

# Mock Trial Attorney Rubric

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Memo: \_\_\_\_\_

5	100	<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. Notes used appropriately.</li> <li>Direct examination questions were relevant, logical, clear. Cross-examination questions were strategically useful. Redirect was effective and used when needed. All examination was purposeful and calculated. There were few or no objections sustained against this attorney.</li> </ul>
	94	
4	85	<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. May be over-reliance on prepared notes.</li> <li>Weakness in examination of witnesses. There were some objections sustained against this attorney</li> </ul>
	78	
3	71	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Witnesses were mostly prepared. Case theory was acceptable.</li> <li>Some disruptive behavior may be 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. May be over-reliance on prepared notes.</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>
	65	
2	58	<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>

## INFORMATION

- There is no credit for tasks scoring below level 2. The rubric is on a five-point scale to parallel the NYS essay rubrics.