￼￼￼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**  |