence. | Presentation/research includes few references to details and examples. Attempts to connect actions of the character to the issues or the trial are awkward or unconvincing. | Presentation/research includes no references details and examples. Group speaks in generalizations about issues disconnected from the reading. |
| Delivery, Engagement and Presentation | Speaker makes frequent eye contact with the jury/witness/lawyer. Volume and pace reflect intensity of main points. Movement and gestures add emphasis to main points. Jury member stays engaged throughout the trial. Dresses professionally or in character. | Speaker uses notes but maintains adequate eye contact with the jury/witness/lawyer. Volume and pace are consistent with main points. Gestures and movement are used hesitantly. Jury member remains engaged during most of the trial. Dresses professionally or in character. | Speaker uses note cards to avoid making eye contact jury/witness/lawyer. Volume and pace are difficult to follow. Movements are not related to speech and reflect nervousness. Jury member does not seem engaged during most of the trial. Does not dress professionally or in character. | Speaker never looks up, cannot be heard, moves nervously, or stands rooted to one spot / Jury member does not seem engaged throughout the trial. Does not dress professionally or in character. |

Total: _____ /50

Feedback: