

SCORING MATRIX

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