￼￼￼2024 CLIENT INTERVIEW COMPETITION

| **Team Name:** | | **Judge:** | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Round:** | | **Date and Time:** | | |
| **CRITERIA** | **PERFORMANCE**  (Please DO NOT circle or mark this column) | | **COMMENTS**  (These are released to competitors) | **SCORE** |
| **Problem Analysis** | **Needs work** (1 mark)   * Questions were sporadic and uncorrelated, unclear and may have confused the client.   **Average** (2 marks)   * Understood a few of the main facts, questions followed up some loose ends.   **Good** (3 marks)   * Followed multiple lines of questioning, followed the client's story and identified key points of contention.   **Very good** (4 marks)   * Identified a clear timeline of events (if relevant) and worked with the client to ensure their understanding was correct.   **Excellent** (5 marks)   * Presented logical and clear lines of reasoning, relevant to what the client has said. Questions made sense to the client. | |  | **/5** |
| **Secret Facts** | **Found none** (0 marks)  **Found one** (1 mark)  **Found less than half** (2 marks)  **Found half *(round up)*** (3 marks)  **Found most** (4 marks)  **Found all** (5 marks) | |  | **/5** |
| **Working Atmosphere** | **Needs work** (1 mark)   * Unengaging and uncaring of the clients personal demeanour.   **Average** (2 marks)   * May have insulted/scared/intimidated/annoyed the client more than once, did not build a positive environment.   **Good** (3 marks)   * Accommodated to the clients personal demeanour.   **Very good** (4 marks)   * Used an appropriate tone and style to work with and not against the client.   **Excellent** (5 marks)   * Engaged well with the client and were able to be ‘on their side’ so as to work effectively. | |  | **/5** |
| **Structure of the Interview** | **Needs work** (1 mark)   * Too casual and informal, bad connection with the client * Interview went over-time   **Average** (2 marks)   * Decent communication and a somewhat logical structure, although at some points the flow/structure of the interview was lost or interrupted.   **Good** (3 marks)   * Professional greeting and introduction, interview flowed logically and aided the questioning.   **Very good** (4 marks)   * Effective conclusion and explanation of their understanding to the client, as well as a good use of time allocation with the client.   **Excellent** (5 marks)   * Also advised the client of the next step in regards to their case | |  | **/5** |
| **Teamwork & Professionalism** | **Needs work** (1 mark)   * Worked as two individuals and had a poor connection with the client   **Average** (2 marks)   * Partners may have cut each other off several times or followed completely separate lines of questioning/given conflicting information to the client.   **Good** (3 marks)   * Good body language and clear, as well as professional and situation-relevant language   **Very good** (4 marks)   * Appropriate tone and remarks, worked well as a team.   **Excellent** (5 marks)   * Team members did not cut each other off, worked harmoniously together with relevant questions following each other. | |  | **/5** |
| **Post-Interview Reflection** | **Needs work** (1 mark)   * Inaccurate fact summary, omitted the merits of the claim   **Average** (2 marks)   * Weak fact summary, some inconsistencies   **Good** (3 marks)   * Accurate account of the facts and/or timeline * Made an evaluation of the client's personality and ability to pay   **Very good** (4 marks)   * Well articulated and organised summary, with clear points of contention   **Excellent** (5 marks)   * Also identified issues that may need further determination before taking the case | |  | **/5** |
| **Additional Comments: TOTAL SCORE: /30** | | | | |