

TRIAL COURT EVALUATORS QUICK REFERENCE:



General Guidelines:

- Evaluators score judge AND team performances.
- Start each team and judge with Score of 5 then add/subtract points based on performances.
- Please 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. Cameron Shepard

WITNESSES FOR THE PROSECUTION TEAM (STATE OF TEXAS):

1. Officer Jordan Cole
2. Emery Payne, RN
3. Imani Haines

WITNESSES FOR THE DEFENSE TEAM (Cameron Shepard):

1. Dr. Sidney Tate
2. Urban Rhodes
3. Taylor Belanger

PHYSICAL EVIDENCE THAT MAY BE ENTERED BY PROSECUTION:

1. SFST Field Notes
2. Blood Vial
3. Blood Draw Lab Report
4. Death Certificate
5. Bar Receipt

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

| 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 a 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 |