

Round A

Room _____

University (Red)= _____

University (Blue) _____

Round A

			Red															
			University Name															
			University															
Main Category	Sub-Category	Aspects for Evaluation	Score															
A. Brief	(1) Persuasiveness	With respect to each issue, is the brief well founded with respect to facts, legal provisions and other authorities? Is it logical and persuasive?	<table border="0"> <tr> <td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td> </tr> <tr> <td>Poor</td><td>Fair</td><td>Avg.</td><td>Exc.</td><td>Outst.</td> </tr> </table>	1	2	3	4	5						Poor	Fair	Avg.	Exc.	Outst.
	1	2	3	4	5													
Poor	Fair	Avg.	Exc.	Outst.														
	(2) Expressions; Ease of Understanding; Organization	Is the brief free from careless errors and omissions? Is it easy to read and comprehend? Is it well organized?	<table border="0"> <tr> <td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td> </tr> <tr> <td>Poor</td><td>Fair</td><td>Avg.</td><td>Exc.</td><td>Outst.</td> </tr> </table>	1	2	3	4	5						Poor	Fair	Avg.	Exc.	Outst.
1	2	3	4	5														
Poor	Fair	Avg.	Exc.	Outst.														
B. Oral Argument	(3) Issue 1	Were necessary facts and the legal basis for the claim or defense presented clearly, and in a timely fashion? Overall, was the team persuasive?	<table border="0"> <tr> <td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td> </tr> <tr> <td>Poor</td><td>Fair</td><td>Avg.</td><td>Exc.</td><td>Outst.</td> </tr> </table>	1	2	3	4	5						Poor	Fair	Avg.	Exc.	Outst.
	1	2	3	4	5													
	Poor	Fair	Avg.	Exc.	Outst.													
(4) Issue 2	Were necessary facts and the legal basis for the claim or defense presented clearly, and in a timely fashion? Overall, was the team persuasive?	<table border="0"> <tr> <td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td> </tr> <tr> <td>Poor</td><td>Fair</td><td>Avg.</td><td>Exc.</td><td>Outst.</td> </tr> </table>	1	2	3	4	5						Poor	Fair	Avg.	Exc.	Outst.	
1	2	3	4	5														
Poor	Fair	Avg.	Exc.	Outst.														
(5) Facts	Did the team understand the given facts accurately and sufficiently? Did they research and present appropriate data?	<table border="0"> <tr> <td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td> </tr> <tr> <td>Poor</td><td>Fair</td><td>Avg.</td><td>Exc.</td><td>Outst.</td> </tr> </table>	1	2	3	4	5						Poor	Fair	Avg.	Exc.	Outst.	
1	2	3	4	5														
Poor	Fair	Avg.	Exc.	Outst.														
	(6) Laws	Did the team analyze, understand and apply the appropriate provisions of the UNIDROIT Principles? Were their construction of the legal arguments and interpretation reasonable, or were they strained?	<table border="0"> <tr> <td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td> </tr> <tr> <td>Poor</td><td>Fair</td><td>Avg.</td><td>Exc.</td><td>Outst.</td> </tr> </table>	1	2	3	4	5						Poor	Fair	Avg.	Exc.	Outst.
1	2	3	4	5														
Poor	Fair	Avg.	Exc.	Outst.														
C. Opening Statement; Closing Statement	(7)	Was the opening statement effective in conveying the overall picture of the team's arguments? Was the closing statement effective, reflecting the discussions that took place during the hearing? Did the team make good use of time?	<table border="0"> <tr> <td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td> </tr> <tr> <td>Poor</td><td>Fair</td><td>Avg.</td><td>Exc.</td><td>Outst.</td> </tr> </table>	1	2	3	4	5						Poor	Fair	Avg.	Exc.	Outst.
1	2	3	4	5														
Poor	Fair	Avg.	Exc.	Outst.														
D. Presentation, Speech and Attitude	(8)	Did team members speak clearly, in a confident manner? Did team members become overly excited or emotional, or confused? Were the team's speech and attitude appropriate for lawyers conducting an arbitration?	<table border="0"> <tr> <td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td> </tr> <tr> <td>Poor</td><td>Fair</td><td>Avg.</td><td>Exc.</td><td>Outst.</td> </tr> </table>	1	2	3	4	5						Poor	Fair	Avg.	Exc.	Outst.
1	2	3	4	5														
Poor	Fair	Avg.	Exc.	Outst.														
E. Relationship to the Arbitrators	(9)	Did the team try to persuade the arbitrators, rather than their opponent? Did they respond appropriately to the questions of the arbitrators? Did they understand accurately the instructions given by the arbitrators?	<table border="0"> <tr> <td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td> </tr> <tr> <td>Poor</td><td>Fair</td><td>Avg.</td><td>Exc.</td><td>Outst.</td> </tr> </table>	1	2	3	4	5						Poor	Fair	Avg.	Exc.	Outst.
1	2	3	4	5														
Poor	Fair	Avg.	Exc.	Outst.														
F. Teamwork	(10)	Did each member of the team perform his or her role appropriately? Did only certain team members dominate, with other members not contributing much?	<table border="0"> <tr> <td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td> </tr> <tr> <td>Poor</td><td>Fair</td><td>Avg.</td><td>Exc.</td><td>Outst.</td> </tr> </table>	1	2	3	4	5						Poor	Fair	Avg.	Exc.	Outst.
1	2	3	4	5														
Poor	Fair	Avg.	Exc.	Outst.														

<Criteria for Evaluation>

5 points: Outstanding

4 points: Excellent

3 points: Average (Good)

2 points: Fair

1 point: Poor

<Remarks>

① Evaluation should be made on an absolute basis (rather than in comparison with the other team).

② Please mark the evaluation sheets clearly, by circling the score for each item. You may award half-points, such as giving a score of 2.5 or 3.5 for an item. You do not need to add up the total points.

③ In evaluating the team's performance, take into consideration the composition of the team (i.e., whether it is composed of undergraduate students or graduate students). 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.) Please remember please that "3:Good" is for average performances, 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.

④ Evaluations should be made by each judge independently. However, to ensure accuracy and fairness, we ask that judges share their views on the scores with each other prior to submitting the evaluation sheets.