

Missouri High School Mock Trial Competition  
**Scoring Matrix**

Roles should be evaluated as compared to the average high school mock trial competitor.

	<b>Attorneys</b>	<b>Witnesses</b>
<b>POOR</b> (Scores of 1-2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Role not presented</li> <li>• Extremely under-prepared</li> <li>• Shows extreme contempt for tribunal</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Role not presented</li> <li>• Extremely under-prepared</li> <li>• Shows extreme contempt for tribunal</li> </ul>
<b>BELOW AVERAGE</b> (Scores of 3-4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrated poor understanding of the case, rules, and legal issues</li> <li>• Poise and delivery needed work, was not persuasive</li> <li>• Asked questions intended to elicit unfair extrapolations; examinations were confusing or unclear</li> <li>• Little to no eye contact, with reliance on notes that detracted from performance</li> <li>• Voice difficult to hear</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No portrayal of character</li> <li>• Performance felt generic or scripted</li> <li>• Responses were not thorough, persuasive, or natural</li> <li>• Little to no eye contact</li> <li>• Voice often difficult to hear</li> <li>• Overly combative on cross examination</li> <li>• Consistently invented factual material outside the case materials</li> </ul>
<b>AVERAGE</b> (Scores of 5-6)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrated fair understanding of the case, rules, and legal issues</li> <li>• Delivery had some hesitation and/or stumbles</li> <li>• Missed appropriate opportunities to object; or made inappropriate or too many objections</li> <li>• Maintained eye contact some of the time</li> <li>• Reliance on script and notes to the detriment of the presentation</li> <li>• Voice sometimes difficult to hear</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintained passable portrayal of character</li> <li>• Performance was passable but lacked depth</li> <li>• Some response felt scripted</li> <li>• Eye contact maintained some of the time when appropriate</li> <li>• Voice sometimes difficult to hear</li> <li>• Sometimes combative on cross</li> <li>• Materially went outside the case materials once or twice</li> </ul>
<b>ABOVE AVERAGE</b> (Scores of 7-8)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrated above-average understanding of the case, rules, and legal issues</li> <li>• Persuasive delivery</li> <li>• Questions on direct &amp; cross were organized and delivered a clear presentation</li> <li>• Eye contact mostly maintained</li> <li>• Some use of notes, but was not distracting and did not take away from delivery</li> <li>• Voice was clear, audible, and confident</li> <li>• Objections and responses were appropriate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintained very good portrayal of character</li> <li>• Performance was mostly credible and convincing</li> <li>• Answered most cross questions appropriately</li> <li>• Maintained eye contact appropriately</li> <li>• Spoke loudly and clearly enough to be heard and understood</li> <li>• Appropriate answers on cross with few combative answers</li> <li>• Did not deviate from case materials; Responses were consistent with the facts</li> </ul>
<b>OUTSTANDING</b> (Scores of 9-10)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates excellent understanding of the case, rules, and legal issues</li> <li>• Near flawless poise &amp; delivery</li> <li>• Asked compelling questions on direct and cross examinations: Made appropriate objections and argued effectively</li> <li>• Avoided unfair extrapolations</li> <li>• Controlled witness on cross-examination</li> <li>• Maintained eye contact with minimal to no reliance on notes</li> <li>• Spoke loudly and clearly enough to be heard and understood</li> <li>• Demonstrated understanding of legal procedure/reasoning, could “think on feet”</li> <li>• Worked well with other team members</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintained excellent portrayal of character throughout trial, even when not testifying</li> <li>• Believable performance; Showed emotion &amp; affect appropriate to role</li> <li>• Responses showed excellent understanding of witness statement and facts</li> <li>• Maintained eye contact that engaged the listeners</li> <li>• Spoke loudly and clearly that engaged the listeners</li> <li>• Maintained poise during cross examination; did not become inappropriately combative on cross, but did not “roll over”</li> <li>• Gave responses that helped his or her team, without inventing material facts on direct examination</li> </ul>