SUPREME COURT APPEAL: LAWYER RUBRIC

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **LEVEL ONE** | **LEVEL TWO** | **LEVEL THREE** | **LEVEL FOUR** |
| **Knowledge/**  **Understanding** | Factum - Issue & Use of Proper Legal Terms | Throughout the factum, the student shows a lack of understanding of the issue/s w/ poor use of proper legal terms | Throughout the factum, the student shows a general understanding of the issue/s w/ some proper legal terms | Throughout the factum, the student shows a good understanding of the issue/s w/ good use of proper legal terms | Throughout the factum, the student shows a strong understanding of the issue/s w/ superb use of proper legal terms |
| **Thinking/**  **Inquiry** | Eloquence of Factum Arguments | Arguments made within the factum are lacking persuasiveness and relevant w/ noticeable lack of research and logic | Arguments made within the factum are somewhat persuasive and relevant w/ satisfactory research and use of logic | Arguments made within the factum are persuasive and relevant w/ good research and suitable use of logic | Arguments made within the factum are highly persuasive and relevant w/ exceptional research and high degree of logic |
| Application | Relevant Case Citations (RESEARCH)!!  Answer to Questions | Lack of evidence of student research into relevant cases and application of those cases is poor  Substance in answers to Supreme Court questions is poor | Some evidence of student research into relevant cases and application of those cases is generally acceptable  Substance in answers to Supreme Court questions is generally acceptable | Suitable evidence of student research into relevant cases and application of those cases is good  Substance in answers to Supreme Court questions is good | Strong evidence of student research into relevant cases and application of those cases is outstanding  Substance in answers to Supreme Court questions is exceptional |
| Communication | Oral: Eloquence, Pace, Wording | Presentation to Supreme Court is lacking depth and quality | Presentation to Supreme Court is satisfactory in quality | Quality of presentation to Supreme Court is good | Quality of presentation to Supreme Court is outstanding |
| Written: Grammar, Spelling, Structure | Factum is littered w/ errors and is lacking in quality | Factum is completed w/ several errors and shows satisfactory quality | Factum is completed w/ few errors and shows good quality | Factum is completed w/ little to no errors and shows exceptional quality |
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