**ISU Law Presentation Rubric**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Level 1 – 20% | Level 2 – 40% | Level 3 – 60% | Level 4 – 80% | Level 5 – 100% |
| ISU – Opening Statement40% | A feeble attempt at legal etiquette and language. Statement is rambling with a very limited attempt at proof or it lacks significant proof. It is obvious to any audience that the case is very weak.  | Several minor or a few major mistakes in legal etiquette and language. Statement is somewhat scrambled and/or rambling. Case is weakly made as sections lack proof and/or proof is mishandled. | Legal etiquette and language has minor mistakes. Statement is mostly clear, mainly thorough and concise. Mostly convincing to the listener. Opinion is mostly supported by proof or a bit scrambled. | Legal etiquette and language is nearly perfect. Statement is clear, thorough but reasonably concise, and convincing to the listener. Proof and opinion are well tied together. | Legal etiquette and language is perfect. Statement is clear, thorough but concise, and very convincing to the listener. Proof and opinion are masterfully tied together.  |
| ISU – Answering questions and objections20% | Only some answers are correct and should be worded more strongly. Other answers are incorrect or not attempted. Objections attempted but done incorrectly or at the wrong moments.  | Most questions are answered correctly but could be worded more strongly or in a more convincing manner. Other answers are incorrect or not attempted. Objections attempted at significant spots but fail, missed opportunities. | Some questions are answered thoroughly but concisely and competently. The other answers are correct but weaker. A few significant objections are raised successfully, 1 or more significant opportunities are missed. | Most questions are answered thoroughly but concisely and competently. The other answers are correct but weaker. Most significant objections are raised successfully. | All questions are answered thoroughly but concisely in such a competent manner that should dismiss any related questions and greatly advances the case. Any significant objections are raised successfully. |
| ISU – Closing Statement (Note: First part of rubric as the opening statement)40% | Closing statement is attempted but does not deal with material raised in the case nor does it sum up your side in a convincing manner.  | Closing statement does an adequate job summing up the case but could have been prepared before the case was heard. No reference to material raised in the case.  | Closing statement incorporates some new material to deal with some of the new points or questions raised in the case.  | Closing statement competently deals with any weaknesses or new points raised during the questions and the other side’s case. | Closing statement masterfully deals with any weaknesses or new points raised during the questions and the other side’s case. |
| Lawyer – Opening Statement40% | A feeble attempt at legal etiquette and language. Statement is rambling with a very limited attempt at proof or it lacks significant proof. It is obvious to any audience that the case is very weak. Author’s essay and report is utilized somewhat and/or errors in using the author’s work.  | Several minor or a few major mistakes in legal etiquette and language. Statement is somewhat scrambled and/or rambling. Case is weakly made as sections lack proof and/or proof is mishandled. No additional research but author’s essay and report mostly well used.  | Legal etiquette and language has minor mistakes. Statement is mostly clear, thorough yet concise, and mostly convincing to the listener. Opinion is mostly supported by proof or somewhat scrambled. Limited additional research done or done but mostly irrelevant. Author’s essay and report completely used. | Legal etiquette and language is nearly perfect. Statement is clear, thorough but reasonably concise, and convincing to the listener. Proof and opinion generally support each other. Obvious and relevant additional research done.  | Legal etiquette and language is perfect. Statement is clear, thorough but concise, and convincing to the listener. Proof and opinion are well tied together. Obvious and well chosen additional research done.  |
| Lawyer – Answering Questions and Objections20% | Most questions are not answered or answered incorrectly. One or more objections attempted but obviously incorrectly.  | Only some answers are correct and should be worded more strongly. Other answers are incorrect or not attempted. Objections attempted but done incorrectly or at the wrong moments. | Most questions are answered correctly but could be worded more strongly or in a more convincing manner. Other answers are incorrect or not attempted. Objections attempted at significant spots but fail, missed opportunities. | Some questions are answered thoroughly but concisely and competently. The other answers are correct but weaker. A few significant objections are raised successfully, 1 or more significant opportunities are missed. | Most questions are answered thoroughly but concisely and competently. The other answers are correct but weaker. Most significant objections are raised successfully. |
| Lawyer – Closing Statement40% | Closing statement actually weakens your case either through very poor presentation skills or due to presenting proof in a manner that strengthens the other side.  | Closing statement is attempted but does not deal with material raised in the case nor does it sum up your side in a convincing manner. | Closing statement does an adequate job summing up the case but could have been prepared before the case was heard. No reference to material raised in the case. | Closing statement incorporates some new material to deal with some of the new points or questions raised in the case. | Closing statement competently deals with any weaknesses or new points raised during the questions and the other side’s case. |
| Judge – Etiquette and Questions50% | Very little evidence of proper etiquette and problems in behaviour that require correction. Questions were obviously inappropriate or unnecessary.  | Either major errors in etiquette or minor problems in behaviour. Questions were either inappropriate or unnecessary.  | A few minor errors in etiquette but behaviour is appropriate. A few opportunities to ask questions or clarification were missed.  | Etiquette and behaviour have only 1 or 2 minor errors. Questions are appropriate for clarifying the case and reaching a decision.  | Etiquette and behaviour are flawless. Questions are very appropriate for clarifying the case and reaching a just decision.  |
| Judge – Written work50% | Decision has major logic problems with either the law or the case presented. Written work gives very limited support for the decision and/or dissent.  | Decision has minor logic problems with either the law or the case presented. Written work is unclear in its explanation or the explanation for the decision and/or dissent lacks detail or contradicts itself.  | Decision is appropriate given the law or the evidence and arguments presented. Written work is clear and gives a reasonable explanation for the decision and/or dissent. | Decision is appropriate given the law and the evidence and arguments presented. Written work is logical, concise, and explains the reasons for the decision and/or dissent. | Decision is very appropriate given the law and the evidence and arguments presented. Written work is logical, concise, but thoroughly explains the reasons for the decision and/or dissent.  |