| Round B | | Е | English | | Evaluation Sheet for Red Co. | | | | | Mate | ch No | Re | | | Blue C | | |
|------------|-----|-----|---------|-----|-------------------------------|------------|------------|----|--|------|-------|----|--|-------|------------|---|------------|
| Deved | | | Deto | | | | | | | | | | | EL : | | | |
| Round | (A) | | Red C | | B | | | | | | | | | | University | | Team |
| Judge | 0 0 | 2 | | 4 | | | D 8 D 8 | | | 2 | 3 | | | | 2 2 2 | | |
| University | 0 0 | | | 4 (| 56 | _ | D 8 D 8 | 9 | | | | | | Judge | e's Name | Т | otal Score |
| Team | 0 | 0 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | D (| 9 | 10 | | | | | | | | | |
| Match No. | 0 0 | | | | | 6 6 | D (8) | 9 | | | | | | | | | |

| No. | Category | Aspects for Evaluation | | Score (3 is average) | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------------------------|--|------|----------------------|-----------|------|------|-------|------|------|--------|--|--|
| 1 | Pre-Memo | Does the preliminary memorandum set forth a clear plan for the negothiation? | 1 | 1.5 | 2 | 2.5 | 3 | 3.5 | 4 | 4.5 | | | |
| | | Did the team set and understand the objectives for the negotiation reasonably? | Poor | 1. 5 | Fair 2 | 2. 5 | Avg. | 3. 5 | Exc. | 4. 5 | Outst. | | |
| 2 | Objective, | Was the team's strategy appropriate to achieve the goals of the negotiation? | 0 | (1.5) | 2 | 2.5 | 3 | 3.5 | 4 | 4.5 | (5) | | |
| | Strategy | Did the team aim for a win-win solution? | Poor | | Fair | | Avg. | 0.0 | Exc. | | Outst. | | |
| | | Under the objectives and strategy for the negotiation, were the discussions | 1 | 1. 5 | 2 | 2. 5 | | 3. 5 | | 4. 5 | 5 | | |
| 3 | Effective | effective? Did the team propose alternatives in a flexible and appropriate | 0 | (1.5) | (2) | 2.5 | (3) | 3.5 | 4 | 4.5 | (5) | | |
| | Discussion | manner? Did the negotiation strategy work well? Did the team respond flexibly? | Poor | | Fair | | Avg. | | Exc. | | Outst. | | |
| | Relationship | Did they make guestions effectively, so as to understand the other side's views | 1 | 1. 5 | 2 | 2. 5 | | 3. 5 | 4 | 4. 5 | 5 | | |
| 4 | with | and interests? Did mutual distrust or mutual dissatisfaction arise? Did the team | 0 | 1.5 | 2 | 2.5 | 3 | 3.5 | 4 | 4.5 | 5 | | |
| | 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 | | Did the team compromise too easy? | 0 | 1.5 | 2 | 2.5 | 3 | 3.5 | 4 | 4.5 | 5 | | |
| | 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 | 41- 0 | a score of 2.5 should ordinarily be given (the score may be adjusted. | 1 | 1.5 | 2 | 2.5 | 3 | 3.5 | 4 | 4.5 | 5 | | |
| | 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 | Explanation | their views in an easy to understand fashion? Did they unintentionally become | 0 | 1.5 | 2 | 2.5 | 3 | 3.5 | 4 | 4.5 | 5 | | |
| | Attitude | 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 | 1.5 | 2 | 2.5 | 3 | 3.5 | 4 | 4.5 | 5 | | |
| | 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 | 1.5 | 2 | 2.5 | 3 | 3.5 | 4 | 4.5 | 5 | | |
| | Assignments | Did any member perform too dominantly, or make no contribution? | Poor | | Fair | | Avg. | | Exc. | | Outst. | | |
| 10 | Negotiation Authority. | Did 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 | Ethics | BATNA? Did the team perform ethically? | Poor | القاب | Fair | 4.0 | Avg. | الو.ق | 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