| _ | | | - | | | _ | | - 4.4 | Oh a at fan Dh | | | | | Matab Ma | | Red Co. | | Blue Co |
|-------------------|----------|----------|---------|-----|-----|------------------------------|---|-------|----------------|-----|---|-----------|---|----------|--------------|-----------|---|-------------|
| Rou | nd A | | English | | sn | Evaluation Sheet for Blue Co | | | | | 0 | Match No. | | <u></u> | | | | |
| Round Language | | ⊕ | [| | Co. | | | | | | | | | | | Universit | y | Team |
| ludes | 0 0 | | _ | | | | | | 0 0 | | θ | O | Θ | | | | | |
| University | _ | | _ | 0 0 | 0 0 | 0 0 | | | 0 0 | - 1 | | | | | Judge's Name | | | Total Score |
| Team | θ | Φ | 0 | Φ | 9 | © | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | | | | | | | | |
| Match No. | 9 6 | | | | | | | | 9 | · I | | | | | | | | |

| No. | Category | Aspects for Evaluation | | Score | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------------------|--|------|-------|------|-----|------|----------|----------|----------|-------|------|
| | Persuasiveness | On each issue, is the brief well founded with respect to facts, legal provisions | 1 | 1.5 | 2 | 2.5 | 3 | 3.5 | 4 | 4.5 | 5 | |
| 1 | of | and other authorities? | Φ | Φ | 0 | Ø | Θ | Φ | Θ | © | Θ | |
| | the Brick | Is it logical and persuasive? | Poor | | Fair | | Avg. | | Exc. | O | ıtst. | |
| | Exapression | Does the brief use adequate and precise expression? | 1 | 1.5 | 2 | 2.5 | 3 | 3.5 | 4 | 4.5 | 5 | |
| 2 | and Organization | Is it easy to read and comprehend? | θ | Φ | Θ | 0 | θ | © | Θ | © | Θ | 1 |
| | of the Bnef | Is it well organized? | Poor | | Fair | | Avg. | | Exc. | O | ıtst. | İ |
| | | Were necessary facts and the legal basis for the claim and/or defense presented | 1 | 1.5 | 2 | 2.5 | 3 | 3.5 | 4 | 4.5 | 5 | |
| 3 | Issue 1 | clearly and at an appropriate time? | Φ | Φ | 0 | 0 | θ | Φ | Θ | © | 3 | |
| | | Overall, was the team's argument persuasive? | Poor | | Fair | | Avg. | | Exc. | O | ıtst. | |
| | | Were necessary facts and the legal basis for the claim and/or defense presented | 1 | 1.5 | 2 | 2.5 | 3 | 3.5 | 4 | 4.5 | 5 | |
| 4 | lasue 2 | clearly and at an appropriate time? | θ | Φ | Φ | 0 | θ | © | Φ | © | 0 | |
| | | Overall, was the team's argument persuasive? | Poor | | Fair | | Avg. | | Exc. | O | .tst. | |
| | Response | | 1 | 1.5 | 2 | 2.5 | 3 | 3.5 | 4 | 4.5 | 5 | |
| 5 | to | Did the team respond to the arbitrators adequately and promptly? | θ | Φ | Θ | 0 | θ | © | Φ | © | 9 | |
| | Arbitrators | | Poer | | Fair | | Avg. | | Exc. | Q | rtst. | |
| | Reponse to | Did the team understand the given facts accurately and sufficiently? | 1 | 1.5 | 2 | 2.5 | 3 | 3.5 | 4 | 4.5 | 5 | |
| 6 | Counterparty's | Did they research and present appropriate information on the | Φ | Φ | θ | 0 | θ | Θ | Θ | © | Θ | |
| | Argument | factual background? | Poor | | Fair | | Avg. | | Exc. | O | rtst. | |
| | | Did the team understand the given facts accurately and sufficiently? | 1 | 1.5 | 2 | 2.5 | 3 | 3.5 | 4 | 4.5 | 5 | |
| 7 | Facts | Did they research and present appropriate information on | θ | 0 | Θ | 0 | θ | Φ | Θ | © | Θ | |
| | | the factual background? | Poor | | Fair | | Ave | | Exc. | Oi | ıtst. | |
| | Opening and | Was the opening statement effective in conveying the overall picture of the team's | 1 | 1.5 | 2 | 2.5 | 3 | 3.5 | 4 | 4.5 | 5 | |
| 8 | Closing | arguments? Was the closing statement effective, reflecting the discussions at the | Θ | 0 | 0 | 0 | Φ | Φ | Θ | © | Θ | |
| | Statement | hearing? Did the team use time effectively? | Pocr | | Fair | | Avg. | | Exc. | O | rtst. | |
| | Presentation | Did the team members speak in a clear and confident manner? | 1 | 1.5 | 2 | 2.5 | 3 | 3.5 | 4 | 4.5 | 5 | |
| 9 | Speech | Did the team members become excessively excited, emotional or confused? | θ | 0 | Θ | 0 | θ | Θ | Θ | © | (3) | ì |
| | Attitude | Were the team's speech and attitude appropriate as attorneys in arbitration? | Poor | | Fair | | Avg. | | Exc. | Oı | stst. | L_ |
| | Tgamwerk | Did each member of the team perform his or her role appropriately? | | | 2 | 2.5 | 3 | 3.5 | 4 | 4.5 | 5 | |
| 10 | TOUR!!! | ым овыт топом от по тови рополить и нег тов вругорищегу? | θ | 0 | Θ | 0 | θ | 0 | Φ | © | 6 | |
| | | Did any member perform too dominantly, or make no contribution? | Pecr | | Fair | | Avg. | | Exc. | Oı | itst. | ł |

< 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 privided in the far right column shall constitute the final score for that category.

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 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 judges 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

Bad