

# SCORING MATRIX

	ATTORNEYS	WITNESSES
1 – 3 Ineffective	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Case/rules/legal issues not understood</li> <li>Trial procedures not understood</li> <li>Delivery not persuasive or articulate</li> <li>Script/notes was total relied upon</li> <li>No questions/arguments moved case forward</li> <li>Asked questions intended for an unfair extrapolation</li> <li>No understanding of making/responding to objections</li> <li>No understanding of how to recover from objections</li> <li>Eye contact not made</li> <li>Voice weak, unclear or inaudible</li> <li>Failed to consider other team's presentation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Witness statements and exhibits not understood</li> <li>Responses not thorough, persuasive, or natural</li> <li>Responses not consistent with facts</li> <li>Consistently went materially outside case materials</li> <li>No understanding of how to recover from objections</li> <li>Eye contact not made</li> <li>Voice weak, unclear or inaudible</li> <li>Deliberately attempted to waste opposing counsel's time</li> <li>Performance was not credible or convincing</li> </ul>
4 – 5 Poor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Case/rules/legal issues poorly understood</li> <li>Trial procedures slightly poorly understood</li> <li>Poise and delivery needed work</li> <li>Script/notes was highly depended upon</li> <li>Few questions/arguments moved case forward</li> <li>Asked questions intended for an unfair extrapolation</li> <li>Struggled to make/respond to objections</li> <li>No understanding of how to recover from objections</li> <li>Little eye contact made</li> <li>Voice often difficult to hear</li> <li>Failed to consider other team's presentation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Witnesses statements and exhibits poorly understood</li> <li>Responses felt generic and/or scripted</li> <li>Responses sometimes inconsistent with facts</li> <li>Materially went outside case materials more than once</li> <li>No understanding of how to recover from objections</li> <li>Little eye contact made</li> <li>Voice often difficult to hear</li> <li>Deliberately attempted to waste opposing counsel's time</li> <li>Performance was passable, lacks depth</li> </ul>
6 Average (Proficient)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Case/rules/legal issues fairly understood</li> <li>Trial procedures fairly understood</li> <li>Delivery had some hesitation/stumbles</li> <li>Script/notes used occasionally</li> <li>Questions/arguments moved case forward</li> <li>Questions asked called for no unfair extrapolation</li> <li>Missed appropriate opportunities to object</li> <li>Recovered adequately after objections</li> <li>Eye contact maintained some of the time</li> <li>Voice sometimes difficult to hear</li> <li>Minimally responsive to other team's presentation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Witness statements and exhibits fairly understood</li> <li>Performance was somewhat credible and convincing</li> <li>Some responses felt scripted</li> <li>Responses consistent with facts</li> <li>Materially went outside case materials once</li> <li>Recovered adequately after objections</li> <li>Eye contact maintained some of the time when appropriate</li> <li>Voice sometimes difficult to hear</li> <li>Answers most cross questions responsibly</li> </ul>
7 – 8 Very Good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Case/rules/legal issues well understood</li> <li>Trial procedure understanding was very good</li> <li>Delivery was persuasive</li> <li>Script not used, reacts to the moment</li> <li>Notes only used for issues raised during trial</li> <li>Questions/arguments moved case forward</li> <li>Questions asked called for no unfair extrapolation</li> <li>Objections/responses were appropriate</li> <li>Recovered well after objections</li> <li>Eye contact mostly maintained</li> <li>Voice was clear, audible, and confident</li> <li>Adjusted case other team's presentation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Witness statements and exhibits well understood</li> <li>Responses mostly felt spontaneous and not memorized</li> <li>Responses consistent with facts</li> <li>Did not materially go outside case materials</li> <li>Rarely went outside scope of case materials</li> <li>Recovered well after objections</li> <li>Eye contact mostly maintained when appropriate</li> <li>Voice was clear, audible, and confident</li> <li>Answers most cross questions responsibly</li> <li>Performance was mostly credible and convincing</li> </ul>
9 – 10 Outstanding and Superior	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Case/rules/legal issues excellent understanding</li> <li>Trial procedure understanding was superior</li> <li>Delivery was compelling</li> <li>Script not used, reacts to the moment</li> <li>Notes only used for issues raised during trial</li> <li>Questions/arguments were compelling</li> <li>Objections/responses were appropriate and mastered</li> <li>Superior recovery after objections</li> <li>Questions asked called for no unfair extrapolation</li> <li>Eye contact maintained</li> <li>Voice was clear, audible, confident and with conviction</li> <li>Excellent responses to other team's presentation</li> <li>Compelling trial presentation</li> <li>Took command of courtroom, but not overbearing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Witness statements and exhibits excellent understanding</li> <li>Performance felt spontaneous and natural</li> <li>Responses consistent with facts</li> <li>Did not materially go outside case materials</li> <li>Superior recovery after objections</li> <li>Eye contact maintained when appropriate</li> <li>Voice was clear, audible, confident and with conviction</li> <li>Answers most cross questions responsibly</li> <li>Took command of courtroom, but not overbearing</li> <li>Performance was compelling</li> </ul>