

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 caseIntroduced a theme/theory of the caseOutlined the burden of proofRequested 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 situationSequenced questions logicallyDid not ask questions that required any unfair extrapolationsLaid foundation for witness testimonyElicited relevant, important evidence from witnessesContinued with consistent theme/theory of the caseProvided proper objections during opposing team's cross-examinationUtilized objections to move the case forward and not just to throw the other side off their gameMade/defended objections utilizing rules of evidence or the rules of the competitionRecovered well after objectionsAdjusted to judges' rulingsAddressed actual testimonyFollowed proper protocol for introducing exhibitsDemonstrated an understanding of the rules of competition and evidenceLimited re-direct to scope of cross-examinationOn re-direct, rehabilitated witnesses
Cross Attorney/ Examination	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Continued with consistent theme/theory of the caseProvided proper objections during opposing team's direct examinationMade/defended to objections utilizing rules of evidence or the rules of the competitionUtilized objections to move the case forward and not just to throw the other side off their gameRecovered well after objectionsAdjusted to judges' rulingsAddressed actual testimonyElicited facts favorable to the attorney's caseAsked properly phrased questions that weakened the testimony given during direct examinationUsed appropriate leading questions suggesting a "yes/no" answerAttempted to appropriately control the witness consistent with the judges' rulingsProperly impeached the witness, if needed, without appearing to harass or intimidateFollowed proper protocol for introducing exhibitsDemonstrated an understanding of the rules of competition and evidenceLimited re-cross-examination to scope of re-direct examination
Closing Arguments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Incorporated what transpired during trialSummarized the evidence with reasoned argumentsOutlined the strengths of his/her side's witnesses and the weaknesses of the other side's witnessesDiscussed relevant exhibits when appropriateTheme was carried through to closingRefers to jury instructions or other legal standards when necessaryAsked for the verdict, including a request for relief, and explained why the verdict was justifiableEffectively answered and rebutted opponent's case

WITNESSES

Performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Presented an interesting and authentic characterPlayed up the strengths of his/her statements and adequately explained the weaknessesUnderstood the facts of the case and the exhibitsProvided logical testimonySounded spontaneous and not memorizedDid not give excessively long or non-responsive answers on cross-examinationPortrayed a consistent character under cross-examinationMaintained factual position under cross-examinationDid not offer answers that included any unfair extrapolationsRecovered well after objectionsRemained in character when not on the witness stand
-------------	---

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

*** Do NOT reward unfair extrapolations.