

Opening

Ineffective 1 – 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Short; nothing useful; no overview, theme, or theory • Read script; inaudible; no eye contact
Poor 4 – 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Short overview of case/ evidence; little eye contact; poor courtroom presence • Note dependent
Average 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduced theme/theory of case, made team introductions • Explained case and gave a “road map” (outlined witness testimony and exhibits) • Demonstrated understanding of rules/ case/legal issues • Appropriate demeanor, good eye contact, clear voice • Notes read occasionally
Very Good 7 – 8 Plus Average Traits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Held attention; professional and confident presence; did not sound rehearsed • Provided overview of parties; anticipated testimony w/out being argumentative • Good use of courtroom • Notes used as guide only
Superior 9 – 10 Plus Traits of Very Good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compelling/believable; Conversational, Confident • Polished/poised • Excellent use of courtroom • Notes used as reference only

Direct / Crossing Attorney**Witness**

Ineffective 1 – 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of knowledge of case; Did not use exhibits • Read from script; inaudible; no eye contact 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not credible; stumbled with testimony • No understanding of affidavit; inaudible
Poor 4– 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Slow, lacked depth; little use of exhibits • On cross, easily flustered with witness • No impeachment when possible • Little eye contact, difficult to hear • Failed to qualify expert, when needed • Many poor objections, Note dependent 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wasted opposing team's time • Scripted/poor eye contact/hard to hear • Weak responses to cross • Undeveloped character; lacked depth • Easily flustered and unconvincing • Frustrated opposing counsel
Average 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrated theme as set forth in Opening; Clear Voice • Properly phrased direct questions with purpose • Good time management and good eye contact • Useful / Proper objections - not overused • Followed proper protocol introducing exhibits • Demonstrated knowledge of rules/case/legal issues • Ineffective impeachment • Notes read occasionally 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with affidavit; Clear Voice • Understood role • Emphasized strengths in affidavit • Developed believable character • Phrasing consistent w/ character • Logical and credible testimony • Maintained composure on cross • Eye contact appropriate
Very Good 7 – 8 Plus Traits of Average	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No questions calling for creation of material facts • Useful Objections made/defended w/ Rules • Adjusted to adverse rulings • Elicited favorable facts on direct • Weakened testimony on cross • Effective impeachment, when necessary • Notes used as guide only 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Command of role; convincing • Charismatic and engaging • Sounded unscripted/conversational • Held up on cross w/ sufficient elaborations • Emotions appropriate for character • Remained in character throughout trial
Superior 9 – 10 Plus Traits of Very Good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conversational; natural, controlled witness • Objections advanced the team's case • Conducted a Damaging Impeachment • Emphasized weaknesses/strengths • Mastery of case, Confident • Notes used as reference only 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unique personality • Entertaining, believable • Minimized weaknesses of case • Kept information out that hurt the case • Responded on cross effectively

Closing Attorney

Ineffective 1 – 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very short; provided nothing useful; no theme or theory • Read from script; inaudible; no eye contact
Poor 4 – 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Short; did not refer to jury instructions/legal issues; no request for relief • No theme or connection to opening • Note dependent; no eye contact; difficult to hear
Average 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrated understanding of rules/case/issues • Addressed the relevant burden of proof • Summarized relevant testimony • Read from notes occasionally; Clear voice and appropriate eye contact
Very Good 7 – 8 Plus Traits of Average	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussed elements of cause(s) of action; referenced burden of proof • Summarized evidence with reasoning and reinforced theme • Referenced relevant evidence and exhibits admitted • Outlined strengths of their case and weaknesses of opposing case • Asked for verdict/relief and argued why it was appropriate and justified • Notes used as guide only
Superior 9 – 10 Plus Traits of Very Good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complemented opening statement; incorporated only what transpired in trial • Persuasively countered opposing team's theme/case; • Compelling, believable, conversational, Confident • Convinced jury that evidence was credible and proved the case • Rebuttal after closing with relevant points, time permitting • Notes used as reference only

Overall Team Performance

Ineffective 1– 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of theme/theory • Did not maintain decorum • Lack of coordination and preparation
Poor 4 – 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Abusive/excessive objections • Delay tactics • Gamesmanship • Uncivil with opposing team
Average 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Used thoughtful & logical theme/theory • Maintained decorum • Used appropriate courtroom procedure • Showed coordinated effort/teamwork • Civil with opposing team
Very Good 7 – 8 Plus Traits of Average	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good time management • Consistent legal arguments and objections • Logical presentation of evidence • Elements of a theme throughout • Good Use of Exhibits
Superior 9 – 10 Plus Traits of Very Good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Polished, poised, and professional • Unscripted performances • Well-practiced • Consistently good in all aspects of the trial