

Orange County Mock Trial Competition

Judge/Attorney Scoring Information

Judges will pick-up scoresheets at the 2nd floor check-in table. Attorneys should receive their scoresheets from the presiding judge. If needed, extra copies will be at the 2nd Floor check-in table. Once in the courtroom, please make sure you receive a *Mock Trial Roster / Award Nomination Form* from both the Prosecution and Defense teams. If you encounter any difficulties, or have any questions, please ask your courtroom monitor for assistance.

Scoring Criteria

Guidelines for 0-5 Scoring Method

The following are general guidelines to be applied to each category on the scoresheet. They refer to attorneys, witnesses, bailiffs, and clerks. These guidelines provide a reasonable framework on which to base your judgment. It is strongly recommended that scorers use "3" as an indication of an average performance, and adjust higher or lower for stronger or weaker performances. If a score of 2 or lower is given, please comment as to a reason for the score. Team performance score should be based on total presentation of the case and whether all members of the team were actively involved, followed competition rules, exhibited good sportsmanship, did not depend on notes, presented a discernable theme and maximized student participation by using six trial lawyers who played balanced roles. The Clerk/Baliff scoring should reflect how courtroom procedures and exhibits are handled and organized, if all exhibits were available and if timing procedures were clearly followed and consistent.

- | | |
|--------------------------|---|
| 0 - Incomplete | Non performance of required presentation <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Failure to conduct direct examination of a witness (no time)• Failure to cross-examine a witness (no time)• Can apply to rule violations (i.e. witness using notes, disrespectful to court or competitors) |
| 1 - Poor | Unacceptable performance <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Disorganized• Illogical or uninformed (not in character or doesn't know basic facts)• Shows lack of preparation and poor understanding of task and rationale behind legal procedure |
| 2 - Below Average | Fair, weak performance <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Inadequate preparation and understanding of task(impeached on major points)• Awkward presentation (lacked confidence)• Ineffective communication (non-responsive) |
| 3 - Average | Meets required standards <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Fundamental understanding of task and adequate preparation• Acceptable but uninspired performance• Grasps major concepts of the case but lacks mastery (got evidence introduced)• Clear but less persuasive communication |
| 4 - Above Average | Good, solid performance <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demonstrated a more fully developed understanding of task and rationale behind legal procedure (controlled cross examination / impeached witness)• Fluent presentation / persuasive / clear and understandable / organized• Believable and skillful presentation |
| 5 - Excellent | Exceptional performance <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demonstrated superior ability to make or respond to objections• Resourceful, original & innovative approaches• Portrayal was both extraordinary and realistic, not overly rehearsed or memorized• Witness examination and summation reflect the trial proceedings (was opening argumentative or was it clear and conveyed a theme of case? Did closing refer to evidence excluded by pretrial or evidentiary ruling? Was testimony elicited during trial used in summation of case?) |