

# SCORING CRITERIA FOR MOCK TRIAL JURY RESPONSIBILITIES

The following evaluation will be used to score participants in the trial who portray members of the jury.  
Every student must play 'jury' for one of the trials.

**Est 2 page report; times new roman, 12 pt font, with headings**

**TASKS:**

1. Write a one paragraph (only) **summary of the case**. Be neutral, fact driven – listen to **Crown opening**. Include the charge and section in the CCC.
2. **Crown & Defence Strength Analysis:** Provide a t-chart that highlights a few strengths and weaknesses of each side's case. You could offer suggestions that would have improved.
3. Then write an explanation for your **personal verdict**. Reference the ability of the Crown to prove its case. What was compelling enough to direct / govern your response? Reference the points made in #2. What **sentence would you have imposed** in this case if the jury came back guilty? Is there a minimum?
4. **Jury Deliberations** - You may or may not have a chance to deliberate as a group. If you do, then comment on the group's (**jury**) **process to come to a conclusion**. It is unlikely you will reach a unanimous decision. If not, then just comment on how challenging is it to get a consensus – a verdict in a jury situation.
5. Trial Reflection - Complete a **final reflection** that addresses what **you've gotten out of the mock trial experience**, both as a jury member and as a participant in the other trial, and throughout the journey.

**Due by May 13 – with this rubric, please.**

	Level 4	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1	u/s
Summary of the case is concise, relevant, and demonstrates solid ability to identify main ideas and supporting details	Summary is spot on and concise. No more than 5 complex sentences.	Summary is good, but it is too long and cumbersome.	Summary needs work to condense or to expand enough to hit the major elements.	Summary shows several areas of weakness. Either vague or sounds copied/.	
T-chart with each sides strengths and weaknesses AS PRESENTED in court. Understanding of the charges, sentencing rules, concept of a unanimous jury verdict, persuasion, rules of evidence, and case facts.	Thorough, highly effective, solid comprehension. Referenced only what was brought forward in the trial.	Very good, provincial expectations met, well done overall. Inferred some information that was not necessarily a highlight or brought up strongly.	Some areas need work, some terms are fully understood, some concepts are not addressed in response. Vague suppositions, no direct links made.	There are many fact errors, legal errors, irrelevant information. You have more work to do. Purely conjecture and ramblings.	
Reasoning in verdict decision is well supported with facts and quotes from the trial.	Solid facts provided, ample reference to evidence used, precedents cited, exhibits, and testimony.	Most of the key facts have been drawn out. Some good reference to facts and evidence, but more could be done to exceed the standards.	Most facts are present but only alluded to. The details are vague and reference to specifics are touch and go.	Only surface facts are mentioned. Some details are not correct. The effort is present but the execution needs work.	
The student will participate actively in jury deliberations. An attempt was made to come to a guilty or not guilty verdict and to work together as a team to determine the outcome. Listening and compromise.	It is evident that you paid very close attention during the trial. You participate very actively and demonstrate real leadership during the deliberations.	It is evident that you listened well during the trial. During deliberations, you are an active participant.	It's possible that you weren't paying attention during parts of the trial. You participate a bit in the discussions, but other jurors aren't really sure where you stand.	You participate only once or twice during deliberations. Your fellow jurors are very unclear about where you stand.	
Reflection – complete and thoughtful comments on strengths and weaknesses – both as a jury member and as a trial participant.	Thorough and in-depth. Evidence of insightful connections are present. Solid steps for growth outlined and learning presented	Good answers that demonstrate a successful completion of the task with some good insight presented. Some balanced views about what you learned.	Overall the reflection is complete but it appears just 'done' and lacks the connections desired for a value-added activity. A minimal to moderate ability to reflect and inquire about learning skills.	Reflection is rushed, has only quick surface answers that offer little to no value. More effort should have been made to connect this activity to overall learning..	
The student uses their written communication skills to effectively convey information on the case they deliberated on and conveys ideas in a fluid manner Uses the format requirements presented and uses MLA correctly (header).	Student projects total confidence and uses excellent communication skills. Response is attractive and very easy to read. Error free writing. Solid use of writing conventions.	Student projects confidence most of the time through the use of good communication skills. Writer stays on topic. Presentation of material is clean and mostly error-free. Well done.	Student's communication skills need a bit more work in order to project confidence, solid conviction and a clear decision. Layout could be improved. There is either too much information or not enough.	Student's communication skills are weak. Information word for word from the handouts. Several writing errors. Layout is not clean	