

Rubric for Historical Trials

Knowledge & Understanding	Level 4	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1
Arguments & Witness testimony & Opening and Closing Statements	-provides exceptional and historically accurate arguments and witness testimony that are relevant to charge and enforce case -exceptional opening and closing statements which frame the case, charge and state innocence / guilt	-provides proficient and historically accurate arguments and witness testimony that relate to charge and build case -proficient opening and closing statements which explain the case, charge and state innocence / guilt	-arguments and witness testimony are somewhat accurate and relevant and relate to the charges -opening and closing statements are brief in explaining the charges and state innocence / guilt	-some arguments and witness testimony are inaccurate or irrelevant to the charges or case -opening and closing statements barely explain the case and do not state the innocence / guilt
Thinking and Inquiry Facts and Evidence	- provides more than 3 facts that are from primary sources; facts are relevant and purposeful: they support the charges/defence by demanding a response from the other side; provides facts that are historically accurate.	- provides 3 facts that are from primary sources; facts are relevant and historically accurate.	- provides 2 facts that are from primary sources; facts are somewhat relevant and historically accurate.	- provides less than 2 facts that are from primary sources; facts are not relevant or are historically inaccurate
Communication Clarity of ideas	- ideas are clear, simple, and cause no confusion; needless details are left out; audience does not require clarification; uses 2 or more strategies (e.g. repetition, telling a story, listing, etc.) to impress important points in the memory of the audience; uses 2 visual aids that enhance the clarity of the points.	- ideas are clear and cause no confusion; most needless details are left out; audience may require some clarification; uses 1 visual aid to enhance the clarity of points.	- ideas are awkwardly stated and cause some confusion; does not get to the point; clarification is required; visual aids are poor and do not enhance the clarity of the points.	- ideas are poorly stated and cause confusion; a lot of needless details detracts from points; complete restatement of points required; no visual aids--or they are poor and cause more confusion, and may even contradict points.
Delivery	- skilfully varies pitch, tone, and volume; speaks confidently and clearly; always audible; body language is confident; varies eye contact with audience; no reliance on notes while speaking; uses appropriate humour.	- speaks confidently and clearly; usually audible; body language is confident; usually maintains eye contact when speaking; some reliance on notes while speaking; minor starts and stops while speaking.	- speaks somewhat clearly; voice is sometimes audible but mostly quiet; frequent pauses and hesitations; reliance on notes while speaking; maintains sporadic eye contact.	- Uses voice with limited skill; mostly inaudible; frequent pauses and hesitations; reads from notes; no eye contact.
Application Connecting factual evidence with specific points	- skillfully draws connections between factual evidence and specific points; some connections are subtle and not obvious; connections are compelling and require a response.	- skillfully draws connections between factual evidence and specific points; connections make sense and are not contrived.	- draws connections between factual evidence and specific points poorly, leaving audience to fill in gaps; connections may be somewhat convoluted.	Treats evidence as self-evident: merely states evidence, leaving audience to draw their own connections
Response to attacks & use of objections	- evidence of anticipating attacks: prepared more than 2 facts to respond to anticipated attack; even when not prepared for attack, responds quickly and thoughtfully; never caught off guard	- evidence of anticipating attacks: prepared 1 fact to counter attack; even when not prepared for attack, responds thoughtfully.	- little evidence of anticipating attacks; no facts prepared, but able to provide a vague response	- no evidence of anticipating attacks; no facts prepared; unable to provide a response (e.g. resorts to attacking the speaker)