



TRIAL COURT EVALUATORS QUICK-SHEET:

General Guidelines:

- Evaluators score judge AND team performances.
- Start each team and judge with a score of 5 and add/dock points based on their performances.
- Remember these are high school students, not college or law school students.
- Please do not consult with other evaluators or any team regarding your evaluation(s) during the competition.
- Please **write** comments on your evaluation of each team and the judge. Written feedback is very valuable for teams to receive at the conclusion of the competition.

Case Information: State of Texas v. Jenny Smith

WITNESSES FOR THE PROSECUTION TEAM (STATE OF TEXAS):

1. Detective Amelie Hodges
2. Dr. Joshua Sapp
3. Dr. Austin Miles

WITNESSES FOR THE DEFENSE TEAM (Jenny Smith):

1. Dr. Kathryn O'Reilly
2. Jamie Manning
3. Joanna Steblay, LPC

The defense should call all three of these witnesses

PHYSICAL EVIDENCE THAT MAY BE ENTERED BY PROSECUTION:

1. Police Report
2. Diagram of Penny Park
3. Autopsy Report
4. Diagram of Body
5. Murder Weapon
6. Journal Pages (4)
7. Knife Picture from Wall
8. Jenny Smith's Psychiatric Records

The defense team does not have to enter evidence, but may



TEXAS YOUTH & GOVERNMENT

| Judge Scoring Criteria | Attorney Team Scoring Criteria |
|--|---|
| Calling the Court to Order: communicating any courtroom rules, swearing in witnesses, announcing that Court is in session, stating the charges against the defendant | Opening Statement: Preferably memorized, effectively delivered; attorneys inform the court what they intend to prove in the trial |
| Knowledge of Trial Procedure: stick to schedule of the trial, rules, and proper procedures. Does not need guidance, does not hesitate during trial proceedings | Attorney #1 Direct Exam: How well attorney #1 handles difficult witnesses and effectively extracts information with good questions |
| Knowledge of Evidence Rules, Objections, and the Law: Judges were required to pass a test on how to handle entering evidence, the order of who presents, etc. | Attorney #2 Direct Exam: How well attorney #2 handles difficult witnesses and effectively extracts information with good questions |
| Demeanor and Professionalism: Demands respect, engaged, good posture, pleasant disposition | Attorney #1 Cross Exam: How well attorney #1 effectively and assertively handles the other team's witnesses, getting the answers they need |
| Interaction with Trial Participants: does not let attorneys go over time, politely directs attorneys and witnesses to proceed, etc. | Attorney #2 Cross Exam: How well attorney #2 effectively and assertively handles the other team's witnesses, getting the answers they need |
| Decision-Making Ability: Handle objections and questions efficiently, does not get thrown off by unexpected events | Use of Exhibits and Evidence: Attorneys use evidence throughout their presentation. Exhibits are marked, offered & entered into evidence properly, and used effectively NOTE: the judge should know the procedure |
| Maintaining Control of Courtroom: Preside effectively, keep time, make a ruling and explain why that team won NOTE: The verdict of the judge does not affect evaluators' score of each team | Knowledge of Trial Procedure: stick to schedule of the trial, know rules and proper procedures; always be relevant, effective and fair to proceedings and to other team |
| | Objections: State objections in legal terms and respond to objections of the other team |
| | Overall Demeanor: respectful interaction with judge and opposing team; standing when addressing the Court or addressed by the judge |
| | Witnesses: Performance (knowledge of affidavit, demeanor, character) |
| | Preparation: Very well-organized, prepared use of facts, effective teamwork |
| | Closing Argument: Persuasiveness, effective use of rebuttal, effective and fair summary of the trial |