

SCORING MATRIX

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