

COURTROOM DRAFT SCORESHEET

Use this to keep score during the trial.

Region: _____ Round: _____ Courtroom: _____ Prosecution: _____ v. _____ :Defense
(Team Code) (Team Code)

Using the Scoring Matrix at the end of the Judging Panel Manual for reference, rate the teams in the categories below, recording one numerical score in each box. You will then enter these scores in the online scoresheet after trial.

Outstanding and Superior	Very Good	Average (Proficient)	Poor	Not Effective
10 – 9	8 – 7	6	5 – 4	3 – 1

	P (Prosecution)		D (Defense)	
OPENING STATEMENT	→		→	
P'S FIRST WITNESS: Sgt. Saturday Montero Pierson	<i>Direct Examination</i>		<i>Cross Examination</i>	
	<i>Witness' Performance</i>	On Direct On Cross		
P'S SECOND WITNESS: Sgt. Saturday Montero Pierson	<i>Direct Examination</i>		<i>Cross Examination</i>	
	<i>Witness' Performance</i>	On Direct On Cross		
P'S THIRD WITNESS: Sgt. Saturday Montero Pierson	<i>Direct Examination</i>		<i>Cross Examination</i>	
	<i>Witness' Performance</i>	On Direct On Cross		
D'S FIRST WITNESS: Holmes Twiggs Dr. Ceridian	<i>Cross Examination</i>		<i>Direct Examination</i>	
	<i>Witness' Performance</i>	On Direct On Cross		
D'S SECOND WITNESS: Holmes Twiggs Dr. Ceridian	<i>Cross Examination</i>		<i>Direct Examination</i>	
	<i>Witness' Performance</i>	On Direct On Cross		
D'S THIRD WITNESS: Holmes Twiggs Dr. Ceridian	<i>Cross Examination</i>		<i>Direct Examination</i>	
	<i>Witness' Performance</i>	On Direct On Cross		
CLOSING ARGUMENT <i>(and rebuttal, if any)</i>			→	
	TEAM POINTS (1 – 10 per side)		NO TIE ALLOWED	
	<i>Tie Breaker</i> <i>(Circle one)</i>	<i>Prosecution</i>		<i>Defense</i>

In the jury deliberation room, enter these scores into the online scoresheet.

WHAT TO LOOK FOR WHEN SCORING TEAMS

The following criteria should be considered by scoring evaluators during the course of a team's trial presentation.

ATTORNEYS

Opening Statement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provided overview on the witnesses and their testimony, evidence, and how it will prove the case Introduced a theme/theory of the case Outlined the burden of proof Requested 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 situation Sequenced questions logically Did not ask questions that required any unfair extrapolations Laid foundation for witness testimony Elicited relevant, important evidence from witnesses Continued with consistent theme/theory of the case Provided proper objections during opposing team's cross-examination Utilized objections to move the case forward and not just to throw the other side off their game Made/defended objections utilizing rules of evidence or the rules of the competition Recovered well after objections Adjusted to judges' rulings Addressed actual testimony Followed proper protocol for handling and introducing exhibits Demonstrated an understanding of the rules of competition and evidence Limited re-direct to scope of cross-examination On re-direct, rehabilitated witnesses
Cross Attorney/ Examination	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continued with consistent theme/theory of the case Provided proper objections during opposing team's direct examination Made/defended to objections utilizing rules of evidence or the rules of the competition Utilized objections to move the case forward and not just to throw the other side off their game Recovered well after objections Adjusted to judges' rulings Addressed actual testimony Elicited facts favorable to the attorney's case Asked properly phrased questions that weakened the testimony given during direct examination Used appropriate leading questions suggesting a "yes/no" answer Attempted to appropriately control the witness consistent with the judges' rulings Properly impeached the witness, if needed, without appearing to harass or intimidate Followed proper protocol for introducing exhibits Demonstrated an understanding of the rules of competition and evidence Limited re-cross-examination to scope of re-direct examination
Closing Arguments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorporated what transpired during trial Summarized the evidence with reasoned arguments Outlined the strengths of his/her side's witnesses and the weaknesses of the other side's witnesses Discussed relevant exhibits when appropriate Theme was carried through to closing Refers to jury instructions or other legal standards when necessary Asked for the verdict, including a request for relief, and explained why the verdict was justifiable Effectively answered and rebutted opponent's case

WITNESSES

Performance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presented an interesting and authentic character Character and performance was consistent between direct and cross Played up the strengths of his/her statements and adequately explained the weaknesses Understood the facts of the case and the exhibits Provided logical testimony Sounded spontaneous and not memorized Did not give excessively long or non-responsive answers on cross-examination (time sucking) Maintained factual position under cross-examination Did not offer answers that included any unfair extrapolations Recovered well after objections Remained in character when not on the witness stand 	<p><i>Witnesses now receive one score on direct and another separate score on cross. This is to allow for differences in performance and character between direct and cross and to address any rules issues, i.e. unfair extrapolation and time sucking in either portion.</i></p>
--	--

***** Do NOT reward excessive explanations and/or obstructionist behavior meant to waste opposing team's time.**

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