ILLINOIS STATE BAR ASSOCIATION HIGH SCHOOL MOCK TRIAL RUBRIC. FOR TEACHER EVALUATION ASSISTANCE. THIS IS NOT AN OFFICIAL SCORESHEET.

| Team/School | Team/School |
|-------------|-------------|
|-------------|-------------|

| PLAINTIFF | DEFENSE |
|-----------|---------|

| Opening Statement 5 4 3 2 1 0 Relevant, appropriate comments 5 4 3 2 1 0 Delivery Style | Opening Statement 5 4 3 2 1 0 Relevant, appropriate comments 5 4 3 2 1 0 Delivery Style |
|---|---|
| Plaintiff Witness ONE <u>Lawyer Evaluation</u> | Plaintiff Witness ONE Lawyer Evaluation on Cross Examination |
| 5 4 3 2 1 0 Questions: Well-written (non-leading) | 5 4 3 2 1 0 Questions: Well-written (leading) |
| 5 4 3 2 1 0 FOCUS of questions was obvious. Goals of questioning were clear. | 5 4 3 2 1 0 FOCUS of questions was obvious. Goals of questioning were clear. |
| 3 2 1 0 RELEVANCE of questions towards goals. Questions wer focused. | 3 2 1 0 POISE of lawyer. Overall composure, handling of objections, preparation, etc |
| 3 2 1 0 POISE of lawyer. Overall composure, handling of objections, preparation, etc | |
| | |
| WITNESS ONE 5 4 3 2 1 0 KNOWLEDGE of affadivit | |
| 3 2 1 0 POISE on cross especially | |
| 3 2 1 0 OVERALL character believable? Comfort level of witness, was it too staged? | |
| , , | |
| | |
| Plaintiff Witness TWO Lawyer Evaluation | Plaintiff Witness TWO Lawyer Evaluation on Cross Examination |
| Plaintiff Witness TWO | |
| Plaintiff Witness TWO Lawyer Evaluation 5 4 3 2 1 0 Questions: Well-written (non- | Lawyer Evaluation on Cross Examination 5 4 3 2 1 0 Questions: Well-written |
| Plaintiff Witness TWO Lawyer Evaluation 5 4 3 2 1 0 Questions: Well-written (non-leading) 5 4 3 2 1 0 FOCUS of questions was obvious. Goals of questioning | Lawyer Evaluation on Cross Examination 5 4 3 2 1 0 |
| Plaintiff Witness TWO Lawyer Evaluation 5 4 3 2 1 0 Questions: Well-written (non-leading) 5 4 3 2 1 0 FOCUS of questions was obvious. Goals of questioning were clear. 3 2 1 0 RELEVANCE of questions towards goals. Questions were | Lawyer Evaluation on Cross Examination 5 4 3 2 1 0 |
| Plaintiff Witness TWO Lawyer Evaluation 5 4 3 2 1 0 Questions: Well-written (non-leading) 5 4 3 2 1 0 FOCUS of questions was obvious. Goals of questioning were clear. 3 2 1 0 RELEVANCE of questions towards goals. Questions were focused. 3 2 1 0 POISE of lawyer. Overall composure, handling of objections, preparation, etc | Lawyer Evaluation on Cross Examination 5 4 3 2 1 0 |
| Plaintiff Witness TWO Lawyer Evaluation 5 4 3 2 1 0 Questions: Well-written (non-leading) 5 4 3 2 1 0 FOCUS of questions was obvious. Goals of questioning were clear. 3 2 1 0 RELEVANCE of questions towards goals. Questions were focused. 3 2 1 0 POISE of lawyer. Overall composure, handling of | Lawyer Evaluation on Cross Examination 5 4 3 2 1 0 |
| Plaintiff Witness TWO Lawyer Evaluation 5 4 3 2 1 0 Questions: Well-written (non-leading) 5 4 3 2 1 0 FOCUS of questions was obvious. Goals of questioning were clear. 3 2 1 0 RELEVANCE of questions towards goals. Questions wer focused. 3 2 1 0 POISE of lawyer. Overall composure, handling of objections, preparation, etc WITNESS TWO | Lawyer Evaluation on Cross Examination 5 4 3 2 1 0 |

PAGE 2 ILLINOIS STATE BAR ASSOCIATION HIGH SCHOOL MOCK TRIAL RUBRIC. FOR TEACHER EVALUATION ASSISTANCE. THIS IS NOT AN OFFICIAL SCORESHEET.

| eam/School | Team/School |
|------------|-------------|
|------------|-------------|

PLAINTIFF

DEFENSE

| PLAINTIFF | DEFENSE |
|--|---|
| Defense Witness ONE Lawyer Evaluation on Cross Examination | Defense Witness ONE Lawyer Evaluation |
| 5 4 3 2 1 0 Questions: Well-written (leading) | 5 4 3 2 1 0 Questions: Well-written (non-leading) |
| 5 4 3 2 1 0 FOCUS of questions was obvious. Goals of questioning were clear. | 5 4 3 2 1 0 FOCUS of questions was obvious. Goals of questioning were clear. |
| 3 2 1 0 POISE of lawyer. Overall composure, handling of objections, preparation, etc | 3 2 1 0 RELEVANCE of questions towards goals. Questions were focused. |
| | 3 2 1 0 POISE of lawyer. Overall composure, handling of objections, preparation, etc |
| | |
| | WITNESS ONE |
| | 5 4 3 2 1 0 KNOWLEDGE of affadivit |
| | 3 2 1 0 POISE on cross especially |
| | 3 2 1 0 OVERALL character believable? Comfort level of witness, was it too staged? |
| Defense Witness TWO | Defense Witness TWO |
| Lawyer Evaluation on Cross Examination | Lawyer Evaluation |
| Lawyer Evaluation on Gross Examination | <u>Lawyer Lvaluation</u> |
| 5 4 3 2 1 0 Questions: Well-written (leading) | 5 4 3 2 1 0 Questions: Well-written (non-leading) |
| 5 4 3 2 1 0 FOCUS of questions was obvious. Goals of questioning were clear. | 5 4 3 2 1 0 <u>FOCUS</u> of questions was obvious. Goals of questioning were clear. |
| 3 2 1 0 POISE of lawyer. Overall composure, handling of objections, preparation, etc | 3 2 1 0 <u>RELEVANCE</u> of questions towards goals. Questions were focused. |
| | 3 2 1 0 <u>POISE</u> of lawyer. Overall composure, handling of objections, preparation, etc |
| | |
| | WITNESS TWO |
| | 5 4 3 2 1 0 KNOWLEDGE of affadivit |
| | 3 2 1 0 POISE on cross especially |
| | 3 2 1 0 OVERALL character believable? Comfort level of witness, was it too staged? |
| | |
| CLOSING Argument | CLOSING Argument |
| 5 4 3 2 1 0 Relevant, appropriate | 5 4 3 2 1 0 Relevant, appropriate |
| comments, use of testimony 5 4 3 2 1 0 Delivery Style, poise | comments, use of testimony 5 4 3 2 1 0 Delivery Style, poise |
| . , , , , , | |

| | 3 2 1 0 POISE of lawyer. Overall composure, handling of |
|--|--|
| | objections, preparation, etc |
| | WITNESS TWO 5 4 3 2 1 0 KNOWLEDGE of affadivit |
| | 3 2 1 0 POISE on cross especially |
| | 3 2 1 0 OVERALL character believable? Comfort level of witness, was it too staged? |
| CLOSING Argument | CLOSING Argument |
| 5 4 3 2 1 0 Relevant, appropriate comments, use of testimony | 5 4 3 2 1 0 Relevant, appropriate comments, use of testimony |
| 5 4 3 2 1 0 Delivery Style, poise | 5 4 3 2 1 0 Delivery Style, poise |
| TOTAL FOR PLAINTIFF: | TOTAL FOR DEFENSE: |
| | |
| Signature of Teacher | |
| | 2 |