

Grade 11 Mock Trials - RST

- You are asked to fill out a paper to indicate the three trial roles that you prefer to have, and in the order. Give this to the teacher.
- The teacher will assign roles in trials that best match your preferences and the teacher's observations of the case and student strengths. (Dec 12)
- You will **review the preparation for trial documents** located in Hapara and mainly on the teacher's weebly website. Galveias.weebly.com
- You will **read over the entire case(s)** assigned and in particular focus on your role and those statements that may offer you more information and context to help you prepare. (Dec 12-13, & 18-20) Make a T chart highlighting case strengths and weaknesses and the main point the case rests upon.
- Complete the document online in Hapara, before trial.** Include your t-chart, and the questions you have been working on. This is evidence of preparation. You can work at home on this RST.
- Memorize your witness role;** write your opening, closing or charge to the jury statements, write out your direct and possible cross examination questions. This preparation takes time and hard work and you need to do this as soon as possible. (Mostly done at home)
- Begin role playing when provided in **class preparation time** (Jan 6-10). This is not when you learn your roles, or read the case, this is when you get a witness and ask them questions, or as a judge you sit in while someone is being asked in role play to anticipate objections that could arise. Tell the team what you see. If you are a lawyer, pretend you are the witness and have someone do the cross examination, so you can be a better lawyer. Practice, iron out the kinks, get ready for the deal.
- Time your team. Each side has 10 minutes to present their evidence.** That means asking direct and cross questions in total. So use it wisely and have a way to track your time. Involve the lawyers in your group so they can help you devise a way to signal the time being used. And what is remaining. Review the timing sheet for the whole case.
- Participate and be ready for the practice run through day(s).** **Kaye is Jan 8, and Irving Jan 9.** Your preparation is part of the marking.
- Read over the **rubrics**.
- On **trial day, dress for the part.** On trial day, arrive on time, and be ready to GO. Trials take a long time and the timing is critical. **Kaye RST full trial is Jan 13; Irving is 14-15** (it will run over a bit on the 15th) **Attendance is vital** or it all falls apart.
- Be a **member of a jury and reflect on the cases and your role.** This is done in class on January 15th.

Case(s) done:

See full rubrics for more details – teacher only returns this rubric – drawing from the comprehensive set

Student	LEVEL 4	LEVEL 3	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 1	u/s
<p>OVERALL</p> <p>Seriousness during trial-career related goals</p> <p>Lawyer Role- -direct examinations -cross examinations -opening stmt -summation /close -Objections raised, missed, responded to or defended.</p> <p>Witness Role- -direct examinations -cross examinations</p> <p>Other Roles- -court clerk</p>	<p>Extraordinary job overall</p> <p>Dressed for the job. Proficient level of collegiality and followed full courtroom procedures (approach, friends, not talk over etc). Very serious and in role when “on” and when sitting. You were focused, you took good notes, and could not be more professional. You understand this career well.</p> <p>As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial, you were excellent and proficient in your delivery of: direct examination(s) cross examination(s) opening statement summation /close stmt Objections raised, missed, responded to or defended.</p> <p>dealing with your performance in the trial, you were excellent and proficient in your delivery of: -direct examination(s) -cross examination(s) -credibility establishment Other: as a witness, you were on point for the character. You developed a thorough understanding of the character’s situation and likely answers that build on credibility. Goes beyond knowing your character – you developed it further. Great evidence.</p> <p>You were very in-tune with the professional demands of the career role you undertook. You looked poised and that you took great care to consider all needs of the role. Clerk kept the teams on time with timecards. You were prepared with books, with the role sheets, and you clearly practiced the swearing in on family and friends. You stood up and kept the class in check without prompting.</p>	<p>Good / at par for provincial goal – overall job</p> <p>Dressed for the role. Excelling level of collegiality and courtroom procedures and protocol. Good level of responsibility and emulation of career related attitudes in a court room setting.</p> <p>As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial, you excelling and achieving good provincial expected standards in your delivery of: direct examination(s) cross examination(s) opening statement summation /close stmt Objections raised, missed, responded to or defended.</p> <p>As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial, you are excelling and reaching good standards in your delivery of: direct examination(s) cross examination(s) credibility establishment Other: You were a good witness. Overall notations indicate that you knew your role, and you were not tripped up by the cross examination. You were very good and credible. No issued in direct – clearly you prepared with the lawyer. Only minor issues with cross.</p> <p>Prepared, but still showing areas for growth. Needed some guidance at the beginning of the trail or reminders. During the trial, you did a good job of doing the role. Clerk kept the class/ jury behaving and tracked the timing of each lawyer. Indictment was read well. Had some of the clerk documents you needed, but some may have been provided to you.</p>	<p>Fair or developing level of skill overall</p> <p>Dressed with a small effort to be “special” for the task. Developing level of collegiality and courtroom procedures and protocol. Some serious moments noted but overall you looked as though you would not likely be hired for this job due to the lack of focus on the task at hand.</p> <p>As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial, you are developing in your delivery of: direct examination(s) cross examination(s) opening statement summation /close stmt Objections raised, missed, responded to or defended.</p> <p>As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial, you are developing in your delivery of: direct examination(s) cross examination(s) credibility establishment Other: You read over the witness role. You knew the overall idea of what you did. You did a fair job of being in sync with the events of the crime. You did not look prepared with your lawyer – you did not answer as if prompted and practiced. However, you still managed to look somewhat poised and somewhat credible.</p> <p>Prepared to do the role but you did not show up with any preparation done for the role.</p> <p>Clerk, did you have the books ready, the trial procedures and the wearing in printed out, or how about the timing sheet? Did you read out the charge as if reading it for the first time? After awhile, did your swearing in improve, but it took you a few rounds to get there?</p>	<p>Minimal or at least beginning to emerge (bud) yet the development is simply not noted</p> <p>Dressed as a student. Emerging level of collegiality and courtroom procedures and protocol. It looked like you took the whole experience as a joke. You demonstrated that you have a limited ability to step into the role assigned with any realism, or effectiveness.</p> <p>I am glad you showed up to class As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial, you are emerging in your delivery of: direct examination(s) cross examination(s) opening statement summation /close stmt Objections raised, missed, responded to or defended.</p> <p>I am glad you showed up to class As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial, you are just emerging in your delivery of: direct examination(s) cross examination(s) credibility establishment Other: As a witness you gave a passable performance. You may have tripped up on facts or you did not elaborate on key details that should have been stated during direct. You may have reviewed your role with minimal focus on how it fit into the whole puzzle and it showed.</p> <p>I am glad you showed up to class.</p> <p>As a clerk, everything was spoon fed to you on the day and you did no preparation, not even watching the videos to prepare. In the end, you muddled through and did a passable job.</p>	<p>See level one and depending on how badly you used your time, you may be blow 50%</p> <p>Below: Direct Cross Open Close Obj</p> <p>Below: Direct Cross CRED</p> <p>See level one and depending on how badly you used your time, you may be blow 50%</p>

<p>-artist</p> <p>-newspaper reporter</p> <p>-judge</p> <p>Focus ... while a member of the jury, a lawyer or witness waiting (listening to others speaking)</p> <p>Jury duty</p> <p>Jury Write Up -due within 48hrs</p>	<p>Level 4</p> <p>Artist had a full set up, took photos, prepared a write up to explain the significant moment in each image. The images captured the depth of the situation at that moment.</p> <p>The reporter submitted an amazing news article that included quotes from witnesses and lawyers, and images from the case. Used the inverted pyramid.</p> <p>The judge ruled on objection and even interceded on their own. Made great notes during trial, prepared and delivered a charge to the jury, and was always in tune with the case. Moved the case along well, without aid, and used a confident tone. Really researched Judge and courtroom etiquette and language used.</p> <p>Always focused. Not using phone, taking notes for deliberation portion after trial, sitting up attentively at the lawyer desks, showing respect to peers who are earning marks and nervous. Not whispering in a way that distracts the teacher nor the participants.</p> <p>Day 1 Day 2 Day 3</p> <p>Actively participated in jury deliberations and helped the foreman. Allow other to speak, and speak up too.</p> <p>Jury write up: recaps the case- summary; identifies weaknesses and strengths in each case. You submitted your own decision, with two good reasons and commented on the jury's group decision. Comment on roles: your write up shows a witness's strengths as you voted them as best witness; and identifies one-two great moments with the lawyers or judge. The write up is reflective of the mock trial experience (preparation, researching, practicing, enacting, deliberating, and seeing it live on the field trip) and has opinions and take away. The jury write up is based on actual case facts brought out in the trial (reflections on witnesses and lawyers or judge is fact based and specific). It is unique, and it is insightful. It is on time.</p>	<p>Level 3</p> <p>As an artist or reporter, you were observed drawing, taking vital notes.</p> <p>News article was received with minimal delays, and it had real images from our case. The write ups show a good capture of the case issues.</p> <p>As a judge you ruled well on objections or none came your way. You took notes during the trial. You had a charge to the jury ready or you read one that the teacher gave you. It looks like you learned a lot from the experience.</p> <p>Good level of respect and attentiveness. Did not disrupt proceedings or give the message that the trial was not being followed. Respectful posture. Respectful voice (shh, and no paper rattling, nor getting up and trying to leave the class)</p> <p>Day 1 Day 2 Day 3</p> <p>Participated in the jury deliberations by listening and sharing.</p> <p>Jury write up shows that you were attentive to case facts. That you selected a few key moment to write about in terms of a good or bad point that struck you as a jury member. You offered points about the deliberations and you shared your decision. You reflected on the experience as a whole and what your take a ways are.</p>	<p>Level 2</p> <p>Artist – did you even sketch? Were you asked to redo? Where is the write up?</p> <p>Reporter, did you take any notes? Where is the article? Two weeks passed and I had to go hunt you down. Why is it so learn? Where are the quotes and why does it appear that you skimmed over the case in order to write something?</p> <p>Judge, did you have objections written out and in front of you? Did you even pay attention when the case was on in order to make a ruling? Charge to the jury? Did you take notes? How did it go? Convincing role with some degree of effectiveness? It looks like you learned something from the experiential task, but only at the final stages. Imagine what you could have done if you had that aha moment earlier.</p> <p>Fair level of respect – but more is expected. You may have been sleeping, working on other work, or otherwise disengaged in a way that was noted several times.</p> <p>Day 1 Day 2 Day 3</p> <p>You listened to others deliberate.</p> <p>Your jury write up is developing. It has case points. They appear more based on overall ideas rather than trial specific points or strengths and weaknesses. You have pointed out a good witness and why. You have more or less made a decision with some reasoning. Limited reflective elements.</p>	<p>Level 1</p> <p>You seem to have forgotten that you had the role of artist, nor what that includes. You were not seen sketching, or not until prompted. I am glad you showed up to class.</p> <p>The reporter never received your sketches for the article. The reporter did not take photos either so used stock photos. Article is missing many fundamentals of news reports and it really is a minimal effort.</p> <p>As a judge, you really only seemed to get that the robe is for you, but the idea of making ruling, charge to the jury, or knowing the letter of the law (charges etc) was completely missed in your planning. But you were here and you did the job. So that is something. I choose to believe that you learned a few things, but for the most part, it looks like you just survived... barely. I am glad you showed up to class.</p> <p>Minimal focus on trials and the arguments. May have even been disruptive, talking, and or walking around. Getting up, changing seats, eating, etc. Wow – pretty rude to peers. I am glad you showed up to class, it is something.</p> <p>Day 1 Day 2 Day 3</p> <p>Did not take part in deliberations and may have pulled away from the proceedings entirely. Absent?</p> <p>Your jury write up looks like a few thoughts tossed out on paper. It is hard to see the messaging you intend to convey. You may be talking in circles, but you are showing emerging thinking about a jury's role and deliberations. You have several elements lacking, but still made some efforts to pass. You have reflective elements, but very little case reflections. You could write this reflection without actual being in class as a jury. It has value about the overall experience.</p>	<p>fail</p> <p>See level one and depending on how badly you used your time, you may be blow 50%</p> <p>See level one and depending on how badly you used your time, you may be blow 50%</p> <p>See level one and depending on how badly you used your time, you may be blow 50%</p> <p>below</p> <p>We had to do a write up? Huh? None – zip Go back to sleep.</p> <p>See level</p>
---	---	---	---	---	---

Observations during planning stages Online document notes – 2 days before trial Add on: Case visual timeline, etc,	<p>Level 4</p> <p>Used class time well; asked the guest lawyer question (if available), came prepared for the run through. You took initiative and acted as a full team member. You sought outside help, came for teacher or coach feedback, and you created and refused drafts several times throughout the process. There is evidence of your progress throughout the preparation period. You led your team, you advocated for needed direct and cross examination opportunities. You provided supportive feedback to others. You used the in class time to its maximum effectiveness. These are teacher observations.</p>	<p>Level 3</p> <p>Good overall - mostly were discussing the case and conducting interviews and doing simulations. You may or may not have had a run through with the lawyer / teacher or asked some questions, but you listened well, took notes, and your group discussions were on topic. You did not appear to rely on others to make notes or create questions for you. When feedback was given, you responded well and made effort to incorporate the changes needed. You were collegial with your team, and were prepared so that they could also prepare. Overall, you did a good job preparing over the prep periods. These are teacher observations.</p>	<p>Level 2</p> <p>Fair but needs work to meet expectations. It took some coaxing to get you to participate and to come prepared for class prep days. At times, you were still confused about your roles and where to find the case facts. Yet over the prep time, you made progress each time. More is needed to reach provincial standards. You had the case out, you did some run throughs, you may have done a simulation and you made effort to work through your role. You requested help. On some of the days set aside for preparation, you used it to do other course work. You may or may not have done work at home, but the observations made were that the bulk of your work occurred at the very end of the process. These are teacher observations.</p>	<p>Level 1</p> <p>Minimal respect for the process. No case printed out or pulled up unless the teacher forced it. On run throughs it was evident that you had not prepared and were reading things for the first time. The in class time dedicated to mock trial preparation was barely used and you acted as an isolated individual, chatting with friends, if at all. Your preparation in class barely emerged throughout the process. You did not seek help when you were struggling. You appear to have done most of your prep, if much at all at the last minute. You have limited evidence of long-term preparation, and development for this task. These are teacher observations.</p>	<p>one and depending on how badly you used your time, you may be blow 50%</p>
	<p>Document looks thorough, updated often, and has exceptional value</p>	<p>Document has the essential elements asked of you and some notes to guide you during trial. You may have worked collaboratively on a group document and uploaded directly into this file the relevant elements asked of you. You added your grid of questions, and statements.</p>	<p>The document has been opened. A few lines have been filled in. And/or you “made my own personal file in another document” and did not add a link to this document. You likely added a little of the level 1 “we did one together”, which did not earn you much sway.</p>	<p>Opened, but really, this was ignored. Stated, “we all worked on a document together”, and figured that collaboration that is needed, removed you from submitting your own work as requested. Really, you did not seem to believe me when I said you were marked on these notes and progress.</p>	<p>Zip zip</p>
	<p>Exceptional Time Line.</p>	<p>Proficient Time Line</p>	<p>Developing Time Line</p>	<p>Emerging Time Line.</p>	<p>You are kidding, right?</p>

Mock Trial Marking Package

Case _____

Date of presentation: _____

Preparation Dates: _____

Students Involved:

Teacher: Mrs. Galveias
Course: CLU3M

	LEVEL 4	LEVEL 3	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 1	u/s
<p>Court Clerk:</p> <hr/> <p>-Exhibits prepared</p> <p>/ 5</p> <p>-Advance practice and prep of swearing in was noted</p> <p>-planned set up evident – bible/other holy book</p> <p>/ 5</p> <p>-reading of the charge</p> <p>-opening procedures</p> <p>/5</p> <p>-command of the court room</p> <p>-keeping order and noise down</p> <p>-using timing cards to ensure each team stays on time</p> <p>Swearing in duties during trial</p> <p>/10</p>	<p>Extraordinary...</p> <p>-Exhibits prepared</p> <p>-Advance practice and prep of swearing in observed</p> <p>-planned set up evident – bible/other holy book</p> <p>-reading of the charge</p> <p>-command of the court room</p> <p>Exceptional – looks like your real job. Notes minimally consulted. Done quickly to avoid courtroom delays.</p> <p>Exceptional</p> <p>exceptional</p>	<p>Good / at par</p> <p>-Exhibits prepared</p> <p>-Advance practice and prep of swearing in observed</p> <p>-planned set up evident – bible/other holy book</p> <p>-reading of the charge</p> <p>-command of the court room</p> <p>Good – you can tell you are getting the hang of it. Wish you could be quicker, more fluid, and avoid reading the whole time.</p> <p>Good</p> <p>good</p>	<p>Fair, but could be better...</p> <p>-Exhibits prepared</p> <p>-Advance practice and prep of swearing in observed</p> <p>-planned set up evident – bible/other holy book</p> <p>-reading of the charge</p> <p>-command of the court room</p> <p>You did it, but you had to be coached before court and there really is no time for this. You also used the notes all the time and had to ask for cues to get up.</p> <p>Satisfactory / fair</p> <p>Satisfactory / fair</p>	<p>Minimal ...</p> <p>-Exhibits prepared</p> <p>-Advance practice and prep of swearing in observed</p> <p>-planned set up evident – bible/other holy book</p> <p>-reading of the charge</p> <p>-command of the court room</p> <p>Teacher had to provide the paper, direct you what to do, and this took time. You still looked completely lost. This task was the easiest role and provided to you to set you up for success. You did the minimal, or maybe even less than the minimal. However, you did perform he role. The teacher may have had to cut out a few swearing ins for time’s sake. The teacher had to do a lot of your duties.</p> <p>Needs improvement</p>	

<p>Judge</p> <p>Beginning of trial: -robe and sash & demeanor of a Judge -awareness of rules of court -in charge –sets tone -calling the shots and asking counsel to proceed . /10</p>	<p>Extraordinary...</p> <p>-robe and sash & demeanor of a Judge -awareness of rules of court -completely in charge –sets professional, judicial tone Able to scold lawyers if they address each other. You will ask your clerk to settle the court down as needed.</p>	<p>Good / at par</p> <p>-robe and sash & demeanor of a Judge -awareness of rules of court -good at being in charge –sets tone -lawyers tend to have a good respect</p>	<p>Fair...</p> <p>-robe and sash & demeanor of a Judge -awareness of rules of court - Fairly in charge –sets tone -Some lawyers should have been scolded and you missed it.</p>	<p>Minimal...</p> <p>-robe and sash & demeanor of a Judge -awareness of rules of court -minimally in charge –sets tone -those lawyers are ready to eat you... they are running your court – ouch.</p>	
<p>Judges Rulings, attentiveness</p> <p>/15</p>	<p>Great rulings – you know the ruling types and are ready. Very focused Taking notes that appear to show a strong grasp.</p>	<p>Good rulings – objection notes at the ready Proficient focused Taking some notes, so it appear to show that you have a good grasp.</p>	<p>Some rulings – it does seem that you are unsure. You do not seemed to be ready for the objections. Try to have a cheat sheet with you. You look to be listening to the case.</p>	<p>You have perhaps made rulings, but they may have sounded very shaky, were wrong in the situation, or were flippant. You seem lost on the types of objections and no notes are visible. You sometimes get distracted on the bench, Your Honour.</p>	
<p>Charge to the Jury and receiving the verdict.</p> <p>/10</p>	<p>Solid understanding of the law, and the duties of a jury member. Clear essay prepared in advanced and some tweaking done to adjust to things that happened during the trial. Your charge to the jury is well thought out and planned (2-3 minutes)to direct the jury about the law and what they may or may not consider. Thank everyone for their time.</p>	<p>Some understanding that you have to address the jury and give instructions. -charge to the jury is planned (2-3 minutes) to direct the jury about the law and what they may or may not consider. If the Charge to the Jury was provided, then you read it well. You added nothing, but you read it with meaning and emphasis. Polite dealings with foreperson.</p>	<p>You did address the jury and excused the court after the session. You did a fairly good job. Your work leaves a bit more room to grow. If provided, I am not sure you even read over the charge, but you did read it to the class without much hesitation. I do not see the full provincial standard of understanding about addressing your court or jury and foreman.</p>	<p>You did not direct the jury about the law and what they may or may not consider. You look lost as you stumbled over the task. I do not think you remembered to consider a CTTJ. But you did try to get through, and for the most part you understood the role of the jury and that of yourself in rendering a verdict or directing the jury a bit. You remembered to ask the foreman for the verdict too. Nice.</p>	

	LEVEL 4	LEVEL 3	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 1	u/s
Crown Opening Statement: 1) Content /5	<p>Provided a clear and concise description of his/ her team's side of the case. Opening catches the jury's attention, confidently leads them through the evidence and lays out the case in a logical sequence.</p> <p>Clearly outlined the main argument of the case – malicious attack, etc.</p> <p>Identified who would present which facts that will support the case and what the J/J should listen to hear.</p>	<p>Description of the case is clear most of the time.</p> <p>Sometimes the case was being argued instead of identifying who would testify to what. Some details obscured.</p> <p>Jury has a good understanding of your version of the events, although they may have a few questions.</p>	<p>Although there was a description of the case, it was unclear at times. Jury had trouble absorbing your version of the events. You forget that they haven't heard the case yet. OR You tried to argue the case before establishing any facts.</p> <p>Over dramatized wording, that did not reveal a good layout of the case facts, what is important, nor who would be testifying in the trial on your behalf.</p>	<p>There was no clear, concise description of the case. Jury is very confused about your version of the case.</p> <p>No clear idea about the case facts, more of a slam- booyeah he did it, with no tangible content to advise a J/J about the trial details. No context provided.</p> <p>Statement seems like a "last minute" effort; unrehearsed.</p>	Feels like some one else gave this script to you and you read it.
2) delivery /5	<p>Powerful courtroom presence; great eye contact with the jury, confident and appropriate use of gestures. Volume and intonation capture and hold the attention of the jury; pace is swift enough to keep things interesting, but not so fast as to confuse them. Your overall impression is of a lawyer who is confident and in control.</p>	<p>Strong courtroom presence; good eye contact with the jury, confident and appropriate use of gestures. Volume and intonation catch the attention of the jury; pacing is good most of the time. Your overall impression is of a lawyer who is competent.</p>	<p>Courtroom presence is strong at times; some eye contact with the jury, and use of gestures. Volume and intonation vary, as does your pacing. Your overall impression is of a student pretending to be a lawyer.</p>	<p>Courtroom presence is weak; little eye contact with the jury, little to no use of gestures. Volume and intonation make it difficult to follow you at times. Your overall impression is of a student who is underprepared and/or overwhelmed.</p>	
Overall Collegiality of lawyer: /5	<p>Exceptional...</p> <p>Professional courtesies all observed. Introductions. Use of terms for Your Honour, Madam Justice, my friend, addressing the judge, not the lawyers, manner with the witnesses, etc.</p>	<p>Good/ at par...</p> <p>Professional courtesies all observed. Introductions. Use of terms for Your Honour, Madam Justice, my friend, addressing the judge, not the lawyers, manner with the witnesses, etc.</p>	<p>Fair but needs work and more effort...</p> <p>Professional courtesies all observed. Introductions. Use of terms for Your Honour, Madam Justice, my friend, addressing the judge, not the lawyers, manner with the witnesses, etc.</p>	<p>Very Minimal...</p> <p>Professional courtesies all observed. Introductions. Use of terms for Your Honour, Madam Justice, my friend, addressing the judge, not the lawyers, manner with the witnesses, etc.</p>	

	LEVEL 4	LEVEL 3	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 1	u/s
Crown: Direct Examination (witness #1) Lawyer's Name: /5	Used carefully sequenced, direct questions with clear, straight-forward answers; brought out all key facts needed from this witness.	Most of the questions were direct and straightforward, brought out key facts needed from this witness.	Some of the questions were direct and straightforward, but some important facts were left out.	Questions were poorly sequenced and/or neglected some of the key facts the witness needed to speak about.	
Crown Witness #1 Witness Name: Student Name: /10	Answers are fully developed and memorized; completely consistent with fact sheet. No deviations. Excellent character development—seems very real. Great costume, use of facial expressions and gestures. Confident responses on cross examination.	Answers are fully developed and consistent with fact sheet. No major deviations. Good character development—seems real. Good costume, use of facial expressions and gestures. Responses on cross examination are clear.	Answers are usually consistent with fact sheet, but there are some obvious deviations. Some character development—seems real at times. Costume is OK, some use of facial expressions and gestures. Responses on cross examination are sometimes unclear—you're vulnerable during cross.	Answers are inconsistent with fact sheet, and your deviations get you into trouble. You attempt some character development, but break character easily. No noticeable costume attempted. Responses on cross examination are sometimes unclear.	
Cross Examination: Lawyer's Name: /5	Brought out major contradictions or problems with testimony and substantially weakened other side's case; used properly phrased questions and exhibited clear understanding of trial procedures; all questions were leading. Great improvisation skills.	Brought out contradictions or problems with testimony and weakened other side's case; used properly phrased questions and exhibited good understanding of trial procedures; most questions were leading. Good improvisation skills.	Attempted to bring out contradictions with testimony; had some difficulty with phrasing questions; exhibited some understanding of trial procedures; some questions were leading. Poor improvisation skills.	Unable to draw out any contradictions with testimony from this witness; major difficulties wording questions; unable to improvise when witness does not respond as anticipated.	
Witness preparation pre-trial observations		/5			
Objections made for/by Defence					
Objections made for/by Crown					
Judge's performance and rulings					

	LEVEL 4	LEVEL 3	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 1	u/s
Crown: Direct Examination (witness #2) Lawyer's Name: /5	Used carefully sequenced, direct questions with clear, straight-forward answers; brought out all key facts needed from this witness.	Most of the questions were direct and straightforward, brought out key facts needed from this witness.	Some of the questions were direct and straightforward, but some important facts were left out.	Questions were poorly sequenced and/or neglected some of the key facts the witness needed to speak about.	
Crown Witness #2 Witness Name: Student Name: /10	Answers are fully developed and memorized; completely consistent with fact sheet. No deviations. Excellent character development—seems very real. Great costume, use of facial expressions and gestures. Confident responses on cross examination.	Answers are fully developed and consistent with fact sheet. No major deviations. Good character development—seems real. Good costume, use of facial expressions and gestures. Responses on cross examination are clear.	Answers are usually consistent with fact sheet, but there are some obvious deviations. Some character development—seems real at times. Costume is OK, some use of facial expressions and gestures. Responses on cross examination are sometimes unclear—you're vulnerable during cross.	Answers are inconsistent with fact sheet, and your deviations get you into trouble. You attempt some character development, but break character easily. No noticeable costume attempted. Responses on cross examination are sometimes unclear.	
Cross Examination: Lawyer's Name: /5	Brought out major contradictions or problems with testimony and substantially weakened other side's case; used properly phrased questions and exhibited clear understanding of trial procedures; all questions were leading. Great improvisation skills.	Brought out contradictions or problems with testimony and weakened other side's case; used properly phrased questions and exhibited good understanding of trial procedures; most questions were leading. Good improvisation skills.	Attempted to bring out contradictions with testimony; had some difficulty with phrasing questions; exhibited some understanding of trial procedures; some questions were leading. Poor improvisation skills.	Unable to draw out any contradictions with testimony from this witness; major difficulties wording questions; unable to improvise when witness does not respond as anticipated.	
Witness preparation pre-trial observations		/5			
Objections made for/by Defence					
Objections made for/by Crown					
Judge's performance and rulings					

	LEVEL 4	LEVEL 3	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 1	u/s
Crown: Direct Examination (witness #3) Lawyer's Name: /5	Used carefully sequenced, direct questions with clear, straight-forward answers; brought out all key facts needed from this witness.	Most of the questions were direct and straightforward, brought out key facts needed from this witness.	Some of the questions were direct and straightforward, but some important facts were left out.	Questions were poorly sequenced and/or neglected some of the key facts the witness needed to speak about.	
Crown Witness #3 Witness Name: Student Name: /10	Answers are fully developed and memorized; completely consistent with fact sheet. No deviations. Excellent character development—seems very real. Great costume, use of facial expressions and gestures. Confident responses on cross examination.	Answers are fully developed and consistent with fact sheet. No major deviations. Good character development—seems real. Good costume, use of facial expressions and gestures. Responses on cross examination are clear.	Answers are usually consistent with fact sheet, but there are some obvious deviations. Some character development—seems real at times. Costume is OK, some use of facial expressions and gestures. Responses on cross examination are sometimes unclear—you're vulnerable during cross.	Answers are inconsistent with fact sheet, and your deviations get you into trouble. You attempt some character development, but break character easily. No noticeable costume attempted. Responses on cross examination are sometimes unclear.	
Cross Examination: Lawyer's Name: /5	Brought out major contradictions or problems with testimony and substantially weakened other side's case; used properly phrased questions and exhibited clear understanding of trial procedures; all questions were leading. Great improvisation skills.	Brought out contradictions or problems with testimony and weakened other side's case; used properly phrased questions and exhibited good understanding of trial procedures; most questions were leading. Good improvisation skills.	Attempted to bring out contradictions with testimony; had some difficulty with phrasing questions; exhibited some understanding of trial procedures; some questions were leading. Poor improvisation skills.	Unable to draw out any contradictions with testimony from this witness; major difficulties wording questions; unable to improvise when witness does not respond as anticipated.	
Witness preparation pre-trial observations		/5			
Objections made for/by Defence					
Objections made for/by Crown					
Judge's performance and rulings					

	LEVEL 4	LEVEL 3	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 1	u/s
Crown: Direct Examination (witness #4) Lawyer's Name: /5	Used carefully sequenced, direct questions with clear, straight-forward answers; brought out all key facts needed from this witness.	Most of the questions were direct and straightforward, brought out key facts needed from this witness.	Some of the questions were direct and straightforward, but some important facts were left out.	Questions were poorly sequenced and/or neglected some of the key facts the witness needed to speak about.	
Crown Witness # Witness Name: Student Name: /10	Answers are fully developed and memorized; completely consistent with fact sheet. No deviations. Excellent character development—seems very real. Great costume, use of facial expressions and gestures. Confident responses on cross examination.	Answers are fully developed and consistent with fact sheet. No major deviations. Good character development—seems real. Good costume, use of facial expressions and gestures. Responses on cross examination are clear.	Answers are usually consistent with fact sheet, but there are some obvious deviations. Some character development—seems real at times. Costume is OK, some use of facial expressions and gestures. Responses on cross examination are sometimes unclear—you're vulnerable during cross.	Answers are inconsistent with fact sheet, and your deviations get you into trouble. You attempt some character development, but break character easily. No noticeable costume attempted. Responses on cross examination are sometimes unclear.	
Cross Examination: Lawyer's Name: /5	Brought out major contradictions or problems with testimony and substantially weakened other side's case; used properly phrased questions and exhibited clear understanding of trial procedures; all questions were leading. Great improvisation skills.	Brought out contradictions or problems with testimony and weakened other side's case; used properly phrased questions and exhibited good understanding of trial procedures; most questions were leading. Good improvisation skills.	Attempted to bring out contradictions with testimony; had some difficulty with phrasing questions; exhibited some understanding of trial procedures; some questions were leading. Poor improvisation skills.	Unable to draw out any contradictions with testimony from this witness; major difficulties wording questions; unable to improvise when witness does not respond as anticipated.	
Witness preparation pre-trial observations		/5			
Objections made for/by Defence					
Objections made for/by Crown					
Judge's performance and rulings					

	LEVEL 4	LEVEL 3	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 1	u/s
<p>Defense Opening Statement:</p> <p>By:</p> <p>1) content</p> <p>/5</p>	<p>Provided a clear and concise description of his/ her team's side of the case. Opening catches the jury's attention, confidently leads them through the evidence and lays out the case in a logical sequence. Clearly outlined the main argument of the case – unfortunate accident, etc.</p> <p>Identified who would present which facts that will support the case and what the J/J should listen to hear.</p>	<p>Description of the case is clear most of the time. Jury has a good understanding of your version of the events, although they may have a few questions.</p> <p>Sometimes the case was being argued instead of identifying who would testify to what. Some details obscured.</p>	<p>Although there was a description of the case, it was unclear at times. Jury had trouble absorbing your version of the events. You forget that they haven't heard the case yet. OR You tried to argue the case before establishing any facts.</p> <p>Over dramatized wording, that did not reveal a good layout of the case facts, what is important, nor who would be testifying in the trial on your behalf.</p>	<p>There was no clear, concise description of the case. Jury is very confused about your version of the case. Statement seems like a "last minute" effort; unrehearsed.</p> <p>No clear idea about the case facts, more of a slam- booyeah he did it, with no tangible content to advise a J/J about the trial details. No context provided.</p>	
<p>2) delivery</p> <p>/5</p>	<p>Powerful courtroom presence; great eye contact with the jury, confident and appropriate use of gestures. Volume and intonation capture and hold the attention of the jury; pace is swift enough to keep things interesting, but not so fast as to confuse them. Your overall impression is of a lawyer who is confident and in control.</p>	<p>Strong courtroom presence; good eye contact with the jury, confident and appropriate use of gestures. Volume and intonation catch the attention of the jury; pacing is good most of the time. Your overall impression is of a lawyer who is competent.</p>	<p>Courtroom presence is strong at times; some eye contact with the jury, and use of gestures. Volume and intonation vary, as does your pacing. Your overall impression is of a student pretending to be a lawyer.</p>	<p>Courtroom presence is weak; little eye contact with the jury, little to no use of gestures. Volume and intonation make it difficult to follow you at times. Your overall impression is of a student who is underprepared and/or overwhelmed.</p>	
<p>Overall Collegiality of lawyer:</p> <p>/5</p>	<p>Exceptional...</p> <p>Professional courtesies all observed. Introductions. Use of terms for Your Honour, Madam Justice, my friend, addressing the judge, not the lawyers, manner with the witnesses, etc.</p>	<p>Good/ at par...</p> <p>Professional courtesies all observed. Introductions. Use of terms for Your Honour, Madam Justice, my friend, addressing the judge, not the lawyers, manner with the witnesses, etc.</p>	<p>Fair but needs work and more effort...</p> <p>Professional courtesies all observed. Introductions. Use of terms for Your Honour, Madam Justice, my friend, addressing the judge, not the lawyers, manner with the witnesses, etc.</p>	<p>Very Minimal...</p> <p>Professional courtesies all observed. Introductions. Use of terms for Your Honour, Madam Justice, my friend, addressing the judge, not the lawyers, manner with the witnesses, etc.</p>	

	LEVEL 4	LEVEL 3	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 1	u/s
Defendant: Direct Examination (witness #1) Lawyer's Name: /5	Used carefully sequenced, direct questions with clear, straight-forward answers; brought out all key facts needed from this witness.	Most of the questions were direct and straightforward, brought out key facts needed from this witness.	Some of the questions were direct and straightforward, but some important facts were left out.	Questions were poorly sequenced and/or neglected some of the key facts the witness needed to speak about	
Defendant Witness #1 Witness Name: Student Name: /10	Answers are fully developed and memorized; completely consistent with fact sheet. No deviations. Excellent character development—seems very real. Great costume, use of facial expressions and gestures. Confident responses on cross examination.	Answers are fully developed and consistent with fact sheet. No major deviations. Good character development—seems real. Good costume, use of facial expressions and gestures. Responses on cross examination are clear	Answers are usually consistent with fact sheet, but there are some obvious deviations. Some character development—seems real at times. Costume is OK, some use of facial expressions and gestures. Responses on cross examination are sometimes unclear—you're vulnerable during cross.	Answers are inconsistent with fact sheet, and your deviations get you into trouble. You attempt some character development, but break character easily. No noticeable costume attempted. Responses on cross examination are sometimes unclear.	
Cross Examination: /5	Brought out major contradictions or problems with testimony and substantially weakened other side's case; used properly phrased questions and exhibited clear understanding of trial procedures; all questions were leading. Great improvisation skills.	Brought out contradictions or problems with testimony and weakened other side's case; used properly phrased questions and exhibited good understanding of trial procedures; most questions were leading. Good improvisation skills.	Attempted to bring out contradictions with testimony; had some difficulty with phrasing questions; exhibited some understanding of trial procedures; some questions were leading. Poor improvisation skills.	Unable to draw out any contradictions with testimony from this witness; major difficulties wording questions; unable to improvise when witness does not respond as anticipated.	
Witness preparation pre-trial observations		/5			
Objections made for/by Defence					
Objections made for/by Crown					
Judge's performance and rulings					

	LEVEL 4	LEVEL 3	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 1	u/s
Defendant: Direct Examination (witness #2) Lawyer's Name: /5	Used carefully sequenced, direct questions with clear, straight-forward answers; brought out all key facts needed from this witness.	Most of the questions were direct and straightforward, brought out key facts needed from this witness.	Some of the questions were direct and straightforward, but some important facts were left out.	Questions were poorly sequenced and/or neglected some of the key facts the witness needed to speak about	
Defendant Witness #2 Witness Name: Student Name: /10	Answers are fully developed and memorized; completely consistent with fact sheet. No deviations. Excellent character development—seems very real. Great costume, use of facial expressions and gestures. Confident responses on cross examination.	Answers are fully developed and consistent with fact sheet. No major deviations. Good character development—seems real. Good costume, use of facial expressions and gestures. Responses on cross examination are clear	Answers are usually consistent with fact sheet, but there are some obvious deviations. Some character development—seems real at times. Costume is OK, some use of facial expressions and gestures. Responses on cross examination are sometimes unclear—you're vulnerable during cross.	Answers are inconsistent with fact sheet, and your deviations get you into trouble. You attempt some character development, but break character easily. No noticeable costume attempted. Responses on cross examination are sometimes unclear.	
Cross Examination: /5	Brought out major contradictions or problems with testimony and substantially weakened other side's case; used properly phrased questions and exhibited clear understanding of trial procedures; all questions were leading. Great improvisation skills.	Brought out contradictions or problems with testimony and weakened other side's case; used properly phrased questions and exhibited good understanding of trial procedures; most questions were leading. Good improvisation skills.	Attempted to bring out contradictions with testimony; had some difficulty with phrasing questions; exhibited some understanding of trial procedures; some questions were leading. Poor improvisation skills.	Unable to draw out any contradictions with testimony from this witness; major difficulties wording questions; unable to improvise when witness does not respond as anticipated.	
Witness preparation pre-trial observations		/5			
Objections made for/by Defence					
Objections made for/by Crown					
Judge's performance and rulings					

	LEVEL 4	LEVEL 3	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 1	u/s
Defendant: Direct Examination (witness #3) Lawyer's Name: /5	Used carefully sequenced, direct questions with clear, straight-forward answers; brought out all key facts needed from this witness.	Most of the questions were direct and straightforward, brought out key facts needed from this witness.	Some of the questions were direct and straightforward, but some important facts were left out.	Questions were poorly sequenced and/or neglected some of the key facts the witness needed to speak about	
Defendant Witness #3 Witness Name: Student Name: /10	Answers are fully developed and memorized; completely consistent with fact sheet. No deviations. Excellent character development—seems very real. Great costume, use of facial expressions and gestures. Confident responses on cross examination.	Answers are fully developed and consistent with fact sheet. No major deviations. Good character development—seems real. Good costume, use of facial expressions and gestures. Responses on cross examination are clear	Answers are usually consistent with fact sheet, but there are some obvious deviations. Some character development—seems real at times. Costume is OK, some use of facial expressions and gestures. Responses on cross examination are sometimes unclear—you're vulnerable during cross.	Answers are inconsistent with fact sheet, and your deviations get you into trouble. You attempt some character development, but break character easily. No noticeable costume attempted. Responses on cross examination are sometimes unclear.	
Cross Examination: /5	Brought out major contradictions or problems with testimony and substantially weakened other side's case; used properly phrased questions and exhibited clear understanding of trial procedures; all questions were leading. Great improvisation skills.	Brought out contradictions or problems with testimony and weakened other side's case; used properly phrased questions and exhibited good understanding of trial procedures; most questions were leading. Good improvisation skills.	Attempted to bring out contradictions with testimony; had some difficulty with phrasing questions; exhibited some understanding of trial procedures; some questions were leading. Poor improvisation skills.	Unable to draw out any contradictions with testimony from this witness; major difficulties wording questions; unable to improvise when witness does not respond as anticipated.	
Witness preparation pre-trial observations		/5			
Objections made for/by Defence					
Objections made for/by Crown					
Judge's performance and rulings					

	LEVEL 4	LEVEL 3	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 1	u/s
Defendant: Direct Examination (witness #4) Lawyer's Name: /5	Used carefully sequenced, direct questions with clear, straight-forward answers; brought out all key facts needed from this witness.	Most of the questions were direct and straightforward, brought out key facts needed from this witness.	Some of the questions were direct and straightforward, but some important facts were left out.	Questions were poorly sequenced and/or neglected some of the key facts the witness needed to speak about	
Defendant Witness #4 Witness Name: Student Name: /10	<p>Answers are fully developed and memorized; completely consistent with fact sheet. No deviations. Excellent character development—seems very real. Great costume, use of facial expressions and gestures.</p> <p>Confident responses on cross examination.</p>	<p>Answers are fully developed and consistent with fact sheet. No major deviations. Good character development—seems real. Good costume, use of facial expressions and gestures.</p> <p>Responses on cross examination are clear</p>	<p>Answers are usually consistent with fact sheet, but there are some obvious deviations. Some character development—seems real at times. Costume is OK, some use of facial expressions and gestures.</p> <p>Responses on cross examination are sometimes unclear—you're vulnerable during cross.</p>	<p>Answers are inconsistent with fact sheet, and your deviations get you into trouble. You attempt some character development, but break character easily. No noticeable costume attempted.</p> <p>Responses on cross examination are sometimes unclear.</p>	
Cross Examination: /5	Brought out major contradictions or problems with testimony and substantially weakened other side's case; used properly phrased questions and exhibited clear understanding of trial procedures; all questions were leading. Great improvisation skills.	Brought out contradictions or problems with testimony and weakened other side's case; used properly phrased questions and exhibited good understanding of trial procedures; most questions were leading. Good improvisation skills.	Attempted to bring out contradictions with testimony; had some difficulty with phrasing questions; exhibited some understanding of trial procedures; some questions were leading. Poor improvisation skills.	Unable to draw out any contradictions with testimony from this witness; major difficulties wording questions; unable to improvise when witness does not respond as anticipated.	
Witness preparation pre-trial observations		/5			
Objections made for/by Defence					
Objections made for/by Crown					
Judge's performance and rulings					

	LEVEL 4	LEVEL 3	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 1	u/s
<p>Crown's Closing Statement: By:</p> <p>1) content</p> <p>/5</p>	<p>Made an organized, memorable and well-reasoned presentation summarizing all the important points of the case. Clearly outlined the main argument of the case – malicious attack, etc.</p> <p>Point out specifically how your witnesses prove beyond a reasonable doubt...</p> <p>Identify ideas the defense has tried to confuse you with and identify how it does not confuse the issue.</p> <p>Left a profound and lasting impression on the jury.</p>	<p>Made an organized, and well-reasoned presentation summarizing most the important points of the case.</p> <p>Most prepared in advance and not much adjustments made to address issues brought up in witness testimony.</p> <p>Clear connection to the charge and the elements of the crime needed to be proven. Linking to these elements in a good way.</p> <p>Left a good impression on the jury.</p>	<p>Presentation summarized some of the important points of the case, but left out a few key points.</p> <p>Scripted. Moderate idea of a closing argument content. Too short or way too long.</p> <p>Limited connection to the legal charge and mens rea or actus reus.</p> <p>Left a weak impression on the jury.</p>	<p>Presentation was very poorly organized and did not represent the case well.</p> <p>Not suitable for a closing. No case recap nor connection to case facts. Not even sure how you connect the case to the charge.</p> <p>Left a bad impression on the jury.</p>	<p>Feels like someone else gave this script to you and you read it.</p>
<p>2) delivery</p> <p>/5</p>	<p>Powerful courtroom presence; great eye contact with the jury, confident and appropriate use of gestures. Volume and intonation capture and hold the attention of the jury; pace is swift enough to keep things interesting, but not so fast as to confuse them. Your overall impression is of a lawyer who is confident and in control.</p>	<p>Strong courtroom presence; good eye contact with the jury, confident and appropriate use of gestures. Volume and intonation catch the attention of the jury; pacing is good most of the time. Your overall impression is of a lawyer who is competent.</p>	<p>Courtroom presence is strong at times; some eye contact with the jury, and use of gestures. Volume and intonation vary, as does your pacing. Your overall impression is of a student pretending to be a lawyer.</p>	<p>Courtroom presence is weak; little eye contact with the jury, little to no use of gestures. Volume and intonation make it difficult to follow you at times. Your overall impression is of a student who is underprepared and/or overwhelmed.</p>	<p>Dry, rushed, unprofessional</p>
<p>Overall Collegiality of lawyer:</p> <p>/5</p>	<p>Exceptional...</p> <p>Professional courtesies all observed.</p> <p>Introductions.</p> <p>Use of terms for Your Honour, Madam Justice, my friend, addressing the judge, not the lawyers, manner with the witnesses, etc.</p>	<p>Good/ at par...</p> <p>Professional courtesies all observed.</p> <p>Introductions.</p> <p>Use of terms for Your Honour, Madam Justice, my friend, addressing the judge, not the lawyers, manner with the witnesses, etc.</p>	<p>Fair but needs work and more effort...</p> <p>Professional courtesies all observed.</p> <p>Introductions.</p> <p>Use of terms for Your Honour, Madam Justice, my friend, addressing the judge, not the lawyers, manner with the witnesses, etc.</p>	<p>Very Minimal...</p> <p>Professional courtesies all observed.</p> <p>Introductions.</p> <p>Use of terms for Your Honour, Madam Justice, my friend, addressing the judge, not the lawyers, manner with the witnesses, etc.</p>	

	LEVEL 4	LEVEL 3	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 1	u/s
Defendant's Closing Statement: By: 1) content /5	Made an organized, memorable and well-reasoned presentation summarizing all of the important points of the case. Left a profound and lasting impression on the jury.	Made an organized, and well-reasoned presentation summarizing most the important points of the case. Left a good impression on the jury.	Presentation summarized some of the important points of the case, but left out a few key points. Left a weak impression on the jury.	Presentation was very poorly organized and did not represent the case well. Left a bad impression on the jury.	
2) delivery /5	Powerful courtroom presence; great eye contact with the jury, confident and appropriate use of gestures. Volume and intonation capture and hold the attention of the jury; pace is swift enough to keep things interesting, but not so fast as to confuse them. Your overall impression is of a lawyer who is confident and in control.	Strong courtroom presence; good eye contact with the jury, confident and appropriate use of gestures. Volume and intonation catch the attention of the jury; pacing is good most of the time. Your overall impression is of a lawyer who is competent.	Courtroom presence is strong at times; some eye contact with the jury, and use of gestures. Volume and intonation vary, as does your pacing. Your overall impression is of a student pretending to be a lawyer.	Courtroom presence is weak; little eye contact with the jury, little to no use of gestures. Volume and intonation make it difficult to follow you at times. Your overall impression is of a student who is underprepared and/or overwhelmed.	
Overall Collegiality of lawyer: /5	Exceptional... Professional courtesies all observed. Introductions. Use of terms for Your Honour, Madam Justice, my friend, addressing the judge, not the lawyers, manner with the witnesses, etc.	Good/ at par... Professional courtesies all observed. Introductions. Use of terms for Your Honour, Madam Justice, my friend, addressing the judge, not the lawyers, manner with the witnesses, etc.	Fair but needs work and more effort... Professional courtesies all observed. Introductions. Use of terms for Your Honour, Madam Justice, my friend, addressing the judge, not the lawyers, manner with the witnesses, etc.	Very Minimal... Professional courtesies all observed. Introductions. Use of terms for Your Honour, Madam Justice, my friend, addressing the judge, not the lawyers, manner with the witnesses, etc.	

	LEVEL 4	LEVEL 3	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 1	u/s
<p>Judge</p> <p>end of trial observations about: demeanor of a Judge</p> <p>-awareness of rules of court -in charge –sets tone</p> <p>-neutrality</p> <p>-collegiality/ professionalism</p> <p>-knowledge of the case and</p> <p>-knowledge of the law</p> <p>-extras done to prepare the case (exhibits, research, all of these extras that demonstrate an enrichment and embracing of the role of a judge.</p> <p>- you gave a verdict - you gave solid reasoning -you addressed the mens rea and actus reus -you remanded court -have you done this before? -exceptional skills</p> <p>/ 10</p> <p>-verdict rendered after jury deliberation. (if they are hung, you provide a verdict and REASONING. -then remand court over for sentencing in two weeks.</p> <p>/5</p>	<p>Extraordinary end of trial observations about: demeanor of a Judge</p> <p>-awareness of rules of court -in charge –sets tone</p> <p>-neutrality</p> <p>-collegiality/ professionalism</p> <p>-knowledge of the case and</p> <p>-knowledge of the law</p> <p>-extras done to prepare the case (exhibits, research, all of these extras that demonstrate an enrichment and embracing of the role of a judge.</p> <p>- you gave a verdict - you gave solid reasoning -you addressed the mens rea and actus reus -you remanded court -have you done this before? -exceptional skills</p>	<p>Good / at par end of trial observations about: demeanor of a Judge</p> <p>-awareness of rules of court -in charge –sets tone</p> <p>-neutrality</p> <p>-collegiality/ professionalism</p> <p>-knowledge of the case and</p> <p>-knowledge of the law</p> <p>-good job</p> <p>Mostly – at expected level of success - proficiency</p>	<p>Fair end of trial observations about: demeanor of a Judge</p> <p>-awareness of rules of court -in charge –sets tone</p> <p>-neutrality</p> <p>-collegiality/ professionalism</p> <p>-knowledge of the case and</p> <p>-knowledge of the law</p> <p>-moderate job – we are not calling you up to the Supreme Court though</p> <p>- developing these skills</p>	<p>Minimal end of trial observations about: demeanor of a Judge</p> <p>-awareness of rules of court -in charge –sets tone</p> <p>-neutrality</p> <p>-collegiality/ professionalism</p> <p>-knowledge of the case and</p> <p>-knowledge of the law</p> <p>-passable</p> <p>- emerging skills - some of these elements may be present in some form or another. - You are just starting to grasp the idea</p>	

	LEVEL 4	LEVEL 3	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 1	u/s
Witness	Extraordinary	Good / at par	Fair	Minimal	
Seriousness during trial /1	Very serious and in role when “on” and when sitting	Good	Fair	Minimal	
Focus while a member of the jury (so listening to others speaking) /2	Always focused. Not using phone, taking notes for deliberation paper, showing respect to peers who are earning marks and nervous	Good level of respect	Fair level of respect – but more is expected	Minimal respect for the process	
Observations during planning stages /2	Used class time well; asked the guest lawyer questions, came prepared for run through; did not appear to rely on others to make notes or create questions – you took initiative and acted as a full team member. These are teacher observations.	Good	Fair	Did not use class time well; ask the guest lawyer enough questions, come prepared for run throughs; appeared to rely on others to make notes or create questions – you took no noticeable initiative and did not act as a noticeable team member. These are teacher observations.	
Score from direct and cross examination /10	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	

	LEVEL 4	LEVEL 3	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 1	u/s
Witness	Extraordinary	Good / at par	Fair	Minimal	
Seriousness during trial /1	Very serious and in role when “on” and when sitting	Good	Fair	Minimal	
Focus while a member of the jury (so listening to others speaking) /2	Always focused. Not using phone, taking notes for deliberation paper, showing respect to peers who are earning marks and nervous	Good level of respect	Fair level of respect – but more is expected	Minimal respect for the process	
Observations during planning stages /2	Used class time well; asked the guest lawyer questions, came prepared for run through; did not appear to rely on others to make notes or create questions – you took initiative and acted as a full team member. These are teacher observations.	Good	Fair	Did not use class time well; ask the guest lawyer enough questions, come prepared for run throughs; appeared to rely on others to make notes or create questions – you took no noticeable initiative and did not act as a noticeable team member. These are teacher observations.	
Score from direct and cross examination /10	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	

	LEVEL 4	LEVEL 3	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 1	u/s
Witness	Extraordinary	Good / at par	Fair	Minimal	
Seriousness during trial /1	Very serious and in role when “on” and when sitting	Good	Fair	Minimal	
Focus while a member of the jury (so listening to others speaking) /2	Always focused. Not using phone, taking notes for deliberation paper, showing respect to peers who are earning marks and nervous	Good level of respect	Fair level of respect – but more is expected	Minimal respect for the process	
Observations during planning stages /2	Used class time well; asked the guest lawyer questions, came prepared for run through; did not appear to rely on others to make notes or create questions – you took initiative and acted as a full team member. These are teacher observations.	Good	Fair	Did not use class time well; ask the guest lawyer enough questions, come prepared for run throughs; appeared to rely on others to make notes or create questions – you took no noticeable initiative and did not act as a noticeable team member. These are teacher observations.	
Score from direct and cross examination /10	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	

	LEVEL 4	LEVEL 3	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 1	u/s
Witness	Extraordinary	Good / at par	Fair	Minimal	
Seriousness during trial /1	Very serious and in role when “on” and when sitting	Good	Fair	Minimal	
Focus while a member of the jury (so listening to others speaking) /2	Always focused. Not using phone, taking notes for deliberation paper, showing respect to peers who are earning marks and nervous	Good level of respect	Fair level of respect – but more is expected	Minimal respect for the process	
Observations during planning stages /2	Used class time well; asked the guest lawyer questions, came prepared for run through; did not appear to rely on others to make notes or create questions – you took initiative and acted as a full team member. These are teacher observations.	Good	Fair	Did not use class time well; ask the guest lawyer enough questions, come prepared for run throughs; appeared to rely on others to make notes or create questions – you took no noticeable initiative and did not act as a noticeable team member. These are teacher observations.	
Score from direct and cross examination /10	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	

	LEVEL 4	LEVEL 3	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 1	u/s
Witness	Extraordinary	Good / at par	Fair	Minimal	
Seriousness during trial /1	Very serious and in role when “on” and when sitting	Good	Fair	Minimal	
Focus while a member of the jury (so listening to others speaking) /2	Always focused. Not using phone, taking notes for deliberation paper, showing respect to peers who are earning marks and nervous	Good level of respect	Fair level of respect – but more is expected	Minimal respect for the process	
Observations during planning stages /2	Used class time well; asked the guest lawyer questions, came prepared for run through; did not appear to rely on others to make notes or create questions – you took initiative and acted as a full team member. These are teacher observations.	Good	Fair	Did not use class time well; ask the guest lawyer enough questions, come prepared for run throughs; appeared to rely on others to make notes or create questions – you took no noticeable initiative and did not act as a noticeable team member. These are teacher observations.	
Score from direct and cross examination /10	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	

	LEVEL 4	LEVEL 3	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 1	u/s
Witness	Extraordinary	Good / at par	Fair	Minimal	
Seriousness during trial /1	Very serious and in role when “on” and when sitting	Good	Fair	Minimal	
Focus while a member of the jury (so listening to others speaking) /2	Always focused. Not using phone, taking notes for deliberation paper, showing respect to peers who are earning marks and nervous	Good level of respect	Fair level of respect – but more is expected	Minimal respect for the process	
Observations during planning stages /2	Used class time well; asked the guest lawyer questions, came prepared for run through; did not appear to rely on others to make notes or create questions – you took initiative and acted as a full team member. These are teacher observations.	Good	Fair	Did not use class time well; ask the guest lawyer enough questions, come prepared for run throughs; appeared to rely on others to make notes or create questions – you took no noticeable initiative and did not act as a noticeable team member. These are teacher observations.	
Score from direct and cross examination /10	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	

	LEVEL 4	LEVEL 3	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 1	u/s
Witness	Extraordinary	Good / at par	Fair	Minimal	
Seriousness during trial /1	Very serious and in role when “on” and when sitting	Good	Fair	Minimal	
Focus while a member of the jury (so listening to others speaking) /2	Always focused. Not using phone, taking notes for deliberation paper, showing respect to peers who are earning marks and nervous	Good level of respect	Fair level of respect – but more is expected	Minimal respect for the process	
Observations during planning stages /2	Used class time well; asked the guest lawyer questions, came prepared for run through; did not appear to rely on others to make notes or create questions – you took initiative and acted as a full team member. These are teacher observations.	Good	Fair	Did not use class time well; ask the guest lawyer enough questions, come prepared for run throughs; appeared to rely on others to make notes or create questions – you took no noticeable initiative and did not act as a noticeable team member. These are teacher observations.	
Score from direct and cross examination /10	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	

	LEVEL 4	LEVEL 3	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 1	u/s
Witness	Extraordinary	Good / at par	Fair	Minimal	
Seriousness during trial /1	Very serious and in role when “on” and when sitting	Good	Fair	Minimal	
Focus while a member of the jury (so listening to others speaking) /2	Always focused. Not using phone, taking notes for deliberation paper, showing respect to peers who are earning marks and nervous	Good level of respect	Fair level of respect – but more is expected	Minimal respect for the process	
Observations during planning stages /2	Used class time well; asked the guest lawyer questions, came prepared for run through; did not appear to rely on others to make notes or create questions – you took initiative and acted as a full team member. These are teacher observations.	Good	Fair	Did not use class time well; ask the guest lawyer enough questions, come prepared for run throughs; appeared to rely on others to make notes or create questions – you took no noticeable initiative and did not act as a noticeable team member. These are teacher observations.	
Score from direct and cross examination /10	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	

	LEVEL 4	LEVEL 3	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 1	u/s
Lawyer	Extraordinary	Good / at par	Fair	Minimal	
Seriousness during trial /1	Very serious and in role when “on” and when sitting	Good	Fair	Minimal	
Focus while a member of the jury (so listening to others speaking) /2	Always focused. Not using phone, taking notes for deliberation paper, showing respect to peers who are earning marks and nervous	Good level of respect	Fair level of respect – but more is expected	Minimal respect for the process	
Observations during planning stages /2	Used class time well; asked the guest lawyer questions, came prepared for run through; did not appear to rely on others to make notes or create questions – you took initiative and acted as a full team member. These are teacher observations.	Good	Fair	Did not use class time well; ask the guest lawyer enough questions, come prepared for run throughs; appeared to rely on others to make notes or create questions – you took no noticeable initiative and did not act as a noticeable team member. These are teacher observations.	
Score from direct and cross examinations /10	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	
Score from opening or closing /10	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	
Objections raised or missed /5	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	

	LEVEL 4	LEVEL 3	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 1	u/s
Lawyer	Extraordinary	Good / at par	Fair	Minimal	
Seriousness during trial /1	Very serious and in role when “on” and when sitting	Good	Fair	Minimal	
Focus while a member of the jury (so listening to others speaking) /2	Always focused. Not using phone, taking notes for deliberation paper, showing respect to peers who are earning marks and nervous	Good level of respect	Fair level of respect – but more is expected	Minimal respect for the process	
Observations during planning stages /2	Used class time well; asked the guest lawyer questions, came prepared for run through; did not appear to rely on others to make notes or create questions – you took initiative and acted as a full team member. These are teacher observations.	Good	Fair	Did not use class time well; ask the guest lawyer enough questions, come prepared for run throughs; appeared to rely on others to make notes or create questions – you took no noticeable initiative and did not act as a noticeable team member. These are teacher observations.	
Score from direct and cross examinations /10	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	
Score from opening or closing /10	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	
Objections raised or missed /5	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	

	LEVEL 4	LEVEL 3	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 1	u/s
Lawyer	Extraordinary	Good / at par	Fair	Minimal	
Seriousness during trial /1	Very serious and in role when “on” and when sitting	Good	Fair	Minimal	
Focus while a member of the jury (so listening to others speaking) /2	Always focused. Not using phone, taking notes for deliberation paper, showing respect to peers who are earning marks and nervous	Good level of respect	Fair level of respect – but more is expected	Minimal respect for the process	
Observations during planning stages /2	Used class time well; asked the guest lawyer questions, came prepared for run through; did not appear to rely on others to make notes or create questions – you took initiative and acted as a full team member. These are teacher observations.	Good	Fair	Did not use class time well; ask the guest lawyer enough questions, come prepared for run throughs; appeared to rely on others to make notes or create questions – you took no noticeable initiative and did not act as a noticeable team member. These are teacher observations.	
Score from direct and cross examinations /10	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	
Score from opening or closing /10	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	
Objections raised or missed /5	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	

	LEVEL 4	LEVEL 3	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 1	u/s
Lawyer	Extraordinary	Good / at par	Fair	Minimal	
Seriousness during trial /1	Very serious and in role when “on” and when sitting	Good	Fair	Minimal	
Focus while a member of the jury (so listening to others speaking) /2	Always focused. Not using phone, taking notes for deliberation paper, showing respect to peers who are earning marks and nervous	Good level of respect	Fair level of respect – but more is expected	Minimal respect for the process	
Observations during planning stages /2	Used class time well; asked the guest lawyer questions, came prepared for run through; did not appear to rely on others to make notes or create questions – you took initiative and acted as a full team member. These are teacher observations.	Good	Fair	Did not use class time well; ask the guest lawyer enough questions, come prepared for run throughs; appeared to rely on others to make notes or create questions – you took no noticeable initiative and did not act as a noticeable team member. These are teacher observations.	
Score from direct and cross examinations /10	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	
Score from opening or closing /10	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	
Objections raised or missed /5	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	

	LEVEL 4	LEVEL 3	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 1	u/s
Lawyer	Extraordinary	Good / at par	Fair	Minimal	
Seriousness during trial /1	Very serious and in role when “on” and when sitting	Good	Fair	Minimal	
Focus while a member of the jury (so listening to others speaking) /2	Always focused. Not using phone, taking notes for deliberation paper, showing respect to peers who are earning marks and nervous	Good level of respect	Fair level of respect – but more is expected	Minimal respect for the process	
Observations during planning stages /2	Used class time well; asked the guest lawyer questions, came prepared for run through; did not appear to rely on others to make notes or create questions – you took initiative and acted as a full team member. These are teacher observations.	Good	Fair	Did not use class time well; ask the guest lawyer enough questions, come prepared for run throughs; appeared to rely on others to make notes or create questions – you took no noticeable initiative and did not act as a noticeable team member. These are teacher observations.	
Score from direct and cross examinations /10	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	
Score from opening or closing /10	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	
Objections raised or missed /5	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	As seen in the other rubric dealing with your performance in the trial.	