

WHAT TO LOOK FOR WHEN SCORING TEAMS

ATTORNEYS

Opening Statement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provided overview on the witnesses and their testimony, evidence, and how it will prove the case Introduced a theme/theory of the case Outlined the burden of proof Requested relief (what the side is asking the court to decide) Non-argumentative
Direct Attorney/ Examination	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Asked properly phrased open ended questions that allowed explanation or description of the situation Sequenced questions logically Did not ask questions that required any unfair extrapolations Laid foundation for witness testimony Elicited relevant, important evidence from witnesses Continued with consistent theme/theory of the case Provided proper objections during opposing team's cross-examination Utilized objections to move the case forward and not just to throw the other side off their game Made/defended objections utilizing rules of evidence or the rules of the competition Recovered well after objections Adjusted to judges' rulings Addressed actual testimony Followed proper protocol for introducing exhibits Demonstrated an understanding of the rules of competition and evidence Limited re-direct to scope of cross-examination On re-direct, rehabilitated witnesses
Cross Attorney/ Examination	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continued with consistent theme/theory of the case Provided proper objections during opposing team's direct examination Made/defended to objections utilizing rules of evidence or the rules of the competition Utilized objections to move the case forward and not just to throw the other side off their game Recovered well after objections Adjusted to judges' rulings Addressed actual testimony Elicited facts favorable to the attorney's case Asked properly phrased questions that weakened the testimony given during direct examination Used appropriate leading questions suggesting a "yes/no" answer Attempted to appropriately control the witness consistent with the judges' rulings Properly impeached the witness, if needed, without appearing to harass or intimidate Followed proper protocol for introducing exhibits Demonstrated an understanding of the rules of competition and evidence Limited re-cross-examination to scope of re-direct examination
Closing Arguments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorporated what transpired during trial Summarized the evidence with reasoned arguments Outlined the strengths of his/her side's witnesses and the weaknesses of the other side's witnesses Discussed relevant exhibits when appropriate Theme was carried through to closing Refers to jury instructions or other legal standards when necessary Asked for the verdict, including a request for relief, and explained why the verdict was justifiable Effectively answered and rebutted opponent's case

WITNESSES

Performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presented an interesting and authentic character Played up the strengths of his/her statements and adequately explained the weaknesses Understood the facts of the case and the exhibits Provided logical testimony Sounded spontaneous and not memorized Did not give excessively long or non-responsive answers on cross-examination Portrayed a consistent character under cross-examination Maintained factual position under cross-examination Did not offer answers that included any unfair extrapolations Recovered well after objections Remained in character when not on the witness stand
-------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*** Do NOT reward excessive interruptions and/or obstructionist behavior.

*** Do NOT reward unfair extrapolations.

SCORING MATRIX

	ATTORNEYS	WITNESSES
1 – 3 Ineffective	Case/rules/legal issues not understood Trial procedures not understood Delivery not persuasive or articulate Script/notes was total relied upon No questions/arguments moved case forward Asked questions intended for an unfair extrapolation No understanding of making/responding to objections No understanding of how to recover from objections Eye contact not made Voice weak, unclear or inaudible Failed to consider other team's presentation	Witness statements and exhibits not understood Responses not thorough, persuasive, or natural Responses not consistent with facts Consistently went materially outside case materials No understanding of how to recover from objections Eye contact not made Voice weak, unclear or inaudible Deliberately attempted to waste opposing counsel's time Performance was not credible or convincing
4 – 5 Poor	Case/rules/legal issues poorly understood Trial procedures slightly poorly understood Poise and delivery needed work Script/notes was highly depended upon Few questions/arguments moved case forward Asked questions intended for an unfair extrapolation Struggled to make/respond to objections No understanding of how to recover from objections Little eye contact made Voice often difficult to hear Failed to consider other team's presentation	Witnesses statements and exhibits poorly understood Responses felt generic and/or scripted Responses sometimes inconsistent with facts Materially went outside case materials more than once No understanding of how to recover from objections Little eye contact made Voice often difficult to hear Deliberately attempted to waste opposing counsel's time Performance was passable, lacks depth
6 Average (Proficient)	Case/rules/legal issues fairly understood Trial procedures fairly understood Delivery had some hesitation/stumbles Script/notes used occasionally Questions/arguments moved case forward Questions asked called for no unfair extrapolation Missed appropriate opportunities to object Recovered adequately after objections Eye contact maintained some of the time Voice sometimes difficult to hear Minimally responsive to other team's presentation	Witness statements and exhibits fairly understood Performance was somewhat credible and convincing Some responses felt scripted Responses consistent with facts Materially went outside case materials once Recovered adequately after objections Eye contact maintained some of the time when appropriate Voice sometimes difficult to hear Answers most cross questions responsibly
7 – 8 Very Good	Case/rules/legal issues well understood Trial procedure understanding was very good Delivery was persuasive Script not used, reacts to the moment Notes only used for issues raised during trial Questions/arguments moved case forward Questions asked called for no unfair extrapolation Objections/responses were appropriate Recovered well after objections Eye contact mostly maintained Voice was clear, audible, and confident Adjusted case other team's presentation	Witness statements and exhibits well understood Responses mostly felt spontaneous and not memorized Responses consistent with facts Did not materially go outside case materials Rarely went outside scope of case materials Recovered well after objections Eye contact mostly maintained when appropriate Voice was clear, audible, and confident Answers most cross questions responsibly Performance was mostly credible and convincing
9 – 10 Outstanding and Superior	Case/rules/legal issues excellent understanding Trial procedure understanding was superior Delivery was compelling Script not used, reacts to the moment Notes only used for issues raised during trial Questions/arguments were compelling Objections/responses were appropriate and mastered Superior recovery after objections Questions asked called for no unfair extrapolation Eye contact maintained Voice was clear, audible, confident and with conviction Excellent responses to other team's presentation Compelling trial presentation Took command of courtroom, but not overbearing	Witness statements and exhibits excellent understanding Performance felt spontaneous and natural Responses consistent with facts Did not materially go outside case materials Superior recovery after objections Eye contact maintained when appropriate Voice was clear, audible, confident and with conviction Answers most cross questions responsibly Took command of courtroom, but not overbearing Performance was compelling



Plaintiff Team Code: _____

Defense Team Code: _____

Courtroom: _____

Round (Circle one) **1** **2** **3** **4** **Final**

On a scale of 1 to 10, rate the teams in the categories below, recording one numerical score in each box. Do NOT use fractional points or give any scores of zero.

Not Effective	Poor	Average (Proficient)	Very Good	Outstanding and Superior
1 – 3	4 – 5	6	7 – 8	9 – 10

Plaintiff				Defense	
OPENING STATEMENTS					
P'S FIRST WITNESS Witness Role:	<i>Direct Exam. by Attorney</i>		<i>Cross Exam. by Attorney</i>		
	<i>Witness' Performance (Score for direct / Score for cross)</i>				
P'S SECOND WITNESS Witness Role:	<i>Direct Exam. by Attorney</i>		<i>Cross Exam. by Attorney</i>		
	<i>Witness' Performance (Score for direct / Score for cross)</i>				
P'S THIRD WITNESS Witness Role:	<i>Direct Exam. by Attorney</i>		<i>Cross Exam. by Attorney</i>		
	<i>Witness' Performance (Score for direct / Score for cross)</i>				
D'S FIRST WITNESS Witness Role:	<i>Cross Exam. by Attorney</i>		<i>Direct Exam. by Attorney</i>		
			<i>Witness' Performance (Score for direct / Score for cross)</i>		
D'S SECOND WITNESS Witness Role:	<i>Cross Exam. by Attorney</i>		<i>Direct Exam. by Attorney</i>		
			<i>Witness' Performance (Score for direct / Score for cross)</i>		
D'S THIRD WITNESS Witness Role:	<i>Cross Exam. by Attorney</i>		<i>Direct Exam. by Attorney</i>		
			<i>Witness' Performance (Score for direct / Score for cross)</i>		
CLOSING ARGUMENTS (and rebuttal, if any)					
Evaluator's Name (Please Print):		FINAL POINT TOTAL		NO TIES	

[illegible]