

SCORING GUIDE

(Effective May 2022)

OPENING	Ineffective 1 – 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very short; did not provide anything useful; no overview, theme or theory Read from script directly; inaudible voice 	
	Poor 4 – 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Short overview of case and evidence Note dependent; no eye contact; difficult to hear 	
	Average 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduced a theme/theory of case, made introductions prior to opening Explained the case and gave a “road map” of what would transpire during the trial (outlined witness testimony and exhibits they would use) Demonstrated understanding of case/rules/legal issues Notes read only periodically; presented appropriate demeanor and eye contact with a clear voice 	
	Very Good 7 – 8 <i>(+ “6” content)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Held attention; professional and confident presence; did not sound rehearsed Provided overview of parties and witnesses; anticipated their testimony without being argumentative Notes used as reference/guide only 	
	Superior 9 – 10 <i>(+ “7 - 8” content)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Compelling/believable Conversational; polished/poised Good use of courtroom 	
		Attorney	Witness
DIRECT / CROSS	Ineffective 1 – 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nervous and unclear of what was to be done Read from script directly; inaudible voice 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not credible; stumbled with testimony No understanding of case; inaudible voice
	Poor 4 – 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No eye contact; difficult to hear Slow and lacked depth Easily flustered with witness Note dependent 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scripted, no eye contact, difficult to hear Weak on responses to cross, lacks depth Undeveloped character Easily flustered and unconvincing
	Average 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrated an understanding of rules/case/issues Laid foundation and addressed actual testimony Sequenced questions logically; direct; and concise Used properly phrased questions with purpose Good time management Made proper objections and did not overuse them Followed proper protocol for introducing exhibits Effectively conducted re-direct/re-cross, if done Eye contact maintained and appropriate Voice was clear and audible Notes read only periodically 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrated understanding of role in case Consistent with facts of the case and exhibits Emphasized strengths in affidavit Developed character Phrasing consistent w/ character represented Provided logical and credible testimony Responded on cross maintaining composure Eye contact maintained and appropriate Voice was clear and audible
	Very Good 7 – 8 <i>(+ “6” content)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Did not ask questions requiring an unfair extrapolation Continued with consistent theme and theory of case Made/defended objections utilizing Rules of Evidence Limited objections only to evidence that hurts team’s case Recovered after objections & adjusted to judges’ rulings If directed/re-directed, elicited favorable facts from witness If crossed/re-crossed, weakened testimony given Notes used as reference/guide only 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Command of role; convincing Charismatic and engaging Sounded unscripted and conversational Held up on cross w/ sufficient elaborations Emotions were appropriate for character Remained in character throughout trial
	Superior 9 – 10 <i>(+ “7 - 8” content)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conversational; natural; took command; not overbearing Brought out and emphasized weaknesses/strengths Objections advanced the team’s case On cross, controlled witness responses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unique, entertaining w/ believable personality Minimized weaknesses of case Kept information out that hurt case Responded on cross effectively & with ease
CLOSING	Ineffective 1 – 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very short; did not provide anything useful; no theme or theory; read from script directly Inaudible voice 	
	Poor 4 – 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Short; did not refer to jury instructions/legal issues; no request for relief; no eye contact; difficult to hear Note dependent 	
	Average 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrated an understanding of rules/case/issues and addressed the relevant burden of proof Summarized relevant testimony and evidence/exhibits admitted Theme was carried through to closing argument Spoke with clear voice and had appropriate eye contact Notes read only periodically 	
	Very Good 7 – 8 <i>(+ “6” content)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outlined the strengths of their case and the weaknesses of the opposing case Asked for the verdict/relief and argued why the relief requested was appropriate and justifiable Summarized evidence with reasoning; Discussed elements of cause(s) of action; referenced burden of proof Notes used as reference/guide only 	
	Superior 9 – 10 <i>(+ “7 - 8” content)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complemented opening statement and incorporated only what transpired in trial exceptionally well Persuasively countered the opposing team’s theme/case; was compelling, believable and conversational Referred to and used relevant exhibits Convinced jury that evidence was credible and proved the team’s case 	