

NATIONAL TRIAL COMPETITION

OFFICIAL SCORING BALLOT

<i>Prosecution Team Number:</i>	v.	<i>Defense Team Number:</i>
Round:		Courtroom:
<u><i>Points for Prosecution</i></u>	<u>Scoring Category</u> <i>(no scored portion can be waived)</i>	<u><i>Points for Defense</i></u>
_____ of 15	<i>Opening Statement</i> – 15 Points Possible	_____ of 15
_____ of 15	<i>Direct of Prosecution Witness # 1</i> (15 Points Possible for Prosecution only)	N/A
N/A	<i>Cross-examination of Prosecution Witness # 1</i> (15 Points Possible for Defense only)	_____ of 15
_____ of 15	<i>Direct of Prosecution Witness # 2</i> (15 Points Possible for Prosecution only)	N/A
N/A	<i>Cross-examination of Prosecution Witness # 2</i> (15 Points Possible for Defense only)	_____ of 15
N/A	<i>Direct of Defense Witness # 1</i> (15 Points Possible for Defense only)	_____ of 15
_____ of 15	<i>Cross-examination of Defense Witness # 1</i> (15 Points Possible for Prosecution only)	N/A
N/A	<i>Direct of Defense Witness # 2</i> (15 Points Possible for Defense only)	_____ of 15
_____ of 15	<i>Cross-examination of Defense Witness # 2</i> (Total of 15 Points Possible for Prosecution only)	N/A
_____ of 15	<i>Closing Argument</i> – 15 Points Possible	_____ of 15
_____ of 10	<i>Evidentiary Objections & Responses</i> (10 Points Possible)	_____ of 10
_____ of 100	TOTAL POINTS (TOTAL OF 100 POINTS POSSIBLE FOR EACH TEAM)	_____ of 100
Prosecution	Winning Team – Circle One (Ties are <u>not</u> permitted.)	Defense
Judge's Signature		Date:

NATIONAL TRIAL COMPETITION

NTC SCORING CRITERIA

Opening Statement (Total of 15 points possible - one advocate will present opening for each team)

1. Generally confined to outline of evidence to be presented?
2. Clearly and persuasively presented theory of case?
3. Personalized himself/herself and client?
4. Made appropriate objections/responses, if any?

15	Outstanding
13-14	Very good
11-12	Solid – More good than bad
9-10	Mediocre – About what you would expect from a law student
6-8	More bad than good
0-5	Extremely poor

Direct Examination (Total of 15 points possible - each advocate will conduct the direct examination of one witness)

1. Questions generated minimum number of valid objections?
2. Made or failed to make objections with tactical or substantive merit?
3. Appropriately responded to objections made?
4. Appropriate general attitude and rapport with jury?
5. Testimony developed in interesting and coherent fashion?
6. Listened to and followed up on witness answers?
7. Showed strength and weakness of witness in most favorable light?

Cross Examination (Total of 15 points possible - each advocate will cross-examine one witness)

1. Questions generated minimum number of valid objections?
2. Made or failed to make objections with tactical or substantive merit?
3. Appropriately responded to objections made?
4. Used leading questions appropriately and advantageously?
5. Listened to and followed up on witness answers to elicit helpful testimony?
6. Used impeachment opportunities and demonstrated same effectively?
7. Did not develop a cross examination based on facts not contained in the problem?

Closing Argument (Total of 15 points possible - one advocate will present closing for each team)

1. Presented a cohesive theory of the case and dealt effectively with the weaknesses?
2. Effectively called attention to opponent's flaws?
3. Presented persuasive argument?
4. Utilized effective style and law?
5. Inappropriately interrupted argument of opposing counsel?
6. Properly confined rebuttal to rebuttal materials?
7. Effectively countered opponent's argument in rebuttal?

NATIONAL TRIAL COMPETITION

Evidentiary Objections & Responses (Total of 10 points possible per team)

Overall, consider the evidentiary objections made – valid, tactical, and/or substantive – by a party and/or a party’s appropriate response to valid, tactical, and/or substantive objections.

Ruling irrelevant:

Do not take into consideration whether the objection was sustained or overruled.

10	Outstanding
8-9	Very good
6-7	Solid – More good than bad
4-5	Mediocre – About what you would expect from a law student
2-3	More bad than good
0-1	Extremely poor