

## 2025 UCLA Law Cybercrimes Moot Court Competition Scoring Guidelines

All scoring will be done on a 1 - 10 scale. To ensure uniformity of grading, the following standards will be used.

- **1-3: Very Poor.** Lacking fundamental knowledge, preparation, or skill.
- **4-5: Poor.** Exhibiting basic knowledge, preparation, or skill appropriate for an educated layperson.
- **6: Average.** Exhibiting knowledge, preparation, or skills appropriate for an average second or third year law school student or law firm summer associate.
- **7-8: Good.** Exhibiting advanced knowledge, preparation, or skills appropriate for a practicing lawyer and advocate.
- **9-10: Exceptional.** Exhibiting exemplary knowledge, preparation, or skill such that you would feel very comfortable having this advocate argue a case in which you were a party before an appellate court.

### Brief Scoring Guidelines

#### 1. **Prose**

- a) The clarity of the advocate's writing style (e.g. is the brief well-structured and coherent? Is the language overly florid or otherwise hard to parse? etc.)
- b) The persuasiveness of the advocate's writing style (e.g. is the brief engaging to read? Does the brief tell an engaging story of the case?)
- c) The appropriateness of the advocate's language (e.g. is the word choice repetitive or boring? Is there slang or profanity, or are contractions used?)

#### 2. **Argument**

- a) Whether the brief clearly states the desired relief in the instant case and proposed legal test for future cases
- b) Whether the brief presents a concise and convincing argument in support of the desired relief
- c) Whether the brief makes good and accurate use of legal precedent in support of the presented argument
- d) Whether the brief makes good and accurate use of the factual circumstances of the case at hand in support of the presented argument
- e) Whether the brief satisfactorily addresses points in opposition to the presented argument

#### 3. **Presentation**

- a) Whether the brief makes good use of the basic elements of an appellate brief. (e.g. whether the section headings effectively organize and signpost the argument; whether the "question presented" is accurate and advances the argument; whether the "summary of argument" concisely presents each of the brief's major contentions, etc.)

- b) Whether the brief is formatted in a professional manner. (e.g. correct margin width, spacing, and font)
- c) Whether the brief is free of typographical errors and misspellings

### Oral Scoring Guidelines

#### **1. Clarity**

- a) The advocate's verbal presentation (e.g. saying "uh" or "um," whether the advocate sounded robotic or "canned", the pace of the advocate's speech, etc.)
- b) The advocate's physical presentation (e.g. an appearance of confidence, nervous gestures or tics, poor eye contact, etc.)
- c) The advocate's rhetorical presentation (e.g. the precision and persuasiveness of the advocate's language, the fluidity with which the advocate transitions between different portions of their argument, whether the advocate addresses the panel with the proper level of respect and deference, etc.)

#### **2. Responsiveness**

- a) The advocate's ability to responsively and respectfully address questions posed by the panel
- b) The advocate's ability to concisely address questions posed by the panel
- c) The advocate's ability to re-cast hypotheticals in a way favorable to his or her argument

#### **3. Knowledge of and Use of Case Law**

- a) The advocate's ability to articulate and defend a clear holding or test which the advocate wants the panel to adopt
- b) The advocate's ability to convincingly analogize his or her position to favorable legal precedents
- c) The advocate's ability to convincingly distinguish his or her position from unfavorable legal precedents

#### **4. Knowledge of and use of facts**

- a) The advocate's accurate knowledge of and ability to explain the present case's facts
- b) The advocate's ability to convincingly distinguish the case at hand from the facts of precedent cases
- c) The advocate's ability to convincingly analogize the facts of the case at hand to the facts of precedent cases