

The following matrix has been developed as a guide to scoring each role in the Mock Trial Competition.

Please note that this is a guide only, as students may demonstrate qualities that fall into different categories.

ALL SCORES ARE TO BE ALLOCATED AT THE SOLE DISCRETION OF THE JUDGE AND ARE FINAL

| | Very Weak A very poor performance Very rarely awarded if ever | Weak A performance that needs improving in a number of respects Rarely Awarded | Average A reasonable performance across most criteria Most students will be in this or the Credit range | Credit A good all round performance Most students will be in this or the Average range | Distinction Very sound performance Rarely awarded | Outstanding Almost flawless performance Very rarely awarded |
|------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| | Where a student has clearly failed to grasp or display the main requirements of the role | Where a student has shown some level of understanding of the role, but who on the whole is missing most aspects of the requirements of the role. | Where a student has made a reasonable attempt at most of the parts of the role, but who demonstrates room to improve their performance | Where a student gives a solid performance that meets most criteria while still missing some aspects of content or delivery | Where a student has demonstrated all aspects of the role with a good performance, clearly in the top group of barristers in the competition | Only where a student clearly exceeds all expectations of the role and excels in their performance |
| | 0-3 marks | 3-4.5 marks | 5-6.5 marks | 7-8 marks | 8.5-9 marks | 9.5-10 marks |
| OPENING ADDRESS | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ideas not particularly ordered No real structure Repetition Missing significant material facts No attempt to address legal principles Clearly nervous Appears unprepared No eye contact, reading entirely from notes, no modulation, pace too fast or too slow | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poor structure and ordering of thoughts Irrelevant material presented Material facts not given central focus No real attempt to address the legal issues No attempt to rebut the other side's case No or little eye contact. Reads notes and has no or very little modulation and fails to present the case as opposed to read their notes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reasonably well ordered thoughts, may be hard to follow Some material facts presented but not all Some irrelevant material Some of the legal argument raised but not all No or minimal attempt to rebut the other side's obvious position No real case theory some nerves Reasonable eye contact Reasonable tone and modulation Stumbles occasionally on notes Reads more than persuasively presents | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Well ordered structure that is easy to follow, though may have a few irrelevant or missing points Most material facts presented At least one legal issue identified and concisely expressed Some outline of the evidence to be relied upon Some attempt made to rebut an obvious part of the other side's position Case theory can be clearly understood Reasonable eye contact, good pace and voice modulation, only a few nerves showing, manner reasonably confident and persuasive | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent structure, clear, logical, easy to follow Clear and persuasive case theory All material facts presented clearly and concisely Clear and concise summary of the specific legal principles relevant to the case Concise outline of the evidence to be provided Reasonable rebuttal of the other side's likely position Not nervous Excellent eye contact, Good pace in delivery, good voice modulation, poised, confident and persuasive | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All Distinction criteria met and exceeded Thoroughly familiar with the factual material, the legal principles and their application Clearly relaxed and in control Thoroughly polished presentation |

2016 Mock Trial Competition – Judge’s Scoring guide

| | Very Weak A very poor performance Very rarely awarded if ever | Weak A performance that needs improving in a number of respects Rarely Awarded | Average A reasonable performance across most criteria Most students will be in this or the Credit range | Credit A good all round performance Most students will be in this or the Average range | Distinction Very sound performance Rarely awarded | Outstanding Almost flawless performance Very rarely awarded |
|-----------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| | 0-3 marks | 3.5-4.5 marks | 5-6.5 marks | 7-8 marks | 8.5-9 marks | 9.5-10 marks |
| EXAMINATION IN CHIEF | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Asks lots of objectionable questions (leading, repetitive, etc) Questions fail to bring forward the majority of relevant information from the witness statements Clearly nervous No eye contact Appears unprepared No differentiation between questions Asks confusing questions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Asks objectionable questions Questions fail to bring forward a significant amount of relevant information from the witness statements No or little eye contact Little differentiation between questions Asks confusing questions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proper introduction of evidence Questioning according to rules of evidence Re-examination if necessary Asks few objectionable questions Decent eye contact Asks few confusing questions Little differentiation between questions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Asks few or no objectionable questions Re-examines if necessary Reasonable eye contact Asks clear questions Good differentiation between questions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Asks no objectionable questions Good re-examination Good eye contact Asks clear questions Great differentiation between questions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All distinction criteria met and exceeded Perfect questioning with the judge being unable to conceive better questions to ask Perfect eye contact and presentation Completely polished |
| | 0-3 marks | 3.5-4.5 marks | 5-6.5 marks | 7-8 marks | 8.5-9 marks | 9.5-10 marks |
| OBJECTIONS | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrating no awareness of the grounds for making or not making objections Unable to make a considered response Does not make any objections or makes poor objections Does not respond well to objections | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrating poor awareness of the grounds for making or not making objections Attempts to make a considered response but may respond poorly Makes some decent objections, but not many | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrating awareness of the grounds for making or not making objections Makes a considered response | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrating good awareness of the grounds for making or not making objections Makes strong objections Making a considered and appropriate response | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrating very good awareness of the grounds for making or not making objections Objects almost perfectly with strong reasoning Makes a considered and good response with strong reasoning | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrating excellent awareness of the grounds for making or not making objections Objects perfectly with flawless reasoning Making a considered and excellent response with flawless reasoning |
| | 0-6.5 marks | 7-9.5 marks | 10-13.5 marks | 14-16.5 marks | 17-18.5 marks | 19-20 marks |
| CROSS EXAMINATION | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unnecessary repetition of evidence-in-chief No relevance to evidence-in-chief No relevance to own case Clearly nervous No eye contact Appears unprepared Asks confusing questions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some unnecessary repetition of evidence-in-chief Poor relevance to evidence-in-chief Poor relevance to own case No or little eye contact Asks confusing questions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Avoiding unnecessary repetition of evidence-in-chief Relevance to evidence-in-chief Relevance to own case Asks few objectionable questions Decent eye contact Asks few confusing questions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Avoids, in the main, unnecessary repetition of evidence-in-chief Good relevance to evidence-in-chief Good relevance to own case Reasonable eye contact Asks clear questions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Avoids, almost without exception, unnecessary repetition of evidence-in-chief Very good relevance to evidence-in-chief Very good relevance to own case Good eye contact Asks clear questions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Avoids all unnecessary repetition of evidence-in-chief Excellent relevance to evidence-in-chief Excellent relevance to own case Perfect eye contact and presentation Completely polished |
| | 0-6.5 marks | 7-9.5 marks | 10-13.5 marks | 14-16.5 marks | 17-18.5 marks | 19-20 marks |
| WITNESS | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reads witness statement or reads from notes (= 0 points) Incomplete and inaccurate recital of evidence Extends beyond ambit of statement, agreed facts and unfairly introduces new evidence Cross-examination: unable to cope Argues with counsel Presentation: incomprehensible speech and no modulation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incomplete and inaccurate recital of evidence Extends beyond ambit of statement and agreed facts Cross-examination: copes poorly Argues with counsel Presentation: mumbled speech and poor modulation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Full and accurate recital of evidence Stays within ambit of statement and agreed facts Cross-examination: good coping skills Presentation: speaks clearly and good modulation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Full and accurate recital of evidence Stays within ambit of statement and agreed facts and introduces additional evidence Cross-examination: copes well under cross-examination Presentation: speaks very clearly and good modulation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Full and accurate recital of evidence Stays within ambit of statement and agreed facts and introduces additional evidence Cross-examination: copes very well under cross-examination Presentation: speaks very clearly and excellent modulation Introduces appropriate dramatic effect to the role | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Full and accurate recital of evidence Stays within ambit of statement and agreed facts and introduces additional evidence Cross-examination: copes excellently under cross-examination Presentation: excellent speech and excellent modulation Introduces appropriate dramatic effect to the role that extends the role above and beyond what is expected |

2016 Mock Trial Competition – Judge’s Scoring guide

| | Very Weak A very poor performance Very rarely awarded if ever 0-6 marks | Weak A performance that needs improving in a number of respects Rarely Awarded 6.5-9 marks | Average A reasonable performance across most criteria Most students will be in this or the Credit range 9.5-13.5 marks | Credit A good all round performance Most students will be in this or the Average range 14-16 marks | Distinction Very sound performance Rarely awarded 16.5-18 marks | Outstanding Almost flawless performance Very rarely awarded 19-20 marks |
|------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| CLOSING ADDRESS | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No structure No attempt to address relevant legal principles No attempt to discuss, rely upon, or distinguish case law provided (where relevant) No attempt to rebut the other side’s case Discusses issues or elements of case, in depth, whilst not in issue (ie wastes time on irrelevant issues) Clearly nervous No eye contact No attempt at modulating voice Clearly a scripted address, with no contemporaneity with how the case has progressed Cannot respond to questions from His/Her Honour | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poor structure of address, with no logical flow of ideas Material that is irrelevant presented, with focus taken away from material facts that are in issue Some attempt to address relevant legal principles No attempt to discuss, rely upon, or distinguish case law provided (where relevant) No attempt to rebut the other side’s case No or little eye contact Clearly nervous Little or no attempt at modulating voice A clear reliance on notes, with address obviously scripted Tries to respond to questions from His/Her Honour, but falters, cannot return to address flexibly. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some logical order to flow of address, ideas have reasoning Some irrelevant material presented, but mostly focussed on central issues Attempts to address relevant legal principles, but does not have in depth understanding of said principles Tries to discuss relevant case law but does not appear to have full understanding of the contents thereof Some nerves apparent Some eye contact Some attempt at modulation in voice Some reliance on notes, erring on the side of reading rather than persuading the bench Attempts to respond to questions from His/Her Honour, and demonstrates some knowledge of the topics asked Tries to rebut the other side’s case, but has some difficulty | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Well ordered flow of address, ideas are reasoned and logical. Close to all relevant issues addressed, with little to no irrelevant material discussed at length Addresses relevant legal principles, has understanding, but when challenged by His/Her Honour, falters Discusses some relevant case law, especially relevant to their side’s case theory, however has some difficulty in distinguishing that which is not favourable Good eye contact An apparent case theory Few nerves showing Some rebuttal of the other side’s case Modulates voice well No reliance on notes, with an obvious contemporaneity of their address, incorporating issues that have arisen as the trial has progressed Answers questions from His/Her Honour with little difficulty, shows broad understanding of relevant topics, and an ability to return to their address unscathed | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Well reasoned ideas, logical flow, and excellent structure All relevant issues addressed, and discussed with full understanding of the same Discusses all relevant case law, with an ability to distinguish that which is not favourable, and advocate for that which is No irrelevant material discussed at all Excellent eye contact A well reasoned case theory, made clear by the address No nerves showing Rebuts all relevant issues displayed in the other side’s case theory, and supports with relevant evidence and case law where necessary No reliance on notes, contemporaneous in their address, and persuasively advocates their side’s position Answers questions from His/Her Honour with finesse, and incorporates the answers into their address, being flexible in the delivery thereof | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All the criteria set out in the Distinction category met and exceeded. Clearly relaxed, and in control of the address and the conduct thereof An exemplary understanding of the material, the evidence as elicited throughout the trial, the case law, and the interaction between the same. |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No contemporaneous notes No interaction with the Barristers throughout the course of the trial Clearly no input or involvement in the drafting of the closing address | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some notes written throughout the trial, and provided to the Barristers Some contemporaneous notes of the hearing Some participation throughout the proceedings Involvement with the Barristers in the drafting of the closing address | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Active participation in proceedings Notes to barristers during trial including comments on evidence Accurate contemporaneous notes of hearing | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Well recorded notes of the proceedings Involvement with the Barristers throughout the proceedings (ie informing the Barrister when they’ve missed evidence in chief, or further questions to ask in cross) Clear involvement with the Barristers in the drafting of the closing address | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All of the criteria recorded in the Credit category; plus All notes are clear, concise and accurately record the proceedings An obvious team ethos between Barristers and Solicitor. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All of the criteria recorded in the Distinction category; plus Professional conduct of the Solicitor An overall appraisal of the notes of the Solicitors, general conduct, and team work that elevates the Solicitor into the level of ‘Outstanding’. |

2016 Mock Trial Competition – Judge’s Scoring guide

| | Very Weak A very poor performance Very rarely awarded if ever | Weak A performance that needs improving in a number of respects Rarely Awarded | Average A reasonable performance across most criteria Most students will be in this or the Credit range | Credit A good all round performance Most students will be in this or the Average range | Distinction Very sound performance Rarely awarded | Outstanding Almost flawless performance Very rarely awarded |
|-------------------|---|---|--|--|--|---|
| | 0-3 marks | 3-4.5 marks | 5-6.5 marks | 7-8 marks | 8.5-9 marks | 9.5-10 marks |
| COURT ORDERLY | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Courtroom role carried out poorly (open/close Court, circulate documents, call and swear witnesses) • Fails to complete time sheet, Notice of Appearance • Court etiquette is of a low standard • Fails to maintain courtroom order • Fails to keep teams to time | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Courtroom role carried out with some difficulty (open/close Court, circulate documents, call and swear witnesses) • Completion of time sheet, Notice of Appearance is to a low standard • Court etiquette requires improvement • Maintains courtroom order with difficulty • Poorly keeps teams to time | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Courtroom role carried out correctly (open/close Court, circulate documents, call and swear witnesses) • Completion of time sheet, Notice of Appearance and appropriate court etiquette • Satisfactorily maintains courtroom order • Time limits are generally well-monitored | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Courtroom role carried out correctly and with some polish (open/close Court, circulate documents, call and swear witnesses) • Completion of time sheet and Notice of Appearance is above satisfactory • Displays good court etiquette • Maintains good courtroom order • Time limits are mostly adhered to and warnings are provided | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Courtroom role carried out correctly and with polish (open/close Court, circulate documents, call and swear witnesses) • Completion of time sheet and Notice of Appearance is very good • Displays court etiquette of a high standard • Effectively maintains courtroom order • Time limits are adhered to and warnings are provided | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Courtroom role carried out correctly and with a high degree of polish (open/close Court, circulate documents, call and swear witnesses) • Completion of time sheet and Notice of Appearance is without error • Displays perfect court etiquette • Very effectively maintains courtroom order • Time limits are strictly adhered to and warnings are consistently provided |
| JUDGE'S ASSOCIATE | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carries out role poorly • Fails to announce case correctly and when required • Court etiquette is of a low standard • List of objections fails to list any or only lists few objections • Fails to take exhibits and present to judge | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carries out role with some difficulty and a lack of polish • Announces case with some difficulty • Court etiquette requires improvement • List of objections lists the majority of objections made • Requires some prompting in taking exhibits and presenting to judge | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carries out role satisfactorily • Announces case with little error • Displays satisfactory court etiquette • Satisfactorily lists objections made • Takes exhibits from Court Orderly when required and presents to presiding judge | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carries out role correctly and with some polish • Announces case correctly • Displays good court etiquette • List of objections is properly completed • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carries out role confidently and with polish • Announces case without prompt when required • Displays court etiquette to a high standard • List of objections records all objections made • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carries out role with a high degree of confidence and polish and without error • Announces case without prompt when required • Displays perfect court etiquette • List of objections accurately records all objections made and by whom |