

Assessment Rubric for
Law Skills 3 Trial Advocacy

Describe student's performance on each of the below assessment areas as one of the following:

Displays High Competence
Displays Average Competence
Displays Minimal Competence
Fails to Display Minimal Competence

1. Rate student's ability, in the context of a deposition, to learn and develop critical information.
2. Rate student's ability to identify and articulate a convincing factual theory of the case and a persuasive theme in the context of opening statement and closing argument.
3. Rate student's ability to present facts clearly and persuasively through direct examination of a witness.
4. Rate student's ability to identify relevant avenues for impeachment and to pursue those avenues through leading questions on cross-examination.

See the following page for a detailed breakdown of the assessment criteria for the preceding four areas.

Dimensions	High Competence	Average Competence	Minimal Competence	Fails to Display Minimal Competence
Student's ability, in the context of a deposition, to learn and develop critical information	Student's questions maximized ability to learn and develop critical information	Student's questions generally demonstrated ability to learn and develop critical information	Student's questions inconsistently demonstrated ability to learn and develop critical information	Student's questions failed to demonstrate ability to learn or develop critical information
Student's ability to identify and articulate a convincing factual theory of the case and a persuasive theme in the context of opening statement and closing argument	Student clearly identifies and persuasively articulates a convincing factual theory of the case in his/her opening statement and closing argument	Student identifies and articulates a plausible factual theory of the case in his/her opening statement and closing argument, but not as clearly or persuasively as possible	Student has a plausible factual theory of the case in his/her opening statement and closing argument, but does not articulate that theory in a clear or persuasive manner	Student fails to identify and articulate a plausible factual theory of the case in his/her opening statement and closing argument
Student's ability to present facts clearly and persuasively through direct examination of a witness	Student's direct examination uses only open-ended questions and proceeds in a logical, persuasive manner	Student's direct examination uses consistently open-ended questions and proceeds in a generally logical, persuasive manner	Student's direct examination uses mostly open-ended questions and proceeds in a minimally logical, persuasive manner	Student's direct examination consistently fails to use open-ended questions and fails to proceed in a minimally logical, persuasive manner
Student's ability to identify relevant avenues of impeachment and to pursue those avenues through leading questions on cross-examination	Student pursues a few, particularly promising avenues of impeachment and uses only leading questions to make points	Student pursues relevant avenues of impeachment and generally uses leading questions to make points	Student pursues both relevant and irrelevant avenues of impeachment and uses more leading than open-ended questions to make points	Student fails to pursue relevant avenues of impeachment and consistently fails to use leading questions to make points