

Round B AM

Round B AM Session

Room _____ University (Red) = _____ University (Blue)

Blue
University Name
University

AM Session

Judge's Name :

Main Category	Sub-Category	Aspects for Evaluation	Score															
A. Preparatory Memorandum, Meeting with President Prior to Negotiation	(1)	Does the preliminary memorandum explain the objectives of the negotiation and the reasons (interests) underlying those objectives? Are the objectives and the reasons reasonable? Did the five-minute explanation to the President set forth a clear plan for the negotiation in an easy to understand fashion? In the remaining five minutes with the President, did the team confirm the necessary items, including the objectives for the negotiation and the reasons for those objectives?	<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. Negotiation	(2) First Half (AM Session)	Was the preparation adequate? Did the team prepare an agenda for the negotiation? Is the team constructing their negotiation in accordance with the agenda? Is the team taking the initiative in the negotiation?	<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.														
(3)	Is the team seeking to establish a better working relationship with the other side? Is the team striving to establish mutual understanding and mutual trust?	<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)	Is the team aiming for a win-win solution?	<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)	In view of the objectives for the negotiation, are the discussions effective? Does the team understand the reasons (interests) of its own side? Is the team seeking to discover the reasons of the opposing side? Is the team setting forth alternative(s) in a flexible manner? Is (Are) the alternative(s) reasonable? Is the plan for the negotiation working? Is the team responding flexibly to the approach of the other side? (Performance of strategy)	<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. Speech; Attitude	(6)	Are team members speaking clearly, in a confident manner? Have team members been overly conciliatory, or have they become overly excited or emotional, or confused? Are the team's speech and attitude (manners) appropriate for business persons handling negotiations?	<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. Efforts at Explaining; Ease of Understanding	(7)	Is the team explaining its purposes, views, etc., in an easy to understand fashion? Is the team undertaking efforts (such as by use of handouts, visual aids, etc.) to explain in an easy to understand fashion?	<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. Questioning the Other Side; Building the Relationship	(8)	Is the team asking questions effectively, so as to understand the other side's views and statements? Has the team been able to build a working relationship with the other side, so as to facilitate smooth negotiations? Has mutual distrust or mutual dissatisfaction, or misunderstanding, arisen?	<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; Division of Responsibility	(9)	Is each member of the team appropriately performing the role corresponding to his or her position in the company? Is the division of responsibility appropriate? Have only certain team members been dominating, 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.														
G. Negotiation Authority; Ethics	(10)	Is the team exceeding its authority or engaging in negotiations that depart from its BATNA? Has the team committed ethical violations?	<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.