

Family Law Education Reform Project

William Mitchell Oral Argument Evaluation

OVERVIEW

This document is an evaluation for a oral argument exercise.

EXPLANATION AND COMMENTS

This evaluation may be used to assess students' performances in an oral argument exercise. It may be distributed to students in the form of feedback, used to grade each student's performance, or both.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Contributed by the Faculty of:
William Mitchell College of Law
St. Paul, Minnesota

The academic program at the William Mitchell College of Law is founded on legal theory and practical learning, professors who are both scholars and legal practitioners, and a student body that includes career professionals and recent college graduates.

The College of Law places an emphasis on practical lawyering skills by fusing together the curriculum and philosophy of teaching. From writing and trial advocacy program to their clinic program, the curriculum combines skills training with a focus on ethics and legal theory, preparing each student to be a powerful advocate and counselor to their clients.

Motion Practice Scored Oral Argument Evaluation Sheet	WRAP Spring 2008
--	----------------------------

William Mitchell College of Law (Writing and Representation)

Score

Professors: _____ Student: _____ (up to 18 points): _____

Introduction:

- Greeted court
- Identified lawyer and client
- Summarized motion

unsatisfactory	satisfactory	excellent		

Facts and Procedure:

- Presented key facts concisely and clearly
- Told story from client's perspective
- Accurately and briefly stated procedural posture

unsatisfactory	satisfactory	excellent		

Argument--Generally:

- Accurate reflection of record and law
- Points chosen for persuasive impact, importance to case, coherence, etc.
- Effective use of authorities
- Persuasive analysis of client's situation
- Effective use of analogies and policies
- Effective rebuttal of opponent's arguments

unsatisfactory	satisfactory	excellent		

Argument--Organization:

- Logical, easy to follow
- Provided roadmap, signposts

unsatisfactory	satisfactory	excellent		

(over)

Argument--Response to Questions:

- Did not interrupt judge
- Understood court's concerns
- Answered clearly and directly
- Knew facts and law
- Responded strategically, e.g., conceded appropriately
- Moved smoothly back to argument

unsatisfactory		satisfactory		excellent

Rebuttal (only movant) :

- Responded to non-movant's argument
- Raised only two or three points

unsatisfactory		satisfactory		excellent

Conclusion:

- Memorable lasting impression
- Specified desired result
- Respected time limit

unsatisfactory		satisfactory		excellent

Style:

- Effective voice, gestures, eye contact
- Conveyed credibility and conviction
- Appropriate tempo
- Helpful roadmaps and signposts
- Little reading

unsatisfactory		satisfactory		excellent

Professionalism:

- Confident
- Respectful
- Articulate
- Well prepared
- Organized
- Ethical
- Proper attire
- Proper attendance

unsatisfactory		satisfactory		excellent