



## Ballot Rubric for Judges

When assigning points to the competitors, **think of yourself like a college professor**. If you find yourself giving everyone 97%+ on their assignments, you're likely going too easy on them.

Likewise, if you find yourself giving everyone less than 80% on all their assignments, you're likely going too hard on them.

Additionally, while this is a competitive event, participation is central to any learning process. Because of this, the baseline for participation should be 50%, with the precise grade beyond that number determined by performance.

### Knowledge of Facts and Law

50-59: *Failing*. Demonstrates a clear lack of knowledge of any relevant caselaw, often miscites or misquotes basic facts.

60-69: *Barely acceptable*. Demonstrates little understanding of central issues, often miscites or misquotes facts.

70-79: *Fair*. Demonstrates a tolerable knowledge of the facts and cases, occasionally lacks the requested information or fails to provide requested caselaw.

80-89: *Good*. Demonstrates high familiarity of fact and caselaw to support chosen arguments, correctly represents the relevant facts.

90-100: *Excellent*. Demonstrates outstanding command over any concept (both facts and caselaw) mentioned, is able to immediately reference requested facts or caselaw with accuracy.

### Response to Questions

50-59: *Failing*. Refuses to engage with questions, ignores clear attempts to communicate.

60-69: *Barely acceptable*. Inconsistently responds to questions, often diverts the response into an entirely different topic.

70-79: *Fair*. Engages with questions, but occasionally fails to adequately address concerns, often requiring a series of follow-up questions.

80-89: *Good*. Engages well with questions, consistently provides a defense of an argument with some supporting facts, caselaw, or proper rhetoric.

90-100: *Excellent*. Responds directly, persuasively, and respectfully, demonstrates clear knowledge of the packet contents by making relevant references during responses.



## **Delivery and Decorum**

50-59: *Failing*. Entirely unaware of courtroom procedure, often rude or dismissive.

60-69: *Barely acceptable*. Clearly unfamiliar with proper procedure, often fails to frame responses with proper language. Distracting filler words and stumbles.

70-79: *Fair*. Aware of but inconsistently uses proper language, occasionally slips into informal language. Limited filler words and stumbles.

80-89: *Good*. Clearly familiar with courtroom etiquette, consistently applies proper language, and has good time management. Few filler words and stumbles.

90-100: *Excellent*. Masters courtroom etiquette, always applies proper language, and has excellent time management. Little to no filler words or stumbles.

## **Logical Argumentation**

50-59: *Failing*. Incoherent arguments, unable to adequately explain reasoning when questioned.

60-69: *Barely acceptable*. Barely understandable arguments, inadequate defense under questioning.

70-79: *Fair*. Logical arguments, but often requires a significant amount of clarification to understand and/or struggles to defend arguments under pressure.

80-89: *Good*. Well-developed arguments that show clear familiarity with the rulings contained in the packet.

90-100: *Excellent*. Excellent, persuasive argumentation that demonstrates clear grasp of the packet, provides clearly developed and concise defenses of arguments under question.