

Guidelines for the Scoring

Attorneys		Witnesses
<p>Excellent understanding of the case, rules, and legal issues Questions and arguments advanced case and did not ask for answers that asked for unfair extrapolations. Persuasive and articulate delivery made without use of notes. Thought well on feet, in control of situation, and responded to the other team’s presentation. Objected when appropriate; clearly understood how to respond to objections. Spoke in clear and audible voice to the camera. Did not verbally address the attorney scorers.</p>	9-10 Excellent	<p>Excellent understanding of case, witness statements, and exhibits (if applicable) Convincing, credible presentation Answers were thorough, accurate, persuasive, and natural, not scripted. Did not provide answers that embellished facts and/or went outside scope of case materials. Spoke in clear and audible voice to the camera. Did not verbally address the attorney scorers.</p>
<p>Good understanding of the case, rules, and legal issues Most questions and arguments advanced case and didn’t ask for unfair extrapolations. Mostly persuasive and articulate delivery; used notes occasionally. Able to think on feet some of the time. Most objections were appropriate; usually understood how to respond to objections. Did not verbally address the attorney scorers. Mostly spoke in clear and audible voice</p>	7-8 Above Average	<p>Good understanding of witness statements and exhibits (if applicable) Mostly convincing, credible presentation Most answers were thorough, accurate, persuasive, and mostly natural, not memorized. Rarely provided answers that embellished facts and/or went outside scope of case materials. Mostly spoke in clear and audible voice Did not verbally address the attorney scorers.</p>
<p>Fair understanding of case, rules, and legal issues Used notes, sometimes stumbled on delivery. Some questions and arguments advanced case and did not ask for unfair extrapolations. Prepared for trial but often relied on preparation and not responding to the other team’s presentation. Missed appropriate opportunities to object; did not always understand how to respond to objections. Sometimes difficult to hear. Verbally addressed the attorney scorers.</p>	5-6 Average	<p>Fair understanding of witness statements and exhibits (if applicable) Somewhat convincing, credible presentation Answers not always thorough, accurate or persuasive; sounded scripted, not natural. Some answers embellished facts and/or went outside scope of case materials. Sometimes difficult to hear. Verbally addressed the attorney scorers.</p>
<p>Demonstrated little understanding of case, rules, and legal issues. Needs work on poise and delivery; did not respond to the other team’s presentation. Read mostly scripted questions; relied heavily on notes. Few questions and arguments advanced case; may have asked questions that required unfair extrapolations. Struggled to understand when to object and how to respond to objections; used objections to interfere with the other team’s presentation. Often difficult to hear. Verbally addressed the attorney scorers.</p>	3-4 Below Average	<p>Struggled to understand witness statements and exhibits (if applicable) Presentation not convincing, credible; often unrealistic Answers were generic and often did not seem natural but based on memorized script; sometimes stumbled over responses. Often provided answers that embellished facts and/or went outside scope of case materials. Often difficult to hear. Verbally addressed the attorney scorers.</p>

<p>Did not understand case, rules, or legal issues. Not persuasive or articulate in delivery; read entirely from script. Not prepared for trial; not able to think on feet. Questions and arguments didn't advance case; asked for answers that required unfair extrapolations. Did not know when to object or how to respond to objections. Disruptive/disrespectful/inappropriate actions Unclear or inaudible voice Verbally addressed the attorney scorers.</p>	<p>1-2 Far Below Average</p>	<p>Did not understand witness statements and exhibits. Presentation not convincing or credible; seems unrealistic. Answers were not thorough, accurate, or persuasive, and didn't sound natural; stumbled over responses. Answers not consistent with the facts and/or went outside scope of case materials. Weak, inaudible, or unclear voice Disruptive/disrespectful/inappropriate actions Gave excessively long, non-responsive answers on cross examination to deliberately use up opposing counsel's time. Verbally addressed the attorney scorers.</p>
Clerk		Bailiff
<p>Very professional demeanor Clear understanding of procedures; excellent time keeping. Clear, audible voice when issuing verbal warnings (if applicable) Visual warnings were clearly visible to student attorneys. Able to think well on feet, in control of situation</p>	<p>5 Excellent</p>	<p>Very professional, believable presentation Consistent use of clear and audible voice, and eye contact Consistently natural delivery of script Excellent understanding of role and procedures</p>
<p>Professional demeanor Good understanding of procedures; good time keeping. Mostly spoke in clear, audible voice when issuing verbal warnings (if applicable) Visual warnings were mostly clearly visible to student attorneys.</p>	<p>4 Above Average</p>	<p>Professional, believable presentation Used clear, audible voice, and eye contact a lot of the time. Knew script and delivery was mostly consistently natural. Good understanding of role and procedures</p>
<p>Good demeanor Basic understanding of procedures; able to keep time. Was heard when issuing verbal warnings (if applicable) Visual warnings were visible to student attorneys.</p>	<p>3 Average</p>	<p>Mostly natural, believable presentation Audible voice, some eye contact Apparent that script was memorized. Understood role and procedures</p>
<p>Demeanor lacked professionalism. Demonstrated little understanding of procedures; time keeping not entirely accurate. Not clear or audible when issuing verbal warnings (if applicable) Visual warnings may not have been visible to student attorneys</p>	<p>2 Below Average</p>	<p>Presentation not realistic, lacked professionalism. Voice not all that clear or audible; little eye contact Used notes, stumbled with script. Did not have a good understanding of role and procedures</p>
<p>Complete lack of professionalism No understanding of procedures; time keeping was inaccurate. Verbal warnings not used or completely inaudible (if applicable) Verbal warnings not used or not at all visible Disruptive/disrespectful/inappropriate actions</p>	<p>1 Far Below Average</p>	<p>Complete lack of professionalism Voice not audible or clear; no eye contact Relied almost entirely on notes/script. Did not understand role and procedures. Disruptive/disrespectful/inappropriate actions</p>

0 Score (10 Point Deductions)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failure to cross-examine a witness (Attorney score) • Failure to conduct direct examination of a witness (Attorney and witness score) • Can apply only to rule violations that specify a zero score
--------------------------------------	---

Participation and Team Presentation	
9-10 Excellent	<p>All competitors, coaches, and other participants, including observers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • showed courtesy and respect for all team members and participants, including their opponents and all courthouse staff, judges, attorney coaches, teacher coaches and mock trial staff and volunteer personnel. • showed dignity and restraint, irrespective of the outcome of any trial. Trials, contests, and activities were conducted honestly, fairly, and with civility. • conformed to the highest standards of department. • focused on the educational value of the Mock Trial Competition. • used proper procedure and decorum. • abided by the letter and the spirit of the competition's Rules and this Code of Ethical Conduct. • did not employ tactics they believe to be wrong or in violation of the Rules. • did not willfully violate the Rules of the competition in spirit or in practice. • Team members: presentation was natural; no overacting.
7-8 Above Average	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pretrial attorney served as trial attorney during the same round. • The prosecution team failed to bring physical evidence to court. • Prohibited motions were used. (The pretrial motion, motions entering exhibits into evidence, and motion to strike testimony are the only motions allowed.) • Team members' roles were not evenly divided.
5-6 Average	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Used 30 second rule to argue additional points of law or rebut opponent's closing argument. • Several team members made unfair extrapolations (in addition to the individual point deductions.) • Portrayed racial, ethnic, and gender stereotypes. • Team members' presentation was not natural; overacting was present.
3-4 Below Average	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Argued for hyper technical interpretations of the rules to embarrass others or to gain an unfair advantage. • Additional exhibits, other than the exhibits provided in the trial material, were used. • Used props, costumes, and theatrical makeup.
1-2 Far Below Average	<p>Competitors, coaches and/or other participants, including observers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • did not show courtesy and respect for all team members and participants, including their opponents and all courthouse staff, judges, attorney coaches, teacher coaches and mock trial staff and volunteer personnel. • did not show dignity and restraint, irrespective of the outcome of any trial. Trials, contests, and activities were not conducted honestly, fairly, and with civility. • did not conform to the highest standards of department. • did not focus on the educational value of the Mock Trial Competition. • did not use proper procedure and decorum. • did not abide by the letter and the spirit of the competition's Rules and this Code of Ethical Conduct. • employed tactics they believe to be wrong or in violation of the Rules. • willfully violated the Rules of the competition in spirit or in practice.