Oregon High School Mock Trial Competition

Updated Tabulation Rules Handbook
(in Partnership with Empire Mock Trial)

2024-2025 Season Note: This Tabulation Handbook is designed to replace Oregon High School's Mock Trial previous Power Matching system. With the adoption of Empire Mock Trial's PROcess system, these new rules will be applied.

Oregon High School Mock Trial
Tabulation Rules

Table of Contents

<p style="text-align:center">Civics Learning Project</p>

Oregon High School Mock Trial Competition Tabulation Rules

Section T1 (Judging)

T1.1 - Definitions

1. A **Judge** is a volunteer that serves as either a presider or scorer for a round of mock trial, providing participants with both quantitative and qualitative evaluations of student performance.
    a. Each trial will contain one presider. The presider will maintain order throughout the trial and rule on objections.
    b. Each trial will contain two or more scorers. Scorers will complete a ballot scoring students on their performance throughout the trial and provide feedback after the trial but will otherwise remain silent until the trial has concluded.
    c. Where necessary, presiders may also complete a ballot scoring students on their performance.
2. A **Conflict** refers to a situation in which a judge is ineligible to view a trial due to one of the following reasons:
    a. A History Conflict is a situation in which a judge is ineligible to view a trial because the judge has watched at least one of that trial's teams in a previous round of the same competition.
    b. A Personal Conflict is a situation in which a judge is ineligible to view a trial because of an affiliation with at least one team in that trial that impedes the judge's ability to impartially evaluate the participants in that trial.
        i. Circumstances in which an 'affiliation' exists include, but are not limited to:
            1. The judge having a relationship with a student participant of the trial,
            2. The existence of a prior association with one of the competing teams in the trial, or
            3. Any other situation that may inhibit the judge's ability to impartially evaluate that trial's participants.
        ii. Personal conflicts do not necessarily arise in the following circumstances:
            1. The judge has judged either team at a previous tournament but not the current one, or
            2. The judge recognizes teams or members of a team from other environments, but such recognition does not amount to an affiliation as defined by subsection (i) of this rule.
        iii. The final authority to determine whether a personal conflict exists rests with the Competition Coordinator in consultation with the judge in question.

T1.2 – Judge Assignment

1. RANKINGS. Judges will be assigned a numerical score based on their litigation and mock trial experience. The most experienced judges may be assigned as presiders (unless they request otherwise), and remaining judges will be assigned as scorers.
2. CONFLICTS. Judges will not be assigned to trials containing teams with which they have conflicts, as defined by Rule T1.2.

T1.3 – Disclosure of Conflicts

1. PRE-COMPETITION. Prior to the tournament, Civics Learning Project will publish a list of competing schools. When judges check in to the tournament, they must disclose any personal conflicts with teams competing at the tournament, pursuant to Rule T2.1CONFLICTS. Judges will not be assigned to trials containing teams with which they have conflicts, as defined by Rule T1.2.

2. IN-COMPETITION. If a judge is allocated to a trial in which they have a Personal Conflict or a History Conflict, it is the responsibility of the judge to notify the Competition Coordination Team to this effect. The Coordination Team will arrange for judges to be exchanged between rooms such that the conflict is resolved.

T1.4 – Scoring Performance of the Participants

1. BALLOTS. In scoring the round, judges shall use the ballots provided by the Mock Trial Online Portal.
2. CATEGORIES. Each team will be scored on their performance in fourteen categories:
   a. Opening Statement
   b. Direct Examination by an Attorney (3X)
   c. Witness Performance on Direct Examination (3X)
   d. Witness Performance on Cross Examination (3X)
   e. Crossing Examination by an Attorney (3X)
   f. Closing Argument
3. SCALE.
   a. Defined. Judges shall award scores ranging from one (poor) to ten (excellent) for students' trial presentations (speeches and examinations).
   b. Total. Each team will receive scores for fourteen separate presentations.

Section T2 (Data Entry)

T2.1 – Ballot Receipt

1. ELECTRONIC BALLOT VERIFICATION. Judges will be asked to submit their ballots electronically via PROcess. Judges will submit scores as the trial progresses, and they will additionally be asked to review their scores prior to submission. PROcess will automatically validate the following conditions on each ballot:
   a. That all scores have been filled in;
   b. That the above scores are valid (that they are integers ranging from one to ten); and
   c. That the three 'best attorney' nominations and three 'best witness' nominations are completed.
2. PENALTIES. Any penalties levied by Competition Coordinators will be applied to the ballot prior to confirmation.

Section T3 (Tabulating Ballots)

T3.1 – Tabulation Definitions

1. **'Pairings'** refers to all of these pairings across the competition for a round.
2. A **'Pairing'** is the combination of two teams assigned to compete against each other in a given round of the competition.
3. **'Side'** refers to the side of the case (Plaintiff/Prosecution or Defense) that a team portrays.

T3.2 – Calculations

PROcess will perform calculations relating to a team's record, using ballot data at the conclusion of each round. It will calculate the following with respect to each team:

1. BALLOT RESULT. Whether the team has won, lost or tied that ballot.
   a. A team wins a ballot where the sum of their scores is greater than the sum of their opponent's.
   b. A team loses a ballot where the sum of their scores is less than their opponent's.
   c. A team ties a ballot where the sum of their scores is equal to their opponent's.
2. POINT DIFFERENTIAL. For each ballot submitted, the point differential is the difference between the team's sum of their scores, and the sum of their opponent's scores.
   a. Teams that win a given ballot will have a positive point differential for that ballot.

b. Teams that lose a ballot will have a negative point differential for that ballot.

c. Teams that tie a ballot have a point differential of zero (0) for that ballot.

3. CUMULATIVE WIN TOTAL. The number of 'wins' each team has accumulated over the course of the entire tournament to that point.

    a. Teams earn one win for each ballot won

    b. Teams earn one half of a win for each ballot tied.

    c. Teams earn zero wins for each ballot lost.

4. NET POINT DIFFERENTIALS. The team's net point differential accumulated over the course of the entire competition (i.e., Regional or Divisional or State) to that point, calculated as the sum of the point differentials on each ballot.

5. CUMULATIVE STRENGTH OF SCHEDULE. (At the end of Rounds 2, 3 and 4 only) The team's SOS is calculated as the sum of the wins of all of the team's opponents to that point in the tournament.

6. CUMULATIVE OPPONENTS' STRENGTH OF SCHEDULE. (At the end of Competition) The team's OSOS is calculated as the sum of the team's opponents' SOSs to that point in the competition.

7. RULE VIOLATIONS. Where a team has been found to commit Rule Violations, ballot penalties levied on that team should be noted and their ballot adjusted accordingly.

T3.3 – Tabulation of Rounds 1 (and 3, during State Competition)

Tabulating results from Rounds 1 (to pair Round 2) [and 3 (to pair Round 4) only during State Competition] occurs as follows:

1. CALCULATION OF RECORD. A team's cumulative tournament record is calculated. Included in this calculation is the number of wins, SOS, and NPD.

2. SOS is not calculated when tabulating Round 1.

3. SEPARATION OF TEAMS. Teams are sorted into one of two pools:

    a. Teams that portrayed Plaintiff in the round are sorted into the 'Needs Defense' pool.

    b. Teams that portrayed Defense in the round are sorted into the 'Needs Plaintiff' pool.

T3.4 – Tabulation of Round 2

Tabulating results from Round 2 (to pair Round 3) occurs as follows:

1. CALCULATION OF RECORD. A team's cumulative tournament record is then calculated. Included in this calculation is the number of wins, SOS, and NPD.

Section T4 (Pairings)
T4.1 – Pairing Rounds 1

Round 1 pairings are assigned randomly.

T4.2 – Pairing Rounds - Overview

1. NOTATION. For a tournament of *n* teams, the following notations n1 and n2 for the purpose of the pairing algorithms in Rules T4.3 and T4.4 apply:

    a. Usage.

        i. n1 refers to the half the number of teams that a single team could be paired against, including themselves. This number is used when constructing pools of side-constrained teams for pairing in Rounds 2 [and Round 4 at State Competition], where teams are ranked relative to the teams from their field which played the same side as them in the preceding round.

        ii. n2 refers to the full number of teams that a single team could be paired against, including themselves. This number is used when constructing the pool of an entire field for pairing in Round 3, where teams are ranked relative to all other teams in their field.

    b. Tournaments.

      i. $n_1 = 0.5n$ (i.e. the size of half the field)

      ii. $n_2 = n$ (i.e. the size of the full field)

2. SET SORTING. For a tournament of n teams:
   a. For Rounds 1 and 3 (to pair Rounds 2 and 4): Within each division (if applicable), teams which played Defense in the previous round will be sorted into the set of teams I (size n_1 teams), and teams which played Plaintiff in the previous round will be sorted into the set of J teams (size n_1 teams).
   b. For Round 2 (to pair Round 3): Teams will be ranked relative to other teams in their division, or the entire field where divisions are not used. Both sets I and J will contain all teams in the division (size n_2 teams).
3. PAIRING ALGORITHM. The algorithm will pair teams subject to the constraints and parameters outlined in Rule T4.3.
4. SIDE ASSIGNMENT.
   a. Rounds 2 and 4. In each pairing, the team drawn from the 'Needs Plaintiff' pool will play Plaintiff in the round, while the team drawn from the 'Needs Defense' pool will play Defense in the round.
   b. Round 3. One of the two scenarios below will be selected, to determine how sides are paired for Round 3: Given subsection 2(f) of this rule, this provision exists only for cases where teams have no other choice but to challenge the bye-buster team.
      i. Scenario 1: If the pairing rank is odd-numbered, then the higher-ranked team will play Prosecution/Plaintiff in the round, and the lower-ranked team will play Defense. If the pairing rank is even-numbered, the lower-ranked team will play Prosecution/Plaintiff in the round, and the higher-ranked team will play Defense.
      ii. Scenario 2: If the pairing rank is even-numbered, then the higher-ranked team will play Prosecution/Plaintiff in the round, and the lower-ranked team will play Defense. If the pairing rank is odd-numbered, the lower-ranked team will play Prosecution/Plaintiff in the round, and the higher-ranked team will play Defense.

T4.3 – Pairing Rounds - Algorithm

There are certain admissions and communications excluded from evidence on grounds of public policy. Among these are:

1. ALGORITHM - ROUNDS 2 [AND Round 4 in State Competition]. The algorithm will minimize the following objective function, for all possible teams from set I, $0 \leq i \leq n_1$, and all possible opponents of team i from set (J), $0 \leq j \leq n_1$:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \sum_{j=1}^{n_1} c_{ij}x_{ij}$$

Subject to the following constraints:
   a. $x_{ij} = 1$ if team i is paired with team j, otherwise 0;
   b. $\sum_{j=1}^{n_1} x_{ij} = 1, 0 \leq i \leq n_1$
   c. $\sum_{i=1}^{n_1} x_{ij} = 1, 0 \leq j \leq n_1$
   d. $c_{ij} = r_i - r_j^2 + \delta h_{ij} + \delta s_{ij}$
   e. r_x = Rank of team x, calculated relative to teams in their competition (to pair Round 3) or relative to the teams in their competition which played the same side (to pair Rounds 2 and [Round 4 of the State Competition).
   f. $h_{ij} = 1$ if team is from the same school as team j (or if the pairing is otherwise impermissible as per Rule T4.4), 0 otherwise
   g. $s_{ij} = 1$ if team i has faced team j in a previous round of the same competition, 0 otherwise

h. $\delta = 10^{100}$
2. ALGORITHM - ROUND 3. The algorithm will minimize the following objective function, for all possible teams from set I, $0 \leq i \leq n_2$, and all possible opponents of team i from set (J), $0 \leq j \leq n_2$:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n2} \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} c_{ij}, x_{ij}, i \neq j$$

Subject to the following constraints:
   a. $x_{ij} = 1$ if team i is paired with team j, otherwise 0
   b. $$\sum_{j=1}^{n_2} x_{ij} = 1, 0 \leq i \leq n_2$$
   c. $$\sum_{i=1}^{n_2} x_{ij} = 1, 0 \leq j \leq n_2.$$
   d. $x_{ij} = x_{ji}$ for all i, j
   e. r_x = Rank of team x, calculated relative to teams in their competition (to pair Round 3) or relative to the teams in their competition which played the same side (to pair Rounds 2 and [Round 4 of the State Competition).
   f. $h_{ij} = 1$ if team i is from the same school as team j (or if the pairing is otherwise impermissible as per Rule T4.4), 0 otherwise
   g. $s_{ij} = 1$ if team i has faced team j in a previous round of the same competition, 0 otherwise
   h. $\delta = 10^{100}$

T4.4 – Impermissible Pairings
1. TYPES OF IMPERMISSIBLE PAIRINGS. A pairing of teams for a round is deemed to be impermissible if one or more of the following criteria applies:
   a. The two teams are from the same school, or
   b. The two teams have faced each other before.
2. RESOLVING IMPERMISSIBLE PAIRINGS. Impermissible pairings are resolved automatically by the pairing algorithm.

Section T5 – End of Tournament Procedures
T5.1 – Calculating Final Records
1. OVERVIEW. At the end of the Regional/Divisional competition all teams will be ranked against each other using the following criteria:
   a. Wins
   b. Head-to-Head Tiebreaker
   c. Strength of Schedule
   d. Net Point Differential
   e. Opponents' Strength of Schedule
   f. Modified Net Point Differential (excluding the top and bottom Point Differential)
   g. Other tiebreaker criteria as necessary, determined by the Competition Coordinators.
2. CRITERIA IN RULE T5.1 LISTED IN ORDER OF PRECEDENCE.
   a. If a team's rank is determinable based on wins alone, none of the other criteria shall be considered.
   b. Where exactly two (2) teams accumulate the same number of wins, and these tied teams have faced each other, the result of that trial (the "head-to-head round") prevails. The team that won the majority of ballots in the head-to-head round is taken to be the higher-ranking team, regardless of any other tiebreaker criteria.

i. Where an even number of ballots are being used at the trial in which the two teams in question have faced each other, the head-to-head tiebreaker is voided if the decision was split (i.e. each team won the same number of ballots outright, excluding tied ballots). Where such a situation occurs, the next tiebreak criterion will be applied.

c. Where more than two teams accumulate the same number of wins, and Rule T5.1.2b does not apply, those teams will be ranked by their SOS, in descending order.
   i. If the number of teams which accumulate the same number of wins and the same SOS is exactly two, the head-to-head tiebreaker will be invoked as per Rule T5.1.2b.

d. Where more than two teams accumulate the same number of wins and the same SOS, those teams will be ranked by their net point differential, in descending order.
   i. If the number of teams which accumulate the same number of wins and the same SOS is exactly two, the head-to-head tiebreaker will be invoked as per Rule T5.1.2b.

e. Where more than two teams accumulate the same number of wins, the same SOS and the same net point differential, those teams will be ranked by their OSOS, in descending order.
   i. If the number of teams which accumulate the same number of wins, the same SOS and the same net point differential is exactly two, the head-to-head tiebreaker will be invoked as per Rule T5.1.2b.

f. Where more than two teams accumulate the same number of wins, the same SOS, the same net point differential and the same OSOS, those teams will be ranked by their modified net point differential. The modified net point differential for a team is equal to the team's net point differential, excluding the highest and lowest point differentials. Teams are ranked by modified net point differential in descending order.
   i. If the number of teams which accumulate the same number of wins, the same SOS, the same standard net PD and the same OSOS is exactly two, the head-to-head tiebreaker will be invoked as per Rule T5.1.2b.

g. Where more than two teams remain equally ranked, the Competition Coordinator will determine the means by which the tie is broken, if applicable. The method used will be communicated to teams.

3. STATE COMPETITION ADVANCING TEAMS. Two teams will advance to compete in the Championship Round of the State Competition
   a. Eligibility. The two highest-ranked teams from the State Competition will advance to the Final Round of Competition.

T5.2 – Individual Awards

1. INDIVIDUAL AWARD COMPONENTS CALCULATED ON A PER-SIDE BASIS. Totals and ratios calculated in this Rule are calculated on a per side basis. This means that a student's judge nominations on the Plaintiff and Defense, as well as side-constrained ballot totals, are tracked separately.

2. CALCULATION.
   a. Judge Nominations. Each ballot at a tournament shall contain six ranks for individual participants. Students will receive points for each time that a judge lists them in a given nomination slot, as follows:
      i. #1 Attorney/Witness - 4 points
      ii. #2 Attorney/Witness - 3 points
      iii. #3 Attorney/Witness - 2 points
   b. Side-Constrained Ballot Total. Students will receive an additional point to their total for a given side for each ballot won by their team on that of the case. Students earn 0.5 points for each ballot tied by their team on a given side.

3. AGGREGATION. The totals calculated in Rules T5.2.1-T5.2.2 are then added together.

4. LISTS. The aggregated totals calculated in Rule T5.2.3 will be used to produce a ranked list of the best attorneys and witnesses at each competition.

a. Two ranked lists for each of Best Attorneys and Best Witnesses, for the Plaintiff side and the Defense side will be produced. Therefore, it is possible for a student to earn a best attorney/ witness award on both sides of the case.

T5.3 – Championship 'Final' Round

1. FORMAT. The Championship 'Final' Round trial of the State competition will be conducted in the same format as a standard trial, with the following exceptions:
    a. Scoring. Each judge will be asked to submit a ballot. The team which accumulates the highest number of ballot wins in the Championship Round trial (irrespective of prior performance at the competition) will be declared the winner of the competition.
    b. Tied Wins. Where both teams accumulate the same number of ballot wins, the team with the greater net point differential in the Championship Round trial only (irrespective of prior performance at the competition) will be declared the winner of the competition.
    c. Tied Wins + Net Point Differential. Where both teams accumulate the same number of ballot wins, and equal net point differentials, judges will be asked to cast a vote for the team that they believed performed the strongest in the trial. The team which accumulates the most votes will be declared the winner of the competition.