

SCORING MATERIALS

In addition to these instructions, you can find the following materials on your Judges Portal on the ILSA website:

1. Memorials to be scored.
2. Scoresheets
3. Bench Memorandum
4. Information on deadlines and how to return scores to the Administrator.

The Problem and the Corrections & Clarifications can be found online at www.ilsa.org/judges/.

ANONYMITY

All Jessup Competition judging is done anonymously. You will not know what school or country you are judging until after the Competition concludes in April.

THE SCORING SYSTEM

Your total score for each Memorial should be between 50 and 100 points, 100 points being a perfect score. It is extremely rare for a Memorial to score a perfect 100, and just as rare for a Memorial to score the minimum 50.

We strongly encourage you to use the five optional evaluation criteria listed on the scoresheet.

BENCH MEMORANDUM

The purpose of the Bench Memorandum is to familiarize judges with the facts and legal issues of the Jessup Problem. We highly encourage review of the Memo prior to evaluating Memorials.

WHAT YOU WILL NOT NEED TO EVALUATE

Certain technical aspects of the Memorial are governed by the Official Rules, and will be evaluated by the Executive Office, including:

1. Typeface
2. Type size
3. Memorial length
4. Inclusion of required constituent parts.
5. Line-spacing
6. Proper identification of Memorials on Cover Page

Penalties for violations will be deducted from the judges' scores by ILSA. Judges should not review Memorials for compliance with formatting rules.

WHAT YOU WILL BE EVALUATING

Five general evaluation criteria have been identified on the Memorial Scoresheet. Please note the following with respect to three of the criteria:

Extent and use of research. Teams are required to include footnotes and an Index of Authorities in their Memorials to identify the authorities that support their legal arguments. The Index of Authorities is intended to be useful to judges. The content of the Index may be considered by judges to help evaluate the extent of research conducted.

The quantity of authorities should be carefully examined. Judges should consider whether each listed authority was necessary, or whether the Index has been “padded” to give a better impression of the research effort.

Judges should also consider the quality of each authority. In international law, the various weights of different legal authorities are different than in most domestic legal systems. For more background, please refer to the section of the Bench Memorandum that provides a general overview of international law.

Clarity and organization. Judges should look at the use of headings, paragraph structure, logical placement of arguments, location of constituent parts, etc. Please remember, though, that typeface and other formatting features are evaluated and penalized by the Administrator, and thus should not factor into your score.

Substantive, affirmative legal argument or legal interpretation of the facts of the Problem may only be presented in the “Pleadings” part of the Memorial. Summaries of arguments may be included in the Questions Presented and the Summary of Pleadings.

Style, Grammar and Citation of sources. Judges should evaluate the use, format, and content of citations. Teams are required to cite all authority in footnotes, and to list all sources in an Index of Authorities. In their citations, teams must provide a “description of each authority adequate to allow a reasonable reader to identify and locate the authority in a publication of general circulation.”

Teams may use any citation system that meets this standard.

Students are required to submit the final work for the International Competition in English, but are permitted to use translators as long as the translation does not change the substance of the Memorials. Not all teams, of course, can afford this option. ILSA is allowed to reveal, upon your request, whether a Team represents a school where the language of instruction is English. You may take this into account in evaluating the grammar and language of a team’s Memorials.

COMPLETING THE SCORESHEET

Please make sure a scoresheet is completed and signed for each Memorial evaluated. Please make sure that the team numbers match the Memorials that were evaluated. If you utilize the optional criteria, please double-check your math. A mistake in calculating the sum of the subscores will not be remedied during the scoring process. The score at the top of the scoresheet will prevail even if the subscores add up to a different number.

RETURNING THE SCORES

Please record your scores on your Judges Portal on the ILSA website. We encourage you to keep a copy as a back-up in case of software failure.

The deadlines for different Memorials will vary, due to the different dates of different National Competitions.

CONCLUSION

If you enjoyed the experience and would like to ensure that you are invited to judge future Jessup Competitions, please contact the ILSA Office to sign up as a Friend of the Jessup. The Friends of the Jessup is a worldwide network of volunteers that consists of Jessup judges and supporters worldwide. We will add you on to our contact list, and you will receive Competition updates and invitations to judge at all levels of the competition.

Again, we appreciate the work and time you have given to the Jessup Competition. We hope you found the experience worthwhile, and we very much look forward to working with you again in the future.

CHECKLIST FOR SCORING MEMORIALS

1. Table of Contents

- 1.1. Do the headings and sub-headings in the Table of Contents lay out a readily understandable, clear structure of the arguments on each of the issues?
- 1.2. Is each heading and sub-heading forceful and affirmative?

2. Index of Authorities

- 2.1. Does it contain all legal authorities cited in the Memorial?
- 2.2. Are the citations adequate to allow a reasonable reader to locate the authority?
- 2.3. Does each entry reference the memorial page where it is cited?

3. Questions Presented

- 3.1. Do they clearly and accurately set out the legal issues?
- 3.2. Are the questions drafted in a neutral but persuasive manner?

4. Statement of Facts

- 4.1. Is it limited to the stipulated facts from the Compromis and its Corrections and Clarifications and necessary inferences from those facts?
- 4.2. Does it draw any unreasonable inferences?
- 4.3. Does it contain any unsupported facts, distortions of stated facts, argumentative statements, or legal conclusions?

5. Summary of Pleadings

- 5.1. Does it coherently tie together the most important arguments of fact, law and policy?

6. Pleadings, including Conclusion and/or Prayer for Relief

- 6.1. Is the organization of the arguments under each section clear and logical?
- 6.2. Do alternative arguments contain an independent basis for deciding the issue?
- 6.3. Do the pleadings focus primarily on the main arguments critical to the case?
- 6.4. Does it contain legally correct arguments that nevertheless are not relevant?
- 6.5. For each issue – is there a clear statement of the rule(s) relied upon?

- 6.6. Is there an appropriate amount of authority with appropriate explanations in support of the existence of the rule(s) relied upon, including examples of actual state practice, judicial and arbitral decisions, opinions of leading publicists, etc.?
- 6.7. Is the cited authority of sufficient weight within the confines of Article 38 of the Statute to support the advocated conclusion?
- 6.8. Does it adequately apply the facts to the rule relied upon or just argue by assertion?
- 6.9. Does it use policy arguments to reinforce the arguments based upon legal authority?
- 6.10. Does it openly confront and deal with weaknesses on the law and on the facts?
- 6.11. Does each citation contain adequate information to locate the authority?
- 6.12. Are the arguments clear and easily understandable?
- 6.13. Overall, are the arguments persuasive on the facts, law and policy?

7. General

- 7.1. Is the Memorial well written, well edited and professional in appearance?
- 7.2. Does the Memorial demonstrate extensive research and a sound understanding of the applicable law?
- 7.3. Overall, is the Memorial persuasive?