

Federal Court of Canada Toronto, ON February 24, 2024

Official Factum Score Sheet

Team #:		Party (check one):	Appellants Respondent	Raw Score:	/100
Judge's comments:					
 Instructions: Each factum judge shall, in his or her sole discretion, give each factum a raw score out of 100. When judging Respondents' factums, factum judges shall take into account the fact that Respondents' counsel have had the opportunity to see and learn from the Appellants' factums. Factum judges shall not adjudicate or assess any penalties against factums. Completed factum score sheets shall be disclosed to the teams concerned after the competition. 					
Scoring guide: 90-100: outstanding; 80-89: excellent; 75-79: very good; 70-74: good; 60-70: fair; 50-59: poor; 0-49: unacceptable.					
Optional Scoring Worksheet This worksheet identifies various characteristics of effective written advocacy. Judges may use it as a scoring aid. Scores should be based on a holistic assessment; no particular weight is assigned to individual elements.					
Element				Judge's	notes
Overview. Does this section state clearly and concisely what the case is about and why the party should win; begin to convince the court that ruling for the party will be legally correct and morally right; and provide a clear road map?					
Statement of Facts . Does this section demonstrate that the factual elements necessary for the relief sought are present (or not, as may be the case for the Respondent); tell a story that shows that ruling in the party's favour is the just thing to do; present only the facts relevant to the proceeding; and present them in a logical way that supports a suitably chosen central theme or themes that correspond(s) to the central issue(s) in the appeal?					
Questions in Issue. Does this section state the questions in issue concisely and accurately, and (Respondent only) state concisely the Respondent's position with respect to the Appellant's statement of the questions?					
most important product of exha principles and p the applicable la difficult points, I generalization a is reviewable an	issues; present or ustive legal resea olicies, their inter- aw as clearly as pr less to minor poin nd undue abstract ad on what standa	show the court how to reach the really the strongest arguments, in an arch; demonstrate a thorough under relations and implications; make et arcticable and apply it to the pertine ts; exhibit originality and creativity tion; show whether and how the courd, and the effect of the error; and responsive position?	order likely to persuade, represer standing of the relevant issues, r ffective use of relevant authoritie ent facts; devote more space to r while respecting existing law; av- burt below went wrong, whether	nt the rules, es; state more oid over- the error	
Order Sought. Does this section state the order sought exactly and concisely, in language that could be inserted directly into the order or judgment?					
weaknesses understaten • Does it effer side? • Is it written avoiding sup first" writing	of the party's ownent? ctively capture the clearly, concisely, perlatives and sup p)? Does it make of	ir and honest with the facts, author in case? Does it avoid overstatement "moral high ground" by showing to, in plain English, using direct and a perfluity? Does it state each point beffective use of headings (e.g. to exe use of transitions? Is it free of types.	nt and make effective use of the phat fairness and justice are on the active language where possible, a defore developing or discussing it short)? Is it well organized, coher	power of ne party's and ' ("point- rent and	
		Judge's Name			