Room＿＿＿＿ ＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿ University (Red)＝＿＿＿＿＿＿＿ University (Blue)

	Blue
	University Name

PM Session

Judge's Name: University

Main Category	Sub-Category	Aspects for Evaluation	Score
A. Negotiations	(1)	Were the negotiation strategies effective? Did the team take the initiative in the negotiations? Did the team strive to establish mutual understanding and mutual trust? Did the team aim for a win-win solution? (Choices on strategy)	1 Poor — 2 Fair — 3 Avg. — 4 Exc. — 5 Outst.
	(2)	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 aproach of the other side? (Performance of strategy)	1 Poor — 2 Fair — 3 Avg. — 4 Exc. — 5 Outst.
B. Results of the Negotiation	(3)	Judging from the team's objectives, did the team maximize its interests? Did the negotiations result in a win-win solution?	1 Poor — 2 Fair — 3 Avg. — 4 Exc. — 5 Outst.
C. Report	(4)	Did the report to the President adequately cover essential matters with regard to the results of the negotiation? Did the team respond to the President's questions appropriately?	1 Poor — 2 Fair — 3 Avg. — 4 Exc. — 5 Outst.
D. Self-Evaluation	(5)	In the self-evaluation, did the team reflect on its own performance objectively, including both what it had done well and what it had done badly?	1 Poor — 2 Fair — 3 Avg. — 4 Exc. — 5 Outst.
E. Speech; Attitude	(6)	Did team members speak clearly, in a confident manner? Were team members overly conciliatory, or did they become overly excited or emotional, or confused? Were the team's speech and attitude (manners) appropriate for business persons handling negotiations?	1 Poor — 2 Fair — 3 Avg. — 4 Exc. — 5 Outst.
F. Efforts at Explaining; Ease of Understanding	(7)	Did the team explain its purposes, views, etc., in an easy to understand fashion? Did the team undertake efforts (such as by use of handouts, visual aids, etc.) to explain in an easy to understand fashion?	1 Poor — 2 Fair — 3 Avg. — 4 Exc. — 5 Outst.
G. Questioning the Other Side; Building the Relationship	(8)	Did the team ask questions effectively, so as to understand the other side's views and statements? Was the team able to build a working relationship with the other side, so as to facilitate smooth negotiations? Did mutual distrust or mutual dissatisfaction, or misunderstanding, arise?	1 Poor — 2 Fair — 3 Avg. — 4 Exc. — 5 Outst.
H. Teamwork; Division of Responsibility	(9)	Did each member of the team appropriately perform the role corresponding to his or her position in the company? Was the division of responsibility appropriate? Did only certain team members dominate, with other members not contributing much?	1 Poor — 2 Fair — 3 Avg. — 4 Exc. — 5 Outst.
I. Negotiation Authority; Ethics	(10)	Did the team exceed its authority or engage in negotiations that departed from its BATNA? Did the team commit ethical violations?	1 Poor — 2 Fair — 3 Avg. — 4 Exc. — 5 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.