

WHAT TO LOOK FOR WHEN SCORING TEAMS

ATTORNEYS

Opening Statement	<p>Provided overview on the witnesses and their testimony, evidence, and how it will prove the case</p> <p>Introduced a theme/theory of the case</p> <p>Outlined the burden of proof</p> <p>Requested relief (what the side is asking the court to decide)</p> <p>Non-argumentative</p>
Direct Attorney/ Examination	<p>Asked properly phrased open ended questions that allowed explanation or description of the situation</p> <p>Sequenced questions logically</p> <p>Did not ask questions that required any unfair extrapolations</p> <p>Laid foundation for witness testimony</p> <p>Elicited relevant, important evidence from witnesses</p> <p>Continued with consistent theme/theory of the case</p> <p>Provided proper objections during opposing team's cross-examination</p> <p>Utilized objections to move the case forward and not just to throw the other side off their game</p> <p>Made/defended objections utilizing rules of evidence or the rules of the competition</p> <p>Recovered well after objections</p> <p>Adjusted to judges' rulings</p> <p>Addressed actual testimony</p> <p>Followed proper protocol for introducing exhibits</p> <p>Demonstrated an understanding of the rules of competition and evidence</p> <p>Limited re-direct to scope of cross-examination</p> <p>On re-direct, rehabilitated witnesses</p>
Cross Attorney/ Examination	<p>Continued with consistent theme/theory of the case</p> <p>Provided proper objections during opposing team's direct examination</p> <p>Made/defended to objections utilizing rules of evidence or the rules of the competition</p> <p>Utilized objections to move the case forward and not just to throw the other side off their game</p> <p>Recovered well after objections</p> <p>Adjusted to judges' rulings</p> <p>Addressed actual testimony</p> <p>Elicited facts favorable to the attorney's case</p> <p>Asked properly phrased questions that weakened the testimony given during direct examination</p> <p>Used appropriate leading questions suggesting a "yes/no" answer</p> <p>Attempted to appropriately control the witness consistent with the judges' rulings</p> <p>Properly impeached the witness, if needed, without appearing to harass or intimidate</p> <p>Followed proper protocol for introducing exhibits</p> <p>Demonstrated an understanding of the rules of competition and evidence</p> <p>Limited re-cross-examination to scope of re-direct examination</p>
Closing Arguments	<p>Incorporated what transpired during trial</p> <p>Summarized the evidence with reasoned arguments</p> <p>Outlined the strengths of his/her side's witnesses and the weaknesses of the other side's witnesses</p> <p>Discussed relevant exhibits when appropriate</p> <p>Theme was carried through to closing</p> <p>Refers to jury instructions or other legal standards when necessary</p> <p>Asked for the verdict, including a request for relief, and explained why the verdict was justifiable</p> <p>Effectively answered and rebutted opponent's case</p>

WITNESSES

Performance	<p>Presented an interesting and authentic character</p> <p>Played up the strengths of his/her statements and adequately explained the weaknesses</p> <p>Understood the facts of the case and the exhibits</p> <p>Provided logical testimony</p> <p>Sounded spontaneous and not memorized</p> <p>Did not give excessively long or non-responsive answers on cross-examination</p> <p>Portrayed a consistent character under cross-examination</p> <p>Maintained factual position under cross-examination</p> <p>Did not offer answers that included any unfair extrapolations</p> <p>Recovered well after objections</p> <p>Remained in character when not on the witness stand</p>
-------------	--

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

***** Do NOT reward unfair extrapolations.**