Rou	nd B	E	inglis	h	Eva	aluat	tion S	Sheet f	or Blu	ue Co		Match N	0			Red	Co.	Blue	Co.
Round Language	(h) (l) (l) (l) (l) (l) (l) (l) (l) (l) (l		Red (		<b>⊕</b>								<u>.</u>			Unive	rsity	Team	1
Judge	0 0				(d)		000	B (D)		<b>(D)</b>	D				1				
University	000	<u> </u>	3	<b>(</b>		<b>®</b>		D (D) D (D) D (D)	4				-	Ju	ıdg	e's Name		Total Sco	e
Match No.	000	_		_		_	_	D (D)						·					

No.	Category	Aspects for Evaluation			Score							
				1.5	2	2. 5	3	3 5	4	4. 5	5	
1	Pre-Memo	Does the preliminary memorandum set forth a clear plan for the negothiation?	0	€.	2	<b>(</b> )	3	<b>(D)</b>	<b>(</b>	<b>(15)</b>	<b>(</b>	
			Poor		Fair		Αvg.		Exc.		Outst.	
	Objective	Did the team set and understand the objectives for the negotiation reasonably?	1	1 5	2	2 5	3	3 5	4	4 5	5	
2 Objective	Objective,	Was the team's strategy appropriate to achieve the goals of the negotiation?	0	<b>(</b>	0	0	3	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b> 5	<b>6</b>	
	Strategy	Did the team aim for a win-win solution?	Poor		Fair		Avg.		Exc.		Outst.	ļ
	F# ather	Under the objectives and strategy for the negotiation, were the discussions	1	1 5	2	2. 5	3	3. 5	4	4. 5	5	
3	Effective	effective? Did the team propose alternatives in a flexible and appropriate	0	0	0	<b>(</b>	3	<b>(D)</b>	<b>(</b>	<b>(15)</b>	<b>6</b>	1
	Discussion	manner? Did the negotiation strategy work well? Did the team respond flexibly?	Poor		Fair		Avg		Exc		Outst.	l
	Relationship	Did they make questions effectively, so as to understand the other side's views	1	1. 5	2	2. 5	3	3. 5	4	4 5	5	
4	with	and interests? Did mutual distrust or mutual dissatisfaction arise? Did the team	0	<b>(</b> )	0	<b>(D)</b>	3	3	<b>(</b>	<b>4.</b> 5	<b>6</b>	
	Counter party	succeed in building a good working relationship with the other side?	Poor		Fair		Avg.		Exc.		Outst.	
	Result of	Judging from the team's objectives, did the team maximize its interests?	1	1.5	2	2. 5	3	3. 5	4	4 5	5	
5	Nonetation	Did the team compromise too easy?	0	<b>(</b> 3	0	<b>2</b> 5	3	<b>3</b>	<b>(</b>	<b>(D)</b>	<b>(5)</b>	į
	Negotiation	Did the negotiations result in a win-win solution?	Poor		Fair		Avg		Exc.		Outst.	
	Outline of	Does the outline accurately reflect all the agreed points? If no outline is drafted,	1	1.5	2	2 5	3	3 5	4	4 5	5	
6 the	the Agreement	a score of 2.5 should ordinarily be given (the score may be adjusted	0	0	0	<b>(</b> )	3	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4.</b> D	<b>(</b>	ļ
	the Agreement	depending on the reason of the non-agreement).	Poor		Fair		Avg.		Exc.		Outst	[
	Speech	Did the team members speak in a clear and confident manner? Did they explain	1	1 5	2	2. 5	3	3 5	4	4. 5	5	,
7	7 Explanation Attitude	their views in an easy to understand fashion? Did they unintentionally become	0	0	0	<b>(25)</b>	3	<b>(D)</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4.</b> D	Θ	
		too emotional? Were the speeches & manners appropriate for business?	Poor		Fair		Avg.		Exc.		Outst.	
	Report to	Did the team report the results of negotiation clearly and sufficiently? Did the	1	1. 5	2	2. 5	3	3 5	4	4 5	5	
8	President	team respond to the President's or the Judges' questions appropriately? Did they	0	<b>(</b> )	2	<b>(D)</b>	3	<b>3.</b> 5	<b>(</b>	<b>(15)</b>	<b>(</b>	i
	Self-evaluation	analyze their own performance objectively and understand good and bad points?	Poor		Fair		Avg.		Exc.		Outst	
	Teamwork	Did each member of the team appropriately perform his/her own role?	1	1 5	2	2. 5	3	3 5	4	4. 5	5	
9	Role	Was the assignment of responsibility appropriate?	0	0	0	<b>D</b>	3	<b>(D)</b>	<b>(</b>	<b>(D)</b>	0	
	Assignments	Did any member perform too dominantly, or make no contribution?	Poor		Fair		Avg.		Exc.		Outst.	
	Negotiation	old the team perform within its authority? Did the team make a deal worse than	1	1 5	2	2. 5	3	3. 5	4	4 5	5	
10 Auth	Authority,	Did the team periorn within its authority? Did the team make a deal worse than	0	<b>(</b> )	2	<b>(</b> )	3	<b>3</b>	<b>(</b>	<b>(</b> )	<b>(</b>	
	Ethics	BATNA? Did the team perform ethically?	Poor		Fair		Avg.		Exc.		Outst.	

## < Remarks for Evaluation >

- 1) Evaluation should be made on an absolute basis (rather than in comparison with the other team).
- 2) Please mark the score and also write the score clearly for each item. You may award half-points, such as giving a score of 2.5 or 3 5 for an item Although the marked score and the written numerical score should be consistent, the numerical score provided in the far right column shall constitute the final score for that category.
- 3) In evaluating the team's performance, please take into consideration the composition of the team (i.e., whether it is composed of undergraduate students or graduate students or persons with legal practice experience). If the team's performance meets the judge's expectations for a team of that level, a score of 3 should be awarded. (If it exceeds that level, the score should be 4; if it greatly exceeds it, 5; if it falls below that level, 2; and if it falls far below that level, 1).
- 4) Please remember that "3: Good" is for average performance, in other words, 3 is the baseline.

  If the team includes members with experience in business or legal practice, please hold the team to a higher standard.
- 5) Evaluation should be made by each judge independently. However, to ensure accuracy and fairness, we ask the judges to share their views on the scores with each other prior to submitting the evaluation sheets.

Good